

**A MULTIDISCIPLINARY ANALYSIS OF THE NATURE, MEANING,
AND MEASUREMENT OF TRUST**

Megan Tschannen-Moran
The College of William and Mary

and

Wayne K. Hoy
The Ohio State University

June 15, 2000

American society entrusts its children to schools to teach, guide, counsel, and protect. Yet we know very little about the nature of trusting relationships in a school once the children arrive and the doors are shut. Do the faculty trust one another and do they trust the principal? Do the teachers trust their students? What is the impact if students do not feel trusted by their teachers? Can students learn from teachers they don't trust? Trust is an important element in human learning because much of what is learned is based on the verbal and written statements of others that the learner is asked to believe without independent evidence (Rotter, 1967). Do parents trust their children's teachers and to what extent do the teachers trust the parents? What are the consequences if they do not? Have changes in society undermined the public's trust in the schools, and, if so, what can be done to begin to repair that trust? These are some of the questions that prompted this investigation.

This review brings to bear the literature on trust as it relates to relationships within schools. This analysis is a multidisciplinary one; that is, we draw upon the trust literature from psychology, sociology, philosophy, economics, organizational science, and education. It is an extensive review of both theoretical and empirical articles spanning the past four decades. Our understanding of trust is enriched by a wide variety of methodologies from experimental studies and surveys to interviews and longitudinal case studies. Articles were included that helped clarify the meaning of trust in an organizational setting, and informed the practice of trust in the context of K-12 schools. First, we examine the importance of trust in schools. Then, we explore the nature and meaning of trust--the facets, bases, and degrees of trust. Next we examine the dynamics of trust--initiating, sustaining, breaking and repairing trust. Finally, we synthesize the research on trust as it relates to organizational processes such as communication, collaboration, climate, organizational citizenship, efficacy and effectiveness.

TRUST AND SCHOOLS

Trust is pivotal as American society considers its schools. Baier (1986) defines trust as the reliance on others' competence and their willingness to look after rather than harm what is entrusted to their care.

Since the things we typically do care about and value include such things as we cannot single-handedly either create or sustain...we must allow many other people to get into positions where they can, if they choose, injure what we care about, since those are the same positions that they must be in order to help us take care of what we care about. (p. 236)

What we care about may be things tangible, such as our children or our money, or things intangible such as democracy, or norms of respect and tolerance. Schools look after all of these for our society, and consequently, the issue of trust is vital in the study of schools.

Schools are also vested with our increasing vision of equality. This has created new roles and expectations for our schools. Goodlad (1984) observed that society used to be content with schools that functioned to sort and rank students for various strata of our society. That goal is being supplanted by a newer goal of fostering equality of opportunity for all students, even those with disabilities or those from lower socioeconomic strata. And yet, schools struggle to realize these new aspirations. Almost a half century after the Brown decision to desegregate the schools, the dream of schools eliminating class distinctions and providing equal opportunities to learn seems far from becoming reality. The professional knowledge possessed by teachers is held suspect as much touted innovations (e.g. open classrooms or new math) fail to bring the dramatic results they promised (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Values promoted by schools may be at odds with the conflicted values of a diverse society. Growing distrust of schools is evidenced in the exploding population of people unwilling to entrust their children to schools at all. From a phenomenon that was virtually unheard of in the early 1980s, in 1997 an estimated 1.23 million American children were taught at home (Ray, 1997).

Lack of trust is a serious impediment to many of the reforms taking shape in American schools. Traditional management practices have tended to emphasize social distance and divergent interests among competing parties, and so they have engendered distrust or a low expectation of responsiveness on the part of other parties. New forms of governance are taking shape, with greater expectations of shared interests and goals, greater effectiveness, and greater flexibility to changing demands and environmental pressures (Powell, 1990, 1996). These new forms increasingly require an atmosphere of trust. Moves to site-based management and shared decision making require administrators to trust those who are granted decision-making discretion (Smylie & Hart, 1999). Including parents in school governance requires trust that they will be motivated to work for the common good, not just the narrow interests of their own child. As school reformers ask teachers to change their fundamental beliefs and instructional techniques, they need to have a community of support in which to challenge and debate new practices (Little, 1990; Putnam & Borko, 1997); this kind of community requires trust among teachers. And teaching methods that emphasize collaborative learning and reducing students' alienation by giving them a greater voice in their lives at school require teachers to trust their students. In short, for schools to realize the kinds of positive transformation envisioned by reform efforts, attention must be paid to issues of trust.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRUST

Trust is fundamental to functioning in our complex and interdependent society. We count on the people who grow and process our food and medicines to do so properly; we depend on those who build our houses to do so sensibly; we rely on other people with whom we share the roadways to obey traffic laws; we trust those who hold and invest our money to deal with us honestly; we depend on our

government to maintain the safety of our infrastructure and to protect us from aggressors. In short, in every facet of our lives we are dependent on other people to behave in accordance with our expectations. It is imperative that we have confidence that our expectations of other people will be met.

Trust is not a feeling of warmth or affection but the conscious regulation of one's dependence on another (Zand, 1971). In situations of interdependence, trust functions as a way of reducing uncertainty (Holmes & Rempel, 1989; Luhmann, 1979). The philosopher Baier (1986) has observed that we notice trust as we notice air, only when it becomes scarce or polluted (p. 234). As life has grown more complex, as changing economic realities and changing expectations in society have made life less predictable, and as new forms of information dissemination have increased both the desire for and availability of negative information, we are beginning to *notice* trust more.

Although themes of trust, betrayal, and suspicion have long been the subject of philosophers, poets, and politicians, the systematic study of trust by social scientists is of relatively recent vintage. In the late 1950s and early 60s, the empirical study of trust and mistrust was spawned, in part, out of the escalating suspicion created by the Cold War and by an optimism that science could find a solution to the dangerous and costly arms race that had resulted (Deutsch, 1958). Then in the late 1960s, in response to a generation of young people who had become disillusioned and suspicious of contemporary institutions and authorities, the study of trust changed to an individual focus, conceptualizing trust as a generalized personality trait (Rotter, 1967). By the 1980s, with soaring divorce rates and radical changes in the American family, research on trust next turned to interpersonal relationships (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Larzelere & Huston, 1980; Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). In the 1990s, with shifts in technology and society, trust has again emerged as a subject of study in sociology (Coleman, 1990), in economics (Fukuyama, 1995) and in organizational science (Kramer & Tyler, 1996; Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer, 1998).

Increasingly, trust is recognized as a vital element in well-functioning organizations. Trust is necessary for effective cooperation and communication, which are the foundations for cohesive and productive relationships in organizations (Baier, 1986; Parsons, 1960). It functions as a "lubricant" greasing the way for efficient operations when people can have confidence in other people's words and deeds (Arrow, 1974). Trust reduces the complexities of transactions and exchanges far more quickly and economically than other means of managing organizational life (Powell, 1990, 1996; Williamson, 1993). In ongoing relationships within organizations, the social network can exert both formal and informal control that encourages people to act in a trustworthy manner. There is incentive to behave in ways that are trustworthy, to develop a reputation for trustworthiness, and to reap the benefits of trusting relationships (Coleman, 1990; Fukuyama, 1995; Putnam, 1993).

To be effective and productive, schools, like other organizations, must be cooperative, cohesive, efficient, and well managed (Goldring & Rallis, 1993; Louis, Kruse, & Marks, 1996). Trust is pivotal in

the effort to improve education. And yet, trust seems ever more difficult to achieve and maintain. As changed economic realities and social problems have led to increasing expectations for schools, new standards and measures of accountability have emerged. Attention from the media has produced negative perceptions of the contribution schools are making to society and has led to increasing distrust of schools and their mission. In such a climate, the nature and meaning of trust in schools has taken on added urgency and importance.

The Cost of Distrust

Engendering distrust can be costly. As trust declines the costs of doing business increase because people must engage in self-protective actions and continually make provisions for the possibility of opportunistic behavior on the part of others (Limerick & Cunningham, 1993). In the absence of trust “people are increasingly unwilling to take risks, demand greater protections against the possibility of betrayal, and increasingly insist on costly sanctioning mechanisms to defend their interests” (Tyler & Kramer, 1996, pp. 3-4).

Distrust tends to provoke feelings of anxiety and insecurity, causing people to feel uncomfortable and ill at ease, and to expend energy on monitoring the behavior and possible motives of others (Fuller, 1996; Govier, 1992). When students feel unsafe, energy that could be devoted to learning is diverted to self-protection. People may use various means to protect themselves from the possible harm of the distrusted person and to minimize their vulnerability. Subordinates may withhold information, use pretense or even deception to protect their interests (Bartolme, 1989; Govier; Mellinger, 1956). Administrators and teachers often resort to alternative control mechanisms such as rules and the contractual agreements to protect themselves. Although such steps may be necessary and important, they are typically dysfunctional and counterproductive (Govier).

Distrust is not necessarily an irrational or unwise response but may be based on knowledge, experience, and a real difference in values (Barber, 1983). One of the most difficult things about distrust, however, is that once it is established it has a strong tendency to be self-perpetuating. When interacting with a distrusted person, even normally benign actions are regarded with suspicion. The behavior of the distrusted person is systematically interpreted in such a way that distrust is confirmed. “Distrust impedes the communication which could overcome it.... so that suspiciousness builds on itself and our negative beliefs about the other tend in the worst case toward immunity to refutation by evidence” (Govier, 1992, p. 56). Although we sometimes have no choice but to rely on someone we distrust, those are situations we normally would prefer to avoid.

There is a growing perception that American society has become increasingly distrustful of its institutions and leaders. Barber (1983) argued that this perception is the result not of less trustworthiness

on the part of particular people or institutions but of the rapid changes in our society. These changes include changing values, higher expectations, and a greater awareness of inequality on the part of the common person. Barber asserted,

There are at least three major reasons for the decline in public trust. One has to do with the ever more powerful knowledge that the professions now have to influence individual and public welfare. Another has to do with the increasing strength of the value of equality in our society, the increasing desire of the less powerful of all kinds to have a little more control over those whose greater power vitally affects them. Ours is revolutionary time for the value of equality. Finally, a third is the increased knowledge and competence that a better educated public brings to its relations with professionals and other experts and leaders. (p. 132)

Higher expectations create the demand for higher levels of trustworthiness from all citizens. These expectations are especially brought to bear on those who would educate our children. The actions of these professionals influence not only our children's current welfare, but their future potentialities as well.

THE MEANING OF TRUST: IT'S FACETS, BASES, AND DEGREES

Hosmer (1995) observed the difficulty of defining trust: "There appears to be widespread agreement on the importance of trust in human conduct, but unfortunately there also appears to be an equally widespread lack of agreement on a suitable definition of the construct" (p. 380). A review of articles on trust spanning the last four decades revealed a wide variety of definitions as well as a number of common aspects or facets of trust. Trust has been difficult to define because it is a complex concept. It seems by now well established that trust is a multi-faceted construct, which may have different bases and degrees depending on the context of the trust relationship.

We began the conceptual investigation of trust by searching the multidisciplinary literature for definitions. From a philosophical perspective, trust has to do with ethically and morally justifiable behavior (Baier, 1986; Hosmer, 1995), but in economic terms trust is a rational calculation of costs and benefits (Coleman, 1990; Williamson, 1993). In individual terms, trust is conceived as the extent to which an individual is willing to rely upon and make oneself vulnerable to another (Rotter, 1967; Frost, Stimpson, & Maugham, 1978). In an organizational context, trust is often a collective judgment that another group will not act opportunistically, is honest in negotiations, and makes a good faith efforts to behave in accordance with commitments (Bradach and Eccles, 1989; Cummings & Bromily, 1996). Table 1 summarizes the range of definitions of trust.

There are certain reoccurring themes that emerge regardless of the context of study, that is, whether philosophical, economic, organizational, or individual. Vulnerability is a general aspect of trust

that emerges among most definitions (Bigley & Pearce, 1998). The level of comfort a person feels in the midst of vulnerability speaks to the level of trust. Mishra (1996) suggests this comfort is based upon a belief or confidence that the other party is competent, reliable, open, and concerned. Honesty is yet another common feature of many of definitions of trust (Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Cummings & Bromily, 1996). Table 1 summarizes the extent to which each definition encompasses these aspects or facets of trust. The analysis of definitions led us to the following multidimensional definition of trust: ***Trust is one party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is (a) benevolent, (b) reliable, (c) competent, (d) honest, and (e) open*** (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998).

FACETS OF TRUST

A more complete comprehension of trust requires a depth of understanding of each facet. A strategy of facet mapping was used to capture the fullness of trust found in the extant literature (e.g. Clark & Payne, 1997; Levy & Guttman, 1985; Shye, 1978). Hence, we explore the key elements of trust. Moreover, there is empirical evidence that all of these facets are important aspects of trust relations in schools. A factor analytic study (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999) demonstrated that all of the facets covary together and form a coherent construct of trust.

Willingness to Risk Vulnerability. A necessary condition of trust is interdependence, where the interests of one party cannot be achieved without reliance upon another (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998). Where there is no interdependence, there is no need for trust. The degree of interdependence may alter the form trust takes. Interdependence brings with it vulnerability. Vulnerability in a matter of importance or value to the trusting person is assumed by most definitions of trust (Baier, 1986; Coleman, 1990; Deutsch, 1958; Mayer, Davis, Schoorman, 1995; Mishra, 1996; Zand, 1971). The trustor is cognizant of the potential for betrayal and harm from the other (Granovetter, 1985; Kee & Knox, 1970; Lewis & Weigert, 1985) and uncertainty concerning whether the other intends to and will act appropriately is the source of risk (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer). Risk is the perceived probability of loss, as interpreted by the decision maker (Coleman; Williamson, 1993). Risk creates an opportunity for trust, which leads to risk taking. Moreover, risk taking buttresses a sense of trust when the expected behavior materializes (Coleman). Trust, then, is a willingness to be vulnerable under conditions of risk and interdependence (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer).

Confidence. One of the early puzzles concerning trust was whether it was an individual's behavior or attitude in a situation of vulnerability. For example, when a parent leaves his or her child with a childcare provider but with significant misgivings, can the parent be said to have trusted the provider? By taking action the parent has voluntarily increased his or her risk to negative outcomes; however, he or she has done so with a certain level of anxiety. Deutsch (1960) suggested that when a

person makes a move that increases vulnerability to another, it is hard to infer the motivation for such a choice. The decision to place oneself at risk to another could be based on many factors including need, hope, conformity, impulsivity, innocence, virtue, faith, masochism, or confidence. Although the behavior of the parent who anxiously left the child with the caregiver was the same as that of a parent with no such misgivings, the level of trust is very different. There is growing consensus that trust lies in the degree of confidence one holds in the face of risk rather than in the choice or action that increases one's risk (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998). Confidence extends across a gap of time. Most interactions do not take place simultaneously but unfold over a matter of time. There is a lag between when a commitment is made and when the recipient knows that it has been fulfilled. The degree to which a person can rest in that uncertainty with a certain amount of confidence is the degree to which that person can be said to trust (Kee & Knox, 1970).

Benevolence. Perhaps the most common facet of trust is a sense of benevolence, the confidence that one's well-being, or something one cares about, will be protected and not harmed by the trusted party (Baier, 1986; Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Bradach & Eccles, 1989; Cummings & Bromily, 1996; Deutsch, 1958; Frost, Stimpson, & Maughan, 1978; Gambetta, 1988; Hosmer, 1995; Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Mishra, 1996; Zand, 1971). Trust is the assurance that the other will not exploit one's vulnerability or take excessive advantage of one even when the opportunity is available (Cummings & Bromily, p. 4). One can count on the good will of another to act in one's best interest. In an ongoing relationship the future actions or deeds may not be specified but only that there will be a mutual attitude of good will. It is the "accepted vulnerability to another's possible but not expected ill will" (Baier, p. 236). In situations of interdependence this faith in the altruism of the other is particularly important.

Reliability. At its most basic level trust has to do with predictability, that is, consistency of behavior and knowing what to expect from others (Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Hosmer, 1995). In and of itself, however, predictability is unsatisfying as a definition of trust. We can trust a person to be invariably late. Or we can count on someone to be consistently malicious, self-serving, or dishonest. When our well-being is diminished or damaged in a predictable way, our expectations may be met but the sense in which we trust the other person or group is weak. Reliability, or dependability, combines a sense of predictability with benevolence. In a situation of interdependence, when something is required from another person or group, the individual can be counted on to supply it (Butler & Cantrell; Mishra, 1996; Rotter, 1967). There is a sense of confidence that one's needs will be met. One need not invest energy worrying whether the person will come through or making mental provisions in case he or she does not.

Competence. There are times when good intentions are not enough. When a person is dependent on another but some level of skill is involved in fulfilling an expectation, then a person who

means well may nonetheless not be trusted (Baier, 1986; Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Mishra, 1996). For example, the patient of a young surgeon may feel that the doctor wishes very much to heal her, but if the doctor's success record has not been good, the patient may not feel a great deal of trust in the physician. Many of the situations in which we speak about trust in an organizational context have to do with competence. In a work context, if a person's or team's project depends on others, they may or may not feel an "assured confidence" that the deadlines will be met or that the products will be of adequate quality to complete the project.

Honesty. Honesty speaks to the person's character, integrity, and authenticity. Rotter (1967) defined trust as "the expectancy that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon" (p. 651). The implication is that statements made were truthful and conformed to "what really happened" at least from that person's perspective, and that commitments made about future actions would be kept. A correspondence between a person's statements and deeds characterizes integrity. An acceptance of responsibility for one's actions and avoiding distorting the truth in order to shift blame to another characterizes authenticity (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Many scholars and researchers see honesty as a pivotal facet of trust (Baier, 1986; Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Cummings & Bromily, 1996; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

Openness. Openness is the extent to which relevant information is not withheld; it is a process by which people make themselves vulnerable to others by sharing personal information with others, a giving of oneself (Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Mishra, 1996). Such openness signals a kind of reciprocal trust, a confidence that neither the information nor the individual will be exploited, and recipients can feel the same confidence in return. People who are guarded in the information they share provoke suspicion; people wonder what is being hidden and why. Just as trust breeds trust, so too does distrust breed distrust. People who are unwilling to extend trust through openness end up living in isolated prisons of their own making (Kramer, Brewer, & Hanna, 1996).

Although all these facets of trust are important and go together, the relative weight of the facets will depend upon the nature of the interdependence and the vulnerability in the relationship. For example, in a surgeon, competence is likely the prime concern, whereas, in an accountant, honesty is just as important as competence. In teachers and principals, all aspects of trust seem to carry significant importance (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

BASES AND DEGREES OF TRUST

Even once we have a common definition of trust, the reality of trust will not be the same in all times and in all places. The importance of each of the facets depends on the referent of trust (who is being trusted) and the nature of the interdependence between the parties. One is differentially vulnerable to an intimate friend, a boss, an investment broker, or a surgeon. Trust may be based on

one's disposition to trust, on moods and emotions, on values and attitudes, on calculative motives, on institutional supports for trust, on knowledge of, or a sense of identification with the other. Even within a single relationship, trust and distrust may be uneven. One must use wisdom to discern the optimal level of trust in any given relationship.

Disposition to trust. Certain people have an attitude that makes them inclined to extend trust more readily--a "disposition to trust" (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998). Rotter (1967) predicted that expectations growing out of people's history of experiences where others had either fulfilled or broken promises would generalize from one societal actor to another (e.g., from one's parents to teachers, doctors, the media, etc.). A child whose parents had been consistent would grow up to be generally trusting, while a child who had been regularly disappointed by broken promises would grow up with a generalized suspicion of people's motives and promises. A person with a disposition to trust would likely have both a faith in humanity, believing that others are typically well-meaning and reliable (Wrightsman, 1966), and a trusting stance, believing that, regardless of whether people are reliable or not, one will obtain better interpersonal outcomes by dealing with people as though they were well-meaning and reliable (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany).

A disposition to trust is particularly salient in making trust judgments when people do not know each other and no more specific situational information is available (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Rotter, 1980). A disposition to trust does not mean that people will be more gullible or exhibit what Deutsch (1958) called "pathological trust." Regardless of their trusting disposition, people are able to make use of information in a given situation and about the behavior of people in that situation to guide their actions. For example, when trust was studied using mixed-motive games, high trusters were more likely to make a cooperative initial move, but they did not continue to trust once they had been tricked. When the proportion of broken promises was varied in the game, the situational variable of promise credibility produced much stronger effects on participants' cooperative behavior than did disposition to trust (Schlenker, Helm, & Tedeschi, 1973). When behavioral measures of trust were used, generalized trust was related to the number of seconds it took for a person to fall backwards into the arms of a waiting partner but was not related to the willingness to disclose personal information to a stranger (Cash, Stack, & Luna, 1975). Trusting disposition, however, was found to have an impact on behavior. People with a trusting disposition tended to be more trustworthy than others, even when they could increase their gain by being untrustworthy; and suspicious people had a greater tendency to be untrustworthy in their choices (Deutsch, 1958, 1960; Rotter; Wrightsman). People who scored high in trusting disposition were less likely to lie, cheat, or steal. In general, high trusters seemed to be happier, to be more popular, and to be considered a better friend than low trusters; moreover, they were less likely to be conflicted, maladjusted, or dependent on others (Rotter; Wrightsman).

Moods and emotions. Moods and emotions can provide a powerful foundation of trust judgments because they provide signals concerning trust relevant information in ongoing relationships and situations (Jones & George, 1998). Emotions are intense affective states tied to particular events or circumstances that interrupt ongoing cognitive processes and behaviors, while moods are less intense, generalized affective states that are not explicitly linked to particular events or circumstances (Jones & George). People experience an emotional response to trust relationships because they are by definition in a position of vulnerability. When people feel a sense of confidence about those relationships, it is based in part on the assumption of genuine caring and concern for one's well-being by the other party which is likely to lead to liking that person (McAllister, 1995). There is not complete overlap, however, between trust and affection. Although several studies have found a correlation between trust and liking, especially where the dimension of benevolence has been assessed (Deutsch, 1958; Rotter, 1967), affection does not seem to be necessary for trust to develop. In a study of CEOs and their subordinates, Gabarro (1978) found that friendship often followed the establishment of trust. In some cases, however, trust based on competence, good judgment, or reliability was maintained in spite of personal dislike. In a mixed-motive game, participants reported having less liking for an opponent who chose an unconditionally cooperative strategy than for one with a conditionally cooperative strategy. Participants reported not understanding the motives of the unconditionally cooperative players and therefore liked them less (Soloman, 1960).

Values and attitudes. People make trust judgments, in part, on the basis of the assumption of shared values. Values are general standards or principles that are considered intrinsically desirable ends, such as loyalty, helpfulness, or fairness (Jones & George, 1998). Sitkin and Roth (1993) proposed that distrust would arise in an organizational setting when an individual or group was perceived as not sharing key cultural values. When a person challenges an organization's fundamental assumptions and values, that person may be perceived as operating under values so different from the group's that the violator's underlying world view becomes suspect (Gabarro, 1978; Lindsfold, 1978). Threat of future violations of expectations arises because the person is now seen as a cultural outsider, one who "doesn't think like us," and may therefore, do the "unthinkable" (Sitkin & Roth, 1993, p. 371). Attitudes are the knowledge structures containing the thoughts and feelings people have about other people, groups, or organizations and the means through which they define and structure their interactions with others. Attitudes are evaluative in nature and values are a key means people use to evaluate other people and organizations (Jones & George). Because relationships within organizations involve interdependence and a certain amount of uncertainty, the attitudes that people form toward each other in an organizational context are likely to contain information concerning the other party's trustworthiness based on perceptions of shared values. In schools research suggests that social trust between principals and teachers emanates from a variety of sources including fairness, a clear vision

that formed the basis of shared values, and consistency of behavior in living out the school ideals (Bryk & Driscoll, 1998; Bryk & Schneider, 1996; Evans, 1996; Smylie & Hart, 1999).

Trust and diversity. People have a tendency to extend trust more readily to people they perceive as similar to themselves—what Zucker (1986) called characteristic-based trust. This kind of trust is based on norms of obligation and cooperation rooted in social similarity, where similarity may depend on characteristics such as family background, social status, or ethnicity. Trust is more difficult in situations of diversity because people are uncertain about the cultural norms of others (Kipnis, 1996). People's knowledge of one another's culture may be limited and based on stereotypes or partial and misleading images. This can leave people unsure about what to expect.

In order to simplify a complexity of relationships, people tend to divide others into two groups: those with whom they share group membership, and those who are outside that group. Once others have been categorized, people make biased assumptions based on group membership about the others' values, preferences, behavior, and trustworthiness. People are more likely to regard out-group members with suspicion and to stereotype them more readily and negatively than in-group members. Biased attributions about the capabilities, intentions, and actions of out-group members can fuel feelings of distrust. People tend to attribute the motivations for the behavior of out-group members to underlying attitudes or values while for in-group members they are more likely to consider situational factors that might have influenced behavior (Allison & Messick, 1985). Furthermore, people are more likely to seek information that conforms to their attitudes about their own and other groups, and to discount information that disconfirms it (Klayman & Ha, 1997). Larson (1997) described a school administration's unwillingness to trust minorities. As a consequence, legitimate protest was defined as disruption meriting expulsion of students rather than a legitimate civil rights issue.

Group biases can be destructive not only by causing people to regard out-group members with suspicion, they can also lead to too much trust for in-group members. People develop a "leniency-bias" for members of the in-group (Brewer, 1995), and tend to give other in-group members the benefit of the doubt when confronted with information that might otherwise be viewed as diagnostic of a lack of trustworthiness. An overconfidence in the collective can lead individuals to "defer too readily to other members, and may inhibit expressions of doubt or engage in inappropriately severe self-censorship rather than press their claims as vigorously as they might" (Kramer, Brewer, & Hanna, 1996, p. 381). The resulting culture has been exposed as a factor in some disastrously poor decisions (Janis, 1982). In the Larson (1997) study of schools cited above, loyalty within the administrative team produced a "groupthink" orientation in which only a limited range of alternatives were considered, which led to a disastrous conflict with the civil rights leaders of the community.

Trust judgments based on similarity or group membership can have very real consequences on organizational functioning. In an organizational context, superiors expressed less trust for subordinates who were lower in job status or predominately from a minority group and they were consequently less

willingness to use participative approaches to decision making with these groups (Rosen & Jerdee, 1977). When teachers in an urban district made trust judgments about students and parents, socioeconomic status was a much starker dividing line of difference than race (Tschannen-Moran, 1998). American schools face increasing diversity of languages, ethnic groups, races, and socioeconomic status. This diversity brings a richness, but it also brings with it challenges in the development of trust. People who perceive themselves as different need time, support and structures to come to view themselves as part of the same collective.

Calculative trust. In calculative trust, individuals accept a certain level of vulnerability based on calculations of the relative costs of maintaining or severing the relationship (Williamson 1975, 1993). Trust is based on a rational choice, calculating that even based on strictly utilitarian motives it is to the other party's benefit to behave in a trustworthy manner because the costly sanctions in place for breach of trust exceed any potential benefits from opportunistic behavior (Gulati, 1995; Shapiro, Sheppard, & Cheraskin, 1992). This kind of trust is strengthened when the deterrent or punishment available if either party breaks trust is clear, possible, and likely to occur (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). If trust is defined as a positive expectation about another's motives, Rousseau, et al. (1998) have pointed out that reliance on strict controls and deterrents may not be trust at all but may be instead a low level of distrust. Calculative trust may remain the default value in an ongoing relationship if continued contact and communication do not result in increased trust.

Institution-based trust. When a person extends trust based on the belief that the necessary impersonal structures are in place to enable one to act in anticipation of a successful outcome, it is referred to as institution-based trust (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998; Shapiro, 1987; Zucker, 1986). Institution-based trust is supported by formal social structures that confer trust, such as having a license or certification to practice a profession, or mechanisms such as guarantees, insurance or contracts (Creed & Miles, 1996). Informal social structures also contribute to trust. The trustor feels assured that because of socially learned behavior patterns the trusted person will act according to the norms surrounding promise in the social setting or risk reaping sanctions through social disapproval (Baier, 1986). The individual's belief that the situation is "normal" provides additional comfort, enabling the person to readily accept interdependence with another person or party (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany). Institutional factors can act as broad supports that sustain a cycle of risk-taking and fulfillment that enables the development of knowledge-based trust (Gulati, 1995; Sitkin, 1995).

Knowledge-based trust. Knowledge-based trust emerges on the basis of the quality of the social exchanges in recurring interactions between trustor and trustee over time (Zucker, 1986). It takes root as actors get to know one another and come to feel able to predict how the other is likely to behave in a given situation. Reliability and dependability in previous interactions with the trustor give rise to positive expectations about the trustee's intentions. Knowledge-based trust grows through regular

communication and the expectation that good will be returned in kind (Creed & Miles, 1996). A kind of courtship takes place in which each party is careful not to violate the other's developing trust (Shapiro, Sheppard, & Cheraskin, 1992). The more points of contact parties have, the better the chances they will come to understand and be able to predict each others' behavior (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996; Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). A self-reinforcing pattern of trust emerges as repeated cycles of exchange, risk taking, and successful fulfillment of expectations strengthen the willingness of trusting parties to rely upon each other. Even unmet expectations can be survived when trust is based on history and knowledge of one another, particularly if parties make an effort to restore a sense of good faith and fair dealing to their interactions (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998). Knowledge that accumulates over repeated interactions where expectations are fulfilled leads to a reputation for trustworthiness, which can then facilitate and reinforce trust with others in a wider social context.

Uneven trust. As interdependent partners in an ongoing relationship gather experience with one another, they will come to have a growing pool of trust relevant evidence to draw upon. However, the trust picture that emerges may not be a simple one. Different levels of trust may emerge across different facets of trust. Relationships are multifaceted; therefore, parties may hold simultaneously different views of each other that may be accurate but, nonetheless, inconsistent among them. A person may come to trust another person in some areas of interdependence and not in others. "Within the same relationship, we have different encounters in different contexts with different intentions that lead to different outcomes. These encounters accumulate and interact to create a rich texture of experience" (Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998, p. 442). This rich texture is described as the "bandwidth" of the relationship, meaning the scope of the domains of interpersonal relating and competency that are relevant to a single relationship. As relationships mature, trust evolves from impressionistic and highly undifferentiated to more finely grained and differentiated among specific facets (Gabarro, 1978). Relationships mature with interaction frequency, duration, and the diversity of challenges that relationship partners encounter and face together in the process gathering greater specification and detail in trust relevant information (Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies).

For trust to form, it may not be necessary to have a high level of confidence in all facets, only in those areas where there is critical interdependence. There are crucial thresholds across which trust turns to distrust (Shaw, 1997), however, different facets of trust may have different thresholds depending on the level of reliance in that area and the consequences of one's expectations not being met. Lindsfold (1978) suggested that if a person's actions and intentions were perceived as benevolent, even if that person's credibility was less than perfect, he or she could nonetheless be trusted. In a study of CEOs and key subordinates, people tended to have a sense of which areas individuals could be relied upon and in which they could not. In that setting, the bottom line was competence. If the CEO did not develop a confidence in a subordinate's competence within the first few months, it was unlikely that the subordinate would remain with the company (Gabarro, 1978).

Unconditional trust. Unconditional or identification-based trust emerges when parties move beyond simple willingness to transact exchanges with one another provided each behaves appropriately to a state of trust where each comes to identify with the other. There is complete empathy with the other party's desires and intentions and there is mutual understanding such that each can effectively act in each other's stead (Jones & George, 1998; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996; Shapiro, Sheppard, & Cheraskin, 1992). Jones and George speculate that as a result of this mutual identification, organizational citizenship behavior improves in a climate of unconditional trust because individuals define their roles more broadly than expected job behaviors and duties. In an environment of unconditional trust, people are more likely to be open with information because they feel more confident that others will not exploit the information for their own benefit, especially when that knowledge (particularly if it is hard to come by) is a source of power. With unconditional trust, people will not hesitate to seek help because they won't fear that others will think they are inadequate. They will not feel threatened by being seen as dependent upon another person, nor be as concerned about incurring indebtedness to another person.

Optimal trust. What is the proper level of trust? Is more trust always better? Not necessarily. There are dangers in both trusting too much and trusting too little. Trusting too much provides too few incentives to deter opportunism and invests too many resources in creating or sustaining trust given the level of interdependence. If trust can be easily created, with little cost and without sustaining unacceptable risks, then overinvestment is not a concern (Wicks, Berman, & Jones, 1999). Trusting too little is undesirable because organizations miss out on the potential to use trust to lower costs as well as to enable certain organizational processes that would, if utilized, confer a competitive advantage (Barney & Hansen, 1994). Too little trust can also be dangerous because one's trust attitudes can be a self-fulfilling prophecy (Baier, 1994). Discerning the proper level of trust requires wisdom and discernment. Organizational members need to know not only when to trust others, and in what respects, but also when to monitor others closely (Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998). Optimal trust is defined as Aristotle's "golden mean" between excess and deficiency. "It implies that trust levels should be appropriate to the context and may fall anywhere on the spectrum, from minimal trust to high trust, depending on the person and situation" (Wicks, Berman, & Jones, p. 102). Trust needs to be tempered by a willingness to punish exploitive behavior. "A bias toward trust, shaped by prudence" offers an appropriate balance for organizational relationships.

The complexity of trust has perplexed scholars and researchers for decades. Greater understanding has led to a multifaceted picture of trust. Different bases of trust, different sources of trust relevant information, and uneven degrees of trust make it an even more challenging construct to grasp.

MEASURES OF TRUST

It is not surprising, with the complexity of the construct of trust, that researchers have struggled with how to capture it for study. As in the various definitions, each measure emphasizes different elements or dimensions of trust. Early measures of trust were experimental and conceived of trust as observable behaviors. These measures looked at trust reactions in interactions with strangers. As conceptions of trust became more refined, measures of trust shifted in focus to the relationships between specific persons. Paper-and-pencil questionnaires emerged, usually asking for respondents' level of agreement with a series of statements. The referents of these scales have varied, from judgments about "people in general" or various social actors (Heretick, 1981; Rotter, 1967) to specific intimate partners (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Larzelere & Huston, 1980; Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). Recent research on trust has focused on trust within organizations, spawning a number of organizational trust measures (Butler, 1991; Cook & Wall, 1980; Cummings & Bromily, 1996; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Shaw, 1997).

EXPERIMENTAL MEASURES OF TRUST

Deutsch (1958) measured trust as a rational choice to make a cooperative move in a two-person mixed-motive game. A mixed-motive game is a game where there is a possibility of mutually beneficial cooperation, but the temptation to compete to exploit another person's cooperation. If both parties select an uncooperative move, the result is mutual loss (Lindskold, 1978). Self-interest (maximization of gains) calls for eventual cooperation because the temptation to exploit the opponent inevitably results in the opponent imposing costs through defensive competition. These kinds of games are commonly referred to as Prisoner's Dilemma (PD) games because of a game originally published by Luce and Raiffa (1957). The PD game posits a player as a prisoner in custody who has been accused of a crime and who has been separated from his or her partner. The district attorney is certain the two partners are guilty of the crime but does not have enough evidence to convict them at trial. The prisoner faces a dilemma – to confess in exchange for leniency but a longer sentence for one's partner or to risk a longer sentence by not confessing and being betrayed by one's partner. If neither confesses they will be booked on some minor fabricated charge, and if they both confess they will be given less than the maximum sentence. Another version of this game frames the situation as two trucking companies that must share a single one-lane road to get goods in and out of their respective factories. Again, cooperation makes for mutual gain, while non-cooperation can lead to mutual destruction. Still, exploiting a cooperative partner leads to the greatest gain for any player.

The version of the mixed-motive game employed by Deutsch (1958, 1960) involved financial payoffs or losses. If both partners cooperated they each received \$9, however, if they each made an uncooperative choice, they both lost \$9. If one player cooperated and his or her partner did not, the

uncooperative partner gained \$10, and the cooperative player lost \$10. Thus, players were said to trust the other player if they made a cooperative choice because they had made themselves vulnerable to possible but not expected exploitation of the other player. Players were said to be untrustworthy if they took advantage of a partner's cooperative choice to increase their own gains at the expense of the partner. Games were played for either one or ten trials, and participants recorded not only their own choice but also what they expected the other player to choose. This simple game allowed for a number of experimental manipulations. Deutsch's work set off an avalanche of experiments using mixed-motive games. It has been estimated that, before they began to wane in popularity in the early 1980's, over 2,000 studies were conducted using these games (Dawes, Van de Kragt, & Orbell, 1990). Many of these studies were used to test alternative courses of action for breaking the cycle of suspicion and tension that had led to the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Despite the fruitfulness of the studies using mixed-motive games in supporting the tenets of suspicion reduction strategies, several researchers have questioned the validity of inferring trust and suspicion on the basis of observing participants' choice to cooperate or compete in a mixed-motive game. They complained that the participants in PD games reacted to the situation as a competitive game rather than an opportunity to be trusting or trustworthy (Dawes, et al., 1990; Fisher & Brown, 1988; Rotter, 1967). A person's competitive or cooperative behavior in a game situation may be of little predictive value concerning that person's trustworthiness in interpersonal relationships. A person may be intensely competitive and utilize all exploitative means within the rules of fair play of a sport or game and still be highly trustworthy when it comes to familial or work relationships. Or a person may be cleverly cooperative in a game of monopoly and nonetheless be dishonest or exploitative of coworkers or friends. In the PD games the opponent was a stranger who was often an accomplice of the experimenter or even an imaginary person played by a machine and whose play was frequently prescribed by a preordained strategy. The intentions of the other party had to be inferred from their behavior or from highly constrained communication. Although these conditions were believed to be faithful on some level to situations arising in foreign policy, they are not true to the conditions of most interpersonal relationships. Most relationships in which trust is of interest are ongoing relationships, and most take place in a social context where the consequences of untrustworthy behavior extend beyond the effects in the immediate situation. In defending against the charge of unreality of the games, researchers have reported that people were engaged enough in the game to report affective responses to the situations, either anger and betrayal (Deutsch, 1958) or liking and disliking (Soloman, 1960) in response to the game strategy of the other player regardless of whether the rewards were imaginary or real (Evans, 1964; Wrightsman, 1966). However, an emotional response on the part of players is not necessarily evidence that the games are a valid measure of people's true behavior because people have affective responses to competitive games as well as to real-life situations of betrayal or trust.

In addition to framing trust as making a cooperative move in a mixed-motive game, trust has been inferred from other behaviors as well. Trust was assessed as the number of seconds a person would wait before falling backwards into the arms of a partner (Cash, Stack, & Luna, 1975). Trust has also been measured as the willingness to disclose personal information either to a stranger (Cash, Stack, & Luna) or a group of strangers who had participated in trust-building exercises (Scott, 1980).

SURVEYS OF TRUST

Rotter (1967) introduced the use of a paper-and-pencil questionnaire to study trust as a personality trait. Rotter's interest was sparked by the cynicism and distrust of a generation of young people in the late 1960s who were alienated from the institutions of society. He conceived of trust as a generalized expectancy that others in various segments of society could be relied upon. Rotter's questionnaire asked participants to make judgments about the trustworthiness of a variety of social actors, including politicians, the media, parents, and people in general.

Although Rotter's work was a beginning, the notion of trust as a personality trait was not as predictive as anticipated. Thus the focus of the study of trust shifted to assessing individual perceptions of the characteristics and qualities of specific others (Clark & Payne, 1997). At first, the concern was for trust in intimate relationships sparked by soaring divorce rates and the toll that social changes were extracting on such relationships. Researchers asked participants to make judgments about the trustworthiness of a specific intimate partner (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Larzelere & Huston, 1980; Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985).

In the past two decades interest in trust has expanded to the study of trust as a collective property of organizations. Value accrues to organizations with high levels of trust by facilitating productive interpersonal relations (Arrow, 1974; Barney & Hansen, 1994; Coleman, 1990; Powell, 1990, 1996; Williamson, 1993). The hierarchical nature of relationships in a work setting complicates the study of trust because it affects the expectations of what people feel they owe to one another. Trust, between and within organizational levels, has been examined as perceptions of the characteristics of significant others within the work context. Some researchers have measured workers' trust in their employer (Athos & Gabarro, 1978), while others have examined both trust in peers in the workplace and in management (Cook & Wall, 1980; Hoy & Kipersmith, 1985). Cummings and Bromily (1996) measured trust between departments or units in an organization. In a school setting, Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) have assessed faculty trust in the principal and in colleagues, as well as trust in students and parents.

Not only have the referents of trust varied, the facets of trust these measures have sought to capture have varied as well. Various researchers have assessed benevolence, good will or positive intentions (Cummings & Bromily, 1996; Athos & Gabarro, 1978; Shaw, 1997). Others have included reliability, dependability or consistency (Butler, 1991; Cook & Wall, 1980; Cummings & Bromily, 1996;

Athos & Gabarro, 1978) as well as competence or the ability to achieve results (Butler, 1991; Cook & Wall, 1980; Shaw, 1997). Honesty or integrity has frequently been assessed (Butler, 1991; Cummings & Bromily, 1996; Athos & Gabarro, 1978; Shaw, 1997), while openness has much less frequently been included (Butler, 1991; Athos & Gabarro, 1978).

We have summarized and divided measures of trust into four categories in Table 2. First, we described the early experimental operational measures of trust; and then we examined three kinds of survey instruments. The survey measures are grouped according to the referent of trust—generalized trust, trust in intimate relations, and organizational trust. Finally, we list the dominant measures of trust in each category, specify the facets of trust tapped, as well as the nature and number of items for each measure.

Coping with the complexity of trust has been a challenge for all who study the construct. One must deal not only with a multiplicity of dimensions of trust, but also with the dynamic character of trust. The next section explores the changes trust can undergo over the course of a relationship.

DYNAMICS OF TRUST: INITIATING, SUSTAINING AND REPAIRING TRUST

Trust has been difficult to study, not only because it is a multi-dimensional construct, but it is a dynamic one as well. The nature of the vulnerability can change over the course of a relationship as the level of interdependence increases or decreases. Trust depends on what one expects of another based on norms of behavior or role expectations. In addition, most relationships of trust do not take place in a vacuum; they are embedded in social contexts that impose constraints, values, and sanctions that affect the trust relationship. Finally, relationships of trust ebb and flow as participants choose how to respond to instances of broken trust, either in engaging in the effort required to repair the relationship or to choose various forms of revenge. An understanding of the dynamic quality of trust is essential to understanding the construct.

Trust is a dynamic phenomenon that takes on a different character at different stages of a relationship. As a relationship develops, trust “thickens” (Gambetta, 1988). The bases of trust may change over time as the parties get to know one another. At the beginning of a relationship, trust will rely on deterrents or institutional structures. As the parties have experience with one another, trust based on knowledge of one another over the history of the relationship can develop. Finally, the partners may come to have a greater understanding and empathy for one another’s purposes and unconditional trust may come to characterize the relationship (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). During some periods of time a relationship may be ripe for rapid change. A fragile trust level is one that is likely to undergo large changes during a given time frame. It is unstable and may change quickly in either

direction. In contrast, there are likely to be stable periods in an ongoing relationship in which a robust trust level is evident (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998).

In a study of newly appointed company presidents and their key subordinates, Gabarro (1978) found that the nature of trust became more differentiated over time. In describing the stages of the development of working relationships, Gabarro found that in the beginning there was an initial period of impression making, followed by a period of more intense exploration. The exploration stage evolved into a third stage that was “characterized by tacit testing of the limits of trust and influence, and attempts to arrive at a mutual set of expectations” (p. 301). Most relationships that lasted for more than eighteen months became stable and underwent relatively little change thereafter. Similarly we expect that when new principals are appointed, their expectations of teachers and students will follow a similar path: initial impressions, exploration, limit testing, and stability.

Although theorists have proposed that trust grows gradually over time, several researchers have been surprised to find higher levels of initial trust than expected (Berg, Dickhaut, & McCabe, 1995; Kramer, 1994). In explaining this paradoxical finding, it has been suggested that when interacting with a stranger, people do not simply assume that the other is trustworthy, but instead suspend belief that the other is unworthy of trust (Jones & George, 1998). People overlook the possibility that the other may not share the same values. Luhmann (1979) explained that trusting another and assuming shared values is often preferred to initial distrust because trust is the easier option. Initial trust is not based so much on evidence as on the lack of contrary evidence (Gambetta, 1988). As parties interact, experience supplies facts that either reinforce the initial trusting assumptions or that quickly displace illusions of trustworthiness. Once people have evidence that leads them to perceive a value incongruence, distrust is likely to emerge (Sitkin & Roth, 1993). A person with a high disposition to trust is more likely to see good points and to overlook flaws in another person or situation that could threaten the development of trust (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998). In schools, we expect that high initial trust is a function not only of the efficiency of assumed trustworthiness but also by the institutional bases of trust, that is, the school has such mechanisms as norms, rules, and regulations that support trust.

INITIATING TRUST

If we are to understand trust, it would be useful to explore what actions are required to establish trust. A primary impetus of work with the mixed-motive games was the identification of factors that would lead to the establishment of trust. Swinth (1967) demonstrated that trust was established through a commitment period in which each partner had the opportunity to signal to the other a willingness to accept personal risk and not to exploit the vulnerability of the other for personal gain.

Administrators' behavior. If organizations hope to garner the benefits of a trusting work environment, it is management's responsibility to initiate trusting relationships through trustworthy behavior on the part of managers (Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998). Whitener, et al., suggest five behaviors managers can engage in to cultivate trust: (1) consistency, (2) integrity, (3) concern, (4) communication, and (5) sharing control. These mirror the facets of trust discussed earlier.

Employees will have greater confidence when they feel they can predict the behavior of their superior and when they perceive their superior to have integrity. In a study of leadership in schools, Evans (1996) found that trust derived from consistency in personal beliefs, organizational goals, and work performance. Similarly, Bryk and his colleagues (1988; 1993; 1996) found that consistency, competence and even handed in the principal's behavior promoted strong and healthy school communities. Attributions of integrity result from telling the truth and keeping promises (Dasputa, 1988). Integrity will also involve authenticity, that is, accepting responsibility for one's actions and avoiding distorting the truth in order to shift blame to another. Authenticity has been linked to trust in principals in schools (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998).

Superiors can promote trust by demonstrating benevolence through showing consideration and sensitivity for employees' needs and interests, acting in a way that protects employees' rights, and refraining from exploiting others for the benefit of one's own interests. Trust is also enhanced by a willingness to apologize for unpleasant consequences (Greenberg, 1993; Konovsky & Puch, 1994). Tschannen-Moran (1998) found that the story of a principal's willingness to apologize for an unfair remark to a teacher was well-known among the faculty in a school and helped to cultivate trust in the principal even among those who had not received such an apology.

Patterns of communication have an impact on employee's trust. Employees see managers as trustworthy when their communication is accurate and forthcoming. Adequate explanations and timely feedback on decisions lead to higher levels of trust (Sapeienze & Korsgaard, 1996). In addition, open communication, in which managers exchange thoughts and ideas freely with employees, enhances perceptions of trust (Butler, 1991; Gabarro, 1978). Principals can foster trust by actively encouraging their teachers to voice their frustrations candidly, which include criticisms of the principal's own decisions. Principals who are open and honest promote supportive and trusting climates for teachers (Bryk et al, 1993; Rosenholz, 1989).

Finally, research has shown that subordinates perceive greater trustworthiness on the part of superiors who share control, including participation in decision making and delegating control. Employees' trust is higher when they are satisfied with their level of participation in decisions (Driscoll, 1978). Similarly, teachers trust is positively related to empowerment and shared decision making (Short, Greer & Melvin, 1994; Tschannen-Moran, in press). Authentic empowerment provides greater

protection of the employee's interests and reduces the risk of opportunism on the part of superiors. In addition, such collaboration allows teachers greater responsiveness to student needs (Mark & Louis, 1997). Schools in which the principals engage in authentic shared decision making also produced high levels of faculty trust in students (Short, Greer & Melvin; Tschannen-Moran). The symbolic value of sharing and delegation of control should not be overlooked. When managers share control, they demonstrate significant trust in and respect for their employees (Rosen & Jerdee, 1977).

Teacher behavior. Administrator behavior is important in setting the general tone of school trust, but teacher behavior will have a more direct impact on student learning. Studies of teachers in schools have suggested that some facets of trust are more salient in teachers' trust judgments of colleagues than others. A sense of benevolence or caring laid a foundation of trust among teachers. In high trust settings, teachers expressed support or benevolence in a variety of ways: by covering classes for one another, socializing outside of school, taking meals to families that were experiencing illness, and even contributing sick days to allow a seriously ill colleague to have more time to recover (Kratzer, 1997; Tschannen-Moran, 1998). Among teachers openness was also an important facet of trust. In high trust schools, teachers were pleased to share professional secrets, successful teaching strategies, materials, and equipment in the interest of helping students learn (Kratzer; Short & Greer, 1997, Tschannen-Moran). Honesty was presumed among colleagues. When it was violated, trust was difficult to regain (Tschannen-Moran). Authenticity of teacher behavior also has been linked to teacher trust in colleagues (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Teachers who distorted the truth in order to make another colleague look bad or who spread negative gossip were cut off from the circle of trusting relationships within a school (Louis & Kruse, 1995; Tschannen-Moran). Tschannen-Moran (1998) found that teaching competence was not necessarily a strong component of trust judgments when teachers did not perceive a great deal of interdependence in this area. With both greater emphasis on school collaboration (Pounder, 1998) and greater school-wide accountability, the competence of one's colleagues is likely to become more salient in trust judgments.

SUSTAINING TRUST IN ORGANIZATIONS

Evidence suggests that a high level of trust pays dividends for organizations. And yet organizational dynamics can complicate trust judgments. The power differential imposed by hierarchical relationships in organizations adds complexity to developing and sustaining trust relationships. However, there are several organizational attributes that cultivate trust. These are explored below, as are strategies that group members sometimes use to facilitate trust in the collective. In addition, the importance of reputation is discussed.

Trust in hierarchical relationships. Baier (1986) complained that much of the philosophical work on trust and morality has been based on contractual relationships between people of roughly equal power. And yet the reality of life in organizations is that individuals are invested with varying degrees of power and authority. Baier found a moral code of trust based on assumptions of equal power inadequate for many social contexts. People at different organizational levels may look to one another with different expectations on which to build trust. Gabarro (1978) found that company presidents and their subordinates used different criteria in making their trust judgments of the other. Both found integrity to be important, however, beyond that the presidents were more concerned with the competence and reliability of subordinates, while subordinates placed more importance on benevolence and openness. Likewise in schools, principals based their trust on teacher competence and commitment whereas teachers' view of principals was anchored in kindness, friendliness, and integrity (Blake, & MacNeil, 1998; Spuck & MacNeil, 1999).

Not only are there potentially different bases for trust across organizational levels, organizational actors at different levels may invest differential importance on information gained through interactions. Kramer (1996) found that subordinates were hypervigilant in their trust assessments of superiors, and that even relatively minor gestures, either positive or negative, took on considerable diagnostic import. Subordinates were able to recall more trust related incidents than superiors, and trust violations were likely to "loom larger" than confirmations of trustworthiness. Similarly, Tschannen-Moran (1998), in her study of urban schools, found that teachers emphasized different facets of trust in their trust judgments of their principals, colleagues, and students. For example, teachers looked for benevolence and openness on the part of their principals whereas teachers were more concerned with competence and reliability of their students.

Trust also seems to play a role in employee reactions to supervision. In a study of the perceptions of fairness of performance evaluations by supervisors, the level of trust in the supervisor was more important to perceived fairness than any other characteristics of the performance evaluation process (Fulk, Brief, & Barr, 1985). Close supervision may serve to drive down the level of trust across organizational levels. In an experimental study of the effects on trust of surveillance by supervisors, Strickland (1958) found that when supervisors were constrained to monitor one of two "subordinates" more closely on the first set of trials, on the second trial when there was a choice of whom to monitor they also chose to more closely monitor that same subordinate. Although the performance of both had been equal and had met or exceeded standards on all but one trial, supervisors expressed greater trust of the less-monitored subordinate. It is not surprising, then, that principals who demonstrate collegial leadership enjoy high levels of faculty trust (Hoy, Sabo & Barnes, 1996).

Organizational attributes. By designing organizations in ways that cultivate trust, organizations can reap the benefits of greater adaptability and reduced costs. Unfortunately, “the very conditions that necessitate or are conducive for the emergence of trust also allow for the abuse of trust” (Elangovan, & Shapiro, 1998, p. 547). Organizational systems can help overcome potential barriers to trust through attention to structure, policies, and culture (Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998). Structural supports may include creating greater perceived and actual interdependence across organizational levels. Structures to facilitate greater shared decision making must distribute not only authority but accountability for shared decisions. For example, Louis, Kruse & Marks, (1996) found that delegating authority to teachers and joint deliberation in decision making were effective means to promote trust in schools.

Both policy and norms are important in development of organizational trust. Policies must be in place that demonstrate an expectation of trustworthy behavior on the part of organizational participants, but means must also be available to respond to breaches of trust (Coleman, 1990). Cultural norms can facilitate trust by encouraging parties to interact frequently face-to-face, in positive ways, demonstrating benevolence, support, and concern. When parties interact in a cordial way, they establish a feeling and appearance that everything is normal and in proper order (Lewis & Weigert, 1985). For example, visible and accessible principals can more readily demonstrate support and concern. Open and healthy school climates have been found to be positively related to faculty trust (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Hoy & Sabo, 1998).

Trust is likely to be sustained as people interact in cooperative ways, and the trusting cycle become self-sustaining. Creating an organizational culture of cooperation rather than competition is likely to have a significant impact on the trusting and trustworthy behavior of participants. One of the experimental manipulations Deutsch (1958, 1960) made was to induce participants toward one of three motivational orientations through differing sets of instructions. Participants were led to believe that the other person shared the same orientation and that the objective or level of concern was mutual. Participants in the cooperative orientation were led to feel concerned not only for their own welfare but for the welfare of the other person as well. In the individualistic condition, participants were to be concerned only for their own welfare without regard for the other person. And in the competitive orientation, each participant was led to feel not only that he or she wanted to do the best for themselves, but also to do better than the other player. Deutsch found that the participants in the cooperative condition were very likely to make a cooperative choice that resulted in mutual gain, while in the competitive condition participants rarely made the cooperative choice. In the individualistic condition, when choices were made in sequence or without communication, participants tended to act competitively, but when there was communication and the ability to reverse one's choices individualistic participants tended to act cooperatively. A cooperative orientation tended to produce both

trusting and trustworthy behavior even when situational factors such as the inability to communicate or lack of knowledge of the other's choices made cooperation more difficult.

Although teaching has historically been a rather individualistic enterprise, greater cooperation and trust emerge when situational conditions emphasize communication and collaboration. In fact, the cooperative orientation found in collaborative school cultures tends to be associated with greater trust (Louis, Kruse & Associates, 1995; Tschannen-Moran, in press). In the context of schools, cooperative strategies are built with strong professional communities, in which there is an equitable distribution of power and joint deliberation and decision making. Such professional communities broaden and enhance trust that teachers and principals will act in the best interest of each other (Louis, Kruse & Marks, 1996; Goldring and Rallis, 1993; Elmore, et al, 1996).

Building collective trust. Kramer, Brewer, and Hanna (1996) recognized that trust operates not only between individuals, but also within and between groups. They were interested in how trust was cultivated in a collective and identified three processes of trust that serve to maintain solidarity and sustain trust in a group—elicitative trust, compensatory trust, and moralistic trust. In elicitative trust, one takes the initiative to make oneself vulnerable with the hope that it will build more trust in the collective. The belief or expectation is that, by engaging in acts of trust oneself, one may be able to induce others to do the same (Kramer, Brewer, & Hanna). Horsburgh (1960) defined such vulnerability as a reliance aimed at increasing the trustworthiness of the person in whom it is placed. He explained, “Such trust is based on a belief in the possibility of stirring someone’s conscious to an extent sufficient to affect his or her conduct” (p. 352). When engaging in compensatory trust individuals are willing to engage in actions to offset the behavior of other individuals they think might threaten the stability or survival of the collective trust. Moralistic trust emphasizes the beliefs held by members of a collective about what responsible membership in a social group entails. Although there is virtually no research on elicitative trust on the part of principals and teachers, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that elicitative trust could have a powerful effect in instituting trusting norms within a school.

Reputation. A reputation of trustworthiness is a valuable asset to individuals and businesses alike. Relationships within organizations tend to be ongoing, in that people expect to continue to relate to the same network of people over time. When this is the case, there is incentive to behave in ways that are trustworthy, to develop a reputation for trustworthiness, and to reap the benefits of trusting relationships. When many people perceive that an individual has a good reputation, it is harder for a negative event to significantly reduce a high level of trust in that individual (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998). The trust between two individuals is significantly influenced by the social context in which that relationship is embedded. A network of mutual friends and acquaintances can enhance the likelihood that a trusting relationship will develop and will strengthen trust as it develops but such a

context can also amplify the effects of a breach of trust. In a study of urban schools, Tschannen-Moran (1998) found evidence of the role of reputational networks in furthering a cycle of trust or distrust through the stories that were told and retold about organizational players and events. The judgment, observations, and gossip of others can tend to “lock in” relationships at positive and negative extremes (Burt & Knez, 1996).

Individuals tend to be more alert to negative information and prefer negative gossip to positive. This can be an impediment to the development of trust. New technologies, such as e-mail, voice mail or the Internet allow the spread of gossip farther and faster and can amplify the impact of broken trust. The propensity of the news media to capitalize on this desire for negative information has made the cultivation of trust more difficult for schools and their publics.

BETRAYAL

Trust involves placing with some level of confidence or assurance something one cares about in the care or control of another (Baier, 1986). At least in part, the outcome one desires is determined by someone else. But what if one’s expectations are not met? What if the one who is trusted acts opportunistically, taking advantage of the confidence that was placed in him or her? Situations inevitably arise when the thing cared for is harmed (even if by accident) or vulnerability is exploited for the gain of the trusted at the expense of the one who has extended trust. The nature of a trusting relationship can be altered instantaneously with a simple comment, a betrayed confidence, or a decision that violates the sense of care one has expected of another. When a violation occurs trust is often shattered, leaving distrust in its place (Burt & Knez, 1996). Such a violation can leave the victim feeling stunned and confused, and with a sense of unreality. Upon reflection, those feelings turn to anger or even rage (Bies & Tripp, 1996; Govier, 1992).

Betrayal is defined as “a voluntary violation of mutually known pivotal expectations of the trustor by the trusted party (trustee), which has the potential to threaten the well-being of the trustor” (Elangovan, & Shapiro, 1998, p. 548). Betrayal involves a behavior (an actual violation), rather than just the thought of betraying. Betrayal has the potential to harm the well-being of the trustor, even if other factors mitigate the actual harm experienced. And even if the violation of expectations is not detected by the trustor, it still constitutes a betrayal. Betrayal is voluntary, in that trustees either lack the motivation to conform to the expectations of the trustor or become motivated to violate these expectations. Elangovan and Shapiro proposed that a person would be motivated to betray another based on a negative assessment of the current situation such that the person believes there is more to be gained than lost by betraying the other person’s expectations. Low satisfaction with the current situation will increase the likelihood of betrayal by lowering the benevolence and integrity of the trusted person. A drop in benevolence implies that the trustee cares less for the good of the trustor and may be willing to

engage in behaviors that might harm him or her. Similarly, a drop in integrity implies that the trustee is less committed to principles acceptable to the trustor and may search for justification to switch to an alternate set of principles, even if it means harming the trustor's best interests.

Trust violations within organizations stem from two broad categories: a damaged sense of civic order or a damaged identity (Bies & Tripp, 1996). Trust violations that result in a damaged sense of civic order involve a breach of rules or norms governing behavior and what people owe to one another in a relationship. These include honor violations such as broken promises, lying, shirking of job responsibilities, stealing ideas or credit from others, the disclosure of private confidences and secrets or changing the rules "after the fact." A damaged sense of civic order could also result from abusive authority, coercive or threatening behavior, sexual harassment, improper dismissal, and favoritism (Harris, 1994). Trust violations that result in a damaged identity include public criticism, wrong or unfair accusations, blaming of employees for personal mistakes, or insults to one's self or the collective of which one was a part.

Incidents of betrayal can have consequential effects on organizational functioning. Robinson (1996) found that when broken promises led to lost trust, distrust was significantly related to a deterioration in the employee's performance and to intentions to leave the employer. And the effects of betrayal are lasting. In a study focusing on betrayal in the workplace, 50% of the incidents recounted by participants had occurred more than 20 years earlier, and 25% had occurred more than 30 years before (Jones & Burdette, 1994).

The organizational context of relationships can influence the likelihood of betrayals occurring. Organizational norms that emphasize ethical behaviors and a work environment of openness, trust, and respect discourage the violation of trust, whereas organizations characterized by goal incongruence, internal politics and conflict, and shifting coalitions lend themselves to a greater number of betrayals. The organizational culture and norms, however, may not always be congruent with the trustor's personal expectations of the trustee or the trustee's own values. Although betrayal involves a violation of personal trust, it is not necessarily unethical or antisocial (Elangovan, & Shapiro, 1998). Teachers may find themselves in situations where they have to choose between betraying a colleague or violating organizational norms. For example, a teacher may be faced with deciding how to respond after witnessing a teacher friend's indiscretion with a student, or becoming aware of a friend's misuse of school funds.

REVENGE

Trust has to do with expectations of other people in situations of vulnerability. When those expectations are not met some kind of response is likely. Whether that response leads to the restoration of trust or to a further escalation of conflict depends on the choices made by the actors in the situation. When a violation of trust has occurred, the way the victim understands the cause of the violation will affect the likely response, and specifically whether there is a desire for revenge. Among people recounting on-the-job experiences of violation, Bies and Tripp (1996) found that when a victim concluded that an action was outside the control of the perpetrator, revenge was not sought; however, when the victim held the perpetrator responsible for the violation, there was always motivation for revenge. Blame was assigned and revenge sought when the victim perceived the behavior to have grown out of selfishness or malevolence on the part of the perpetrator. Victims also assigned responsibility to the system or organization as a whole for hiring or failing to constrain the perpetrator. The victim's act of revenge may provoke a sense of betrayal on the part of the perpetrator, fueling a spiral of distrust.

Revenge is not solely an emotional reaction to violation; cognitive processes play a prominent and mediating role in the seeking of revenge as well (Bies & Tripp, 1996). At the time a violation occurred, people reported having been stunned and confused as well as angry. Contrary to stereotypic notions of revenge, victims' choice of revenge strategy was "cool and calculated, ... it appeared to be quite rational in both deliberation and delivery" (p. 259). There was evidence, however, of "different arithmetics" between victim and perpetrator, each assessing the cost of the perceived damage differently. These different calculations, and the responses they evoked, played a role in the escalation process of a conflict. Upon reflection people were likely to "discover" more malevolence on the part of the perpetrators, thus enhancing blame, paranoid cognitions, and conspiracy theories that led victims to seek social support and reinforcement for their perceptions.

Victims considered a variety of responses to violation (Bies & Tripp, 1996). Some simply withdrew from any social contact with the person who had betrayed them. Others enjoyed indulging in revenge fantasies or did nothing. Still others either sparked or continued a self-perpetuating cycle of feuding. Some victims arranged for a private confrontation or sought the restoration of their reputation. Finally, some offered forgiveness. Bies and Tripp noted that there is power in forgiveness because the victim, not the perpetrator, restores trust. They also concluded that some harms appear to be irreversible -- trust is no longer possible in these circumstances.

Rather than seeing revenge in an altogether negative light, Bies and Tripp (1996) asserted that revenge can play a potentially positive role in organizational life. Not only can revenge act as a constraint against the abuse of power and injustice, it can also promote cooperation and be a potent motivator for constructive change. Revenge has a way of equalizing some of the power differential in organizations. It gives victims a choice of how to respond to a breach in trust and it gives them some

control over if and when they will again offer their trust. Schools attempt to control the revenge motive by creating formal mechanisms such as union grievance procedures to address abuse of power and injustice.

TRUST REPAIR

How can trust, once broken, be repaired? Will it forever be weaker than it was before it was broken or can it grow back stronger than it was to begin with? To be sure, trust repair can be a difficult and time-consuming process. It is a bilateral process in which each party must perceive that the short-term and/or long-term benefits to be derived from the relationship are valued highly enough to be worth the investment of time and energy required by the repair process. Each party must decide that the benefits of restoring the relationship are preferred to finding ways of having the needs that were fulfilled by the relationship met in another manner (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Osgood offered a strategy for reestablishing trust, even in a situation that had previously fostered suspicion.

The Osgood Proposal. Osgood (1959) observed that trust was fundamental to cooperation, and yet trust could be difficult to establish once a cycle of suspicion, competition, and retaliation had begun. When one party suspects the other of harboring exploitative intentions, then one must take defensive action to protect one's interests. However, these actions reinforce the suspicions of the other party that the first is being exploitative. Thus, an escalating cycle of distrust and competition ensues. If the two parties were able to establish trust, they could engage in a cooperative search for a mutually beneficial solution and the cycle could be reversed. Then both parties could gain rather than lose. However, without trust, negotiating a bilateral agreement to reverse this escalating cycle is unlikely.

Osgood proposed that, even in the midst of such tension and conflict, trust could be fostered through the conciliatory initiatives of one party acting unilaterally signaling the desire to establish trust without sacrificing genuine security interests. The proposal is quite simple. To overcome distrust one party announces a clear, conciliatory initiative and carries it out reliably. This is followed by an explicit invitation (but not a demand) to reciprocate. If after several conciliatory attempts the other party remains hostile, the first party matches their actions one for one, being careful not to overreact. The Osgood proposal seems especially useful in schools where there has been a major labor-management dispute and mutual distrust is high.

Communication. One of the key components of the Osgood proposal was the use of announcements in building a mutually cooperative strategy. Several studies tested the impact of communication on the establishment of a cooperative, mutually beneficial strategy (trust). A combination of a conciliatory strategy with honest prior announcements was the most effective in inducing reciprocal trust (Pilisuk, & Skolnick, 1968). Trust was much harder to establish in the absence

of communication, but communication was not always used honestly in a competitive situation (Deutsch, 1958). Participants with a competitive orientation frequently used communication deceptively to exploit the opponent. Participants who received dishonest communication were likely to become evasive in their own communication. However, when honest prior announcements of cooperative intentions were made they induced in the partner greater reciprocation of promises of cooperative intentions, greater reciprocation of honesty, and greater actual cooperation than did the dishonest announcement of cooperative intentions (Schlenker, Helm, & Tedeschi, 1973). Without honest communication Deutsch found that once two players had made choices that were out of step, that is, one choosing cooperatively and the other not, it was extremely difficult for them to get together again.

Credible threats. Deutsch proposed that two conditions must be met for cooperation to be maintained in a stable ongoing system. Each person must have a way of reacting to violations, a credible threat, which is known to the other and which can serve to inhibit violations. And the system must have a method of absolution to restore cooperative relations once lost. Deutsch reasoned that in any ongoing system violations are likely to occur, if only by chance, but the system of interchange will break down if violations are frequent and go unchecked. In the mixed-motive games, an unconditional strategy of cooperation tended to be exploited, especially when there was no way for the cooperative player to retaliate for violation (Soloman, 1960; Lindskold & Bennett, 1973). However, when the highly cooperative player demonstrated a willingness on even a single occasion to retaliate for broken trust, the other player tended to respond cooperatively to preserve the possibility of mutual gain. Therefore, the maintenance of a relatively unused threat capability had the effect of enhancing both the participant's credibility in terms of attributions of trustworthy intentions and the cooperative behavior of the participant (Coleman, 1990; Lindskold & Bennett). Principals have the capacity to punish inappropriate behavior, but they must use power judiciously if they are to foster and maintain trust within the school community because coercive principal behavior is likely to alienate teachers (Hoy, Blazovsky, & Newland, 1983).

Constructive attitudes and actions. Fisher and Brown (1988) suggested that even in situations of mutual suspicion, each side has the opportunity of improving the level of trust in the relationship. They noted that there are many contexts in which we have to interact with individuals and groups of whose conduct we disapprove. Although relationships necessarily have two parties, it takes only one of these parties to change the quality of the relationship. To this end, Fisher and Brown recommended what they called "unconditionally constructive attitudes and actions." These include trying to understand the other side's interests, attitudes and beliefs; taking an attitude of acceptance toward the other side; working for good communication; being meticulously reliable; and using persuasion rather than coercion. Fisher and Brown recommended against expecting reciprocity in relationships, because such expectations risk disillusionment or even escalation of the conflict. They

pointed out that the tit-for-tat strategy that proved effective in the Prisoner's Dilemma games does not work in most real-life situations because most relationships are not well-modeled by the constraints of the prisoner's dilemma games. School principals are in a position to initiate such a unilateral strategy provided they have the security and confidence to do so, but there is little evidence that they pursue such a strategy.

In trying to understand the other party and their motivations Fisher and Brown (1988) recommended that one assume that others do not see themselves as "bad people pursuing immoral ends through illegitimate means" but that they have what they consider good reasons for doing as they do. Blind trust, or extending trust beyond what is reasonable given the information available about the others' actions and motivations is dangerous, but each side has the opportunity to be completely trustworthy. Whether distrust has grown from hurt pride over a damaged sense of identity, disillusionment growing out of a damaged civic order or perceived value incongruence, attention will need to be paid to these issues in the restoration of trust (Sitkin & Stickel, 1996).

Reparation. The violator and the victim have different roles and responsibilities in the reestablishment of trust. Lewicki and Bunker (1996) argued that the violator must start by recognizing and acknowledging that a violation has occurred. Listening carefully to the victim, the violator then must determine the nature of the violation and admit to having caused the event. He or she must also admit that the act was destructive. Finally, the perpetrator must accept responsibility for the effects of his or her actions. These acknowledgments made, the victim then determines what is required to restore trust. According to Lewicki and Bunker there are four alternative courses of trust repair:

- The victim refuses to accept any actions, terms, or conditions for reestablishing the relationship.
- The victim acknowledges forgiveness but specifies "unreasonable" acts of reparation
- The victim acknowledges forgiveness and specifies "reasonable" acts of reparation
- The victim simply acknowledges forgiveness and indicates that no further acts of reparation are necessary

The acts of reparation are usually designed to demonstrate that the violator is sincere and committed in the desire to rebuild the relationship, and to demonstrate a willingness to incur a certain amount of personal loss to do so. The victim then has the opportunity to judge the sincerity and commitment of the violator in carrying out these actions. Reparations also create an opportunity for the violator to work out any guilt that he or she may have over the harm that was done, whether it was intentional or unintentional.

Understanding the dynamic nature of trust is as important as understanding its facets. Awareness of the issues involved in the development, dissolution, and repair of trust will help theorists

and practitioners alike. Particularly in a school context, it is important to understand the role played by organizational structure, policies, and culture in the development and sustenance of trust. With greater understanding of the importance of trust and the costs of distrust, principals and teachers should be more willing to invest in the effort required maintain trust and to repair trust that has been damaged.

TRUST AND SOCIAL PROCESSES IN SCHOOLS

Although research on trust in schools is relatively recent, interest in the dynamics of trust in organizations has been underway for a longer time. Research on trust in organizations can be brought to bear on the relationships of trust in schools. The relationship of trust in organizations to processes such as communication, collaboration, climate, organizational citizenship, and the proliferation of rules are all subjects addressed below. When relationships are embedded in an organizational context the dimensions and dynamics of trust make a very real impact on the effectiveness and collective sense of efficacy of the organization.

TRUST AND COMMUNICATION

Trust is necessary for open communication in an organization. People with a high degree of trust are more likely to disclose more accurate, relevant, and complete data about problems. They will also be more willing to share their thoughts, feelings or ideas (Wrightsman, 1974; Zand, 1971). Distrust, on the other hand, is likely to have a deleterious effect on communication. When interacting with a distrusted person, especially if that person holds more power within an organizational hierarchy, the goal of communication becomes the protection of one's interest and the reduction of one's anxiety rather than the accurate transmission of ideas (Bartolme, 1989; Mellinger, 1956). A person may feel compelled to be evasive or to distort attitudes or information in communicating with a distrusted person.

Patterns of communication across levels of a hierarchy within an organization are affected by differential levels of trust. When there was a high level of trust between superiors and subordinates, Roberts and O'Reilly (1974) found that subordinates expressed high levels of confidence in the accuracy of information coming from the superior, a desire for interaction with the superior, and satisfaction with communication with the superior. When there was low trust, subordinates disclosed a great tendency to withhold information and acknowledged significant forces to distort upward communication. Empirical evidence supports the claim that trust is affected by the amount and quality of communication in a relationship. Using a mixed-motive game, Loomis (1959) found that the level of perceived trust increased as communication increased. Trustworthy or cooperative behavior increased as well. When Schlenker, Helm and Tedeschi (1973) varied the accuracy of information in a mixed-motive game, participants tended to make choices either to cooperate or to compete based on their perception of the

trust relationship. When participants received promises that were only 50% accurate, they cooperated less and were more likely to be evasive or dishonest in their own communications.

When high trust allows for the open exchange of information, problems can be disclosed, diagnosed, and corrected before they are compounded. Principals can help foster the flow of information to them by being open with communication that flows from them (Bartolme, 1989). Principals who want to encourage candor among their staffs must cultivate an atmosphere of trust. In a study of urban elementary schools, Tschannen-Moran (1998) found that communication between principals and teachers was hindered in a climate of distrust; teachers were guarded in whom they talked to and what they said. Although teachers acknowledged such significant problems as children being left unsupervised on the playground and teachers arriving after the start of the school day, they were unwilling to reveal those problems for fear of retaliation. Communication was often blocked or distorted to avoid confrontation.

TRUST AND COLLABORATION

Shared decision-making, as it has typically been exercised in schools, has been criticized as affording teachers little real influence over organizational decisions that matter to them (Bartunek & Keys, 1979; Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1988; Duke, Showers, & Imber, 1980). Teachers are asked to be involved in decision making simply to increase their satisfaction, loyalty, and acceptance of decisions. This might be called contrived collaboration.

Recent calls for collaboration seem to be pressing for a more genuine sharing of decision making authority, where principals and teachers make decisions jointly (Pounder, 1998; Short & Greer, 1997). This model highlights teachers' competence in bringing valuable knowledge and insights to contribute to decisions. Higher quality decisions are the goal of this more genuine form of collaboration in which teachers have actual influence over the outcome of decisions that affect them. The Hoy and Tarter (1995) model of shared decision making suggests that principals must trust their faculty before they will be willing to engage in a collaborative process in which they share authority and have the same vote as every other member of the committee. There are also calls for greater collaboration among teachers in fostering a spirit of professional community in schools (Louis & Kruse, 1995; Marks & Louis, 1997). However, such collaboration is unlikely to develop in the absence of trust among teachers (Leonard, 1999; Short & Greer). Trust plays an important role in overcoming barriers to collaboration, including conflict avoidance, destructive competitiveness, and low levels of teacher efficacy (Leonard).

In an elicitive fashion, when principals extend trust to teachers through shared control, they provoke greater trust in response. In a study of urban elementary schools, the level of collaboration on school-level decisions was significantly related to the level of trust in the principal. An environment of trust

also led to greater inclusion of parents into the decision making process. In schools where there was a high level of faculty trust in parents and students, there tended to be a higher level of shared decision making on school-level decisions with both the parents and the faculty (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, in press).

TRUST AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

The climate of the school can be one that cultivates trust or that makes trust difficult to foster. As the climate of the school becomes more open, trust is reinforced (Hoy, Hoffman, Sabo, & Bliss, 1996; Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989). Empirical evidence links openness of the climate and faculty trust (Hoffman, Sabo, Bliss, & Hoy, 1994; Tarter, Bliss & Hoy, 1989; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995). In addition, healthy interpersonal relationships have been related to the levels of faculty trust in the principal and in colleagues (Hoy, Sabo, & Barnes, 1996). Studies of school climate and trust have demonstrated that the behavior of the principal and the behavior of teachers have differential impacts on the quality of trusting relationships in schools. Supportive leadership on the part of the principal influenced the degree of trust teachers felt for the principal, and collegial and engaged teacher behavior helped to create trust in colleagues (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). These studies indicate the significant relationship between trust and a positive school climate.

TRUST AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP

Organizational citizenship describes instances when a worker spontaneously goes beyond the formally prescribed job requirements and performs non-mandatory behaviors without expectation of receiving explicit recognition or compensation. Organ (1988, 1997) emphasized the importance of organizational citizenship in promoting organizational effectiveness. "Organizational citizenship behaviors are vital for productivity because organizations cannot forecast through stated job descriptions the entire spectrum of subordinate behaviors needed for achieving goals" (p. 4). These kinds of behaviors are particularly important for schools, where formal job descriptions can, at best, delineate broad parameters of the expectations of teachers' responsibilities. Organizational citizenship behaviors include altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue. When these behaviors are absent, organizational life is likely to be strained and fraught with tension. If schools attempt, however, to require citizenship activities, they may engender resistance and resentment.

Transformational leadership behaviors describe a leader who has articulated a clear vision, is able to foster an acceptance of group goals and holds high performance expectations, while providing an appropriate model for followers to emulate, individualized support, and intellectual stimulation.

Transformational leadership behaviors were found to lead to greater citizenship behavior of subordinates *if and only if* the employees trusted the leader. When employees did not trust the leader these leadership behaviors did not lead to greater citizenship (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). The implications for schools are significant. For principals or superintendents to be effective in producing a kind of organizational culture in which employees are inspired to go beyond the explicit requirements of their job they must earn the trust of organizational participants (Deluga, 1994; Walker, 1999).

TRUST AND THE PROLIFERATION OF RULES

Organizations must continually balance extending trust to employees at various levels of the organization with the creation of safeguards against the possibility of opportunistic behavior. Organizations adopt rules and formal organizational mechanisms to act as substitutes for interpersonal trust and to restore damaged trust within the organization (Shapiro, 1987; Zucker, 1986). However, formal controls instituted to increase performance reliability can undermine trust and interfere with the achievement of the very goals they were put in place to serve. Extreme elaboration of bureaucratic rules are likely to be counterproductive because they communicate distrust to those to whom they are directed. They are based on the premise that workers desire to evade responsibilities and withhold proper and full performance of obligations (Fox, 1974). In a study of a professional organization where a system of bureaucratic rules was introduced, conflict and hurt feelings resulted from the use of standardized procedures that threatened workers' sense of professionalism. When employees perceived a mismatch between the tasks they performed and the management control systems they had to accommodate, distrust was the result (Sitkin & Stickel, 1996). Rules and regulations are likely to be effective only when the requirements of a task are understood well enough to be specified clearly and concisely, but they may engender distrust and resentment in situations where workers need a certain amount of discretion in order to function effectively (Fox).

The work of schools is complex and changes with the needs of each student. Discretion is required and resentment and distrust are likely to result when teachers perceive a proliferation of rules interfering with their ability to do their jobs well. The consequence of such a stance impacts organizational participants' affiliation with the organization. Teachers as well as students may respond to a proliferation of rules with feelings of alienation, disloyalty, and lack of commitment, which ironically can make dishonesty and cheating more prevalent (Govier, 1992; Hoy, Blazovsky, & Newland, 1983; Walker, 1999).

COLLECTIVE EFFICACY, ACHIEVEMENT, AND SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

Not only has trust been linked to effectiveness and quality theoretically, in the past decade empirical evidence has demonstrated the significant role of trust in school effectiveness and student achievement. Teachers' trust in their colleagues as well as their principal have been linked to general school effectiveness, including the quality of teaching and the flexibility and adaptability of the school (Hoy, Tarter & Witkoskie, 1992; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995). Faculty trust has also been found to have a direct impact on student achievement (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2000). The greater the faculty trust in students and parents, the higher was the level of school achievement in reading and mathematics. Even when controlling for SES, faculty trust was significantly related to mathematics achievement.

Faculty trust also has an indirect influence on student achievement. The level of trust is related to the collective efficacy of the faculty, that is, the extent to which teachers perceive they can make a positive contribution to student learning (Tschannen-Moran & Goddard, 2000). Teachers' collective sense of efficacy has been powerfully linked to student achievement (Bandura, 1993, 1997; Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, in press), even controlling for the socioeconomic status of students. Student demographics also have an interesting relationship to teacher trust. In a study of urban schools, low socioeconomic status was a greater barrier to the development of teacher trust than membership in a minority racial group (Tschannen-Moran, 1998).

In sum, there is compelling evidence that trust is important to the processes required for the smooth functioning of schools. Trust is related to a positive school climate, to productive communication, to participative decision processes, and to organizational participants' willingness to go beyond the minimum requirements of their job descriptions. When trust is absent, organizations may see a profusion of rules as a substitute means to keep participants in line, which can be counterproductive to the purposes of school. Trust makes a difference in student achievement, teacher's collective sense of efficacy, and to overall school effectiveness. For schools to function well, they need trust.

CONCLUSION

Trust is a critical factor as we consider school improvement and effectiveness. At all levels of the organization, trust facilitates productivity, and its absence impedes progress. Without trust, a student's energy is diverted toward self-protection and away from learning. A proliferation of rules stemming from a lack of trust causes resentment and alienation among teachers and students alike. Without trust, communication becomes constrained and distorted, making problems more difficult to resolve. Even where leaders work to build a common vision and foster acceptance of group goals, absent trust these

leaders do not inspire workers to go beyond the minimum requirements of their jobs. When distrust pervades a school culture it is unlikely the school will be effective.

Trust is required for many of the reforms taking shape in American schools. New forms of governance such as site-based management, collaborative decision making, and teacher empowerment depend upon trust. Parents are pressing for involvement in school governance; this too requires trust. Even within the classroom, relationships are shifting to forms that require greater trust. Cooperative learning and project-based learning create higher levels of interdependence, which demand higher levels of trust. As teachers are asked to change their fundamental beliefs and instructional techniques, they need to build new professional communities anchored in trust and teamwork. In short, for schools to realize the kinds of positive transformation envisioned by reform efforts, attention must be paid to issues of trust.

At the same time that schools face a greater need for trust, they encounter many obstacles. The difficulties of achieving new and higher societal expectations for equity and equality in schools have led to distrust of schools and school personnel. Higher standards and more accountability have fostered conditions of suspicion and blame. Moreover, schools have to cope with greater diversity and transience. A multicultural society with diverse values and shifting populations makes the generation of trust a major challenge. Adding to this formidable task is the tendency for distrust, once established, to be self-perpetuating. Not only is there a propensity for news of broken trust to spread faster and further than news of intact or restored trust but the media feed off and aggravate the spiral of distrust. Finding ways to overcome these many obstacles to trust will be important if we hope for schools to reach the aspirations we hold for them.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Evidence of the importance of trust to organizational productivity, and to such important outcomes as student achievement requires greater knowledge and understanding. Research on trust is just beginning in the school context. There are a host of unanswered issues and questions.

Understanding the facets and dynamics of trust in the linkages between organizational levels in schools is important: between boards and superintendents, between superintendents and principals, between principals and teachers, between teachers and students, and between parents and schools.

Understanding trust within organizational levels is also important: teacher to teacher as well as student to student relationships. Both quantitative and qualitative studies are needed. Quantitative studies are needed to explore the various facets of trust and their relationship to other constructs across a large number of schools. Qualitative studies are helpful in exploring the dynamic nature of trust within particular school buildings. We turn to a few illustrative examples of areas in need of further study.

One area in need of greater understanding is the relationship of trust and leadership. For example, how is trust linked to leader effectiveness? How is trust fostered when a new principal or superintendent enters a school setting? What strategies do expert principals employ for establishing trust with a new faculty? What impact does the existing level of trust in a building make on the decisions and strategies of a new principal coming into that building?

The development of faculty trust is another area in need of inquiry. What is the impact of a school's culture of trust on new faculty members in such realms as teacher efficacy, commitment, satisfaction, and motivation? What can principals do to cultivate faculty trust in colleagues? What kind of school structures facilitates faculty trust? As teachers collaborate more, what communication and conflict resolution skills are needed to nurture greater teacher trust in one another?

The study of student trust has also been neglected. There is intriguing evidence that trust matters in facilitating student learning, yet we know little about the structural, cultural, and individual characteristics of teachers and schools that promote student trust. For example, do school structures such as academic teams and block scheduling cultivate greater student trust? What kind of teacher and student values and norms foster student trust? Are certain teaching styles more or less conducive to the development of student trust? What community factors are linked to levels of student trust? These and other questions concerning how trust functions in the context of schools are important as schools struggle to rise to the challenge of a changed and changing world. The four decades of research upon which this review is based lays a solid conceptual and empirical foundation for continuing the quest to understand trust in schools.

REFERENCES

- Allison, S.T. & Messick, D. M. (1985). The group attribution error. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 21, 563-579.
- Athos, A.G. & Gabarro, J. J. (Eds.). (1978). *Interpersonal behavior: Communication and understanding in relationships*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Arrow, K. J. (1974). *The limits of organization*. New York: Norton.
- Bacharach, S.B., Bauer, S. & Shedd, J. B. (1988). The work environment and school reform. *Teachers College Record*, 88, 241-256.
- Baier, A. C. (1986). Trust and antitrust. *Ethics*, 96, 231-260.
- Baier, A. C. (1994). *Moral prejudices*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman & Co.
- Barber, B. (1983). *The logic and limits of trust*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Barney, J. B., & Hansen, M. H. (1994). Trustworthiness as a source of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 175-190.
- Bartolme, F. (1989). Nobody trusts the boss completely--now what? *Harvard Business Review*, 67(2), 135-142.
- Bartunek, J. M. & Keyes, C.B. (1979). Participation in decision making. *Urban Education*, 14, 52-75.
- Berg, J., Dickhaut, J., & McCabe, K. (1995). *Trust, reciprocity, and social history*. Unpublished working paper, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Bies, R.J., & Tripp, T.M. (1996). Beyond distrust: "Getting even" and the need for revenge. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Bigley, G. A., & Pearce, J. L. (1998). Straining for shared meaning in organization science: Problems of trust and distrust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23, 405-421.

Blake, M., & MacNeil, A. J. (1998). Trust: The quality required for successful management. In Y. Cano, F. H. Wood, & J. C. Simmons. *Creating High Functioning Schools: Practice and Research* (pp 29-37). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Bradach, J. L., & Eccles, R. G. (1989). Price, authority, and trust: From ideal types to plural forms. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 97-118.

Brewer, M. B. (1995). In-group favoritism: The subtle side of intergroup discrimination. In D.M. Messick & A Tenbrunsel (Eds.) *Behavioral research and business ethics*, (pp. 101-117), New York: Russell Sage.

Bryk, A. S. & Driscoll, M. E. (1988). *The high school as community: Contextual influences and consequences for students and teachers*. Madison: National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, University of Wisconsin.

Bryk, A. S., Lee, V. E. & Holland, P. B. (1993). *Catholic schools and the common good*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bryk, A. S. & Schneider, B. (1996). *Social trust: A moral resource of school improvement*. Chicago: University of Chicago, Center for School Improvement.

Burt, R.S. & Knez, M. (1996). Trust and third-party gossip. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Butler, J. K. (1991). Towards understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a conditions of trust inventory. *Journal of Management*, 17, 643-663.

Butler, J. K. & Cantrell, R.S. (1984). A behavioral decision theory approach to modeling dyadic trust in superiors and subordinates. *Psychological Reports*, 55, 81-105.

Cash, T. F., Stack, J. J., & Luna, G. C. (1975). Convergent and discriminant behavioral aspects of interpersonal trust. *Psychological Reports*, 37, 983-986.

Clark, M. C., & Payne, R. L. (1997). The nature and structure of workers' trust in management. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 205-224.

Coleman, J. S. (1990), *Foundations of social theory*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Cook, J. & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53, 39-52.

Creed, W.E.D., & Miles, R.E. (1996). Trust in organizations: A conceptual framework linking organizational forms, managerial philosophies, and the opportunity costs of controls. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Cummings, L.L. & Bromily, P. (1996). "The organizational trust inventory (OTI): Development and validation, in Kramer, R. and Tyler, T. (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dasgupta, P. (1988). Trust as a commodity. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations*, pp. 213-238. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Dawes, R.M., van de Kragt, A. J. C., & Orbell, J. M. (1990). Cooperation for the benefit of us – not me or my conscience. In J. Mansbridge (Ed.) *Beyond self-interest*. (Pp. 16-55). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

De Furia, G. L. (1997). *Organizational Trust Surveys*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deluga, R.J. (1994). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67 (4), 315.

Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2, 265-279.

Deutsch, M. (1960). The effect of motivational orientation upon trust and suspicion, *Human Relations*, 13, 123-39.

Driscoll, J.W. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21, 44-56.

Duke, D.L., Showers, B.K., & Imber, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decision making: The costs and benefits of involvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16, 93-106.

Elangovan, A. R., & Shapiro, D. L. (1998). Betrayal of trust in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 547-566.

Elmore, R. F., Peterson, P. L., & McCarthey, S. J. (1996). *Restructuring the classroom: Teaching, learning, and school organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Evans, G. (1964). Effect of unilateral promise and value of rewards upon cooperation and trust. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 69, 587-590.

Evans, R. (1996). *The human side of change: Reform, resistance, and real-life problems of innovation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Fisher, R. & Brown, S. (1988). *Getting Together*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fox, A. (1974). *Beyond contract: Work, power and trust relations*. London: Farber & Farber.
- Frost, T., Stimpson, D. V., & Maughan, M. R. (1978). Some correlates of trust. *The Journal of Psychology*, 99, 103-108.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Fulk, J., Brief, A.P., & Barr, S.H. (1985). Trust in the supervisor and perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluations. *Journal of Business Research*, 13, 301-313.
- Fuller, E. J. (1996). *Conflict or congruence? Faculty, parent, and student trust in the principal*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Gabarro, J. J. (1978). The development of trust, influence, and expectations. In A.G. Athos & J.J. Gabarro (Eds.), *Interpersonal behavior: Communication and understanding in relationships*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 290-303.
- Gambetta, D. (1988). Can we trust? In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations*, 213-238. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Goddard, R.D., Hoy, W.K., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (in press). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Journal of Educational Research*.
- Goddard, R.D., Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, W. K. (2000, under review). The relationship of trust to student achievement in urban elementary schools: A multilevel analysis.
- Goldring, E. B., & Rallis, S. F. (1993). *Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Govier, T. (1992). Distrust as a practical problem. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 23(1), 52-63.
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problems of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91, 481-510.

- Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gulati, R. (1995). Does familiarity breed trust? The implications of repeated ties for contractual choice in alliances. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 85-112.
- Harris, g. G. (1994). *Trust and betrayal in the workplace*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.
- Heretick, D.M.L. (1981). Gender-specific relationships between trust-suspicion, locus of control, and psychological distress. *Journal of Psychology*, 108, 267-274.
- Hoffman, J., Sabo, D., Bliss, J., & Hoy, W. K. (1994). Building a culture of trust. *Journal of School Leadership*, 4, 484-501.
- Holmes, J.G., & Rempel, J. K. (1989). Trust in close relationships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Close Relationships*, 187-220. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Horsburgh, H. J. N. (1960). The ethics of trust. *Philosophical Quarterly*, 10, 343-354.
- 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., Blazovsky, R., & Newland, W. (1983). Bureaucracy and alienation: A comparative analysis. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 21, 109-120.
- Hoy, W. K., & Kupersmith, W.J. (1985). The meaning and measure of faulty trust. *Educational and Psychological Research*, 5, 1-10.
- Hoy, W. K. & Sabo, D. J. (1998). *Quality middle schools: Open and healthy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Hoy, W. K., Sabo, D., & Barnes, K. (1996) Organizational health and faculty trust: A view from the middle level. *Research in Middle Level Education Quarterly*, Spring, 21-39.
- Hoy, W. K. & Tarter, C.J. (1995). *Administrators Solving the Problems of Practice: Decision-making concepts, cases, and consequences*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). Open schools, healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C.J., Witkoskie, L. (1992). Faculty trust in colleagues: Linking the principal with school effectiveness. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 26 (1), 38-45.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9(3), 184-208.
- Janis, I. L. (1982). *Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascos*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Johnson-George, C.E., & Swap, W.C. (1982). Measurement of specific interpersonal trust: Construction and validation of a scale to assess trust in a specific other. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 1306-1317.
- Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implication for cooperation and teamwork. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 531-546.
- Jones, W., & Burdette, M. P. (1994). Betrayal in relationships. In A. Weber & J. Harvey (Eds.), *Perspectives on close relationships* (pp. 243-262). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kee, H.W., & Knox, R.E. (1970). Conceptual and methodological considerations in the study of trust and suspicion, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 14, 357-365.
- Kipnis, D. (1996). Trust and technology. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Klayman, J. & Ha, Y.W. (1997). Confirmation, disconfirmation, and information in hypothesis testing. In W. M. Goldstein and R. M. Hogarth (Eds.), *Research on judgment and decision making: Currents, connections, and controversies*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Review*, 37, 656-669.
- Kramer, R. M. (1994). The sinister attribution error: Paranoid cognition and collective distrust in organizations. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18, 199-230.
- Kramer, R. M. (1996). Divergent realities and convergent disappointments in the hierarchic relation: Trust and the intuitive auditor at work. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kramer, R. M., Brewer, M. B., & Hanna, B.A. (1996). Collective trust and collective action: The decision to trust as a social decision. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Kramer, R. M. & Tyler, T. (Eds.)(1996). *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kratzer, C. C. (1997, March). A community of respect, caring, and trust: One school's story. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Larson, C. L. (1997). Is the land of oz an alienation nation? A sociopolitical study of school community conflict. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33, 312-350.
- Larzelere, R.E., & Huston, T.L. (1980). The dyadic trust scale: Toward understanding interpersonal trust in close relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42, 595-604.
- Leonard, P. E. (1999, November). Do teachers value collaboration? The impact of trust. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Levy, S., & Guttman, L. (1985). A faceted cross-cultural analysis of some core social values. In D. Kanter (Ed.) *Facet Theory: Approaches to Social Research*, New York: Springer-Verlag, pp 205-222
- Lewicki, R.J. & Bunker, B.B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 438-458.
- Lewis, J. D., & Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces*, 63, 967-985.
- Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and Initiative in Teachers' Professional Relations, *Teachers College Record*, 91, 509-536.
- Limerick, D. & Cunningham, B. (1993). *Managing the new organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lindskold, S. (1978). Trust development, the GRIT proposal, and the effects of conciliatory acts on conflict and cooperation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85, 772-793.
- Lindskold, S., & Bennett, R. (1973). Attributing trust and conciliatory intent from coercive power capability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28(2), 180-186.
- Loomis, J. L. (1959). Communication, the development of trust, and cooperative behavior. *Human Relations*, 52, 305-315.

- Louis, K. S., Kruse, S., & Associates. (1995). *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Louis, K. S., Kruse, S., & Marks, H. M. (1996). School-wide professional community: Teachers work, intellectual quality and commitment. In F. W. Newman & Associates, *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality* (pp 179-203). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Luce, R. D. & Raiffa, H. (1957). *Games and decisions: Introduction and critical survey*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Luhmann, N. (1979). *Trust and power*. Chichester, New York: Wiley.
- Malen, B., Ogawa, R. T., & Kranz, J. (1990). Evidence says site-based management hindered by many factors. *The School Administrator*, 47 (2), 30-32, 53-56, 59.
- Marks, H. M., & Louis, K. S. (1997). Does teacher empowerment affect the classroom? The implications of teacher empowerment for instructional practice and student academic performance. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 19, 245-275.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 709-734.
- McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24-59.
- McKnight, D. H., Cummings, L. L., & Chervany, N. L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 473-490.
- Mellinger, G. D. (1956). Interpersonal trust as a factor in communication. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 52, 304-309.
- Mishra, A.K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA.: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10, 85-97.

Osgood, C. E. (1959). Suggestions for winning the real war with communism. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 3, 295-325.

Parsons, T. (1960). *Structure and process in modern societies*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Pilisuk, M. & Skolnick, P. (1968). Inducing trust: A test of the Osgood proposal. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8, 121-133.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.

Pounder, D. G. (1998). *Restructuring schools for collaboration: Promises and pitfalls*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Powell, W. W. (1990), "Neither Market nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organization", in B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (Eds.) *Research in Organizational Behavior*, JAI, Greenwich, CT, Vol 12, pp.295-336.

Powell, W.W. (1996). Trust-based forms of governance. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). The prosperous community: Social Capital and public life. *The American Prospect*, 13, 35-42.

Putnam, R. T. & Borko, H. (1997). Teacher learning: Implications of new views of cognition. In B. J. Biddle, T. L. Good, & I. F. Goodson (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Teachers & Teaching*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Ray, B. (1997). *Home schooling across the United States*. National Home Education Research Institute.

Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G., & Zanna, M.D. (1985). Trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 95-112.

Roberts, K. H. & O'Reilly, C.O. (1974). Failure in upward communication in organizations: Three possible culprits. *Academy of Management*, 17, 205-215.

Robinson, S.L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 574-599.

- Rosen, B. & Jerdee, T.H. (1977). Influence of subordinate characteristics on trust and use of participative decision strategies in a management simulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 628-631.
- Rozenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' workplace*, Longman, New York.
- Rotter, J. B. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality*, 35, 651-665.
- Rotter, J. B. (1980). Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility. *American Psychologist*, 35, 1-7.
- Rousseau, D., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 393-404.
- Sapienza, H. J., & Korsgaard, M. A. (1996). Managing investor relations: The impact of procedural justice in establishing and sustaining investor support. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 544-574.
- Schlenker, B.R., Helm, B., & Tedeschi, J.T. (1973). The effects of personality and situational variables on behavioral trust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25, 419-427.
- Scott, C.L. III (1980). Interpersonal trust: A comparison of attitudinal and situational factors. *Human Relations*, 33, 805-812.
- Shapiro, S.P. (1987). The social control of impersonal trust. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93, 623-658.
- Shapiro, D.L., Sheppard, B.H., and Cheraskin, L. (1992). "Business on a handshake", *Negotiation Journal*, 8, 365-378.
- Shaw, R. B. (1997). *Trust in the balance: Building successful organizations on results, integrity and concern*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1997). *Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts*. Columbus: Merrill.
- Short, P. M., Greer, J. T., & Melvin, W. M. (1994). Creating empowered schools: Lessons in change. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32, 38-52.
- Shye, S. (1978). *Theory construction and data analysis in the behavioral sciences*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Sitkin, S. B. (1995). On the positive effect of legalization on trust. In R. J. Bies, R. J. Lewicki, & B. H. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research in negotiations in organizations* (Vol. 5, pp. 185-217). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Sitkin, S.B., & Roth, N.L. (1993). Explaining the limited effectiveness of legalistic “remedies” for trust/distrust. *Organizational Science*, 4(3), 367-392.
- Sitkin, S.B., & Stickel, D. (1996). The road to hell: The dynamics of distrust in an era of quality. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Smylie, M. A., & Hart, A. W. (1999). School leadership for teacher learning and change: A human and social capital perspective. . In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis , *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (pp 421-441). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Solomon, L. (1960). The influence of some types of power relationships and game strategies upon the development of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 223-230.
- Spuck, D. W., & MacNeil, A. J. (1999, November). *Understanding trust relationships between principals and teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Strickland, L.H. (1958). Surveillance and trust. *Journal of Personality*, 26, 200-215.
- Swinth, R.L. (1967). The establishment of the trust relationship. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 11, 335-344.
- Tarter, C.J., Bliss, J. R., & Hoy, W. K. (1989). School characteristics and faculty trust in secondary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 25 (3), 294-308.
- Tarter, C.J., Sabo, D., & Hoy, W. K. (1995). Middle school climate, faculty trust and effectiveness: A path analysis. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29 (1), 41-49.

- Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). *Trust and collaboration in urban elementary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (in press). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Goddard, R.D. (2000). Building collective efficacy and trust in schools. Unpublished working paper, The College of William and Mary.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, W. K. (1998). A conceptual and empirical analysis of trust in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36, 334-352.
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tyler, T. & Kramer, R. (1996). Whither trust? In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Walker, K. (1999, November). *The foundations and the fragility of trust in school leadership* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 513-530.
- Wicks, A. C., Berman, S., L., & Jones, T., M. (1999). The structure of optimal trust: Moral and strategic implications. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 99-116.
- Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Market and hierarchies: Analysis and antitrust implications*. New York: The Free Press.
- Williamson, O.E. (1993). Calculativeness, trust, and economic organization. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 36, 453-486.
- Wrightsman, L.S. (1966). Personality and attitudinal correlates of trusting and trustworthy behaviors in a two-person game. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 328-332.
- Wrightsman, L.S. (1974). *Assumptions about human nature: A social psychological approach*. Monterrey, CA: Brooks Cole.