

World Conference on Educational Sciences 2009

Predicting organizational trust level of school managers and teachers at elementary schools

Ali Erden^a, Hale Erden^b *

*Canbulat Ozgurluk Secondary School, Famagusta and 0090, North Cyprus
Ataturk Vocational High School, Nicosia and 0090, North Cyprus*

Received October 20, 2008; revised December 11, 2008; accepted January 02, 2009

Abstract

The main aim of this study is to determine which variable or variables are important for predicting organizational trust level at school managers (principals and vice principals) and teachers working and teaching at elementary schools of Ankara. 1239 managers and 8778 teachers from Ankara constitute the population of the study, which is a prediction study of correlation. There are 518 managers and 922 teachers from Ankara as samples. Two instruments, which are used for the purpose of this study, have been used for finding out the factors affecting trust and the features of trustee. Data have been interpreted by using multiple regression analysis on SPSS program. Tendency-to-trust as well as values and attitudes are essential predictors for managers and teachers from Ankara in order to explain the perception of trust.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Keywords: Trust, organizational trust, managers, teachers, elementary school.

1. Introduction

Human being is need of trust from birth to death. Trust is such a feeling that is demanded within the family, school environment, work life and among friends.

Trust is a subject of various social sciences and their disciplines to be search thoroughly such as social psychology (Lewicki and Bunker, 1996), sociology (Lewis and Weigert, 1985), economy (Williamson, 1993), organizational behaviour (Zaheer, McEvily and Perrone, 1998), strategical management (Barney and Hansen, 1994), international business (Inkpen and Currall, 1997)

Studies in relation to trust have been started in 1970 in fact. There are few previous studies regarding trust. Argyris, Likert and McGregor in 1960s showed that trust is an important variable of organizational effectiveness (in Dirks and Ferris, 2001, 450).

* Hale Erden. Tel.: +90 533 863 93 05

E-mail address: alierden14@msn.com & hale_cy@yahoo.com

Trust related studies have shown that trust is based on experience and it is learned. As life as a whole is considered a process of learning, trust has become true by being socialized in the early ages and then by being part of the social organizations. If trust which is gained in the earlier ages has been parallel to the trust which is gained at later ages, trust has become stronger, social stabilization has been increasing and trust has been transferred from one generation to another (Gokirmak, 2003, 134).

Trust is a root feeling for human beings. It has been almost in every section of emotional life (Inam, 2003, 22). In this sense, trust is a key concept for understanding human beings and social systems (Gibb, 1991). Voluntarily cooperation is required for having a qualified social life rather than requiring deterrent steps. Voluntarily cooperation can only be achieved by common values. Trust as a common value, orients human beings towards positive relationships and facilitates to form a good society (Tschannen-Moran ve Hoy, 2000, 546).

In societies where there is high trust, more responsibility can be given to lower levels of organizations; work conditions can be arranged based upon group work and a flexible understanding. In societies where there is low trust, employees are surrounded by bureaucratic walls. It is necessary to trust employees as grown-ups who assist in the society where they live. However, distrustfulness towards employees may cause to hinder job satisfaction (Fukuyama, 2000, 47). Human beings are the indispensable elements of organizations. Number of employees can be decreased in organizations but can not be abolished completely. Human relations in organizations, which can be considered as communication network, are intense (Basaran, 1989, 90). The invisible element maintaining healthy horizontal and vertical relationships in organizations is trust.

Trust is like a glue providing human beings to be tied up to each other as a group. Employees in organizations expect trust from managers before all else. Trust is accumulation of all behavior of managers. As managers treating sincere, open, consistent and foresighted towards the employees, trust will appear. Managers should behave respectfully to employees and put them in the decision making process. Winning someone's confidence is hard; but losing one's confidence is easy (O'Toole, 2002, 9). Trust has an important place in close relationships. If a person does not trust a person, the level of trust can be reduced. Nevertheless, people have tendency-to-trust others in general (Birtchnell, 1993, 184).

Trust has established a basis for safety, confidence and faith on employees against actions and intentions of inspectors, managers and leaders of organizations (Carnevale and Wechsler, 1992, 473). Employees defending their rights require a free environment and trust. Trust makes progress between two parties in environments where ideas can be shared freely, and where there is openness and respect. It is, at least, accepted as confidence and respect others' integrity, competence, truth and trustworthiness. At the same time, trusting to another party or to an organization may cause you to have risk for that party or organization or you may be vulnerable (Werhane, 1999, 238-239).

Organizational trust is a belief that an employee feels towards his/her organization (Mishra ve Morrissey, 1990; in Gilbert and Tang, 1998, 322). It shows the belief of employees towards organization's purposes and leaders regarding organizational actions having been for the benefit of the employees (Kim ve Mauborgne, 1993; in Gilbert and Tang, 1998, 322). Gilbert and Tang (1998, 321) have an effort to explain organizational trust in terms of individual based communication and demographic variables. Communication variables are harmony of working group, centralization of communication network and relation of mentoring. Demographic variables are age, gender, number of children, status, position in the organization (being at the temporary or permanent position) and ethnic origin. Organizational trust is a general belief and trustworthiness towards colleagues' and upper managers' capabilities and qualities. There are two dimensions of organizational trust which are interpersonal trust and trust to organization. Organizational trust consists of common opinions of employees regarding trustworthiness of different actors in the organization (Perry and Mankin, 2004, 281). Organizational trust can be described as making sure of other's behavior and statements and then considering them as good intentioned people (Firth-Cozens, 2004, 56). Individual trust is based on individual behaviour and relations whereas organizational trust is based on organizational behaviour and relations (Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis and Winograd, 2000, 37).

As trust does not have a common definition in the literature, there is not unity on what constitutes the structure of trust. Mishra (1996, 265) determined the dimensions of trust as competency, openness, care towards employees and trustworthiness. Trust is a multidimensional concept. Shockley-Zalabak and others (2000) added identity dimension to Mishra's dimensions of trust model, which are competency, openness, care towards employees and trustworthiness for identifying the dimensions of trust. Butler and Centrell (1984) determined the dimensions of trust as integrity, perfection, consistency, loyalty and openness (in Hosmer, 1995, 384; Korsgard, Schweiger and

Sapientza, 1995, 70). Butler (1991, 659) determined the dimensions of trust as perfection, consistency, justice, integrity, loyalty, openness, one's keeping word and respect. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999, 186) considered risk of vulnerability, benevolence, trustworthiness, competence, integrity and openness as dimensions of trust. Currall and Epstein (2003, 193) indicated that there is also confidence and risk in the structure of trust. Dunn (2000, 290) emphasized that trust have both cognitive and affective sides. Perfection and consistency constitute the cognitive sides of trust whereas integrity, loyalty and openness are the affective side of trust.

In general, dimensions of vulnerability, integrity, competence, consistency, loyalty, openness and care constitute the structure of trust.

As schools both socialize (Russell ve Holkner, 2000, 891) and prepare young generations for the future, they can contribute for building trust in the society. Schools should care some concepts such as democracy, tolerance and respect. Schools as organizations are more complex than other organizations as its complexity is due to its role and expectations into the society. Schools have influence on other organizations due to its place in the society. Also, schools can mediate people or organizations around them (Handy and Aitken, 1990, 32).

Tendency to feel distrust toward schools can happen with time. This may lead comprehensive section of the society unwilling to send their children to schools. Especially in extensive societies, tendency to feel distrust toward schools (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2000, 547) and complainings about traditional school procedures make people search for alternative schooling (Pehlivan Aydin, 2002, 29)

Lack of trust is a true barrier towards shaping many reforms. Traditional management applications have tendency to social departures and to emphasize differences among the groups which are competing each other. With traditional management applications, either low level of expectations of groups is met or distrustfulness appears. Democratic management requires increasingly trust atmosphere. Making decisions together and accepting managers' giving commonsensical decisions require trust. Teachers need to trust for applying innovations at schools. Applying innovative teaching methods such as collaborative learning emphasize decreasing alienation at schools and require teachers' trust to students (Tschannen-Moran ve Hoy, 2000, 548). Trust constitutes the invisible nature of relations at schools (Hargreaves, 2002, 405).

Teachers may not trust to students for some reasons. However, a teacher should be able to give tasks requiring a student's taking responsibility although that student is excessively lack of care. With this behaviour, the teacher expects seeing trust by the student. This behavior is the main feature of education. Teachers need to present their important expectations to students. Less important or unimportant expectations of teachers do not influence on students' behaviour (Lahno, 2001, 175).

Main resources of a school are teachers teaching there, students and the group which has interaction with that school. Effectiveness of a school has been determined by the shared values, expectations and fears of the school's main resources. The main task of a school manager is to build trust and widespread it (Morris ve Chamberlain, 1998, 26). Determining the effective school, trust is at the expressive activities dimension. Expressive activities form the system of norms and values. These activities are vital for developing the sense of social solidarity and creating the organizational culture (Balci, 2001, 9). Aydin (1991, 175), with the study of qualifications of an educational manager, found out that trust is an individual quality of a manager. Honesty and integrity are also qualities of a manager.

Studies show that small schools influence personality and social developments of the students based on their experiences (Ogulmus ve Ozdemir, 1995, 270). However, the ideas that number of students increase at schools parallel to population or large schools' allowing productivity bring widespread large schools. Developing relationships in large schools is highly difficult. Also, gained trust is not long term and it is not powerful (Karakaya, 2003, 171).

Parents need to trust schools to be able to cooperate. Level of trust influence the level of cooperation of parents with school. Trust here means to decide whether to cooperate or not to cooperate with school. Low level trust to a school may cause the low level cooperation of the parents. Parents' higher level of trust to school ensures cooperation (Rosenblatt ve Peled, 2002, 352-353).

Trust related studies in various disciplines have been found insufficient for three points. These points are definition of trust, creating trust dynamism and feelings. First of all, extensive differences in the definition of trust present a complex picture on what trust is. Second, how trust is shaped and what it is based on is not explained clearly. Finally, what roles feelings have on trust are not well clarified (McKnight, Cummings ve Chervany, 1998).

Development of trust at schools is a continuum rather than hierarchic. In this continuum, trust development has got stages. In these stages, the role of the trust can be hindered by the managers. There are variables at schools effecting trust at schools. One of these variables is related to the effect of teachers' experience on trust development. As teachers' experience increase, trust increases. Second, small schools help managers and teachers show their skills easily. Third, teachers of rural regions display close devotion towards their schools. Fourth, there is a difference between teachers' perception of trust and managers' perception of trust. Difference among the perceptions of trust is related to the nature of existent and loaded roles. In more confidential cases, managers make use of more knowledge to shape their decisions. Mostly, teachers form their perceptions according to the apparent decisions of the managers (Macmillan, Meyer ve Northfield, 2004, 290-292).

Schools are the organizations where human relations are intensive. Managers, teachers, other employees and students at schools as well as inspectors, parents and environment outside the school show the intensity of human relations. Human relations at schools require trust. Any kind of trust based problem at schools will affect the future via students. Through fast changes, trust for schools is an important issue, but it is getting difficult to gain trust from day to day.

The problem of this study is to determine the variables comparatively which are used for predicting trust at schools.

2.Purpose of the study

The main purpose of this study is to determine which variable or variables are important for predicting trust at schools. For this purpose:

1. Which one/s of the variables of tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes, gender, level of education, length of teaching at the same school, teaching seniority and school size is/are important for predicting organizational trust level of managers?
2. Which one/s of the variables of tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes, gender, level of education, length of teaching at the same school, teaching seniority and school size is/are important for predicting organizational trust level of teachers?

3.Significance of the study

Trust is an important subject of social and organizational life. Basic of trust has been started from the childhood years. Continuous and consistent relationship between mother and her baby provide seed of trust started. For developing high self-esteem with children, temper, democratic and supporter attitudes of parents are required. Carrying on the feeling of trust with the child, attitudes of close environment and teachers at school are also important besides parents' attitudes (Eldeleklioglu, 2004, 120).

Organizations, as organizations of relationships between human beings and group dynamism and at the same time, as organizations of where peculiar values of individuals and group dynamism are produced, are structures in which trust can be analyzed effectively (Erdem, 2003, 11). Employees develop their trust feeling when they perceive that organizational process and outcomes are dealing justly. When employees trust to their employers, they behave volunteer and willing apart from daily work necessities (Ozkalp and Kirel, 2003, 79).

Absence of trust at schools may cause conflict. Trust can be seen the most difficult and hard to achieve fact in the 21st. century. In this structure, it is necessary to understand the nature of trust at schools. School managers especially need to understand the dynamism of trust in order to maintain student success and development of the organization. However, trust has been the neglected subject upto now (Tschannen-Moran, 2004, xi-xii). This study has contributed to the managers and teachers in terms of understanding trust in educational organizations. Nevertheless, this study has contributed to developing an entire organizational trust perspective as it brings a relatively new and many-sided approach to the organizational literature.

4.Limitations

This study has been limited to the school managers and teachers working / teaching at elementary schools of Ankara, the capital city of Turkiye in 2006-2007 academic year.

5.Methodology

In this section of the study, information about research design, population and samples, data collection procedures, instrumentation and data analysis is given.

6.Research Design

As this study has aimed at determining the important variables for predicting organizational trust level at schools in accordance with perceptions of the samples, it is designed as prediction studies of correlation.

7.Population and samples

The target population of this study is school managers and teachers working/teaching at elementary schools Ankara.

Table 1: Distribution of School Managers and Teachers working/teaching at elementary schools of Ankara in 2006-2007 academic year

Districts	Principals		Vice Principals		Total	Teachers		
	Male	Female	Male	Female		Male	Female	Total
Total	385	33	641	180	1239	2377	6401	8778

Source: Data was obtained from the Director of National Education of Ankara province personally.

Table 1 shows that there are 418 principals and 821 vice principals; there are 1239 managers in total at the elementary schools of Ankara. There are 8778 teachers at the elementary schools of Ankara. 1026 of the managers are males and 213 of them are females. There are 33 female school principals. 6401 of the teachers are females and 2377 of them are males. Majority of the teachers are females whereas majority of managers are males.

As stratified sampling has been used for the school size variable, sample schools are categorized as school size variable. Sample schools are categorized as large schools, middle size schools and small schools.

Lee and Loeb (2000), with their studies in relation to effect of teacher attitudes to student achievement at Chicago elementary schools in terms of school size, categorized schools as small schools where there are 400 and less students; middle size schools where there are 401 and 750 students and large schools where there are 751 and more students. Eberts, Schwartz and Stone (1990, 6) have separated school size into 5 categories and emphasized that schools which have 0-199 students are small schools; schools which have 200-399 students are accepted as small-medium schools; schools which have 400-599 students are considered as middle size schools; schools which have 600-799 students are called middle-large schools and schools which have 800 and over students are accepted as large schools. As it is indicated in the literature there is not any definite numbers clarified for the school size. Criterion used for elementary schools of Ankara for the purpose of this study is that schools which have between 0 and 350 students are accepted as small schools; schools which have between 351 and 700 students are considered as middle size schools and schools which have 701 and above number of students are accepted as large schools. Table 2 shows the distribution of school managers at elementary schools of Ankara in terms of school size.

Table 2: Distribution of school managers working at elementary schools of Ankara in terms of school size in 2006-2007 academic year

School size	Principals				Vice principals				Total	
	M	%	F	%	M	%	F	%	N	%
Large	225	26.8	8	1.0	485	57.7	123	14.6	841	100
Middle size	105	38.3	12	4.4	116	42.3	41	15.0	274	100
Small	55	44.4	13	10.0	40	32.3	16	12.9	124	100
Total	385	31.1	33	2.7	641	51.7	180	14.6	1239	100

Table 2 illustrates that 385 of the managers who work at elementary schools of Ankara are males and 33 of them are females. 233 of the managers work at large schools; 117 of them work at middle size schools and 68 of them work at small schools. 641 of the vice principals are males and 180 of them are females. 608 of the vice principals work at large schools; 157 of them work at middle size schools and 56 of them work at small schools. Table 3 shows the distribution of teachers teaching at elementary schools of Ankara in terms of school size.

Table 3: Distribution of teachers teaching at elementary schools of Ankara in terms of school size in 2006-2007 academic year

School size	Teachers				Total	
	Male	%	Female	%	N	%
Large	1789	28.2	4563	71.8	6352	100
Middle size	425	24.3	1324	75.7	1749	100
Small	163	24.1	514	75.9	677	100
Total	2377	27.1	6401	72.9	8778	100

As it is illustrated in table 3 that 2377 of the teachers teaching at elementary schools of Ankara are males and 6401 of them are females. In other words, 72,9 % of them are females and 27,1 % of them are males. 6352 of the teachers teach at large schools; 1749 of them teach at middle size schools and 677 of them teach at small schools. 1789 of the teachers teaching at large schools are males and 4563 of them are females. 425 of the teachers teaching at middle size schools are males and 1324 of them are females. 163 of the teachers who teach at small schools are males and 514 of them are females. As the school size decreases, number of female teachers decreases proportionally. The number of the samples (managers and teachers) at elementary schools of Ankara in terms of school size is given in table 4.

Table 4: Distribution of samples at elementary schools of Ankara in terms of school size

School size	Principals		Vice principals		Total	Teachers		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female		Male	Female	
Large schools	71	2	152	39	264	102	260	362
Middle-size schools	61	6	68	25	160	77	238	315
Small schools	42	9	30	13	94	59	186	245
Total	174	17	250	77	518	238	684	922

Table 4 shows that there are 264 managers and 362 teachers as samples of large schools. 73 of the managers are principals and 191 of them are vice principals. 71 of the principals are males and 2 of them are females. 152 of vice principals are males and 39 of them are females. 102 of the teachers are males and 260 of them are females.

In middle size schools, there are 160 managers and 315 teachers. 67 of the managers are principals and 93 of them are vice principals. 61 of the principals are males and 6 of them are females. 68 of the vice principals are males and 25 of them are females. 77 of the teachers are males and 238 of them are females.

In the small schools, there are 94 managers and 245 teachers. 51 of the managers are principals and 43 of them are vice principals. 42 of the principals are males and 9 of them are females. 30 of the vice principals are males and 13 of them are females. 59 of the teachers are males and 186 of them are females. Number of questionnaires sent and how many of them are returned back are given in table 5.

Table 5: Proportion of questionnaires sent and proportion of their returning

School size	Position	No. of questionnaire sent			No. and percentage of questionnaires returned back					
		M	F	T	M		F		T	
					N	%	N	%	N	%
Large	Manager	223	41	264	159	71	38	93	197	75
	Teacher	102	260	362	145	142	228	88	373	103
Middle	Manager	129	31	160	91	71	24	77	115	72
	Teacher	77	238	315	117	152	173	73	290	92
Small	Manager	72	22	94	54	75	22	100	76	81
	Teacher	59	186	245	63	107	152	62	215	88
Total	Manager	424	94	518	304	72	84	89	388	75
	Teacher	238	684	922	325	137	553	81	878	95

In table 5, it is shown that all of the questionnaires returned back are evaluated. It can be seen in the table that most of the questionnaires were given back by the teachers. 95 % of the questionnaires were back by the teachers.

When we consider school size, 103 % of teacher questionnaires were back from large schools. In middle size schools, 92 % of teacher questionnaires were back. Similarly, 88 % of teacher questionnaires were back in small schools. 75 % of manager questionnaires were back in large schools. In middle size schools, 72 % of them were back. In small schools, 81% of manager questionnaires were back in small schools.

8. Instrumentation

There are two sections in the questionnaire: First section is called the factors affecting the trust which has two sub-sections as “tendency-to-trust” and “values and attitudes”. Second section is named as characteristics of trustee which has six sub-sections as “integrity, competence, consistency, loyalty, openness and care”. Reliability and validity studies of the study have been completed by the researcher (see table 6). 5-likert type questionnaire was used to determine the responses of the participants. First part of the questionnaire includes items starting from 1) strongly disagree; 2) rarely agree; 3) agree; 4) largely agree to 5) strongly agree. Second section of the questionnaire has the following levels: 1) never; 2) rarely; 3) sometimes; 4) usually; and 5) always. Validity of the questionnaire has been examined through factor analysis (through extraction method: principal component analysis). With this technique, it is examined whether each questionnaire measures one component or more than one component; in other words, it is examined whether each questionnaire has one dimension or not. Items which have below .45 factor loadings are eliminated from the questionnaire. Cronbach’s Alpha is used for determining the validity of sub-questionnaires, corrected item total correlation has been taken to see item discrimination of each item.

Questionnaire for determining organizational trust level. Questionnaire regarding factors effecting trust include two sub-questionnaires which are prepared independent from each other. Analysis results of reliability and validity studies of the sub-questionnaires are given in table 6.

Table 6: Explained total variance, reliability results and number of items in the questionnaire

Dimensions of the Questionnaire	Explained total variance	Reliability results (alpha)	Number of Items
Tendency-to-trust	39,26	.671	6
Values and Attitudes	60,70	.834	5
Integrity	56,34	.884	8
Competence	56,06	.881	8
Consistency	61,85	.842	5
Loyalty	57,32	.923	11
Openness	62,64	.952	14
Care	63,48	.942	11

9.Data Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was used for finding out which one/s of the variables tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes, gender, level of education, length of teaching at the same school, teaching seniority, managing seniority and school size are important for predicting trust at schools. SPSS statistical package was used for data analysis.

Factors Effecting Trust and Findings and Interpretations of Regression Analysis Results Regarding Relationship between Independent Variables and Trust

Multiple regression results regarding whether there is a significant relationship between managers' trust and tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes, gender, level of education, length of teaching at the same school, teaching seniority, managing seniority and school size are given in table 7.

Part and partial correlations between trust and predicting variables of tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes, gender, level of education, length of teaching in the same school, teaching seniority, managing seniority and school size of the managers working at elementary schools of Ankara show that there is a significance relationship between tendency-to-trust and trust (the relationship is positive and average; $r=.57$). When considering other variables, the relationship between two variables is $r=.26$ (see table 7). There is a significance relationship between values and attitudes and trust (the relationship is positive and average; $r=.66$). When considering other variables, the relationship between two variables is $r=.45$. There is not any correlation between trust and gender ($r=.00$), level of education ($r=.09$), length of teaching at the same school ($r=.00$), teaching seniority ($r=.06$) and school size ($r=.07$).

There is a positive but low relationship between trust and managing seniority ($r=.12$). When considering other variables, there is a significant relationship between two variables.

Table 7: Results of multiple regression regarding managers' predicting trust

Variables	B	Standard error	β	t	p	Part R	Partial R
Constant	73.168	15.926	-	4.594	.000	-	-
Tendency-to-trust	2,169	.412	.261	5.258	.000	.572	.261
Values and attitudes	4,825	.499	.480	9.677	.000	.658	.446
Gender	-3.902	3.088	-.050	-1.264	.207	.002	-.065
Level of Education	-3.917	2.866	-.015	-.783	.172	-.094	-.070
Length of teaching at this school	-.372	.234	-.070	-1.588	.113	-.002	-.081
Teaching seniority	-.338	.431	-.065	-.783	.434	-.064	-.040

	Managing seniority	.033	.455	.007	.073	.942	.118	.004
	School size	.909	1.572	.022	.578	.563	.065	.030
	R= .696 R ² = .483 F _(10, 379) =39.198, p= .000							
	Variables	B	Standard error	β	t	p	Part R	Partial R
Teachers	Constant	40.571	8.913	-	4.552	.000	-	-
	Tendency-to-trust	4,280	.270	.471	15.827	.000	.680	.473
	Values and attitudes	3,599	.315	.337	11.426	.000	.630	.361
	Gender	-.304	1.851	-.004	-.164	.870	.070	-.006
	Level of Education	-.997	1.564	-.015	-.637	.524	-.075	-.022
	Length of teaching at this school	.018	.208	.002	.091	.928	-.033	.003
	Teaching seniority	-.071	.206	-.016	-.349	.727	.016	-.012
	School size	.876	1.087	.019	.806	.420	.078	.027
	R=.732 R ² = .536 F _(8, 869) =125.508, p=.000							

There is a significant relationship between managers of elementary schools in Ankara and tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes, gender, level of education, length of teaching years at the same school, teaching seniority, managing seniority and school size (R=.696 R²=.483, p<.01). 48% of the variance in trust is associated with the variance in the tendency-to-trust and values and attitudes.

Beta (β) results show that predicting variables over trust for relative order of importance are values and attitudes, tendency-to-trust, length of teaching in the same school, teaching seniority, gender, school size, level of education and managing seniority. T-test results regarding significance of regression coefficients show that there is a significant relationship between tendency-to-trust and values and attitudes and trust. Other variables do not have significant relationship among trust.

Results of regression analysis between teachers’ trust and tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes, gender, level of education, length of teaching years at the same school, teaching seniority, and school size are given in table 7.

Part and partial correlations between trust and predicting variables of tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes, gender, level of education, length of teaching in the same school, teaching seniority and school size of the teachers teaching at elementary schools of Ankara show that there is a positive and average relationship between tendency-to-trust and trust (r=.68). When considering other variables, the relationship between two variables is r=.47 (see table 7). There is a significant relationship between values and attitudes and trust (the relationship is positive and average; r=.63). When considering other variables, the relationship between two variables is r=.36. There is not any correlation between trust and gender (r=.07), level of education (r=.08), length of teaching at the same school (r=.03), teaching seniority (r=.02) and school size (r=.08). There is a significant and high relationship between trust and tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes, gender, level of education, length of teaching in the same school, teaching seniority and school size of the teachers teaching at elementary schools of Ankara (R=.732, R²=.536, p<.01). 54% of the variance in trust is associated with the variances in the tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes, gender, level of education, length of teaching in the same school, teaching seniority and school size.

Beta (β) results show that predicting variables over trust for relative order of importance are tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes, school size, teaching seniority, level of education, gender and length of teaching in the same school. T-test results regarding significance of regression coefficients show that there is a significant relationship between tendency-to-trust and values and attitudes and trust. Other variables do not have significant relationship among trust.

Thompson, Joseph, Bailey, Worley and Williams (2000, 4) found out that there is not any significant relationship between gender and trust to employees, managers and organization. While having a search regarding trust to groups, Costa (2003, 115) found out that tendency-to-trust can only explain .10 of trust. Costigan, Ilter and Berman (1998; in Ozen, 2003, 188) explained that while explaining trust, cognitive processes based on organizational procedures are more effective rather than individual and affective characteristics of employees. Gunaydin (2001) found out that

there is not any significant difference between organizational trust and demographic variables such as gender, level of education, marital status, length of working in that organization and total work experience.

10. Conclusion

There is a positive and average relation among trust and prediction variables which are tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes for predicting organizational trust level of managers working at elementary schools of Ankara. There is not any significant difference between trust and gender, level of education, length of teaching at the same school, teaching seniority and school size. There is a positive but quite low relationship between trust and managing seniority. 48% of the variance in trust is associated with the variance in the tendency-to-trust and values and attitudes.

There is a significant relation between managers and teachers working / teaching at elementary schools of Ankara for predicting organizational trust level and variables of tendency-to-trust and values and attitudes.

There is a positive and average relation among trust and prediction variables which are tendency-to-trust, values and attitudes for prediction trust of teachers working at elementary schools of Ankara. There is not any correlation between trust and gender, level of education, length of teaching at the same school, teaching seniority and school size. 54% of the variance in trust is associated with the variance in the tendency-to-trust as well as values and attitudes.

References

- Aydin, M. (1991). *Egitim yonetimi*. Ankara: Hatipoglu Yayinlari.
- Balci, A. (2001). *Etkili okul ve okul gelistirme: Kuram, uygulama ve arastirma* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Barney, J. B. & Hansen, M. H. (1994). Trustworthiness as a source of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 175-190.
- Basaran, I. E. (1989). *Yonetim* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Gul Yayınevi.
- Birchneil, J. (1993). *How humans relate: A new interpersonal theory*. East Sussex: Psychology Press
- Butler, J.K. (1991). Towards understanding and measuring conditions of trust: evolution of a condition of trust inventory. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 643-663.
- Carnevale, D. G. & Wechsler, B. (1992). Trust in the public sector; individual and organizational determinants. *Administration & Society*, 23(4), 471-495. Retrieved April 5, 2005, from <http://infotrac.thomsonlearning.com>.
- Costa, A. C. (2003). Understanding the nature and the antecedents of trust within work teams. In B. Nooteboom and F. Six (Eds.), *The Trust Process in Organizations: Empirical Studies of the Determinants and the Process of Trust Development*, (pp.105-124). Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Currall, S. C. & Epstein, M. J. (2003). The fragility of organizational trust: lessons from the rise and fall of enron. *Organizational Dynamics*, 32(2), 193–206.
- Dirks, K. T. & Ferrin, D. L. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization Science*, 12(4), pp. 450-467.
- Dunn, P. (2000). The importance of consistency in establishing cognitive-based trust: A laboratory experiment. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 4, 285-306.
- Eberts, R. W., Schwartz, E. K. & Stone, J. A. (1990). School reform, school size, and student achievement. *Economic Review*, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, issue Q II, 2-15.
- Eldeleklioglu, J. (2004). Cocuklarda Ozguven gelismisi. *Journal of Gazi Educational Faculty*, 24(2), 111-121.
- Erdem, F. (2003). Orgutsel yasamda guven. In F. Erdem (Eds), *Sosyal bilimlerde guven*, (pp.153-182). Ankara: Vadi Yayinlari.
- Firth-Cozens, J. (2004). Organisational trust: the keystone to patient safety. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, 13, 56-61. Retrieved March 30, 2005, from www.qshc.com.
- Fukuyama, F. (2000). *Guven: Sosyal erdemler ve refahin yaratilmasi* (2nd ed.), (Cev.A. Bugdayci). İstanbul: Turkiye Is Bankasi Kultur Yayinlari.
- Gibb, R.J. (1991). *Trust: A new vision of human relationships for business, education, family, and personal living* (2nd ed.). California: Newcastle Publishing. Retrieved March 1, 2004, from <http://www.geocities.com/toritrust>.**
- Gilbert, A. J. & Tang, T. L. P. (1998). An examination of organizational trust antecedents. *Public Personnel Management*, 27(3), 321-336.
- Gokirmak, M. (2003). Kuresel kriz ve politikada guven. F. Erdem (Ed.). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Guven*. Ankara: Vadi Yayinlari.
- Gunaydin, S.C. (2001). Isletmelerde orgutsel adalet ve orgutsel guven degiskenlerinin politik davranis algısı ve isbirligi yapma egilimine etkisini inceleyen bir calisma. Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Yayimlanmamis Yuksek Lisans Tezi.
- Handy, C. & Aitken, R. (1990). *Understanding schools as organization*. London: Penguin Books
- Hargreaves, A. (2002). Teaching and betrayal. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and practice*, 8(3/4), 393-407.
- Hosmer, L. T. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 379-403.

- Hoy, W. K. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9, 184-208.
- Inkpen, A. C. & Currall, S. C. (1997). International joint venture trust: An empirical examination. In P.W. Beamish & J.P. Killing (Eds.), *Cooperative strategies: North American perspective*, (pp. 197-226). San Francisco: New Lexington Press.
- Inam, A. (2003). Herseyin basi guven. In F. Erdem (Eds.), *Sosyal bilimlerde guven*, (pp. 13-26). Ankara: Vadi Yayinlari.
- Karakaya, S. (2003). *Modernizm-postmodernizm ve ogretmen calisma kulturu*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing Press.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Schweiger, D.M. & Sapienza, H.J. (1995). Building commitment, attachment and trust in strategic desicion-making teams: the role of precedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal*. 38(2), pp.60-84.
- Lahno B. (2001). On the emotional character of trust. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 4, 171-189.
- Lee, V. E. & Loeb, S. (2000). School size in Chicago elementary schools: Effects on teachers' attitudes and students' achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(1), 3-31.
- Lewicki, R. J. & Bunker, B. B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organization: frontiers of theory and research*, (pp.114-139). California: Sage Publications.
- Lewis, J. & Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces*, 83, 967-968.
- Macmillan, R. B., Meyer, M. J. & Northfield, S. (2004). Trust and Its Role in Principal Succession: A Preliminary Examination of a Continuum of Trust. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 3(4), 275–294.
- McKnight, H., Cummings, L. L. & Chervany, L.N. (1998). Inital trust formation in new organization relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 473-490.
- Mishra, A.K. (1996). Organizational responses to crises: The centrality of trust. In R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organization: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, (pp.261-287). California: Sage Publications.
- Morris, L. & Chamberlain, J. (1998). Management in context: A personal vision. In H. Horne (Eds.), *The School Management Handbook* (5th ed.). London: Kogan Page.
- O'Toole, J. (2002). Guven yara aldiginda... *Personal Excellence*, 30, 9.
- Ogulmus, S. & Ozdemir, S. (1995). Sinif ve okul buyuklugunun ogrenciler uzerindeki etkisi. *Egitim Yonetimi*, 1(2), 261-271.
- Ozen, J. (2003). Orgute duyulan guvenin anahtar unsuru olarak orgutsel adalet. F. Erdem (Eds.). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Guven*, (pp.183-206). Ankara: Vadi Yayinlari.
- Ozkalp, E. & Kirel, C. (2003). *Orgutsel davranis*. Eskisehir: Anadolu Universitesi Yayinlari.
- Pehlivan Aydin, I. (2002). *Alternatif Okullar*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Perry, R.W. & Mankin, L.D. (2004). Understanding employee trust in management: Conceptual clarification and correlates. *Public Personnel Management*, 33(3), 277-290.
- Rosenblatt, Z. & Peled, D. (2002). School ethical climate and parental involvement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(4), 349-367.
- Russell, G. & Holkner, B. (2000). Virtual schools. *Future*, 32, 887-897.
- Shockley-Zalabak, P. Ellis, K. & Winograd, G. (2000). Organizational trust: What it means, why it matters. *Organization Development Journal*, 18(4), 35-48.
- Thompson, R.C, Joseph, K.M., Bailey, L.L., Worley, J.A. & Williams, C.A. (2000). *Organizational change: An assessment of trust and cynicism*. Virginia: National Technical Information Service.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, W.K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(4), 547-593.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, (Preface).
- Werhane, P.H. (1999). Justice and Trust. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 21, 237–249.
- Williamson, O.E. (1993). Calculativeness, trust and economic organization. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 34, 453-502.
- Zaheer, A., McEvily, B. & Perrone, V. (1998). Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organizational Science*, 9(2), 1478-1517.