Durham E-Theses

The Impact of Trust on School Principals' Leadership.

WOOD, PETER,RAYMOND

How to cite:

WOOD, PETER,RAYMOND (2014) *The Impact of Trust on School Principals' Leadership.*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/10743/

The Impact of Trust

on School Principals' Leadership

Peter Raymond Wood

DURHAM UNIVERSITY

The Impact of Trust

on School Principals' Leadership

By

Peter Raymond Wood

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

School of Education

Durham University

2014

Abstract

The impact of trust on working relationships has become a focus of discussion by educational researchers. However, the role trust plays in the relationship between principal and teacher has seen few studies undertaken and thus forms the basis for this study's investigation. The primary aim of this study in contributing to educational research focuses on developing an understanding of the conditions that allow trust to develop and those that damage trust from being established or maintained between principal and staff member.

This study is informed by a synthesis of theoretical and educational research of the dimensions of trust, and through a field-study, examination of the impact staff actions have on the maintenance and repair of trust and the impact these actions have on the principal.

The main question of the study is: "What is the impact of trust on school principals' leadership?"

The first phase of the research design incorporates a literature review to distil the current knowledge of trust, so as to establish a theoretical context for the study. The second phase of the study employs a qualitative research methodology engaging 20 Western Australian school principals in the process of recounting their observations of trust relationships in their schools. The links between phases of the study identify common themes.

The study found that trust plays an important role in the establishment and maintenance of working relationships between school principals and their staff. The findings identify the importance of trust to principals; the conditions that promote and diminish trust in relationships, the outcomes of breaches of trust, and the conditions that allow for trust repair.

The findings are discussed in the light of contemporary research of trust in related fields and recommendations are made for further research.

Statement of copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the prior written consent, and confirmation derived from it acknowledged.

Dedication

To my wife, Janet.

Thank you for trusting in me,

and for your continued support

in this and all we do.

Declaration

This thesis is my own work and has not been offered previously in candidature at this or any other university.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Carl Bagley and Anji Rae in supporting me with this study.

Thanks also to the principals who so willingly participated in this research by giving their time and sharing their personal experiences.

To my wife Janet and my family for their unwavering support and encouragement, thank you.

Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Research overview

Scholarly interest in the study of trust in organisations has grown significantly with extensive management and organisational literature supporting this field of research. This interest has been stimulated, at least in part, by growing evidence that the development of trusting relationships has benefits for enhanced organisational performance (Battaglio and Condrey 2009), and their employees (Kramer 1999). Trust is a central element in the formation of healthy personality (Erikson 1968; Hazan and Shaver 1994 p.13), as a basis for establishing and developing interpersonal relationships (Rempel, Holmes et al. 1985), as a foundation for cooperation (Blau 1964) and a principal factor in stabilising organisations (Arrow 1974; Zucker 1986). Searle and Dietz (2012) cite research on the impact of trust on performance management in (Mayer and Davis 1999), training and development (Tzafrir 2005) and union-management partnerships (Dietz 2004).

The view of trust as a foundation for organisational order is evident across a number of intellectual disciplines. The understanding of why people trust others and how that trust shapes interpersonal relations within the organisation has been a central focus for psychologists (Deutsch 1962); (Worchel 1979); sociologists (Gambetta 1988), anthropologists (Ekeh 1974) and organisational theorists (Kramer and Tyler 1996). From inception, a central focus of the disciplines has been the identification of trust factors that impact on intra-organisational cooperation, coordination and control (March and Simon 1958; Arrow 1974). There has been a resurgence of interest amongst scholars in exploring the role trust plays in such processes (Coleman 1990; Putnam 1993; Sitkin and Roth 1993; Fukuyama 1995; Mayer, Davis et al. 1995; McAllister 1995; Kramer and Tyler 1996; Misztal 1996; Seligman 1997; Tschannen-Moran 2004; Dietz 2011).

Research on the study of trust in organisations has focused on understanding the dimensions of trust and how they emerge (Sitkin and Roth 1993; Hosmer 1995; Mayer, Davis et al. 1995; Kramer and Tyler 1996;

Hope-Hailey, Searle et al. 2012). The growing study of trust in organisations leads to a general consensus amongst scholars that trust is important and useful in a range of organisational operations such as leadership, team work, goal setting, development of working relations and negotiation (Morris and Moberg 1994; Mayer, Davis et al. 1995; Zeffane and Connell 2003; Tschannen-Moran 2009).

Common elements of current definitions of trust are captured in the definition by Mishra (1996) and Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) that trust is one's willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable and competent, and it is this definition that informs this research.

This study sets out to recognise these contemporary views of trust research, to conceptualise trust, and apply this to the observations made during school-based interviews with principals so as to determine commonalities with existing research and identify the conditions which allow for the trust phenomenon to exist. The study seeks to not only identify the conditions that contribute to the formation of trusted working relationships between principal and a staff member but to account for the role trust plays and specifically, the impact trust has on facilitating, maintaining and/or preventing working relationships being established. The study is presented from the viewpoint of the principal, in that it is the principal's view of how influential trust is in the formation and maintenance of working relationships with staff. It is the principals' opinions, and not those of their staff, that shape this research.

The notion of the 'impact' of trust on school principals' leadership of their school is considered, in this context, to be the influence trust plays in shaping the ways principals interact with their staff, the extent and strength of the effects that trust has in determining the instigation of trusted work relationships, the maintenance of these relationships and the influence trust plays in the observed consequences of relationships that are damaged. It is the notion of change that occurs through the involvement of trust in a relationship that defines impact in this study.

1.2 Rationale for the study

The research in understanding the dimensions of trust in organisations, in part, prompted this researcher to seek an understanding of the role trust plays, from a relational trust perspective, in the interpersonal relationships of teachers and school principals. In particular, it is desirable to determine whether the research identified facets of trust are manifest in the daily work of principals and their staff and to identify the impact these have on the running of the school, the interpersonal relationships with the staff and how the principals managed the situations. This study has the potential to inform research about the influence of the trust dimension in creating and maintaining working relationships with staff.

The researcher has 37 years experience in education, as principal of schools for 27 years in Australia and Hong Kong, and involvement in senior educational administration at a system and State level, which has provided opportunities to witness the daily interactions teachers have with the school leadership and the impact positive and negative relationships have on the functioning of the school and in particular, the effect these have on the players. The variance in these relationships raised for me questions about the factors that seemed to strengthen or weaken the bond between two staff members. Personal observations, over time, through daily interaction with teaching staff, support staff and principals suggested trust be considered as a central element to the way in which they interacted. With many, it was observed that staff members were implicitly trusted by their principal and for these relationships a great respect was held for each other and productive communications and joint actions observed. These relationships were noted as being harmonious. Other relationships between staff members and/or the principal were strained, at times verbally hostile, or at best showing indifference and avoidance, often with voiced non-compliance characterising their relationships. These relationships were considered strained or dysfunctional. This prompted the focus for this study: to better understand the conditions that promote or destroy trust and to account for these having

an impact on the principal. This research affords the opportunity to delve into the perceptions of principals, through an exploration of their personal experiences, to identify and better understand if and how trust enhances the functioning of the school; how relationships between staff members are shaped by the development or breaching of trust, and the influence it has on the principals' perception of their leadership of the school.

1.3   Research aims

The field of education has increasingly focused attention on the role of trust in schools' organisational structures. A greater understanding of the practices that foster trusting relationships between school staff members is likely to inform the study of trust in schools. An interesting line of research has begun to assess the state of trust in schools and to draw out the prominent themes and emerging perspectives on the nature of trust within these educational organisations e.g., (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran 1999; Tschannen-Moran and Hoy 2000; Goddard, Tschannen-Moran et al. 2001; Smith, Hoy et al. 2001; Bryk and Schneider 2002; Van Maele and Van Houtte 2009). This research aims to summarise progress in conceptualising trust, noting some of the more leading images of trust found in contemporary organisational research. Additionally, this study describes some of the recent research on the creation of trusting environments, the consequences of establishing such trust and similarly, the consequences of betrayal of trust and the impact this has on interpersonal relationships. Finally, a focus on the role of trust in principals' leadership of their schools through a recount and analysis of field study interviews with principals about the importance of trust formation, establishment, maintenance and repair of damaged trust within their schools. This study endeavours to develop a better understanding of principals' leadership in managing school environments that support collegial trust and how they manage the outcomes of breaches of trust in answering the main question of the study: "What is the impact of trust on school principals' leadership?"

This was achieved through a qualitative approach linking field research with a synthesis of theoretical and educational research.

The research aims:

1. to contribute to the knowledge of the importance of trust in principals' leadership of their schools
2. to determine the conditions which cause principals to trust or distrust a staff member
3. to better understand the dominant factors that impact on the betrayal of trust
4. to determine how trust is repaired between a principal and a staff member
5. to better understand the impact of restored/unrestored trust.

1.4 Research structure

This study is organised so as to present aspects of research into trust in school environments. Firstly, the study aims to present some of the more leading images of trust found in contemporary organisational research. Secondly, it describes an interview research methodology employed to elicit principals' responses to the study's main question about the impact of trust on their leadership and thirdly, it presents a discussion of the findings of the analysis of the interview data and considers this with reference to the literature.

Chapter 1 identifies the essential concerns of the research, provides the framework for the study and presents the purpose, background and aims of the research together with an introduction to the theoretical basis for the investigation of trust. It provides the focus for the study of trust's role in schools.

1.1 Research overview: sets the study's place in the field of research on trust, describing the development of research into trust and ties it to the purpose for the study.

1.2 Rationale for the study: identifies the author's personal reasons for undertaking the research and the contribution the study makes to research. This part of the chapter describes the potential contribution the study makes

to the literature on trust and the potential it has to inform about the trust dimension of relationships between principals and their staff in schools.

1.3   Research aims section: sets out to identify the purpose of the study noting that with the increased literature attention on trust, there is a concomitant underrepresentation of the study of principals' perceptions of trust in schools. As such, this research seeks to fulfil the gap in the knowledge between current organisational views of trust and those specifically pertaining to principals in school situations. This section identifies the five aims of the study.

Chapter 2   The theoretical framework of the study is described in this chapter. It identifies the epistemology of the study, the theoretical perspective behind the inquiry, the details of the methodology and the methods that steer the inquiry. It provides a review of the literature and a synthesis of dominant themes that pertain to the main question of the study. The focus of this chapter is to identify and trace the development of trust concepts in the literature to determine a working definition of trust and those conditions that influence trust development. It specifies the research into the dimensions of trust that are most commonly observed in working relationships and details the role trust plays in shaping these situations. The main themes identified in the literature review are ultimately considered against the findings of the field work interviews in chapter 4.

Chapter 3 details the research method and design. Here, the interview protocols and the data analysis method used are presented. The rationale for the selection of the method to analyse the data is discussed in relation to the method of data collection.

Chapter 4 discusses the findings of the analysis of the interview data, considers these in relation to the themes that emerged from the literature review and discusses these in the light of the main study question.

Chapter 5 draws together the findings of the study to a conclusion that provides a theoretical explanation of the social phenomenon of trust's

influence on school principals' leadership of their schools. This section also includes the researcher's reflections on the study.

Chapter 6 sets out possible areas for consideration in future trust related research.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework guiding this research forms the link between the theoretical aspects of the study and the practical, in-field findings of the investigation. It provides this researcher's perspective for the examination of the topic.   Crotty (1998) distinguishes four elements in shaping a theoretical framework and this study is guided by these considerations when espousing the structure of this study. This chapter makes known the epistemology, methods, methodology and theoretical perspective underpinning the research and forms the theoretical construct on which this research is based and frames the research question and objectives.

The following table depicts the four elements of the theoretical framework that shape the design of this study and is subsequently explained:

Epistemology	**Constructivism**	• Multiple participant meanings • Understanding • Social construction • Pattern of meaning or theory generation
Theoretical Perspective	**Interpretivism**	• Meanings are emergent • Knowledge claims created as investigation proceeds
Methodology	**Qualitative**	• Grounded Theory • Analysis of existing texts
Method	**Interview**	• Open-ended questions • Interview transcript data analysis

Table 2.1 Theoretical Framework

This research starts with the assumption that it will contribute to the knowledge of the role and influence trust plays in the leadership principals provide to their schools.

2.1.1 Epistemological Construct

 The epistemological construct chosen for this research is that of constructivism. A constructivist approach holds that individuals seek meaning from the world in which they live and that varied meanings are identified, leading the researcher to look for the complexity of views rather than narrowing the meanings to a few categories. The goal of this form of research is to rely as much as possible on the participants' views of the phenomenon being studied. Participants construct the meaning of a situation by responding to broad, open-ended questions about the processes of interaction between themselves and another in a social situation (Crotty 1998; Neuman 2000). This researcher's intent then, is that through this qualitative approach, the interpretation of the meanings others have about the world, specifically the role of trust in relationships, and the processes of interaction among individuals, will inductively develop a theory or pattern of meaning of trust's impact on principals' school leadership.

2.1.2 Theoretical Perspective

The theoretical perspective of the framework relates to the researcher's particular view of the human world and the social life within that world (Crotty 1998). The constructivist epistemology, the purpose of the research and methodology employed lend themselves to an interpretivist approach which (Crotty 1998, p.68) defines as "the study of society in the context of human beings and interacting." In undertaking this form of study it is important to note that there can be more than one meaning expressed by participants and the researcher needs to be receptive to these variations and capable of making sense of the multiple perspectives of the same phenomenon (Lincoln, Lynham et al. 2011). The intention of the interpretivist researcher is to understand and interpret human behaviour rather than attempt to predict causes and effects; and through ensuring there is adequate dialogue

between the interviewee and researcher, interact in order to collaboratively construct a meaningful reality. The interpretation of principals' expressions of their views of trust thus allows for the generation of patterns of meaning.

2.1.3 Methodology

The methodology chosen for this research provides specific direction for the data analysis procedures in the research design. The strategy chosen contributes to the overall qualitative research approach. Grounded Theory (Corbin and Strauss 1990) is chosen as the preferred strategy as it establishes a general, abstract theory of a process, action or interaction grounded in the views of the participants. This process affirms the constructivist approach in that it involves using multiple iterations of data collection and refinement and the identification of interrelationships of categories of information. Characteristics of this method are the constant comparison of data with the emerging categories identified from the discourse and theoretical sampling to identify similarities and differences in the participants' responses (Corbin and Strauss 1990). This Grounded Theory method is further described in chapter 3.

2.1.4 Research Method

The research method employed to collect data was that of interview. The open-ended nature of the initial question allowed for interviewees' responses to be on topic but unconstrained by pre-conceived expectations. It allowed for participants to express their personal interpretation of the trust phenomenon and how it played a role in their lives, thus revealing to the researcher previously unknown variables to examine. This method provided a strong platform for the identification and subsequent analysis of the qualitative data set. The interview technique is further discussed in chapter 3.

This research method generated meanings of the trust construct from the perspective of the interviewed principals which were then considered in the light of existing literature on the subject. The purpose of the literature review

is to distil the current knowledge of trust so as to establish and link a theoretical context for this study with the findings of the interviews. The intention of the literature review is to provide an evaluative report of studies of trust found in the literature by: defining key terms pertaining to the understanding of trust in working relationships; presenting contemporary beliefs about the field of trust and to provide a theoretical link to the analysis of this study's investigation into the impact of trust on school principals' leadership.

2.2   Literature review methodology

Electronic library databases and hardcopy texts were employed to source references on the concept of trust in school and wider organisational studies. Due to the vast reference list generated, an iterative search was employed to focus on the identification of early definitions and notions of trust in organisations so as to establish an in-depth understanding of the work of early theorists. Systematic mapping of the generated literature search focused further engagement with the literature on those aspects of trust previously identified by early trust researchers and subsequently explored in more contemporary studies.

2.3   Key themes emerging from the literature

The literature search served to identify the key themes of trust research in organisations: those factors that contributed to the formation of trusting relationships which were deemed the most prevalent in research studies; the factors that impinged upon the trust element and either enhanced or diminished the formation and/or maintenance of trust; and those factors that contributed to the restoration of broken trust. This chapter explores these issues in depth.

2.4   Literature Review:

2.4.1 The importance of trust in organisations

The reliance on others to collaborate to achieve common organisational goals is dominant in the trust literature. Organisations exist to accomplish tasks that are too big, complex and costly for individuals alone to accomplish and so a level of interdependence is established between colleagues by

virtue of their common purpose of achieving the organisation's goals (Tschannen-Moran 2004). Schools rely on the building of strong staff relationships in order to provide a collaborative environment in which planning, programme delivery and evaluation are seen as shared responsibilities of all staff in bringing about educational opportunities and improved student learning. It is important that the employee is able to forge workable relationships with colleagues and to serve the organisation's purpose. Trust matters most in situations of interdependence in which the interests of one party cannot be achieved without reliance upon another because unless parties are dependent on one another for something they care or need, trust is not critical (Tschannen-Moran 2004).

The research into the factors affecting these trusting relationships is great and trust's importance in effective working relationships is widely acknowledged by scholars. Trust makes cooperative endeavours happen e.g., (Deutsch 1973; Arrow 1974; Gambetta 1988). McKnight and Chervany (1996) assert that trust is a key to positive interpersonal relationships in various settings (cf. Fox 1974; Lewis and Weigert 1985); because of its centrality to how we interact with others e.g., (Golembiewski and McConkie 1975; Berscheid 1994). Trust is crucial during periods of uncertainty due to organisational crisis, during which time trusting relationships contribute to a more united effort for improvement (Weick and Roberts 1993; Mishra 1996; Webb 1996).

Hence, interpersonal trust matters in schools that are dependent on "critical task interdependencies" (Gargiulo and Benassi 1999): schools that rely on regular interactions and cooperation between school staff for work to be completed and for the school's goals to be attained. These trusting relationships can be diverse within a school and take many forms of interaction, whether interactions are between individuals, within teams, or among an entire staff, trust reduces uncertainty and increases the likelihood of people cooperating (Zand 1972; McAllister 1995; Jones and George 1998; Uphoff 2000; Krishna and Uphoff 2002). Trust helps to make "collective action of various sorts more feasible" (Uphoff 2000, p.229).

Cooperative action, such as problem solving and decision making that requires the contribution of all group members, is more effectively addressed when trust exists between members of the collective (Putnam 1993) and because members need to realise collective goals they are dependent on one another. In such situations of interdependence trust may reduce uncertainty (Luhmann 1979) and enhance cooperation (Gambetta 1988). The reliance upon another staff member to achieve a common end is a key aspect of the trusting relationships between staff.

Research also suggests that as a result of collegial trust, the sharing of essential information is promoted within an organisation (Serageldin and Grootaert 2000; Lin 2001; Grootaert and van Bastelaer 2002). Through collaboration, trust can allow individual and group access to "structurally embedded" information, resources and opportunities that take form within social structures in the organisation (Lin 2001). In particular, individuals who feel trust in those with whom they interact are more likely to disclose relevant and accurate details of problems (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy 2000). Thus, the willingness to be open to confide in others is stronger in trusted working relationships.

Trust is related to the effective functioning of a school (Uline, Miller et al. 1998; Troman 2000; Bryk and Schneider 2003; Kochanek 2005; Louis 2007). Van Maele and Van Houtte (2009) contend that as trust is linked to the better functioning of organisations, trust can be assumed to positively affect the functioning and effectiveness of schools. The notion that trusting relationships are an integral part and a central functioning of an organisation is recognised by Coleman (1990) and Leana and Van Buren (1999). Similarly, interpersonal trust enhances a school's effectiveness (Hargreaves 2001; Bryk and Schneider 2002; Goddard 2003) and therefore, because a school's effectiveness is enhanced through trust, Van Maele and Van Houtte (2009) assert that a connection can be established between trust relations in schools and the school's success. Further, if trusting relationships support teachers' collaboration (Tschannen-Moran 2001) and a school's capacity for developing a professional learning community among staff, Hargreaves

(2007); Tschannen-Moran (2009), Van Maele and Van Houtte (2009) contend that trust strengthens some characteristics of effective schools.

Goddard, Tschannen-Moran et al. (2001) assert that the levels of collegial trust among staff may affect students' performances, and may affect teachers' efficiency by affecting their sense of efficacy (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran 1999; Goddard, Hoy et al. 2000), and job satisfaction (van Houtte 2006). Not only is the level of trust a measure of the individual's self-efficacy but also a determinant of teachers' collaboration with others in schools (Tschannen-Moran 2001), of successful teacher leadership (Muijs and Harris 2006) and of a school's capacity to build a professional learning community (Gamoran, Gunter et al. 2005; Mulford 2007; Tschannen-Moran 2009).

In schools where trust is evident throughout the organisation, a greater degree of professionalism in staff behaviour is observed. Simpson (2007, p.264) contends that trust "may be the single most important ingredient for the development and maintenance of happy, well-functioning relationships" and similarly, Hargreaves (2007) called trust the backbone of a strong and sustainable professional learning community. In terms of gains in student achievement, a ten-year study of schools in Chicago, Bryk and Schneider (2002) concluded that trust was a critical factor in predicting which schools would make the greatest gains over time.

2.4.2 Defining trust

Early studies described trust in behavioural terms (Deutsch 1958; Zand 1972), as an individual's expression of confidence in others' intentions and motives. Mellinger (1956), Deutsch (1958) and Read (1962) for instance, described trust as an individual's confidence in another person's intentions and motives, and the sincerity of that person's word. Deutsch (1960) viewed trust as an interpersonal phenomenon, as the person's confidence in the intentions and capabilities of a relationship partner and the belief that a relationship partner would behave as one hoped. Building upon early research that focused on intentions and motives, later studies defined trust as an attitude or judgement as well (Frost, Stimpson et al. 1978). Rotter

(1967) viewed trust as a personal attribute. The focus of more recent research is on behaviour (Hosmer 1995; Mayer, Davis et al. 1995) where trust is defined as one person's optimistic expectation of the behaviour of another, when the person must make a decision about how to act (under conditions of vulnerability and dependence) and as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other party will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party" (Mayer, Davis et al. 1995, p.712). "Trust is also a choice... a judgement based on evidence" (Tschannen-Moran 2004, p.16) and the element of willingness to be vulnerable is a dominant theme in recent definitions. Trust is one's willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable and competent (Mishra 1996; Tschannen-Moran and Hoy 2000).

A number of researchers have commented on the considerable quantity of trust definitions and their interpretations. Barber (1983) notes that most research on trust has been definitionally and conceptually vague, that it suffered from unidimensional conceptualisations and operationalisations that failed to discriminate from related constructs such as cooperation or familiarity. Similarly, Taylor (1989) found that an examination of available research on trust to be "a bewildering array of meanings and connotations". Shapiro (1987, p.625) saw trust definitions as a "confusing potpourri", an "elusive concept" (Gambetta 1988) and likewise "a conceptual confusion" (Lewis and Weigert 1985, p.975). For example, some early classifications included Gabarro's (1978) findings of perceived integrity, motives, consistency, openness, discreteness, functional competence, interpersonal competence and decision-making judgement contributing to attitudes of trustworthiness and Butler (1991) identified perceived availability, competence, consistency, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, overall trust, promise of fulfilment and receptivity as indicators of a superordinate's trustworthiness. However, some clarity is identified with the McKnight and Chervany (1996) review of the trust literature from 60 research articles and

books. Here, dominant trust attributes were identified within the authors' definitions. The following trust indicators were identified:

- committing to a possible loss based on the other's actions (Anderson and Narus 1990)
- placing resources or authority in the other party's hands (Shapiro 1987; Coleman 1990)
- providing open/honest information (Mishra 1993)
- cooperating or task coordinating (Solomon 1960)
- entering informal agreements (Currall and Judge 1995)
- entering a bargain with another under risk conditions (Scanzoni 1979)
- increasing one's vulnerability (Zand 1972)
- reducing one's control over the other (Dobing 1993)
- allowing another to influence one (Bonoma 1976)
- risk taking (Coleman 1990; Mayer, Davis et al. 1995)
- increasing the scope of the other person's discretionary power (Baier 1986), or expanding their role (Fox 1974)
- reducing the rules we place on other's behaviour (Fox 1974)
- involving subordinates in decision making (Carnevale and Wechsler 1992).

Certain attributes were cited more frequently than others, these being benevolence, caring, concern (14 instances), competence (10), goodwill, good intentions (10) and honesty (7). McKnight and Chervany's (1996) analysis also identified that the attributes the trusted person must possess differ from relationship to relationship and from situation to situation.

Interestingly, a similar finding was made by Mayer, Davis et al. (1995) who independently identified the most prevalent trust factors from the study of 23 articles and books to be benevolence, ability and integrity.

Researchers increasingly agree that trust is a multi-dimensional concept (Golembiewski and McConkie 1975; Corazzini 1977; Wrightsman 1991; Williamson 1993). This is evident in the following definitions:

"Trust is one's willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable and competent" (Mishra 1996; Tschannen-Moran, Hoy et al. 1998; Tschannen-Moran and Hoy 2000).

"Trust is the extent to which one is willing to rely upon and make oneself vulnerable to another" (Baier 1994; Bigley and Pearce 1998).

"Trust rests on the assurance that one can count on the good will of another to act in one's best interest, that the other will not exploit one's vulnerability even when the opportunity is available" (Cummings and Bromiley 1996).

"Trust means that one can expect that the word or promise of another individual whether verbal or written, can be relied upon" (Rotter 1967).

"The willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control the other party." (Mayer, Davis et al. 1995).

Scholars focusing on the concept of trust have defined being vulnerable as taking action where the potential for loss exceeds the potential for gain (Mishra p.261 in Kramer and Tyler, ed., 1996).

2.4.3 Dimensions of trust

Studies have identified the complexity and multidimensionality of trusting relationships (Baier 1986; Swan, Trawick et al. 1988; Butler 1991; Cummings and Bromiley 1996; Schoorman, Mayer et al. 2007) and an understanding of trust's dimensions is important (McKnight and Chervany 1996). The dominant dimensions of trust cited in the literature are benevolence, competence and honesty.

2.4.3.1 Benevolence

Benevolence is the most commonly recognised dimension of trust in the aforementioned studies. Benevolence is a sense of caring (Tschannen-

Moran 2004), a confidence that one's well-being or something one cares about will be protected and not harmed by the trusted party (Baier 1994; Zand 1997). Also, Dietz and Den Hartog (2006, p.560) "benevolence reflects benign motives and a personal degree of kindness toward the other party, and a genuine concern for their welfare." This trust rests on the assurance that one can count on the goodwill of another to act in one's best interest, that the other will not exploit one's vulnerability even when the opportunity is available (Cummings and Bromiley 1996). A benevolent person does not act opportunistically (McKnight and Chervany 1996). Having faith in the caring intentions or altruism of the other is particularly important (Tschannen-Moran 2004; Hope-Hailey, Searle et al. 2012). In a school situation, parents who trust that educators will care for their children are confident that teachers will consistently act with the best interests of their child in mind; that their child will be treated with fairness and compassion and that there will be an attitude of goodwill (Putnam 2000). This sense of care is not only pertinent to the immediate outcome but also about the relationship (Tschannen-Moran 2004).

School principals promote trust by demonstrating benevolence (Tschannen-Moran 2004), by demonstrating through actions such as showing consideration and sensitivity for employees' needs and interests, acting in a way that protects employees' rights and refraining from exploiting staff for personal gain. She cites appreciation of teachers' hard work as one way of showing benevolence by school principals.

2.4.3.2 Competence

Competence is the ability to perform a task as expected, according to appropriate standards (Tschannen-Moran 2004). A person in demonstrating a benevolent manner and good intentions alone towards another may not be enough for the other to gain trust in that person. They may also be required to show a particular ability or skill. A benevolent person may not be worthy of trust in all situations since one may trust them to demonstrate competence in a particular field but not in another. Therefore, when a person is dependent on another, some level of skill is involved in fulfilling the

expectation; an individual who simply means well may nevertheless, not be trusted (Baier 1994). "A trustee demonstrating the attribute of competence has the 'capabilities' to carry out her/his obligations (in terms of skills and knowledge)" (Dietz and Den Hartog (2006, p.560). The essence here is that one has the ability to do for the other person what the other person needs to have done. It is this capacity for producing a desired result or effect; the expected level of expertise that one party assumes the other to have, that impacts on the degree of trust bestowed.

2.4.3.3 Honesty

Honesty is a fundamental facet of trust (Butler and Cantrell 1984; Cummings and Bromiley 1996). The concept of honesty concerns a person's character, their integrity and their authenticity (Tschannen-Moran 2004) and is fundamental to the formation of interpersonal trust. There is a sense of confident expectation in the definition by Rotter (1967, p.651) "Trust means that one can expect that the word or promise of another individual, whether verbal or written, can be relied upon." This concurs with Bromiley and Cummings (1995) assertion that honesty means one makes good faith agreements, tells the truth and fulfils any promises made. Similarly, Dietz and Den Hartog (2006, p.560) explain that "integrity involves adherence to a set of principles acceptable to the other party, encompassing honesty and fair treatment and avoidance of hypocrisy". The growth of trust relies on this belief that actions are truthful and correct and that the integrity promised in future actions will be kept. People earn a reputation of integrity by telling the truth and keeping promises (Dasgupta 1988) and the match between what they say they intend to do and what is actually carried out is what characterises their integrity (Simons 1999). A person's integrity is questioned when trust is broken. Trust may survive a broken promise if an explanation is given but a pattern of broken promises will likely provoke a serious threat to trust (Tschannen-Moran 2004).

As articulated by Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995), and Cummings and Chervany (1996), the combined trust factors of benevolence, competence and honesty form a foundation for trust, that if one consistently proves to be

willing (benevolence) and capable (competence) to serve another's interests with integrity (honesty), then that person is worthy of trust. They contend that these actions form Trusting Beliefs that find expression via Trusting Intentions and which are in turn acted upon through Trusting Behaviours. McKnight and Chervany (1996, p.26) categorise these as follows: "When one has Trusting Beliefs about another, one will be willing to depend on that person (Trusting Intention). If one intends to depend on that person, then one will behave in ways that manifest that intention to depend (Trusting Behaviour)."

Trusting Beliefs

Trusting beliefs are the extent to which one believes (and feels confident in believing) that the other person is trustworthy in the situation. A trustworthy person is able and willing to act in the other's best interests (Driver, Russell et al. 1968; McLain and Hackman 1995). Trusting beliefs are person and situation specific (McKnight and Chervany 1996); "a subjective, aggregated and confident set of beliefs about the other party and one's relationship with her/him which lead one to assume that the other party's likely actions will have positive consequences for oneself" (Dietz and Den Hartog (2006, p.558).

The Trusting Belief construct encompasses belief-related confidence, the level of confidence one possesses in one's beliefs about the other person, (McKnight, Cummings et al. 1998). Here, confidence is a feeling of certainty or easiness regarding a belief one holds and "an assessment of the other party's trustworthiness" (Dietz and Den Hartog (2006, p.559) and as such is "more than hopefulness, blind faith or gullibility" (McEvily, Perrone et al. 2003, p.99).

Based on their 1996 trust literature review, McKnight and Chervany (1996) found the most prevalent trusting beliefs in the literature involve benevolence, competence and honesty and in a given situation, a person with Trusting Beliefs usually believes that the other is benevolent, honest and competent.

Trusting Intention

McKnight and Chervany describe "Trusting Intention" as the extent to which one party is willing to depend on the other party in a given situation with a feeling of relative security, even though negative consequences are possible." (McKnight and Chervany 1996, p.27). Trusting Intention is situation specific and an intentional state in so much as the person is ready to depend on the other in that situation. Trusting intention is one-way and may not involve the other person necessarily trusting the other party. It is an individual level as opposed to group or societal level of trust (McKnight and Chervany 1996). Their definition of trusting intention embodies five essential elements synthesised from the trust literature:

1.   Potential negative consequences
In acknowledging the potential for negative consequences they specify that some risk is necessary in order for trust to be present (Zand 1972; Williamson 1993). Without risk the situation would not present any challenge for the formation of Trusting Intention.

2.   Dependence
Dependence on another e.g., (Scanzoni 1979; Lewis and Weigert 1985; Atwater 1988; Dobing 1993) or a reliance upon another (Giffin 1967; McGregor 1967; Good 1988; Ring and Van de Ven 1994). If one is not required to depend on the other, then one doesn't need to be willing to depend on the other. Emerson (1962) defined dependence as the "obverse of power." One who becomes dependent on another, places the other in a position of power over him or her. McKnight, Cummings et al. (1998) define influence-based power as the ability (used or not used) to achieve desired ends through influence. Influence means that one person causes changes in another person (as manifest in their behaviour, emotions or cognitions). Their view is that dependence-based power means that one party has the ability to influence the other party because the other party is dependent on the first party. Dominance means influence by one party over another is

asymmetrical over a broad range of attributes (Huston 1983). In trusting
relationships one party is dependent on the other to act appropriately in their
best interests.

3. Feelings of security

In order to trust, the person facing risk must be willing to depend on the other
with feelings of security. Felt security means one feels safe and assured and
comfortable (not anxious or fearful) about one's willingness to depend on
another (McKnight, Cummings et al. 1998). The research literature has
defined trust in terms of security e.g., (Lewis and Weigert 1985; Rempel,
Holmes et al. 1985); Comfort, (Eayrs 1993); or lack of fear, (Brandach and
Eccles 1989). To Rempel, Holmes and Zanna (1985), felt security is what
enables the trustor to make the "leap of faith" beyond the evidence they
possess about the other party. Felt security distinguishes Trusting Intention
from willingness to depend that has feelings of anxiety or fear associated
with it. This aspect of Trusting Intention has an emotional component,
whereas the other aspects of Trusting Intention are cognitive. Security is
implied by trust, but is only one component (McKnight, Cummings et al.
1998).

4.   A situation-specific context

One does not trust another person to do every task on one's behalf
(McKnight, Cummings et al. 1998). Rather, one develops over time, a
mental model of the specific domains (Baldwin 1992) in which one may
depend upon the other person (Gabarro 1978; Sitkin and Roth 1993). A
person may be trusted in one situation but not another.

5.   Lack of reliance on control.

"If one has power over other people...then one can by definition control
events, bringing them to a desired conclusion. In this sense, the man of
power need not trust others to do what he wants because he can coerce
them instead" (Riker 1971, p.66). Hence, Trusting Intention is different from
a deterrence-based trust, which relies on power and control mechanisms,

sanctions and rewards (Lewicki and Bunker 1995). For example, a supervisor who monitors an employee's work performance through direct covert observation is not willing to depend on the employee to behave properly; therefore, the employer doesn't have a trusting intention toward the employee. Rather, the supervisor controls the employee by use of influence-based power (McKnight, Cummings et al. 1998).

Trusting Behaviour

The third form of trust is the decision to actually trust the other person; it is the manifestation of the Trusting Belief. The willingness to depend leads one to actually depend (behaviourally) on the other party (McKnight, Cummings et al. 1998). This dependency, being a behavioural term, is what distinguishes Trusting Behaviour from the construct Trusting Intention (willingness to depend). When one depends on another person, one gives the other an obligation to act on one's behalf (Barber 1983). In essence, the first person decides to give the other person some measure of power over him or her. When a party gives another power over themselves, they place themselves in a situation of risk, a willingness to render themselves vulnerable (Mayer, Davis et al. 1995; Rousseau, Sitkin et al. 1998). Trusting Behaviour takes place in a specific situation with a specific person and takes place in the presence of little or no use of control (McKnight, Cummings et al. 1998). The contention is that here one relies on trust, not on control. The primary difference between Trusting Behaviour and Trusting Intention is that the latter is a cognitive-based construct (willing to depend) and the former is a behaviour-based construct (depends) (McKnight, Cummings et al. 1998). However, Trusting Behaviour still only implies an intention to act and for the trustor to demonstrate trust in the trustee they must undertake risk-taking behaviours having considered the trust implications.

2.4.4 Building trust

Initial trust between two parties may not be based on any previous encounter or first-hand experience. Whilst some researchers have stated that trust develops over a period of time (Blau 1964; Zand 1972; Rempel, Holmes et

al. 1985) others have noted high initial levels of trust (Kramer 1994; Berg, Dickhaut et al. 1995). For example, Kramer's (1994) study of MBA students with no history of previous contact, found high initial trust levels among these individuals.   And similarly, McKnight, Cummings et al. (1998) and Bromiley and Cummings (1995) found that in today's work environment interaction with new employees is becoming increasingly commonplace and that working together well requires some level of trust. Increasingly common, new work encounters demand that parties come to trust each other quickly (Meyerson, Weick et al. 1996). Tschannen-Moran (2004) identifies situations where higher levels of initial trust than expected were observed with parties that have little knowledge or experience of one another. It seems, she notes, that when people interact with a stranger they tend to extend a professional trust until evidence suggests that the other is untrustworthy. The preference of provisional trust over initial distrust is understood, she claims, as it is the easier option. Distrust of another requires effort and the expenditure of energy in anticipation of possible harm and in ways to overcome it (Berg, Dickhaut et al. 1995; Jones and George 1998). However, once a perceived difference in values is observed in the partner, distrust is likely to emerge (Sitkin and Roth 1993).

Initial trust is based on the individual's disposition to trust (McKnight, Cummings et al. 1998). Some people are inclined to extend trust more readily; as such, they can be said to have a disposition to trust. Dispositional Trust recognises that people develop, over the course of their lives, generalised expectations about the trustworthiness of others (Rotter 1967; Erikson 1968). McKnight and Chervany (1996) identified that a person with Dispositional Trust has a consistent tendency to trust others across a range of situations. They state that such a party may exhibit dispositional trust for the following reasons:

i.   Belief in People: A person assumes that others are generally trustworthy and hence one can always trust them.

ii.   Trusting Stance: A person assumes that irrespective of whether people are good or bad, one can form better relationships with them by trusting them (Riker 1971).

This disposition to trust may stem from a person's history of relationships in which promises over time have either been fulfilled or broken (Tschannen-Moran 2004). Therefore, a person with a high disposition to trust is more likely to see good points and overlook flaws in another person that could threaten the development of trust (Rotter 1980; Johnson-George and Swap 1982). In the absence of opposing evidence, extending trust may be the simplest path to establishing a relationship. People with a trusting disposition tend to be more trustworthy than others; they tend to be less likely to cheat, steal or lie even when the opportunity offers increased gain by breaching trust. Highly trusting people tend to be happier, more popular and considered better friends than those with low-trusting dispositions. They tend to be less complicated, mal-adjusted or dependent on others (Deutsch 1960; Wrightsman 1966; Rotter 1967). Hope-Hailey, Searle et al. (2012, p.32) note that "leaders who demonstrated their benevolence and integrity on a day-to-day basis made a difference. These trustworthy leaders saw themselves as having a duty to serve the needs of employees as well as customers".

People have a tendency to extend trust more readily to those they perceive as similar to themselves based on the assumption that they will have adopted similar norms of obligation and cooperation learned through similar cultural structures (Zucker 1986).

2.4.4.1 System Trust

The school environment also shapes the degree of trusting relationships in place. System trust means the extent to which one believes that organisational structures are in place to enable one to have a successful future (Luhmann 1979; Lewis and Weigert 1985; Shapiro 1987). High initial trust in organisations such as schools is a function of not just assumed trustworthiness but also of demonstrated organisational mechanisms such as policies, rules and procedures that support trust. The belief that the necessary organisational structures are in place allows one to anticipate successful relationships and the development of trust (Zucker 1986; Shapiro

1987; McKnight, Cummings et al. 1998). Researchers reference two types of impersonal structures in system trust:

1. Structural Assurances – include the organisation's safeguards in the form of rules, regulations, guarantees or controls (Zucker 1986; Shapiro 1987).
2. Situation Normality – in which perceptions are based on things appearing to be normal (Garfinkel 1967; Baier 1986) in "proper order" (Lewis and Weigert 1985).

System Trust supports Trusting Intention in that as a result of structural safeguards which act like a safety net or the feeling of security that comes with situational normality, one feels more secure in taking risks to trust others (McKnight and Chervany 1996).

2.4.4.2 Situational Decision to Trust

Situational Decision to Trust refers to one's intention to depend on a non-specific other person in a given situation. Riker (1971) elaborates that in a given situation, irrespective of one's beliefs about the other person, one will form the intention to trust every time that situation arises. This means that one has decided to trust another without regard to the specific persons involved because the advantages of trusting in this situation outweigh the possible negative outcomes of trusting (McKnight and Chervany 1996). Similarly, Kee and Knox (1970) suggest this form of trust may occur when there is "much to gain from trusting...but little attendant risk" (cited in McKnight and Chervany 1996, p.38).

McKnight and Chervany (1996) note the distinction between Situational Decision to Trust and Trusting Stance is that Situational Decision to Trust is specific to a situation whereas Trusting Stance can apply across situations generally. With Trusting Stance a person assumes that whether a person is good or bad (Riker 1971), one will obtain better outcomes by trusting them than not. The former also differs from System Trust in that it does not imply structural safeguards and because it does not concern the trustworthiness of another, it doesn't support Trusting Beliefs about a specific individual. However, because it requires a willingness to depend on an unspecified other

in the situation, Situational Decision to Trust supports Trusting Intention. This is considered an impersonal construct (McKnight and Chervany 1996).

2.5 Barriers to trust

2.5.1 Distrust and Betrayal

There is interest in distrust and the violation of trust in organisations e.g., (Sitkin and Roth 1993; Morris and Moberg 1994; Robinson and Bennett 1995; Bies and Tripp 1996; Lewicki and Bunker 1996; Giacalone and Greenberg 1997). As several researchers have noted (Granovetter 1985; Morris and Moberg 1994) the very conditions that are conducive for the emergence of trust also allow for the abuse of trust and the formation of distrust. Numerous scholars have noted that trust is easier to destroy than create (Barber 1983; Janoff-Bulman 1992; Meyerson, Weick et al. 1996; Kramer 1999).

Slovic (1993) posited that a number of factors contribute to asymmetries in the trust-building versus trust-destroying process:

1. Negative (trust-destroying) events are more visible and noticeable than positive (trust-building) events.
2. Trust-destroying events carry more weight in judgement than trust building events of comparable magnitude.

He also found that sources of bad (trust-destroying) news tend to be perceived as more credible than sources of good news.

Lewicki, McAllister et al. (1998) contend that trust and distrust are separate dimensions and not the opposite ends of the trust continuum. They suggest that trust and distrust relationships are multifaceted or multiplex. However, Schoorman, Mayer et al. (2007) contrast this view by asserting that distrust may be seen as the opposite of trust, because by definition trust is a willingness to take a risk (i.e., to be vulnerable) in a relationship and therefore by example, at the lowest level of trust one would take no risks at

all. Their view is that a complete lack of trust and distrust are therefore the same thing. Further, in their model, trust, being domain specific, does allow for the multifaceted and multiplex relationships as raised by Lewicki, McAllister et al. (1998) and cite the example that it may be appropriate to trust a colleague to do a good job collaborating on a research project but not to trust him or her to do a good job teaching your class in your absence. The difference, they observed, is in the level of trust within the same relationship as a function of the different abilities across different domains. Similarly, McKnight and Chervany (2001, p.42) conclude that "most theorists agree that trust and distrust are separate constructs that are opposites of each other".

Burt and Knez (1996) note the impact of a betrayal of trust as being a violation where trust can be shattered, leaving distrust and suspicion in its place. The frequency of minor betrayals in everyday life is observed by Hogan and Hogan (1994) ranging from failing to return a telephone call to deliberately sabotaging another person's reputation, as being relatively common. In a study by Jones and Burdette (1994) focusing on betrayal in the workplace, 25.4% of men and 9.4% women identified work related episodes in which they had been betrayed by co-workers or boss.

Deutsch (1960) saw trust as an individual's confidence in the intentions and capabilities of a relationship partner and the belief that a relationship partner would behave as one hoped. Similarly, Deutsch viewed suspicion or distrust as confidence about a relationship partner's undesirable behaviour, stemming from knowledge of the individual's capabilities and intentions.

Jones and Burdette (1994) define betrayal in relationships as the violation of the trust expectations on which these relationships are based. Harris (1994) notes that subordinates in work situations have also identified a range of leadership behaviours that demonstrate a betrayal of trust: coercive or threatening behaviour, withholding of promised support, blaming of employees for personal mistakes, favouritism, sexual harassment, improper dismissal and misuse of private information. Similarly, Bies and Tripp (1996) partial list of actions that are often considered a violation of trust, include

changing the rules "after the fact", breach of contract, broken promises, lying, stealing of ideas, wrong or unfair accusations and disclosure of secrets.

Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) define betrayal of trust 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. Hogan and Hogan (1994, p.94) have observed that the breach of trust is the greatest danger to modern organisations and not from external agencies but from the betrayal of "ambitious, selfish, deceitful people who care more for their own advancement than the mission of the organisation." They contend that the most prevalent form of trust breach is initiated from within the organisation.

 "Betrayal, thus, is a shadow of trust and loyalty – part and parcel of social life" (Carney 1994 cited in Elangovan and Shapiro 1998, p.547).

2.5.2 Motivation to betray trust

Dominant in the literature on motivation to betray trust is the notion of self-interest to satisfy the trustee's interests and needs e.g., (Lewicki 1983; Trevino 1986; Trevino and Youngblood 1990; Scheibe 1994; Grover 1997). Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) identify three properties of a self-interest perspective:

1. Betrayal is the outcome of a decision-making process.
2. Betrayal is one of the options in this decision process where the most "attractive" of two or more options is chosen and,
3. The attractiveness of the betrayal option is a function of a critical assessment of the overall situation as perceived by the trustee.

Researchers say the underlying theme is that acts involving trust violation in general, are outcomes of a decision-making process rather than impulsive acts (Lewicki 1983; Trevino and Youngblood 1990; Grover 1993; Eoyang 1994; Neuman and Baron 1997). Birner (1992 in Elangovan and Shapiro, 1998, p.42) defines betrayal as "an act calculated to lead another person

astray" which underscores the information processing decision-making nature of the betrayal phenomenon.

Several examples of trust violations e.g., (Lewicki 1983; Sarbin 1994) take into consideration the various rewards and consequences to predict the behaviour to break or maintain trust. A decision to betray, therefore, implies that according to the trustee's assessments, he or she stands to gain more by violating trust than keeping it.

The attractiveness of the betrayal option and the likelihood it will be selected is informed by the following considerations:

1. Is the overall current situation such that the trustee would want to break the trust?
2. Is the trustee likely to experience severe penalties if he or she breaks trust? The 'right opportunity' not only has betrayal as an option in a certain situation but also gives the trustee a high likelihood of "getting away with it" (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

The research on trustworthiness by Mayer, Davis et al. (1995) suggests that for a trustee to fulfil the expectations of the trustor (to keep the trust), he or she must have ability, benevolence and integrity. In other words, in the absence of (1) sufficient ability to meet the expectations of the trustor, (2) a feeling of goodwill toward the trustor, or (3) commitment to principles acceptable to the trustor, there is no guarantee that the trustor's expectations will be fulfilled.

The trustee's standing on these three components can be seen as a measure of his or her likelihood of keeping or betraying the trustor's trust. A negative change or drop in these factors will increase the likelihood of the trustee being very willing to violate (in the case of benevolence and integrity) or actually violating (in the case of ability), the trustor's expectations in a given situation; that is, one or more of these factors weakens.

Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) put forward that with betrayal being a voluntary violation of the trustor's expectations then a drop in benevolence

and integrity is more significant than a drop in ability. If the trustee fails to meet the trustor's expectations because of an inability it implies more of a "can't meet the expectations" rather than a "don't want to meet the expectations" orientation that is inconsistent with the voluntary nature of betrayal. There is greater freedom in the trustor's control of benevolence and integrity to decide who to like or dislike. However, the trustee's ability is only partly under his or her control, thus when a trustee is unable to meet a trustor's expectations, the violation is deemed involuntary and not considered betrayal. The trustee's not wanting to fulfil expectations constitutes a voluntary act and may result in a reduction of a sense of benevolence and/or integrity. Thus, Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) contend, a drop in benevolence implies that the "trustee cares less for the good of the trustor and may engage in behaviours that might harm the trustor, including violating expectations. Similarly, a drop in integrity implies that the trustee is less committed to principles acceptable to the trustor and may be ready to switch to a different set of principles, thus violating expectations, even if it means having the trustee's best interests."

Changes in benevolence and integrity are therefore more indicators of "don't want to" rationale for violating expectations and qualify as the critical change mechanisms underlying motivation to betray.

2.5.3 Trust's effect on organisational culture

A number of researchers have noted that organisational culture is affected by breaches of trusting behaviour such as lying, cheating and stealing e.g., (Shepard and Hartenian 1991; Shapiro, Lewicki et al. 1995; Elangovan and Shapiro 1998). Additionally, Hope-Hailey, Searle and Dietz (2012, p.31) note "poor communication, high levels of conflict and limited opportunities for staff to develop and progress were key factors in reducing trust." How the organisation functions may be reflected in its beliefs in dealing with violations of trust (Enz 1988; Grover 1997). Organisations that discourage violations of trust are often characterised by signs of respect, openness and ethical behaviour (Morris and Moberg 1994; Shapiro, Lewicki et al. 1995; Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

By way of contrast, organisations characterised by goal incongruence, internal politics and conflict and shifting coalitions lend themselves to a greater number of betrayal incidents (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998). These environments, they assert, may result in organisations where loyalty to sub-units (at the expense of the overall organisation), favouritism, breaking promises, hoarding resources and disregard for rules and norms exist. The strength of the sub-unit or "virtuous circles of benevolence" as coined by Hope-Hailey, Searle et al. 2012, p.32), can be seen in maintaining trust relations when other relationships within the organisation become strained. They note that these organisations, which relied solely on trust in leaders, were at high risk of losing trust if those leaders were found to be lacking in ability, benevolence and integrity. Past practices and the manner of dealing with prior incidents of trust violation also influence the trustee's assessment of penalty probability and severity, which, in turn, affects the trustee's decision to betray (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

However, the organisation's culture and norms are not always aligned with the trustor's expectations of the trustee or his or her own values. Trustees might find themselves in situations where they have to choose between betraying the trustor and violating the organisational norms. Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) note, by way of illustrative example, in an organisational culture characterised by an emphasis on trust, openness and ethical conduct, a trustee may have to choose between betraying a colleague by disclosing his or her padding of expenses or ignoring the colleagues conduct and, thus, violating dominant organisational norms.

Thus, organisational culture plays an important role in shaping the trustee's view and motivation for the likelihood of betrayal.

2.5.4 Deviant behaviour and betrayal

Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) differentiate between deviant behaviour and betrayal. Betrayal, they assert, occurs only when the personal expectations of a specific trustor (or trustors) toward a specific trustee, rather than just organisational norms, are violated. The role of the trustor, thus, is more explicit in betrayal than in deviance and helps distinguish the two. This view

is consistent with the observation of Morris and Moberg (1994) that betrayal relates to a violation of personal expectations that are very important to a relationship.

Morris and Moberg (1994) view impersonal trust as the trust accredited to a staff member by nature of the organisation employing that person. It is fundamental to the employment relationship between the organisation and the member and is directed more toward the office of the position rather than the individual. Personal trust however, is a focus on the interpersonal nature of the trust with its inherent expectations and risks. Impersonal trust violation is limited to the organisation as a whole and is often dealt with by such formal means as reprimands and sanctions. Accordingly, in their view, a violation of impersonal trust could be considered deviance whereas a violation of personal trust could be considered betrayal.

Whilst the observed actions demonstrated in acts of defiance and betrayal may be similar (e.g., harassment, lying or abuse of privileges) the two are differentiated with betrayal being initiated by a specific trustor (instead of the organisation in general). It is quite possible that a certain act constitutes both deviance and betrayal e.g., when a manager sexually harasses a subordinate; the harassment not only violates a significant norm of anti-harassment espoused by the dominant coalition (deviance) but it also violates a personal expectation held by the subordinate (trustee) that his or her boss will treat him or her in a professional and respectful manner (betrayal) (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

2.5.5 Types of betrayal

The literature identifies a range of dimensions used by researchers in studying betrayal. The extent to which the trustee's actions are deliberate; the motivation for such and the degree to which the opportunity is considered have featured in the research:

Eoyang (1994) – the extent to which betrayal is induced, opportunistic or premeditated.

Sarbin (1994) – whether the betrayer is motivated more by ideology or egoistic desires.

Morris and Moberg (1994) – the intentionality of the betrayer.

Collectively, the various differentiations tend to revolve around the issue of intent in the betrayal behaviour. Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) cite five key characteristics of betrayal:

1.   Voluntary Act

Betrayal involves a voluntary act that may be intentional or unintentional, done through freewill with no coercion involved. It signals a specific intent to harm. An involuntary act shifts blame from the trustee to another party who coerces the trustee to act in a certain way. Whilst an act can be voluntary but unintentional, as in for example, disclosing confidential information in error, a sense of volition is a necessary part of betrayal whereas intentionality is not. Thus, betrayal can be intentional or unintentional (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

2.   Pivotal expectations

The expectations between the parties may be task or value related (Sitkin and Roth 1993) but must be instrumental to the nature of the relationship. If the expectations are not significant to the relationship then their violation is not important and will most likely be excused, ignored or viewed as a disappointment by the trustor rather than betrayal (Jones and Burdette 1994; Morris and Moberg 1994).

3.   Mutually known expectations

The condition of being mutually aware requires both parties to acknowledge (even if it is implicit) but not necessarily accept the conditions of the relationship. This condition therefore ensures that when expectations are violated, the actions cannot be misinterpreted through ambiguity, misunderstanding or lack of awareness on part of the trustee, otherwise it may be interpreted as a mistake more than a

betrayal. Here a trustee's violation of expectations is still considered an act of betrayal whether detected by the trustor or not. An emphasis on mutually known rather than mutually accepted also allows for premeditated betrayal, where the betrayer is aware of central expectations but doesn't accept these and uses it to earn the trust of the trustor and then betrays him or her.

4. Violation of expectations
Betrayal involves a behaviour (an actual violation) rather than just the thought of betrayal.

5. Potential to harm
Betrayal is commonly linked with acts closely associated with treachery, disloyalty and deception, all of which indicate the potential for harm. Harm, however, may not actually happen since mitigating factors may come in to play (e.g., the potential harm from a colleague's broken promise on a joint project is mitigated by the understanding of a supportive boss) (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

Betrayal may not necessarily be unethical or anti-social. Betrayal, for example, of a colleague's theft of funds (thus violating the colleague's personal expectations of not disclosing such activities) may in fact be a pro-social stance to take (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

Accidental Betrayal

The actions leading to a betrayal of trust by the trustee may be known to the trustee but the outcomes may not have been anticipated. Situations where a colleague voluntarily but unintentionally discloses confidential information about a colleague, for example, is an act of betrayal but is most likely viewed as a regrettable error by the trustee and is often accompanied by feelings of disbelief and remorse (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

Intentional Betrayal

When the intent to betray is present even before the establishment of a relationship it is categorised as premeditated betrayal (Eoyang 1994). In these circumstances the trustee enters a relationship, desiring to build trust with the specific intent to betray the trust later or at a more opportune time.

In some organisational settings, relationships are created, coalitions formed and expectations created with trustees fully aware that they are doing so because the arrangements are beneficial and convenient to the completion of the task at hand and will be abandoned as soon as it is completed (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998). When the intent is not established prior to the formation of the relationship however, but forms as a result of a specific situation during the relationship, then that violation is characterised as opportunistic betrayal. Here the trustee evaluates the implications of betraying versus maintaining the trust in that situation, and chooses to violate the expectations of the trustee by betraying them (Eoyang 1994; Sarbin 1994). The trustee often attempts to justify their violating actions. An important distinction between intentional and unintentional betrayal is the element of reasoned analysis that entails the former (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) indicate that research shows opportunistic betrayal is the most frequent form of betrayal. This is verified in research by Lewicki (1983); Grover (1993); Neuman and Baron (1997) showing that trustees are mostly aware of violating trustor's expectations, which suggests that accidental betrayals are not too frequent.

Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) also contend that of the three most common dimensions of trust, and in recognising that betrayal is defined as being a voluntary violation, a drop in benevolence or integrity in a trusting relationship becomes more relevant than a drop in ability. Benevolence and integrity under the trustor's control, they say, allows for greater freedom to decide who to like or dislike, but a person's ability is only partially under their control when a trustee is unable to meet a trustor's expectations. In their

view the breach of trust through inability is deemed involuntary and not considered betrayal. However, not wanting to fulfil the trustor's expectations constitutes a voluntary violation and could be as a result of diminished benevolence and or integrity. Its effect is that it lowers a trustor's motivation to honour the trustee's expectations in that situation. A drop in benevolence implies that the trustee cares less for the good of the trustor and may engage in acts that might violate expectations and harm the trustor (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998). These changes in benevolence and integrity are critical indicators of not wanting to maintain trusting expectations and are the critical change mechanisms for motivation to betray (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

Changes in benevolence and integrity

A trustee's perception that a relationship is favouring the trustor often leads to the trustee's sense of dissatisfaction with the relationship and a lowering of the benevolence felt towards the trustor (Lake and Hills 1979; Duck 1988; Clark and Chrisman 1994). Also, the expectation of a natural end to the relationship and the availability of other trustors involves a lessening dependence on the trustor (lowering integrity) and prompts the shift of allegiance to other trustors (lowering benevolence), allowing for betrayal (Lewicki 1983; Duck 1988; Geis 1994).

Penalty Rating

A trustee's perception of the severity of penalties for betrayal plays a crucial role in inducing actual betrayal behaviour (Bintliff 1994; Eoyang 1994; Sarbin 1994; Shapiro, Lewicki et al. 1995). The trustee is more likely to betray the trustor when he or she perceives a low likelihood of suffering severe penalties. These penalties are, in general, deterrents to unwanted behaviours rather than deterrents to the motives (Johns 1996); that is, for actually violating trust rather than thinking about violating the trust. A high likelihood of being caught and the high cost of such action, indicates a high penalty rating that may curtail the actions of individuals who are more inclined to lie and cheat than others (high motivation); however, the absence of penalties may still not tempt others to engage in betrayal behaviours (low motivation) (Greenberg 1997; Grover 1997). Penalty plays an important role

in influencing the act rather than the motive to act but in itself is not likely to increase or decrease the motivation to betray (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

Another factor affecting the likelihood of betrayal is the probability that the trustee will be penalised by the trustor. A low probability indicates a low likelihood of being penalised. Penalty probability is a function of three distinct probabilities (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998):

1. Probability of detection
2. Probability of responsibility
3. Probability of forgiveness.

The probability of detecting betrayal and the probability of identification of responsibility as the betrayer may affect the likelihood of betrayal (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998). They assert that some acts of betrayal go undetected, depending on the scope and effectiveness of the trustor's monitoring. For example, betraying the trust of a colleague by disclosing confidential information, blaming co-workers for personal mistakes or betraying a supervisor's trust by misusing expense accounts might not be detected if the trustee's actions and outcomes are not monitored. Even if betrayals are detected, in some cases, the violator might be identified by default (e.g., sexual harassment) but may not be in other cases (e.g., leaking information). They suggest that even if the probability of detection is high, the probability of responsibility may not necessarily be so. However, if the probability of detection is low and the probability of responsibility is also low (i.e., if the betrayal is not detected or noticed), the trustor has no reason to engage in an effort to assign responsibility.

Therefore, since the likelihood of penalties is possible only if responsibility for the betrayal is assigned, researchers argue that conditions for the betrayal exist when: (1) the probability of detection is low or (2) the probability of detection is high but the probability of responsibility is low. However, given that detection without identifying the betrayer may still lead to worksite-wide penalties, an "ideal" penalty probability for betrayal is when both the

probability of detection and responsibility are low (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

The costs of detection often involve an organisation or worksite-wide loss of privileges or increased monitoring and reduced flexibility for employees. For example, detection of important documents being leaked might result in increased monitoring of all employees and restricted access to information. Therefore, even though the trustee may not endure any personally identified penalties, he or she will experience worksite-wide penalties with other employees. If these penalties are judged by the trustee to be significant, they will most likely mitigate his or her actual betrayal (Shapiro, Lewicki et al. 1995).

Sanctions that punish those who violate trust have the effect of constraining employee behaviour within acceptable bounds (Lindskold and Bennett 1973). When detection of betrayal results in identification of the violator, he or she often personally endures certain penalties. This may involve both the loss of current privileges and the additional penalties for breaking the trust. Where a supervisor has been betrayed, the trustee might face new restrictions and boundaries in the relationship, encounter tighter monitoring conditions, have reduced room for error, reduced future options and even suffer a reprimand. For betraying a work colleague, the costs may involve workmate disapproval, loss of friendship and support, retribution and alteration of the social dynamics at work. If the trustee values these relationships, the potential loss of them makes the costs of betrayal very high. The severity of penalties associated with personal publicity, thus acts as a deterrent to betrayal (Elangovan and Shapiro 1998).

2.6 Repairing trust

Repairing a once trusted relationship is seen as occurring when a violation causes the positive state of that relationship to disappear and a negative state to arise, as perceived by one or both parties, and then activities by one or both parties substantively return the relationship to a positive state (Dirks, Lewicki et al. 2009). The actual repair of the relationship has been a focus of

research by numerous scholars. For example, the investigation into how trust can be made more positive after a violation (Kim, Ferrin et al. 2004; Nakayachi and Watabe 2005; Kim, Dirks et al. 2006; Ren and Gray 2009) and a specific focus by Bradfield and Aquino (1999) cited in Dirks et al. (2009) in examining the concepts of forgiveness and reconciliation.

Lewicki and Bunker (in Kramer and Tyler, eds, 1996) assert that trust violations affect the interpersonal relationships of parties and that since trust is the 'glue' that holds most cooperative relationships together, a major violation of the trust is not simply an isolated event but rather a significant event that is likely to have an impact on the parties and the relationship. They see trust as so intimately connected to the fundamental nature of the relationship that trust-shattering events that cannot be repaired will probably result in destroying the essence of the relationship itself.

Committing to trust repair is a bilateral process for both parties (Lewicki and Bunker 1996) that in spite of the violation usually being undertaken by one party, a significant amount of work will be required from both the violator and the victim for the relationship to be re-established. They contend that engagement in a trust repair process requires each party to be willing to invest time and energy into the process; see value in the short and long-term benefits derived from the continuation of the relationship and see that investment of additional energy is worthy of the relationship; and perceive that the benefits to be derived are preferred relative to the options of having those needs met in an alternative fashion.

Goffman (1967) identified four stages of restoration of trust within relationships: challenge, offering, acceptance, thanks.

- Challenge — once a breach of trust has occurred the victim calls attention to the violator's conduct. These actions symbolise the meaning of the act and convey how worthy the victim is of respect (Goffman 1967).
- Offering — In light of the challenge the violator decides upon the response he or she will offer, such as an explanation, apology, recompense (Goffman 1971). The victim may be presented with

attempts to redefine the offensive act, provision of compensation or offers of self-castigation and atonement (Goffman 1967, 1971). These offerings display a desire by the violator to restore what has been jeopardised and an effort to try to remove or ameliorate the victim's negative impression of himself or herself (Goffman 1971).

- Acceptance and thanks — The victim, once presented with the offering, may choose his or her level of acceptance or rejection of the offering, extend forgiveness, accept dispensation and revise his or her negative impression of the violator (Goffman 1967).

Different types of trust violation may require different restorative practices, determined by what has been jeopardised (Ren and Gray 2009). They claim that different violations break different rules of conduct, threaten different needs and lead to different types of offence being taken. In addition to repairing the status of disputants, the repair process must also demonstrate the continuing viability of the trust rule (Goffman 1967).

In a similar vein, the work of Ohbuchi (1994) proposes four dominant tactics that can be used in restoring damaged relationships: accounts, apologies, demonstration of concern, and penance (cf. Goffman 1967).

Accounts

Violators offer accounts for conflict-inducing actions to deny, reduce or explain their culpability (Schlenker, Pontari et al. 2001). Ren and Gray (2009) note also that violator's accounts can be used to attribute responsibility to an external factor over which the violator had no control or that with altruistic intent the violator acted without self-interest in creating the offending act (Folger and Cropanzano 1998). Additionally, the violator's account may involve reframing the account to change the victim's frame of reference by comparing the victim to someone else or by promising a better future as a result (Sitkin and Bies 1993; Folger and Cropanzano 1998).

Apologies

Some researchers claim that apology helps absolve violations because it signals to the victim a responsibility to avoid similar violations in the future

(Ohbuchi, Kameda et al. 1989; Lewicki and Bunker 1996). An apology is often the first step in repairing conflict in a damaged relationship, that through apology, the offender acknowledges that harm was done, shows regret for the violation and offers a promise not to repeat the offence (Ren and Gray 2009). It signals that the conduct of the violator should not be considered a typical reflection of his or her identity (Goffman 1967; Schlenker 1980).

A violator shows consideration of the other's welfare and demonstrates his or her benevolence by acting in a prosocial manner to repair perceptions of broken trust (Whitener, Brodt et al. 1998). By conspicuously engaging in behaviours that benefit others, the violator conveys the message that he or she has been rehabilitated and is once again worthy of respect (Goffman 1967). These actions invite the victim to forgive the offender (Aquino, Grover et al. 2003).

Ren and Gray (2009) state that the sincerity of any explanation or verbal apology is difficult to discern and therefore penance in the form of compensation or restitution may be necessary for rebuilding some relationships. Some studies have suggested that apologies are effective in reducing victim's negative emotions (Ohbuchi, Kameda et al. 1989), whilst others have suggested that calling attention to one's guilt through apology leaves a lasting negative impression (Riordan, Marlin et al. 1983). Whitener, Brodt et al. (1998) say that whilst apologies and accounts are effective to a degree, some forms of trust repair may require a consistent show of benevolent intentions or even more tangible and substantive actions (Bottom, Gibson et al. 2002). Kim, Ferrin et al. (2004) and Kim, Dirks et al. (2006) identified that trust repair was more effective by apology for violations related to the competence dimension of trust and more successful by denial if the violation was linked to the other's sense of integrity.

The person who has violated the trust needs to assume responsibility for the trust-destroying events that occurred. Ohbuchi, Kameda et al. (1989) in studies of the effect of apology found that 'accounts' to victims may have a hierarchical structure in which the violator must admit that he or she caused

the event in question; acknowledge that the act itself was destructive and take responsibility for causing the consequences of the action. Ohbuchi (1994) has subsequently proposed four steps that the violator needs to take into account:

i. Recognise and acknowledge that a violation has occurred.
ii. Determine the nature of the violation, what caused it and admit that one caused the event.
iii. Admit the act was destructive.
iv. Admit responsibility for the effects of one's actions.

Step i. Acknowledges that violators may come to see that their actions are a violation of trust because they experience the reaction of affected others directly or become aware that their actions are likely to be considered a breach of trust. On the other hand, they may not be aware they have caused a violation if they don't know how their actions have been experienced or are ignorant to the consequences of their actions. Ohbuchi (1994) claims that it is easier to repair trust when the violator recognises events which damaged trust have occurred, than if the victim has to confront the violator with the evidence. If the victim has to confront the violator, his assertion is that the victim then carries the double burden of the consequences of the trust violation and the embarrassment or awkwardness of confronting the other about his or her actions. Further, if the victim has to initiate the approach it may imply that the violator is insensitive and out of touch with his or her actions and the consequences.

Step ii. The violator is able to identify the cause of the violation. This may be evident if the victim has already declared the problem and what occurred. If the violator doesn't acknowledge the problem, or is unaware how the victim feels, repair cannot commence unless the violator admits that he or she has caused the event (Ohbuchi 1994, cited in Kramer and Tyler, 1996 p.131).

Step iii. The violator must acknowledge the damaging effects of his or her actions and participate in discussion of the event and consequences with the victim. In order for any repair process to occur the violator must recognise the victim's feelings and how the relationship has been affected.

Step iv. Acknowledges that if the violator doesn't accept responsibility for the violation, which may occur by denying that the event happened, claiming there weren't any consequences, denying his or her responsibility for the act or by claiming the act was unimportant and should have no impact on their level of trust, will most likely intensify the trustor's anger and contribute to further trust degradation rather than trust repair. Lewicki and Bunker (1996) state that if trust has been broken in the "eye of the beholder" then it has been broken.

Victim's Role in Trust Repair

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) view relationships as a negotiated balance of rights, obligations, duties and responsibilities and say that violations of trust will tend to unbalance the relationship. By offering an apology the violator signals the intention to engage in a process to repair trust. The victim, they contend, is now in a position to accept or refute the apology and steer the terms on which the relationship may be repaired.

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) present a sequence of four, fundamentally different courses of action to repair trust:

i.   The victim may choose not to accept any actions, terms or conditions for re-establishing the relationship. For example, the victim's anger or sense of injury may be so great that he or she can see no way the other party could ever be trusted again. Therefore, a series of trust-destroying events or a particularly severe instance may be sufficient grounds for the trustor to decide that a relationship is irretrievable. Similarly, if the trustor feels that the benefits to be gained from re-establishing the relationship are low, he or she may not consider the relationship worth saving. The violator, with or without the forgiveness of the victim may still choose to show public gestures of his or her apology e.g., flowers, cards; thus letting others know of his or her contrition. Lewicki and Bunker (1996), note that under some conditions, such actions may subsequently be enough to persuade a victim to accept the apology and propose the following considerations:

ii.   The victim accepts the violator's apology and offers forgiveness, albeit with unreasonable conditions of reparation attached. However, should the violator not accept these terms for trust repair then the relationship will terminate unless the parties can negotiate more acceptable terms.

iii.   The victim acknowledges forgiveness and seeks no further acts of restoration. Lewicki and Bunker (1996) note that in this instance whilst the intention is simply to carry on as before, the violator is likely to continue to feel embarrassed or awkward and may expect the victim to seek revenge or retaliatory action. Similarly, Deutsch (1958) notes that even though the violator has been forgiven the very act of untrustworthy behaviour may be enough to create suspicion of the violator's future intentions and hyper-vigilance of future actions. Therefore, acts of true forgiveness without consequent reparations may not be adequate for good trust repair and would not see this alternative occurring very frequently (Lewicki and Bunker 1996).

iv.   The victim acknowledges forgiveness and specifies reasonable acts of reparation which must be fulfilled by the violator. These acts may be prompted by the violator seeking ways to make amends or by the victim stating what the violator must do to repair trust. Lewicki and Bunker (1996) claim that these conditions may be very specific or quite vague and may extend for long, or short periods of time. They assert that the reparations serve four functions:

- To demonstrate, to the victim's satisfaction, that the violator is genuine and committed to rebuilding the relationship.
- The violator accepts some personal loss in rebuilding the relationship.
- The actions give the violator the chance to work out any guilt or remorse that may be felt by violating the other's trust.
- The victim can judge the sincerity and commitment of the violator in carrying out the reparations thus determining the substance of what the violator is doing as well as his or her manner in doing so.

Chapter 3 Research Method and Design

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research design and methodology employed in
this study. The aim of the study is to provide an in-depth understanding of
the influence of trust on school principals' leadership and in order to do so a
qualitative research approach was undertaken. The attraction of the
qualitative method was that it facilitated study of an issue in depth and detail
through fieldwork that "without being constrained by predetermined
categories of analysis contributes to the depth, openness and detail of the
qualitative inquiry" (Patton 2002, p.14). It thus provided for an interpretive,
naturalistic approach to the subject matter that allowed for attempts to
interpret the trust phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to it —
that describe the meanings and reactions people bring to the understanding
of trust in school relationships.   The intention was to analyse the multiple
perspectives of principals, of acts initiated by school staff that impacted on
the principal's trust in them. The initial levels of trust principals had in their
staff; the importance of trusting relationships with staff; actions taken by staff
which caused distrust; the principal's response to the betrayal of trust; acts to
repair the trust and the results of such interventions on the quality of ongoing
relationships between the staff and the principal were all considered.

3.2 Ethical approval

Ethical approval to undertake the research was sought and gained from
Durham University, Department of Education Ethics Committee.

3.3 Data collection method

A qualitative inquiry into the trust phenomenon was chosen as the preferred
methodology. Interview was chosen as the data collection method because
it permitted the respondents to describe personal experiences of interactions
and professional relationships with staff members. The interview afforded
the interviewer the opportunity to clarify interviewee responses; seek
expansion of responses for increased clarity of meaning; give the opportunity

to test responses by rephrasing responses and to probe for deeper meaning should it be required. Kumar (2011) asserts that interviews offer the preferred method of data collection where in-depth information is required because questions can be explained if misunderstood, repeated or put in a form understood by the respondent. The interview technique was considered an appropriate way of generating first-hand recounts and an in-depth understanding of principals' own experiences in encountering relationships shaped by trust.

3.3.1 Sampling

The qualitative inquiry method permitted inquiry into a selected issue — trust's impact on school leadership — to be carried out in great depth and with careful attention to detail; context and nuance. It permitted data collection not constrained by predetermined analytical categories and indeed, following the subsequent Grounded Theory data analysis methodology, saw categories themselves generated from the raw data. As such, the linked factors influencing the sampling process included a determination of an appropriate sample size to provide enough depth of information; consideration of a realistic allocation of time for a thorough data collection to take place; access to a sample and representativeness of the sample. Patton (1990, p.184) states "there are no rules for sample size in qualitative inquiry", and so it was determined that a sample size of 20 school principals' responses provided sufficient depth to allow an expression of varied experiences, noting the breadth of experience, different school size, situation and the opportunity to generate answers to open-ended questions allowed a range of scenarios to be generated. The substantial amount of data generated was considered an optimum quantity for this study.

Twenty schools were selected from the list of all Government Primary Schools in the Perth, Western Australia, metropolitan area and the principals contacted for their participation in the study. A consideration of the time taken to travel to each school limited the sample to those schools within a half-hour to one hour travel distance.

Student population in the schools ranged from 103 to 461 Kindergarten to Year 7 primary school age students (4 -12) thus providing a breadth of school size for the study. The average student population was 295. The number of staff members at each school ranged from 14 to 63 persons, with 40 persons the average. Twelve of the 20 schools had a senior leadership team comprising one principal and two deputy principals. The other eight schools had a leadership team of one principal and one deputy principal.

The classification of government schools in Western Australia is determined by the number of students enrolled. Each classification level comprises a range of student enrolments as per the table below:

School classification	Student numbers	Typical Senior Leadership Team
Primary School level 3	1-100	Principal
Primary School level 4	101-300	Principal plus one deputy principal
Primary School level 5	301-700	Principal plus two deputy principals
Primary School level 6	701 and greater	Principal plus three deputy principals

Table 3.1: Western Australian school classification criteria

The number of leadership positions and their level depends on the classification of a school. Typically, Level 3 primary schools have a principal and no other senior leadership team members. Level 4 primary schools usually have a principal and one deputy principal. Level 5 primary schools usually have a principal and two deputy principals whilst level 6 primary schools typically have a principal and three deputy principals. Some school principals, with increased autonomy granted, may choose to determine the profile of the leadership team; including the number and level of incumbents. So whilst all schools must have a principal, the number of deputy principals can be determined at a school level. In effect, this is often seen on level 5 and level 6 schools where the number of deputy principal positions may be reduced and the level of the position similarly altered. Deputy principal positions in primary schools are classified as a level 3 position and a school with two deputy principal positions may choose to reduce the number to one but have it reclassified as a level 4 position. A school principal may choose this option, which at level 4 would be a higher salary cost to the school than a level 3 position, but which may attract more experienced applicants to the

role, perhaps a level 4 principal seeking to take on a level 4 deputy principal at the same salary scale.

Explanation of the different school classifications is made so as to inform interpretation of this study's observations and provide a contextual background to the discussion. This is especially noticeable in interviewees' responses that showed a level 3 deputy principal considering themselves at equal standing to the newly appointed level 4 principal who had most recently been a level 3 deputy.

Table 2.0 illustrates the staffing and enrolment profile of the 20 schools that participated in the study.

Principal	Classification of School	Gender of Principal	Length of service as Principal	Gender of Deputy Principals	Student Enrolment	Staff
1	5	F	>20 years	M,F	245	30
2	5	M	>20 years	M,F	353	35
3	5	M	>20 years	M,F	459	45
4	4	F	>10 years	M	217	29
5	5	F	>10 years	M,F	413	44
6	4	F	1-5 years	F	184	25
7	4	M	1-5 years	M	101	24
8	4	M	1-5 years	F	194	29
9	4	F	>10 years	F	175	38
10	5	M	>20 years	M,F	461	50
11	5	M	>10 years	M,F	418	47
12	5	F	1-5 years	M,F	312	56
13	4	M	1-5 years	F	191	30
14	5	M	>20 years	M,F	358	43
15	5	F	1-5 years	M,F	327	51
16	5	M	>10 years	F,F	422	49
17	5	F	1-5 years	F,F	279	49
18	4	M	>10 years	M	265	42
19	4	F	1-5 years	F	103	14
20	5	F	>10 years	M,F	415	63

Table 3.2: School staffing and enrolment profile

The principals were initially contacted by telephone by the researcher who explained the purpose of the research and the proposed method of data collection. The principals' permission to participate in a face-to-face

interview with the researcher at their school was sought with the agreement that written permission from each participant would be obtained through a signed permission agreement. The duration of the interview, confidentiality of their responses, purpose of the interview and the voluntary nature of their participation were explained at the initial telephone conversation, in the written permission approval, and prior to the commencement of each interview. Dates and times for the interviews were negotiated with each principal during the telephone conversation.

Interviews

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with each school principal at their school with the exception of one interview conducted off-site as per request of the principal, for reasons of perceived greater confidentiality. Open-ended questions and probing questions for clarity of meaning were employed to yield in-depth responses about the principals' experiences, perceptions, opinions and feelings. The collected data consisted of verbatim quotations, ensuring the data was interpretable.

Each interview was electronically recorded and a written transcript made of the recordings once the interview had finished. Interviews were of approximately 30 - 40 minutes in duration.

Each interview commenced with the interviewer explaining the purpose of the interview, thus reiterating the content of the consent form previously signed and the preliminary telephone conversation in which the study was discussed. This served to focus the interview on the topic of trust in that principal's leadership of his or her school. Each was asked to consider the importance of trust in staff members in the effective running of their schools, to give examples, where possible, of situations where trust was seen as important in maintaining working relationships. Principals were encouraged to give real-life examples from interactions with staff and to describe the relationship prior to and during any breach of trust in the relationship. Respondents could choose the incident or incidents to be described. Lines of inquiry were developed from the responses made by the participants with clarification and probing questions employed to determine the actions and

feelings of the participants being described. These were phrased so as to identify what the relationship looked like before the event; what actions caused a change in the trust relationship; the actions of the players in the situation; and the principal's feelings before, during and after the event. Descriptions of actions taken to repair the trust in the relationship and what sanctions, if any, were noted. The final state of the trust relationship was also questioned. In acknowledging their responses the principals were prompted to expand on the scenarios they presented so as to develop a clear portrayal of their own actions and those of their staff members in the maintenance or breach of trust in their working relationships.

3.4   Method of data analysis

This section describes the method used to undertake data analysis. In order to answer the research question an inductive process of data collection evolved from the analysis of interview data. Grounded Theory was chosen as the qualitative analysis tool because it allowed themes to develop as the interview data were analysed and coded rather than using a deductive theory supported by hypothesis testing against collected data. This method was employed because Grounded Theory is "designed to develop a well-integrated set of concepts that provide a thorough theoretical explanation of a social phenomenon under study" (Corbin and Strauss 1990, p.5). It provided for the development of themes or categories as further interview data were analysed and coded. Grounded Theory is based on the assumption that it is possible to allocate labels (categories) to text segments during a coding process (Breckenridge 2009) and through continued, subsequent coding, based on constant comparative analysis, the coding of each transcript is compared with previous codes and these are then adapted by new insights, thus allowing for the development of a core category (Holton 2010). Glaser (2011) indicates that constant comparison of data can proceed from the moment of starting to collect data and that "All is data, and all data has patterns" and that "It is up to the researcher to figure out what data he/she has and code its patterns" (Glaser 2011, p.14) . Carrying out procedures of data collection and analysis systematically and sequentially

enabled the researcher the opportunity to capture all potentially relevant aspects of the topic as they were being perceived. This is a major source of the effectiveness of the Grounded Theory process in that it is this process that guides the researcher in exploring all of the possible pathways in the data to form an understanding. Glaser and Strauss (1967) clarify that the Grounded Theory research method is one of discovery and as such grounds a theory in reality. In accordance with Corbin and Strauss' (1990, p.6) guidance, Grounded Theory analysis of data begins as soon as the first piece of data is collected because it is used to direct the next interview. This is not to say that the data collection is not standardised because the researcher enters the field with some questions or areas to be probed during the interview and these form the framework for the opening of each subsequent interview and the basis for open-ended questioning. Grounded Theory was used as a framework as it allowed for the identification of elements or codes from each interview to be subsequently included in the interviewer's questioning in future interviews, so as do develop a more detailed understanding of the phenomenon.

Specifically, Grounded Theory was employed as it provided for an inductive analysis of data to provide specific annotations that built toward the emergence of categories and an understanding of patterns that exist in the principals' recounts of their experiences. This method of inductive analysis contrasts, for example, with the hypothetical-deductive approach of experimental designs that require the specification of main variables and the statement of specific research hypotheses before data collection begins, (Patton 2002) . The choice of the inductive design strategy was to allow the important analysis dimensions to emerge from patterns found in the cases under study without presupposing in advance what the important dimensions would be. Patton (2002, p.56) contends that "the qualitative analyst seeks to understand the multiple interrelationships among dimensions that emerge from data without making prior assumptions or specifying hypotheses about linear or correlative relationships among narrowly defined operational variables." The Grounded Theory approach was chosen as it prescribes specific methods and systematic procedures for direct interviews with participants so as to develop an understanding of the trust phenomenon that

is grounded in the empirical world. It is used to "build a theory rather than test a theory" (Strauss and Corbin 1998, p.13). Glaser and Strauss (1967, pp.105-106) suggest that the Constant Comparison method of data interrogation involves four stages: (1) comparing incidents and data that are applicable to each category: comparing them with previous incidents in the same category and with other data that are in the same category; (2) integrating these categories and their properties; (3) bounding the theory; (4) setting out the theory. It was this methodology that guided this study's data analysis.

During the analysis of data this researcher employed three forms of data coding: Open, Axial and Theoretical Coding, as defined by Corbin and Strauss (1990). The initial Open Coding involved the analysis of each line of interview transcript by coding the incidents, events or happenings with a descriptive phrase. It was during this interpretative process that data were broken down analytically with events, actions and interactions compared with others for similarities and differences and given conceptual labels. This process of constant comparison was used by employing Strauss and Corbin's (1998) guidance in conducting Open Coding of qualitative data sets to define categories and then using Axial Coding to link categories and finally Theoretical Coding to establish a core category or categories. Open Coding identified, described and categorised phenomena in the data. As each interview was coded and the concepts identified, they were compared with those previously identified, grouped like with like and labelled collectively. The constant checking of a concept's correct categorisation increased the precision of the coding process and the internal consistency within the groups.

In this constant comparison, data are compared across a range of situations, times and groups of people. The selection of 20 school principals from schools of different socio-economic, geographical regions and sizes of school provided a depth in the range of school types and groups of people for the study to draw upon.

The next step of integrating these categories and their properties required the use of Axial Coding to relate each of the codes to each other through

deductive and inductive reasoning. Axial Coding is defined as "generating theoretical propositions or formal hypotheses after inductively identifying categories" (Strauss and Corbin 1998, p.22). The generation of 'in vivo' codes point to possible theoretical codes and tend to be "the behaviors or processes which explain how the basic problem is resolved or processed" (Glaser 1978, p.70).

The final step of employing Theoretical Coding is the process of choosing one or more categories to act as the core of the theory against which all categories link, thus creating a theory for identifying the themes underpinning the findings of the study. The skill of the grounded theorist is to abstract concepts by leaving the detail behind, lifting the concepts above the data and integrating them into a theory that explains the latent social pattern underlying the behaviour in a substantive area (Locke 2001). Thus, once statements are related through statements of relationships into an explanatory theoretical framework; that is from Axial Coding to Theoretical Coding; the research findings move beyond conceptual ordering to a theory. Miles and Huberman (1994) posit that the researcher uses qualitative methods to describe and explain phenomena as accurately and completely as possible so that their descriptions and explanations correspond as closely as possible to the way the world is and actively operates. The researcher, in undertaking analyses, uses conceptualisations and classification of events and outcomes into categories that emerge along with relationships that form the foundations of the developing theory. This notion is supported in Strauss and Corbin's (1998, p.22) assertion that "A theory is usually more than a set of findings, it offers and explanation about phenomena."

3.5   Coding process

Data collection and analysis were concurrent. Corbin and Strauss (1990) see data collection and analysis as an interrelated process because the analysis begins as soon as the data collection commences. A significant element being that analysis of the data informed the direction of the next interview — concepts frequently raised were considered in the questioning of the subsequent interviews. Carrying out procedures of data collection and

analysing this information systematically provided the researcher the opportunity to capture all relevant elements of the topic as they were being generated. This was deemed a major source of effectiveness as the process guided the researcher in exploring all possible avenues in the data to form understandings. During the open coding analysis of the data this researcher analysed each line of the interview transcripts and coded each incident or interaction with a descriptive phrase. It was during this interpretative process that the data were broken down and compared with other elements for similarities and differences and allocated descriptive labels.

It became apparent in early interviews that principals were describing in most detail aspects of trust relationships that involved staff acting in ways that broke the trust the principal had in them and the impact this had on their relationships with that person. This analysis saw all seemingly related trust transgression issues being incorporated into the lines of inquiry of the subsequent interviews. This allowed all potentially relevant aspects of the topic to be captured as soon as they were perceived. It is this research process that guided the researcher to examine all potential themes to develop an understanding of the phenomenon. This is why the research method is one of discovery and one which grounds a theory in reality (Glaser and Strauss 1967).

Each concept, generated through analysis of the transcripts, was initially considered provisionally important and it was only through repeatedly being present in the dialogue of subsequent interviewees that the concept's pattern of prevalence became more obvious and relevant to the emerging theory as a condition, action, interaction or consequence. This requirement of concept prevalence helped guard against bias in conducting the Grounded Theory analysis.

The concepts were given provisional labels as potential indicators of the phenomenon and by comparing the incidents recounted by the principals; like concepts were accumulated to form the basis of the emerging theory. Corbin and Strauss (1990) note that in the Grounded Theory approach such concepts become more numerous and more abstract as the analysis continues. This was the case with initial analyses revealing quite narrow labels and subsequent analysis revealing more specific and numerous

qualities within each concept. For example, early examples of breaches of trust were identified and grouped but were further demarcated into categories including self-interest, deception and denial. Not all of the concepts became grouped categories and it was these categories that achieved a higher level of abstraction than the concepts they represented. The categories were generated by making comparisons to highlight similarities and differences in the same manner that the lower level concepts were generated. Corbin and Strauss (1990) consider categories the cornerstone of theory development and term this part of the process Axial Coding. They assert that to achieve the status of a category, a more abstract concept must be developed in terms of its properties and dimensions of the phenomenon it represents, conditions that give rise to it, the action / interaction by which it is expressed and the consequences it produces. This research then undertook a process of "Theoretical Sampling" Corbin and Strauss (1990), where the sampling of conditions that had an impact on trust, that is those that facilitated, interrupted or prevented the development of principals' trust were evident from the interviews together with the prevalence of the condition across the data set. Prevalence was determined by the frequency of categories identified from the constant comparison engagement with the data. Riessman's (1993) approach to determining the prevalence of an item is to consider how many different speakers articulate the same theme across an entire data set or each individual occurrence of an event and this approach was adopted for the study.

The research sought to identify conditions within the principals' leadership that brought about the representativeness and consistency of the core category; to build a theoretical explanation by specifying the phenomenon of trust in terms of conditions that give rise to the building or betrayal of trust and how they are expressed through action and the consequences that arise from these conditions.

3.6   Avoidance of bias

The researcher was cognisant of the need to undertake an interview process that was free of bias. In doing so the researcher was aware of the need to elicit responses that were expressed in the interviewee's own words and not to create an expectation in the interviewee that there was, in any way, an expected response to questions posed. It was important that bias was avoided and hence the use of an interview format that used open-ended questions where respondents could choose their own examples to respond to the question. These questions typically took the form of: Tell me about a situation where you have been required to trust an employee; How was trust in a staff member broken? What did you do? How did you feel about that? The questioning technique employed asked respondents to reflect on actual situations and describe what occurred; how participants reacted, feelings and actual outcomes. Hypothetical questions were not used as the responses may not have reflected the true actions the respondent would have used and may have elicited a response that the interviewee thought was an expected response. Similarly, closed questions that merely required the respondent to agree with a statement made were not employed as the intention of the interview was to seek a deeper response from the interviewee that showed their perceptions of events and how the parties acted. Confirmation of what the interviewee had meant may have taken the form of restating or paraphrasing the interviewee's response by the interviewer, if clarification of response was required. By having the interviewee describe past events the interviewer was more likely to hear of actual situations, dialogue and reactions of the parties in events they had actually participated in rather than hypothetical situations in which the response may or may not have been truly indicative of their actions.

Bias is avoided in the use of the Grounded Theory approach to analyse data because each coding phase requires the analysis and collating of actual hard evidence in the form statements made by the interviewees. The testing of

the prevalence of identified categories from the transcript analyses ensures a number of the same concepts form the basis of understandings and judgements.

3.7   Disadvantages of interview

Kumar (2011, p.150) identifies the following disadvantages of the interview technique for data collection:

- Time consuming and expensive, especially over a wide geographical area involving considerable travel costs.
- Quality of the data depends on the quality of the interaction. The quality of response from different interviews may vary significantly in terms of relevance to topic, openness and insight into the phenomenon under study.
- Quality depends on the quality of the interviewer — affected by experience, skills and commitment of the interviewer.
- Researcher may introduce bias in framing questions and the interpretation of responses.

To eliminate any possibility of the appearance of the interview disadvantages identified by Kumar (2011), the following actions and considerations are acknowledged:

- The researcher acknowledges the considerable travel distances and time taken to meet with principals and undertake the interviews, however, time and costs were allowed for and not considered factors that impinged on the reliability of the data collected.
- Whilst all interviewees understandably referred to different trust related scenarios from their own experience, each was able to focus their response on the role they and their staff members played in developing, maintaining and/or repairing trust. Each was forthcoming about significant events that related directly to the field of study. Transcripts attest to the willingness to describe very personal incidents with the knowledge that their responses were to be treated with confidentiality and impartiality.

- The researcher brings to the study over 30 years of experience conducting interviews within the education field, employing a questioning technique that is based on eliciting behaviourally anchored examples of past experience from respondents.

- This researcher avoided bringing a bias to questions posed to interviewees by deliberately structuring open-ended prompts that encouraged continued discourse about previous experiences. Interviewees were required to reflect and recount personally experienced situations that involved elements of trust. Clarifying questions seeking participants' responses, feelings and actions undertaken were framed so as to seek an elaboration of their initial response, not a steering of a response to any desired end. Bias was eliminated in the interpretation of the results by employing the Grounded Theory method of data analysis which requires constant comparison of interview transcripts to identify predominant themes being espoused, thus avoiding any likelihood of introducing a personal preconception.

Chapter 4 Results

The previous chapter presents the argument for the choice of a qualitative research methodology and its suitability for this research. This chapter aims to present the findings of the data analysis in that it seeks to identify the common themes raised by the interviewees and then to account for the conditions that brought about these results.

Each principal interviewed gave examples of the importance of building trusting relationships with staff and described situations where they perceived trust had been broken between them and another staff member. The principals described situations where they had lost trust in that staff member due to that person's actions in either a single event or more typically, a series of events that eroded the principal's confidence in them. Principals also described the effect of these breaches of trust on how they personally felt, the harm done and how they managed the situation. The principals spoke of their efforts to repair the broken trust and whether these were successful or not.

Grounded Theory analysis of the transcripts of the interviews at first showed broad categories of similar content across all interviews. The coding process of constant comparison followed Strauss and Corbin's (1998) guidance on implementing 'Open Coding' of qualitative data sets to initially define categories. Miles and Huberman (1994, p.4) contend that phenomena "exist not only in the mind but also in the objective world, and that some lawful and reasonable stable relationships are to be found among them." It is in these relationships that the researcher "aimed to account for events, rather than simply to document their sequence... in looking for individual or social processes (and/or) ... a mechanism or structure at the core of the events that can be captured to provide a causal description of the forces at work" (Miles and Huberman (1994, p.4).

This first phase of coding was carried out through a line-by-line interpretation of the written transcripts of each interview with descriptive coding being generated for each action described by the principals. The initial Open

Coding captured categories that were descriptive of the importance of trust in individuals and the presence or lack of initial trust; breaches of trust and feelings of betrayal that accompanied them; a sense of blocking by staff members and their actions or inactions in trying to repair relationships.

The next phase of coding employed Axial Coding in which the same data set was interrogated to identify the prevalence of common categories and then the relating of those categories based on decisions about the relationship of those open-coded categories to each other. The categories thus identified were filtered by the notion that each had to capture an important element in relation to the impact of trust on the working relationship between the principal and staff member. Each had to capture something important about the data, with the item's validity being whether it captured an important aspect in relation to the research question. Riessman (1993) notes that constant comparison with the research question generates an awareness of the prevalence of the data item allowing a count of the incidence of the item and identification of those most commonly cited, in this instance, by the principals. The "number of participants" (Braun, Ellis et al. 2002, p.249) suggests an emerging category within the transcripts and allows for a consistent method of identifying non-quantifiable themes from the data. The incidence of common categories was noted and formed the requirement to satisfy on-going inclusion. The prevalence of common categories cited within the analysis was employed to determine strong themes for inclusion.

Axial Coding generated links between the categories based on commonalities. Principals, for example, often reported their initial level of trust in their staff. For some, they had a predisposition to trust all staff at first and interacted with their staff members from the premise that they could be trusted until something went awry. For others, they were less trusting of staff initially and preferred to rely on staff proving themselves worthy of trust before they could have confidence in them. In generating the Axial Coding of principals' responses this example of the variance in levels of initial trust demonstrates the labelling processes employed to identify factors that could be linked by the common coding of initial trust and also shows the divergence of elements that make up the code.

4.1   Findings

The Theoretical Sampling process follows and ultimately brought forth common themes pertaining to all of the participants' responses; listed below and subsequently explained. These revealed a theoretical explanation of the conditions that give rise to the building or betrayal of trust, and how they are expressed through action and the consequences that arise from these conditions:

Theme 1: The impact of the importance of trust

Principals cited a commonly held belief that the development of trusting working relationships with staff members was important as it had an impact on their own workload in leading the school, the quality of their interpersonal relationships with staff members and also the public image of the school.

Theme 2: The impact of the principal's predisposition to trust

A principals' disposition to trust others affected the initial development of trusting relationships. A principal's disposition to trust others or not showed marked differences in the pace of, and eventuality of the development of trusting relationships.

Theme 3: The impact of trust betrayal

The betrayal of trust was an intentional act entered into voluntarily by staff. A dominant category of self-interest, as the most commonly attributed cause for the betrayal of trust, was noted. Specifically, it was observed that principals classified breaches of trust that involved a betrayal of integrity and benevolence as most severe.

Principals felt harmed when trusted staff members betrayed their trust. This harm was often cited because principals, in placing trust in another, had made themselves vulnerable to the other person to carry out an expectation that they would behave in a certain manner.   Principals had placed trust in staff members to fulfil roles that were important to them, not only in the proper functioning of the school, but also in being able to depend on them to act appropriately. The principals revealed that staff members had betrayed

the trust placed in them in many instances through such actions as: contradicting the principal publicly; undermining his or her authority; not carrying out their role in a professional manner or refusing to collaborate with the principal.

Theme 4: The impact of the repair of betrayed trust

The repair of trusting relationships between principals and their staff was a fragile process characterised by acts lacking apology or restorative practice. In the responses of the studied principals it was determined that no lasting repair of trust was had and this had an impact on the nature of the ongoing relationship with the staff member as well as the way the principal conducted their leadership of the school and their own sense of wellbeing.

4.1.1 Theme 1: The impact of the importance of trust

This theme investigates how reliant principals are on trusted relationships with their staff and the extent to which trust is required to carry out their role in the school. Analysis revealed that principals expressed great importance in being able to trust staff members. They relied on staff to act professionally and carry out their role in such a manner that the trusted person did not disappoint the principal's expectations of them or that their actions didn't reflect adversely on the principal's leadership of the school. In trusting the staff member the principals needed to be confident that the other person would not act in a manner that would bring them personal harm. Principals also asserted that trust played an important role in establishing an effective working climate in the school. Being able to trust staff members were contributing to the achievement of a shared vision for the school reassured principals that the staff was united and focused in their efforts and that they could rely on them to act appropriately.

The trusted staff member was relied upon as the enormity of the task of managing a school required a confidence in other staff members to share the workload. Whilst principals acknowledged their end-of-line accountability for the outcomes of the school, they indicated that in order to achieve these outcomes they needed to rely on the work of others. The principal and staff

member had a common purpose in achieving the goals of the school and this reliance on the other serves to underscore the need for trusting relationships to be forged. As such, the principals have had to place themselves in a vulnerable position of relying on staff members to carry out their role appropriately. Other factors include the perspective that trust in staff members created a more harmonious working environment, and trusting working relationships portrayed a professional image of the school in the community.

The following quotes illustrate the importance principals placed in trusting another work colleague. Principals acknowledge the significance of professional trust in their staff as a crucial factor in running the school. The conditions that contribute to this reliance on another include the job of principal being complex with the desired outcomes best achieved through the collaborative efforts of others. They state that the job is too big to carry out alone and that they rely on staff members to collaborate in sharing the workload, generating a sense of team work and commitment to working together to achieve the goals of the school. For these principals it is important to them that they are confident in their staff members' professionalism in carrying out the tasks allocated to them because they have devolved responsibility to act to their staff but still retain the overall accountability for the outcomes of their staff's actions. A second condition impacting on the principals' level of trust in others is the position of vulnerability principals place themselves in by empowering the staff member to assume roles that may reflect on them. The significance of relying on the other party to have the ability to carry out their entrusted role, share the principal's workload and build the tone of the school is demonstrated here:

Principal 20 *"there is no question, trust is a huge component of my leadership style and as our job becomes more complex it becomes an even more important aspect because I simply can't do the job on my own, therefore I need to be able to rely on my senior administration team, as well as my entire staff in fact, it's not just the administration. Um, that if we are working on something together that I can have the confidence that we are all on the same ship heading in the same direction and we are all supporting each other."*

Principal 1 *"Yes, you do. No, you cannot run the school without trust because as the principal you can't do everything yourself, so you need to delegate to people. And therefore, that delegation takes with it trust. And the trust has to be both ways. The person who has been delegated the task has to trust*

> *that I've made that decision knowing the skills they have to do it and I have to trust that they will follow through on what I've asked them to do."*

Principal 17   *"No, I don't believe you can because not in the way schools, the development of school curriculum and everything else these days, you can't do it. There is no way you can do it as a singular so you do have to trust that those underneath you are actually pulling those things together."*

Principal 16   *"And certainly, you know, you rely as a principal, you're relying on your deputy principals, you have to develop that trusting relationship with them to take on such a big part of the workload. Things were going well last year with the deputy that had been here sometime, and I felt that I could trust that person to do the job and do it well."*

In addition to principals seeking trust in others to help carry the workload of the school the following quotes show that they also trust others to undertake these responsibilities with a sense of collaboration and like mindedness. As such the manner with which the trust is demonstrated is also important.

Principal 12   *"No, not efficiently. You can run a school but you would have to be the person doing it all the time. I've got some great staff, teacher leaders as well, that are you know, really stepping up so as far as the day in the classroom, most definitely, because we have, you know, each teacher is cost centre coordinators and learning area coordinator so in that way that can be devolved but I could still have those conversations with those teachers so strategies will still go ahead, but to run a school it's more than just the curriculum side there is so much involved in it and you really need complete and utter trust where everyone is on the same page. You've got a vision, you're all going for the same vision, where and, those deputies when they go and have conversations with teachers you know they're saying the same messages as what you want and that you have. And that's really, to me, how you try to get an effective school. The messages are the same. There's not one person delivering another message to what you want. You want the same messages being delivered across the board."*

Principal 9   *"Being a new principal in to a school, that's what, the first thing you want to do is to develop a trusting relationship with your staff, because without that you're not going to be able to successfully run a school."*

Principal 7   *"No. You have to..., no because... You have to rely on people to do their job. You have to trust people to do their job at the very basic level because as you know we don't have the time to make everybody accountable on a daily basis."*

Hence, the reliance on others to assume workload is noted as a condition that supports the importance of trust in building a professional learning community in schools, a finding echoed in the work of Hargreaves (2007) and Tschannen-Moran (2009).

A sense of caring for one's work colleagues was revealed as an important facet of trust, notably in creating harmonious work environments. A dominant category of benevolence, caring for the well-being of another, is

noted and concurs with the work of McKnight and Chervany (1996) as being the dominant trusting belief in the formation of trusting relationships. The bond of consideration for the other's needs was as an important factor raised in the study. These quotes show the importance principals placed in a benevolent attitude in shaping effective working relationships:

Principal 19   *"No, not at our school. I don't believe you could at any school. No and we have a difficult community to work in so we need to trust each other in almost like daily to make sure we're covering each other as well. So we've got that personal amount of trust plus our professional amount of trust that we need to..."*

Principal 13   *"Yes, it's giving of yourself to people a certain amount so they feel, um, I suppose valued. There is that relationship of value."*

Principal 7   *"They demonstrate an understanding of what I am trying to do with the school. They demonstrate a genuine belief in the kids and the school and me. And they understand their job."*

Principal 4   *"I can rely on her and she has never let me down."*

Principal 6   *"The structures have set yes and very collaborative and very...it's really, again it's a trust thing. We've got to have collaboration, we've got to have people here working together with a common goal centred on improvement of the children."*

Principal 12   *"Similar expectations, high standards, you know I have very high standards of you know excellence and of teachers. Particularly the quality of teaching is paramount to me so I know I can have discussions with her about different individual teachers and she will follow up with the ones I expect her to follow up through and to see that the strategies we've put in place are actually there, provide the support etc and I'll work with another group of teachers. So it's about, I think, the trust is there. She knows that I trust her completely and I have that loyalty. Um, that she, that we both work quite closely together and have a similar background knowledge as well which makes things quite easy in getting things going."*

The elements of benevolence, giving of oneself, collaboration and similar expectations of others set the conditions for establishing the importance of trust in principals' relationships.

The importance of trust as an outward indicator of school effectiveness is seen in these examples:

Principal 19   *"Absolutely, and that's really important and I'm often um, putting that trust into staff that they will do what I've asked them to do in regards to key messages to the community."*

Principal 12   *" I know that I can walk away from this school and know that (names deputy), as I did at the end of last term, (names deputy) will run it in the same manner as to whether I'm here or whether I'm not here. She follows through on the whole school strategy, she'll follow up. So that is a huge amount of trust, because you know, as a principal you want to make sure that everything is going according to how we planned it at the beginning of the year and then when you go on long service leave you actually devolve all your trust to who's stepping up."*

The importance of trusting work colleagues is thus seen to be a major factor of the effective functioning of the working relationship. Analysis of data reveals two conditions that impact on whether principals consider trust important in their work with others: firstly, the acknowledgement that in order for principals to achieve the outcomes they desire for the school they must enlist the support of school colleagues to carry out tasks. The size of their workload is often cited as a determiner of the requirement to trust others. Secondly, if conditions in the relationship are likely to require trust to achieve expectations then the principal must be willing to place him or herself in a position of vulnerability. The degree to which the principal is willing to place themselves in a vulnerable position determines whether trust is important in that relationship. If the principal need not rely on the trust of another then a condition arises where trust is not important to achieve expectations. As such, if trust is not an important condition then no reliance on the other is expected and trust need not be established.

This finding encompasses a reliance on others to work collaboratively with the principal to meet the common goals of their respective roles, protective of any vulnerabilities, and also that an outward display of trusted working relationships serves to send a message to the school community that the school is a harmonious organisation serving the best interests of its students. This finding aligns with the research of Tschannen-Moran (2004, p.15) "Trust matters because single-handedly we can neither create nor sustain many of the things we care most about". Trust is therefore seen to be important because it fosters conditions that allow cohesive and cooperative relationships (Baier 1994) and an engaged workforce and ultimately enhanced organisational performance (Battaglio and Condrey 2009).

4.1.2 Theme 2: The impact of a predisposition to trust

This theme discusses the influence a principal's readiness to trust another plays in the establishment of trust and the importance it plays in undertaking the tasks of managing a school.

The study identified that the establishment of trust in a working relationship between principal and staff member took place either quickly, over a period of time or not at all. It was determined that a principal's predisposition to trust another was a condition that had an impact on the degree and pace of trust developing between the parties. Principals with a predisposition to trust — whether based upon a sense of urgency to develop the trust in another so as to have tasks completed, or a belief that a person's job title / length of experience in the role implied a sense of safety in trusting that person— the common factor was that these principals were prepared to assume trust in another without the trusted person having to demonstrate trustworthy characteristics as a prerequisite for the trust to be formed. The trusted relationship in these instances was characterised more by a sense of reliance on the goodwill of the trusted party to act appropriately than a demonstration of the ability to do the role.

The predisposition to trust others was evident in principals who voiced a preference to trust people initially, and then maintaining that level of trust in their working relationships until something caused the trust to be broken. These principals recognised the importance to them of quickly establishing positive, trusting relationships early in their working relationship so as to achieve work objectives and create a sense of unity of purpose with staff. These principals were more likely to see the other party's good points and overlook or make allowances for flaws in the person that may threaten the development of trust. Johnson-George and Swap (1982) classify this behaviour as a 'high disposition' to trust. For these principals it was more in their nature to accept others because from their personal experience, relationships with others had seen trust develop more readily when using an open accepting stance than by starting the relationship with doubt. These principals had a set of beliefs that it was more beneficial to one's long-term self-interest if one developed initial trust with another. For other principals, the very nature of the staff member's long standing position as a teacher or senior administrator brought to their first encounters a sense that one could trust them because of the inherent authority of their position or rank. Rotter (1980) affirms the notion of the high trustor having more a belief in moral

rightness of the stranger than it is an expectancy of less risk in trusting others. This finding that principals will trust in a given situation irrespective of their beliefs about the other is supported in the work of Riker (1971).

It is important to recognise that principals, whether they have a pre-disposition to trust or not, are in fact making an assessment of the other's trustworthiness before placing the trust in another and assuming a risk. For some, the placing of trust is based on an assessment of the other's experience or title, an assumption that they can be trusted because they've held a trusted position in the past or have long-term experience in a similar role or situation. For others, the assessment of the other's trustworthiness is made over time, having observed and made conclusions about the person's actions. This conclusion concurs with the research of Dietz (2011, p.215) "there is *always* an assessment (however thorough) of the other party's trustworthiness which informs a preparedness to be vulnerable that, in genuine cases of trust, leads to a risk-taking act."

The following examples exemplify the principal's predisposition to trust staff early in a relationship, noting the reasons some have for a ready willingness to trust others:

Principal 20   *"I think I am that style of person who does trust people initially and then they either maintain my trust in them or as in the case with the first team, it just was eaten away. Some parts were eaten away rather quickly and others more slowly."*

Principal 3   *"There is something that appeals or grabs you about that particular person."*

Principal 2   *"Ok, I think as far as professionalism is concerned I take a view that I trust everyone until they give me cause not to."*

    "Yeah, I do. Give them a fresh start as far as this situation is concerned and as I say treat everyone, you know, equally. You expect them over a period of time to rise to the occasion."

    "And, um, I guess that gives staff quite a bit of professional leeway, um, some of them will rise to the occasion as far as that situation is concerned."

A distinction was seen with principals who did not have a predisposition to trust compared with those who did. A common characteristic with these principals was to extend trust to a staff member only after they had shown they were worthy of their trust. Some staff members earned the trust quickly and others over time but in each category the staff member showed whether

they could be trusted by the way they behaved. A dominant expression of principals' trust in others when attributed to their ability was that principals observed the staff members being skilled in their teaching or non-teaching roles and engaging with students, teachers and parents positively and collaboratively. This study found that principals trusted staff members who, whilst requiring the ability to undertake the work required of them, needed also to show a benevolent, caring attitude toward the principal and honesty in their dealings. It was this sense of goodwill and integrity that reassured the principals that their trust in the other party was not likely to be compromised more than their ability to do the role. Benevolence and integrity towards the trustor were noted as the most commonly identified attributes shown by the trustees as the precursor to forming trust and that principals identified these people as being dependable, bringing with them a sense of security if one was to place trust in them.

Where principals did not form trusted working relationships at all with a colleague the factors that contributed to this stance were in keeping with the principal being unwilling to trust and the staff member being untrustworthy. The principals who were unwilling to trust showed suspicion of the other party, commonly based upon wariness brought about from their own past experience and the acquired coping strategies from previous situations, or the trustees not demonstrating trustworthy characteristics thus precluding the formation of principals' trust in them. These principals employed management practices that were observed to achieve similar ends to the more trusting principal, in that the tasks that were required to be done in the school were carried out, but most often through a reliance on rules and expected compliance than by a sense of trusting others to act appropriately. Those principals, who expressed doubt in the staff members' ability to do the job, weren't prepared to engage in a relationship that may have established a sense of caring for the other nor did they assume an innate honesty of the other. Their actions, through reliance on enforcing routines and policies, did not require them to trust others, and as such placed them in a position of not having to rely on them, because the very expectation of compliance with

stated rules and procedures was enough to imply a requirement to act appropriately to avoid repercussions.

Principals who reserved committing to a trusted relationship are observed in the following quotes. The common theme of the predisposition of the principal waiting to observe the person demonstrating trustworthy qualities before placing trust in them is noted:

Principal 17   *"I reserve judgement. But what I normally do is I take it on the types of conversations and the types of things that I see as to, you know, is this person doing the sorts of things that they say they're doing? Or is there a question mark in my head?"*

Principal 4   *"Perhaps that is lack of trust on my behalf with all of them but I like to think it is I just like to make sure things are running."*

Principal 11   *"No, I felt that I had to work on that and that it took time to build that up too."*

Principal 6   *"When you give trust initially until people have shown you that they can, the initial training we would sort of you know... Until the process, you can see it's up and working."*

While reserving decisions to trust, principals observed the person's ability to carry out their role to ascertain whether the person had the necessary skills to complete assigned tasks:

Principal 1   *"Yeah, I do." (Only give jobs to people she trusts.) It's just the way they conduct themselves in the classroom, the relationship they have formed with children, the relationship they form with other staff members, and the relationship they form with me, so it's just an observational thing. And it's not a 100% because at times people do let you down. But, yeah, you try to pick the people you trust without overburdening them as well."*

Principal 12   *"I think that we've built it over a number of years and I don't think it was there initially in the first year I think the first year that um when she came in from the other school that probably it was, had a lot of um, leadership in that school which may have been portrayed in a different manner."*

Principal 7   *"And then I observe them, because there is only a handful. Overtime to see of those people, who can I trust to do their job first of all? And so from that point of view and similarly with teachers, it's more important with teachers that they understand the direction we're heading."*

Principals reserved the decision to trust another until they had observed the level of interpersonal skills and degree of benevolence the staff member showed to others. The level of caring shown in interactions helped inform principals' decisions to trust or not:

Principal 13   *"I think, rarely have I made the decision straight away where you walk in and you've usually had some opportunity for reflective thought in your senior staff in interacting in staff meetings, in the playground and in the classroom*

71

> *even in sitting down at recess and lunch times seeing how they interact with one another."*
>
> *"And I think I tend to choose people who demonstrate what I call the informal leadership where others defer to that person because of their personality their strength of character. Maybe it's their interpersonal skills, they seem to be able to engender conversation with all or through their knowledge of a particular aspect of curriculum you start to build up a, yes, their ability, capacity, not so much what they have demonstrated but I think you take a judgement on that person has the capacity to be able to take these roles on."*

Principal 2   *"Ah, probably because they've got an insight into the ways schools operate. And I guess what we're looking for, they're aligned to targets as far as schools go, they're aligned to, I think individually they have a defined professionalism themselves so internally they have some goals for themselves that they want to reach and generally I think they are team players. Whereas the others, who may be isolates, are inclined to do their own thing and it may be misaligned to what the school's direction is as far as ...."*

Principal 17   *"The qualities that I look for in terms of those people that I've been able to have doing those sorts of roles is a) their enthusiasm, I also look at their knowledge base and even if they haven't got the knowledge are they keen to apply the knowledge and learn it? Um, I suppose they're also the ones that you do see, just as you're walking around, they're the ones busy people that always get it done. And so you know that they will run with it and they'll do something about it. So they're probably the qualities and they're also the ones who will come and approach you too. Because they're really keen to do something or they've got the latest ideas or that type of thing. So from that perspective you know I think if you look at those sorts of qualities those people who have got inherent leadership sort of styles and strategies stand out. And I think that is just part of their make-up not necessarily something they've learnt."*

The interpersonal skills demonstrated by the trustee, their level of enthusiasm and engagement with colleagues thus impart a strong influence on the trustor's decision to trust or not.

As per the principals' observation of the other party's behaviour when interacting with other school colleagues, the quality of demonstrated honesty influenced a principal's trust in another:

Principal 3   *"You can usually gather from an experience like that whether they have humility, whether they have honesty, whether they've got some self-discipline and can carry through and you can work with someone like that, sometimes you get, you know, a shocker where you know it's just fraudulent."*

It is also noted that in order for the principals to trust others they needed to demonstrate that they were trustworthy and set about showing these qualities to their staff:

Principal 9   *"That I'm here for the long run so they've got to see that sustainability and also the parents have to see that as well. So just to building that trust I think takes a long time depending I suppose if you've come from a strong principal who has just retired or something or gone on to a new job and they've already had that trusting relationship that might be quite different but they had it and then they lost it. Now it's about regaining that and you know I must admit it didn't take long to regain that trust I think they, as I've said, I put everything out. I was very communicative, very collaborative, putting things down on the table, ensuring they had a process where they were involved in some of the decision making stuff, that they were um, yeah, just included. So it's necessary about making them feel included with me. Hopefully ensured their trust for me and that would be reciprocated back to me trusting them. Um, so what the trust looks like in my school at this point in time is that I've got an extremely supportive staff. We've got a really tough cohort of kids and I know that in my first six months here in particular very violent kids, I had kids lined up outside my door and ensuring that I was ok and I knew that when my staff came to me at the end of the day and they said we are just checking up on you to make sure you're ok."*

Principal 14   *"I think you've got to build trust and then you've got an environment of trust. Where people are insulted when something untrustworthy happens."*

Principal 11   *"Once again when I was acting principal my first year, I found that I didn't seem to have the trust of the community. It took time to build that trust. They were a bit wary and also the fact that I was unknown and they knew that I probably wasn't going to be here long term at that point. Yeah, it took a while to sort of gain their trust. I think the best thing I did was just got heavily involved in all aspects of the school. Rolled up my sleeves and didn't act like someone who was only going to be here 12 months. And I found that towards the end they were starting to approach me more readily whereas in the past they tended to go more to the deputy principals or people they knew. I found that the relationship with the P&C and also the School Council level was improved as the year went on."*

It is noted that the principals worked openly and with concerted effort to demonstrate their own trustworthiness in efforts to form trusting relationships with their staff members. In doing so they showed a willingness to engage with others and establish an atmosphere of collegiality that would in turn enable trust to be established. They exhibited honest traits through their conscious engagement with others to prove that they were genuine. These included preparedness to give time for decisions to be made, establishing situations in which others' involvement ensured inclusive participation, and a demonstration of genuine acceptance of others' views as a way of showing collaboration and receptiveness.

Principals who indicated that staff members did not receive their trust initially, but instead had to earn it over a period of time, acted by withholding their trust until they were assured the staff member demonstrated, typically through their work habits, that they were worthy of their trust. A clear

difference between the two dispositions to trust was the extent to which each principal was prepared to accept a level of risk in trusting the other person and the timing of that trust acceptance.

A condition that facilitated or prevented the formation of trust is the existing levels of trust within a school which influences the level of trust a principal would initially place in a staff member, and was voiced as a determinant of levels of initial trust by principals new to a school. In these instances, principals reported that being new to the school had raised scepticism amongst staff about their intentions. They expressed great difficulty in countering these negative impressions and subsequently altered the level of willingness they were prepared to allow in trusting the staff, especially if they considered it not reciprocal. In schools where there was distrust between the previous principal and staff, the principal found it a difficult and time consuming process to establish his/her own credibility with staff and to forge the trust.   A principal, new to the school, may experience an initial lack of trust by the school staff if they compare him or her to the previous principal. This was particularly evident where the previous principal was held in high regard by the staff and the perception was that the new principal would have to prove themselves equal to the predecessor. The increased scrutiny of the incumbent's actions and hyper-vigilance towards any perceived changes to procedures and routines has been observed to lead to a lack of trust of the new principal. Principals voiced the staff perception that the past ways of doing things were the preferred way and that the disruption to this perceived stability was not welcome. These findings corroborate the work of Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) that prevailing organisational culture plays a dominant role in establishing trust. Correspondingly, the new principal in not receiving welcoming and communicative interactions with staff, reported a hostile reception and hence many principals stated they had little or no initial trust in their new staff members. Data analysis revealed that the reluctance of staff being open to the principal's vision for the school or to a different way of doing things, led to a reciprocal doubting that the staff were team players and able to be relied upon to carry out the principal's requests. Principals presented with such doubt, typically persisted in trying to persuade staff of

the genuineness of their requests through expressions of their sincerity by clarifying procedures and processes at forums that often included staff meetings and individual face-to-face meetings with staff. A number of principals responded that these early signs of distrust by staff have had far-reaching effects on their own sense of self-efficacy in undertaking the role of principal. They found that their new appointment to the school presented a considerable workload in firstly gaining an understanding of established school processes and secondly, identifying strategies they would use to bring about improvements. To have this process hindered by a display of mistrust by staff often left the principal feeling isolated, disappointed in the lack of staff conviction to undertake a change agenda, and doubting the level of trust they could give staff members in relying upon them to carry out the agenda.

This lack of reciprocity of trust was raised by a number of principals as hampering their efforts. These principals indicated that whilst they believed they showed openness and preparedness to discuss issues with their staff, made opportunities to clarify and explain what they wanted, they found that the staff members were not so inclined to be as open with them. A common element disclosed in the interviews was that staff members often took a non-compliant approach to demonstrating their accountability to the principal and would often seek external intervention on their behalf instead of discussing the situation with the principal. Principals reported great difficulties in implementing system-wide policies such as performance management practices when staff would not comply with the procedures for undertaking these, and similarly were unreceptive in meetings. The impact on levels of trust in their staff was marked with many principals reporting that they spent considerable energy and time in convincing staff that their motives were honourable in trying to establish system requirements in the face of staff members who were not conducive to undertaking their role in the process. As such, principals reported that the formation of trust in these staff members was extremely difficult to establish or not established at all as a result of conditions characterised by non-compliance.

The impact of staff hindering the establishment of trust is seen in the following excerpts from interviews — with pre-existing obstacles to trusting a

75

new principal based on staff members' previous experiences shaping the degree to which they are prepared to trust another. In many instances the staff attitudes were entrenched. These examples demonstrate the recalcitrant nature of staff members unwilling to participate and holding on to long-held practices of non-compliance which presented to the new principals considerable push-back when trying to establish initial trust:

Principal 19   "*Yes, but it's been, I would suggest, a struggle for every principal that's been here. And it's just an ongoing thing. When (names previous principal) was here, when I took over from (names previous principal), it was one of his key things ...Keeping staff professional. Um, so it has just been a continued focus. But, yes, it has been very easy... to get burnt by silly lame comments that ...*"

Principal 18   "*So we tried, as much as my deputy and I were new to the school, both pretty relatively newcomers as most of the staff had been here ten plus years. Trying to time and time again explain and re-explain the process and say look this is about you being accountable to the system and accountable for the work you do in the school and you know you'd explain the policy and the process and yet, um you know we did that with it was all well intentioned. It was all, um, this is what it involves and you know there was a level of negotiation, there was still all the backroom deals being done with the teachers' union and of course before we knew it we've got you know, um, the State, the union organiser in here telling us...*"

Principal 5   "*Um, I think that from the time I first came to the school there were, or there was a group of about four teachers who identified themselves through their behaviour, through attitudes at meetings and also their work in the classroom as being not very cooperative and I recognised that and obviously I realised that I would have to work on that to get everybody on board so we're all going in the same direction.*"

"*Yes, and I think that it wasn't new. That's right it wasn't just for me it was something that was very well practised. They were all union members and they stuck only to the rules of the union. Never really put their hand up to do additional work around the school.*"

Principal 8   "*Um I suppose the one I found the most frustrating, as you say, the trust element of staff is a crucial part. A group of EAs at (names school), from the first time I got here I was warned that they sort of do things through the union and don't actually speak to you about issues directly and all of that sort of thing so I made a point right from the beginning, thought well obviously the previous principal hasn't worked. To work more closely with them and be part of their performance management process and all of that sort of thing. So I thought I'll meet with them once or twice a term, we'll sit and discuss all the issues if there are any problems. When these things come up that I think they need to know about we'll meet and talk about it and that eventually that they would learn, that we would learn to just get along with each other and understand the right way to do things, the processes and all that sort of thing. This has been a problem and that and I thought being a new bloke in the job is a great time to put a new process in place that hopefully will... And here I am five years later just as frustrated and wanting.*"

A similar effect is noted when principals encounter a new staff that is non-compliant and refusing to engage by reason of pre-existing relationships with a prior principal or vice principal. In these situations, past methods were the preferred mode of operation and the staff's preference to those ways of doing things hindered the principal's ability to fully engage staff members and created a hurdle for the new principal to overcome when introducing a different approach. These two examples show how this occurred in the field, the difficulty in forming the relationship with the staff and the impact on the principal:

Principal 15   *"I'll just give you the background in terms of being appointed here, and following up after (names previous principal). Um, who had been at the school for some time, who was very charismatic and everyone loved him and he was a young male and da, da, da and so 'cos coming in here I think a lot of them were quite disappointed that he was moving on and I was relatively inexperienced in terms of acted at level 5 but I was deputy, probably where I am now, but anyway at that point, so I guess I was finding my way. So coming in and trying to develop relations, I guess in reflection now I realise I had my focus in a lot of other things which should have been on relationship building and developing trust and so on to be able to work with those people but essentially there was a lot of resistance, why fix something if it aint broken was the attitude you know."*

Principal 13   *"Where I got burnt, actually there's two situations where I got burnt and both times I've been in a school where the person was already there was already in a role, in an administrative role. Level 3, so their personality, strengths, characters and everything else was different from mine, which can be a good thing. You don't always want people to be the same as you otherwise you end up with a yes organisation. You don't want that. But what had happened is that I had come in to the school and the person had been there a number of years, several years and they had a relationship with the previous administrator and a way of operating and my leadership, management was different."*

Similarly, encounters with staff members who were of a like status or rank caused difficulties for principals in establishing trust with them. Often the trustee considered they were better or equal to the newly appointed principal especially if the principal had recently held the same promotional level as the trustee:

Principal 20   *"Well, they came in as a person who had already worked at this level. So professionally I believed they had the skills and the ability to do the job. Um, they um, certainly within the first couple of weeks set about establishing their position within the school but then unfortunately, it became quite apparent that they didn't see themselves as part of a team, they went and did their own thing."*

Principal 6   *"Yeah, and of course it goes back into that trust of them, of me, and I think there was also a factor there that the deputy, you know, that I have been*

> *working with, actually probably perceived herself as being a deputy a lot longer than I."*

Whilst previous examples often refer to the reluctance or deliberate non-compliance of staff members to willingly engage with the principal in order to form a trusting working relationship, others were not passive in their refusal but actively sought to block the principal's efforts. The hindering of trust formation was influenced by staff unwilling to either participate or engage in collaborative practices with the principal but also to obstruct the process:

Principal 18   *"And so they've got something they don't want to discuss or demonstrate to you. And um, therefore you know they start putting blocks in your way, start blocking the process. And um, from my point of view, I guess from looking from the side of admin you look at it and think all I want you to do is share with me what you are doing in your classroom. And then I can see what you are doing and I can then assist you in making that better or improving or just pat you on the back. And that is all it ever was, but it was sort of misconstrued by some as being you know this opportunity to get in there and you know and do nasty things and it was never that, it was never that at all.*

And, I whilst working with the person, being open and explaining where I'm coming from, explaining my style, everything was fine on the surface but we didn't mind having a couple of disagreements or different points of view. It was, and that, because you've got to give a bit because as a principal you can't always come in to the school and your way isn't always the right way you've got to take the feedback as well because they give different, the deputies give different feedback that they feed from staff. They say to you so you can adjust your style and management."

A theme of staff resistance caused by unwillingness to engage with the new principal proved to be a common barrier to the principal endeavouring to create a trusting relationship with staff. For while he or she was prepared to offer the trust, staff did not reciprocate, either through preference for 'old ways' of doing things, often linked to a devotion to a previous leader; or as equally debilitating for the principal, a deliberate blocking and lack of cooperation with the new principal.

4.1.3 Theme 3: The impact of betrayal of trust

The previous sections of this study identify the conditions under which trust is deemed important to principals and also the tendency they have to trust others or not. This section notes the conditions under which trust is facilitated or interrupted and the impact a betrayal of trust has on the

participants. A theme emerged that each act of betrayal carried the outcome of a lessening of the trustor's trust in the other and that the trustor could no longer rely on the person to act without causing harm to the trustor; that the expectations of the trusted party were not carried out. The predominantly identified cause for the betrayal was one of self-interest — perfidious acts in which the previously held state of trust between principal and staff member was broken through actions that satisfied their own wants at the expense of the previously established trusting relationship with the principal.

It is noted that the principals' recounts of staff behaviour showed incidents where staff members, once having the trust of the principals, chose to act in a manner that caused the principal to distrust them; sometimes with an expectation that their actions would go undetected and other times not. The staff members' actions were often spontaneous or opportunistic for which principals expressed they could not dismiss as simple errors of judgement. Most prevalent were acts that would bring personal gain to the staff member, often in the form of not meeting timelines, refusing to comply with instructions and thus reducing their own workload or withdrawing from engaging with colleagues, all seen as a preference to meet one's own ends rather than the needs of the school or principal. Trust was broken because the actions broke the principal's expectations of the person; made the principal vulnerable to harm; risked tasks deemed beneficial to the school not being carried out and reflected poorly on the principal, thus confirming that the principal could no longer rely on the person to act in the way they had done so previously. Doubt in this person established the principal's distrust. The study reveals that when trusted parties chose to act in a manner that caused a breach of trust they did so by making an informed choice between the options of maintaining and not maintaining the trust. By choosing to betray the trust it was considered there was more to be gained by doing so than maintaining the status quo. It is noted that the choice to betray the trust was additionally influenced by a calculation of the risk of being caught and the extent of any penalty. When betraying trust with the full knowledge that the cause would be attributed to them, the trustee often used an excuse of claiming they thought their acts were in the public domain and therefore

common knowledge. Elsewhere, similar acts of betrayal were made in the knowledge that the penalty of doing so was minimal and the gain outweighed any possible negative impact. Principals affirmed their frustration at having few options available, in the form of penalty, to dissuade acts of betrayal.

In situations where betrayals of trust were undertaken with the expectation that the trustee's actions would go unnoticed or not be able to be attributed to them, the impact on the principal's level of trust in them was nevertheless significant. Similarly, a voiced concern that the extent of penalty able to be imposed by principals was seen to be little deterrent to preventing acts of trust betrayal. The principals reported feeling vulnerable to harm in the form of ridicule, undermining their authority or damage to their sense of self-worth and quite powerless to prevent these wilful acts. Trustees' responses to this form of betrayal were typically of denial of any involvement or attempts to shift blame to others.

Principals reported a breakdown of trust in staff members who were seen to "go behind their backs"; staff who the principals would have liked to have discussed issues with them personally but instead pursued enquiries with external agencies. Often, the principals reported, that unions or industrial advocates were contacted by staff members to address a situation that had occurred in a school when the answer could just have easily, in the principal's opinion, been had from him or her. For all principals, it was this perceived lack of courtesy in not discussing the issues with them firstly that they found most disappointing and resulted in the principal being cautious in his or her dealings with the staff member involved and ultimately not trusting that person. A number of principals voiced concern that they believed they were strong advocates for their staff in difficult situations and always supported their staff publicly and yet were not receiving equal respect when staff chose to ignore the principal and seek outside advice. It was reported by principals that their perception of the situations raised by staff could have been resolved through their early involvement but had instead elevated the situation to a different level by involving third parties, that in the principal's opinion, implied his or her inability to manage the situation. The principals

voiced a lack of trust in these staff and a set-back in their promotion of an open, collaborative teamwork ethic across the school.

The principals' recounts of situations in which they found trust betrayed revealed prevalent categories of intentional, harmful acts carried out voluntarily. These acts were intended to satisfy the trustee's self-interest and in being enacted damaged the principal's trust expectations of the staff member. Further analysis of these categories revealed conditions of betrayal caused by a drop in ability, benevolence and integrity shown to the principal. The same conditions that emerged as conducive to the establishment of trust were also those that allowed for the betrayal of trust and the formation of distrust.

Principals placed trust in those whose skill they could depend upon, people who had the ability to do their job competently and perform tasks as expected according to the appropriate standards of the profession; people they could rely on to act proficiently. Principals noted in the following excerpts, the betrayal of trust when staff actions caused them to question the person's ability to carry out their role appropriately. It is important to note that in cases of trust betrayal due to a lack of ability, differentiation must be made between not having the ability because one is new to the position and still learning the required skills, compared with an act of betrayal of trust where the trustee may have had the ability to do the role but made a voluntary, intentional decision not to undertake the task or where the previously demonstrated ability was dispensed with to satisfy their self-interest, and thus breach the trust placed in them. In all situations the principals' confidence in the person's ability to do the role was damaged and their trust in them broken.

 The study revealed common themes of betrayal of trust in all descriptions of trust relationships presented by principals. Every scenario described by principals showed a breakdown of trust as a result of actions by a staff member. The actions causing the betrayal of trust were identified through the constant comparison method and categorised as either breaches of ability, benevolence or integrity.

The following interview excerpts demonstrate the categories of betrayal against different facets of trust:

4.1.3.1 Ability

Principals described situations where the betrayal of trust as a result of the person's inability to carry out a required action was deemed to be more in keeping with a person not wanting to rather than a sense of not being able to carry out the action. Principals showed tolerance towards a staff member who, perhaps because they were new to the role, or an inexperienced teacher, made mistakes in carrying out their expected role. However, more experienced staff members were deemed to have an expected level of ability by nature of the length of time they had spent in the role. Staff members who made mistakes through lack of ability were more likely to be forgiven if they had undertaken the task with sincerity, benevolence and integrity. For these incidents principals did not interpret the staff members' actions as betrayal of trust to the same degree as actions caused by breaches caused by a lack of benevolence or integrity. For a number of principals a breach in trust caused by the lack of ability required of them to be quite analytical to determine whether the staff member's actions were genuinely caused by an inability to carry out the required role or whether the perception of the person's inability was merely a 'cover-up' for a lack of desire to participate appropriately.

Principal 1   *"And when I broached it with her she couldn't see that she had done anything wrong."*

Principal 4   *"There is one teacher I don't trust as much as the others just in the grading of children and what he um, what he tells me and what actually happens. I don't trust his judgements and what he tells the parents sometimes."*

Principal 5   *"Well, it started to um, it put me on notice in a sense that I had to watch out for what is happening with um, the children in the classroom and how they were being managed."*

Principal 3   *"One has to be realistic in setting reasonable tasks to people based on all the evidence that we intuitively, in using observation skills and comparing and contrasting with normal performance and behaviour. One has to be, realise that you are going to open the batting for a first class cricket team and the person is a butter fingers or something like that or hasn't got the ability to do it, you've got to be quite careful. If one is appointed to a position, presumably has the qualifications and things of that nature then there is a realistic expectation (sic) that the standard will be not only achieved*

	but maintained, sustained and that is fair enough because you are actually drawing the Queen's coin so to speak and therefore should render service in reciprocation."
Principal 6	*"I have my way of doing it", that was it and not even willing to um, you know yelling, and I won't even go into some of the things that I saw...and but nothing, quite often there was nothing. No, no, things just did not happen."*

Coupled with concerns of the teacher's ability to do the role were accompanied attitudinal qualities that either showed a low-level interest in the role or an overly confident sense of bravado. Both attitudes by the staff members are an attempt to cloud the interpretation of their ability but in effect contribute to the perception that they have a lack of ability to do the job.

Principal 3	*"The general, the lackadaisical attitude. A secretive nature I suppose, the things that strike you at the intuitive level and you somewhat, you do have a trust."*
Principal 17	*"I have got big question marks that she has got the skills. Confidence far exceeds competence is the statement that would come to my mind. Um, she will tell you she is the most brilliant thing under the sun but I'm not seeing that in terms of the competence. I'm seeing her having to spend a lot of time going back to fix up what she has messed up. Because she didn't know how to do it properly first up."*

The finding of this study that a condition for the betrayal stems from factors including ability is supported in the research of Mayer, Davis et al. (1995) and that of Solomon and Flores (2001) when they say that we trust people whose skill we depend upon, especially professionals, to be honest about their level of skill and maintain their skills. This effort reflects not merely on their reliability but on their character and conscientiousness.

4.1.3.2 Benevolence

The acts of trust betrayal caused by the trustee's display of an uncaring attitude and related acts toward the principal defined the conditions of a breach of the benevolence facet of trust and signalled a lack of good-will towards the principal. The staff member's actions indicated that they were willing to engage in behaviours that might cause harm. Once again, the intentionality of the actions which caused the betrayal of trust showed the choice made by the trustee to voluntarily engage in the untrustworthy behaviours. The harm was caused because principals depended on these people and had confidence in them to act appropriately. Their actions

showed a lack of consideration and sensitivity for the principal's needs and a dismissal of the importance of the trusted bond. Most dominant in the scenarios was that the lack of good-will towards the principal was amplified by the trustee's intention to satisfy their own self-interests and exploit the vulnerability of the principal in the opportunity it presented to them.

Uncaring acts often involved the promotion of the trustee's self-interest; disruptive actions that caused the principal damaged identity through public criticism, wrong or unfair criticisms and increased workload in attempting to repair the damage caused by the staff member. In these circumstances the principals were placed in what they considered awkward situations of having to maintain a professional demeanour whilst dealing with the debilitating effects of the trustee's actions that were very often seen in public.

Intentional acts of betrayal of trust with specific reference to acts affecting the benevolence facet of trust are depicted in the following examples.

Principals acknowledged the impact of the benevolence facet of trust but struggled to categorise reasons for it:

Principal 1   *"No, no it's just lack of thought."*

Principal 2   *"Yeah. Either that or they're being antagonistic to others. Deliberately undermining others? OK."*

The sense of personal hurt was very marked:

Principal 15   *"And I just felt let down again and I guess to me I assumed there should be a trusting relationship, I should be able to trust them to be supporting me. And I just felt extremely let down."*

Principal 6   *"She actually emailed a lot of staff. And said (names interviewee) has questioned my authority, in front of all, my integrity, in front of all of the um staff. I heard it second hand. Which was interesting. Well it's probably saving face, it's probably getting like a confirmation back that she was doing the right thing. It's um, definitely trying to undermine me because there's never been any support."*

Principal 8   *"So, yeah that has caused, no matter how open we've been about it. No matter how much we've talked about it. And that's the sort of thing I find most difficult about the situation. Is no matter how open you are about stuff and encourage people to come and speak to you about it they just don't get it. Yeah. I'm not worried about them ringing the union, that's their prerogative but at the end of the day I would prefer they have the conversation with me first. And then if not happy with the response that I gave then go ahead and call the union. And that is that level of trust thing that you'd like to,... just the way you would like people to deal with you."*

The lack of benevolence not only broke the principal's trust in the person but had a wider impact across the operations of the school community as seen in the following excerpts:

Principal 16   "*There was a mobile drug lab stopped out the front of our school. We had to go into a lock down situation and we were in the middle of an assembly practice when that happened and in doing that I went to have some discussions with the Police of where in the school they wanted the students and staff. Where was going to be the best location? We were under their guidance in that situation. I took one of the deputies with me while the other stayed in the undercover area and managed you know, the staff and the students that were in there. And then I asked the other deputy to go back and speak to the deputy in the undercover area and she said "I don't want to". We're in the middle of a crisis and I said sorry, that's your role, you will do it, you will go back and have that conversation. Look, um, I believe she went back to the undercover area, I don't believe she had the discussion with the other deputy. I believe she chose a couple of other staff members to have that discussion with. So there was no, so immediately to me there was no trust in that because I knew in a crisis situation she wasn't going to be there.*"

Principal 9   "*So he was not negotiating with me or coming to terms because the girl was upset and that's fine and it's ok to support your friend. Um, he had no understanding that I, it was about the safety of the children in the school. Safe handling of the food in the canteen. It was appalling, maggots growing in the canteen and stuff. So it was really appalling. And anyway, so I said yes I supported the decision and he was devastated about the fact that I had supported this decision. Anyway he went off and he then took it out into the community so it didn't just come to me so he took school stuff into the community so there was a huge breach of trust. Absolutely.*

                 So then he's come back at me and what he's saw (sic) he took away all that professionalism that I had and made it very personal. So he then, um didn't like the fact that then I had to deal with all of those situations and it ended up going to (Investigation Authority) because it got so bad and he got so bad."

Principal 10   "*I think that has had an influence on my trust of him. Um, you never say anything to him otherwise it will get through the whole school. In fact I had a staff member today who came to me and said look my wife's pregnant, please don't tell anyone, especially don't tell the deputy male, because if you tell him the whole school will know about it. And that's the sort of person he is. So in terms of trust, I do trust him, but not to the extent that I could tell him something and to keep it confidential. Because, he wouldn't do that. It would be around the school very quickly.*"

The conditions for the decline in benevolence shown to the principal came about as a result of the trusted party being motivated to betray the trust because of dissatisfaction with the current situation. It is noted that the drop in goodwill shown towards the principal is motivated by the expectation of there being more to be gained by betraying the expectations placed in them and that their actions were made of a stronger self-interest than that of maintaining the trust of the principal.

4.1.3.3 Integrity

It is noted that principals report that situations causing a breach of trust that relate to the staff member's integrity most often result in relationships that were severely damaged or permanently irreparable. It was often expressed that the breaching of trust through dishonest actions was a major source of disappointment for the principals; at the very core of the relationship. A frequent depiction of this type of trust betrayal involved principals sharing confidential information with senior staff members, in many cases their deputy principals, as trusted confidants. Principals described situations in which they would involve their deputy principals in planning discussions during which such items as human resource planning and finances were often tabled, discussed and possible issues or future actions generated. In these scenarios, discussions were considered formative and speculative of possible solutions but not set as concrete procedures or policy. An often cited breach of trust occurred when the deputy principals divulged the content of these meetings with other staff members. Principals claimed that these actions often involved selected staff members receiving information from the deputy principal in a form that seemed to be presented as privileged information. Being seen to be 'on the inside' and through such provision of information, these people were considered favoured by the deputy principal. Principals noted these actions by the deputy principals as 'having a foot in both camps', and 'big noting himself'; as being seen to be a conduit of privileged information. Principals indicated that the actions undermined their trusted relationship; were seen to be divisive and painted the principal as one not needed to be trusted by the staff because the deputy could act on their behalf instead. Principals formed the view that it was undermining their relationships with staff members if the previously trusted staff member leaked information to staff and marginalised the principal's influence in the decision.

It was found that when principals confronted the deputy principals with their concerns about their actions the often used response was that they thought the discussions with the principals had been finalised and that the

information was free to be disseminated. That the staff member didn't acknowledge protocols and showed a lack of integrity, was frequently referred to by principals as cause for them to present their concern to them and to seek changes in their deputy principal's behaviour. Where changes in the deputy principal's behaviour did not happen trust was not repaired and these principals faced a working environment where they coped with the situation by various means including conducting senior leadership meetings with all senior leaders and not singularly with the un-trusted person, or by changing the deputy's role in the school so as to sideline the person away from important decision-making situations. The repercussions from these trust damaged scenarios, compounded by industrial restrictions in schools, saw principals unable to dismiss or transfer staff that caused these disruptions to working relationships. Principals typically coped through the provision of the work role adjustments or 'waited-it-out' as one principal endured betrayal by his deputy principal knowing that the deputy was due to retire later that year. In situations where the damage caused by the lack of trust in the trustee became overwhelming, it was often noted an increased incidence of principals taking stress leave, sick leave or bringing forward long-service leave as the only mechanism available to them to avoid the situation. Severely distressed principals stated they would 'drive out here and be really ill before I got here' and questioned what they were doing by working at that school.

The debilitating effects of staff acting without regard to personal integrity in their dealings with the principal are seen in the following examples of betrayal of agreements between the parties —situations in which the trusted party breaks trust by contradicting previously established agreements:

Principal 1   *"What used to happen is that I'd have both deputies in and we'd toss around ideas, do you think we should do this? , do you think we should do that? You know classes for next year, what if we did this? And we'd have up different scenarios. Well the next day teachers are coming to me and saying (names herself) I heard I'm taking a year 5 next year or I heard we're changing the literacy plan. And no decision had been reached, you know how you kick around...*

He said "Oh well, I thought we had decided that." I said, no, no, no we were talking things through. And I said what you want to do is big-note yourself with staff members, a foot in both doors. I said you are an admin person

> *and your loyalty is to the administration to this school not to me, the administration of the school and the fair running of the school."*

Principal 13   *"When there was an opportunity for discussion the deputy got up and then went back to his original view. And shot me down in front of everyone else. And went, when I say shot me down, he went to the exact opposite to what we had already agreed on in an admin meeting. This is the stance we are taking and in that forum he agreed ... and so he completely and utterly went the opposite to where I thought we were going and he blindsided me. And that then, I think the staff then picked up on that because we couldn't get a consensus at that stage I called him in to try to find where exactly this person's intent was and he felt that he could justify it by saying that it, there were options available for discussion and that whilst we had, I believe an agreement in our admin meeting, he felt that if staff were going a particular way that he would support the staff because ... I said, yeah, it's not a consensus, that's where management comes in and we stick to the line. And he felt that as it was an open forum and we were discussing it, um he could share his perspective. I said we'd already done that. This was for the staff to try and put their view across and for us to present our point of view."*

Principal 10   *"When we have our admin meetings in the office, it's closed doors, we discuss items that we will then discuss with the staff at our staff meetings and when we go in there and I make an attempt to talk about the aspects we talked about at our staff meeting, at our admin meeting, um, he puts me down straight away. He tells staff it is totally incorrect and we should be doing something other than what we discussed in our admin meeting. All on side, and then he completely denigrates me by saying that it's not what we discussed, um and he goes down a different track. And says, "I think you're saying things the wrong way. We didn't discuss that. We should be saying this and this". And our other deputy, just looks at him and shakes her head. And I shake my head and there are times when I've got up and just said I don't want to discuss this anymore, you're just going down the wrong path. And later on when we have a discussion about this, he's not apologetic at all, um but when we have a discussion and make him aware of it, because a lot of staff members also make him aware how aggressive he is and how he tries to push his own way and get his own way. Um, I've had a lot of complaints from staff members and ultimately I've had to talk to him on a number of occasions. I've even had intervention of district office where we've had the district superintendent come and see him just to talk to him about the way he conducts himself. He's ok for a while and then he goes back to what he's normally like."*

The person's deliberate actions in breaching the integrity facet of trust are noted in these scenarios. The planned, secretive nature of the actions caused principals to question the other's integrity and broke the level of trust in them:

Principal 15   *"No I think they were deliberate, no I think they were definitely deliberate. I think he tried to come across as Mr Nice Guy and um, I think he quite enjoyed the fact that he was the one they were coming to. People didn't trust (names interviewee) or didn't have the confidence..."*

Principal 16   *"I have seen some situations that have made me feel less inclined to put my trust in that person. A recent example is I had Central Office call to say that they were concerned about an email that had been sent by one of the deputies. I knew nothing about it and this person had actually been on leave, long service leave for about a five-week period in Europe..."*

Principal 18   "*The thing that really disenchanted me as well, is they sent in a union organiser and that, I didn't like that too much because we felt they weren't being very productive in the way they were approaching it with staff and with admin. So then they brought in their administration heavyweight who was a school principal to come in and talk to us as well. And again he was pretty... So a school principal but he was working for the union at the time. And also he was very stick-in-the-mud about it too. He was, you know, he sat there and told me what was acceptable and not acceptable. I found that really affronting. I thought hang on a minute. Yeah, it becomes that, but it creates that ill feeling, it creates that distrust and makes it really difficult to deal with because you're trying to work with people and to work with people effectively in classrooms you've got to have trust. They've got to trust you and you've got to trust them.*"

The principals placed great importance in integrity as a facet of trusting relationships with their staff members. They relied on staff members to keep the commitments they had made. When trustees failed to follow through on what they said they would do the principals considered their actions a breach of the trust they had placed in them. Similarly, the expectation that the trusted staff member was committed to telling the truth was called into question when principals realised they couldn't count on the staff member to be open and honest. The examples cited above indicate that a person may act by telling the truth in disclosing confidences to other staff members, that is, telling factually correct information, but the betrayal of the principal's trust pertains to the irresponsible nature of the act in breaching the confidentiality of the principal's conversation with them.

The example of dishonesty detailed in the following excerpt illustrates the importance of the person's integrity in maintaining a trustworthy relationship with the principal. Of note are the elements of telling the truth and keeping promises which were commonly broken by trustees and often the shedding of blame to others:

Principal 17   "*And yet, when you actually front that person it's smokescreens and 'I wouldn't do that' and then you question does the person really have no self-reflection skills? Um, or is that's our personality and we cover it up you know, by blaming somebody else you know.   So when we haven't got what we need done we blame and blame and blame and that sort of thing has probably been a bit of a trend with the person I'm thinking of. But does it, you know, in such a way that when you actually try to ping her on it it's a big 'I never said that' and the big cover up. And even what she says at the front counter is really quite inappropriate and can be quite rude. And so you chat to her about that and it's like 'oh, there's no way', 'I didn't do that, I didn't say that'.*"

The lack of integrity seen in the following example highlights that staff members may not consider their actions immoral but the attempts to avoid detection results in a reduction in openness and attempts to rationalise their actions so as to minimise the exposure of their breach of trust to others. The consequent repercussions on the players can have major influence on the health and wellbeing of staff and the actions of the principal in maintaining the good order of the school:

Principal 1   *"But, I mean he breached trust in other ways, he was having an affair with the year 1 teacher which I didn't know about until the cleaner found them (description of sex) one day in the classroom. What they had been doing was they were coming in at night and having (sex) on the sick bed, which is pretty gross. But the whole alarm system for the school was turned off. Now that's a real breach of trust. So I just hauled him into the office and said your private life is your private life but inside of this school you keep your (body part) in your trousers thank you very much. Cos you know how subtle I am. Honestly Peter I was fuming when I found that out. Because, (names the school's suburb), for goodness sake. It is a difficult area. We had break-ins... It wasn't as strained um, and also a couple of weeks later I had to put all of that aside because he broke it off with her and she attempted suicide... I felt it was against the school but because it was my school it was about me as well and, and that sense of betrayal was pretty strong and the anger was huge."*

Principals rely on the integrity of their staff to communicate openly and honestly with parents of students and themselves and to act appropriately in demonstrating that trust. Examples that show a lack of integrity which subsequently affects the trust the principal had in a teacher are seen here. The dealings affected the principal's belief that the teacher's actions and word could be counted on, that their communications were reliable.

Principal 4   "*There is one teacher I don't trust as much as the others just in the grading of children and what he um, what he tells me and what actually happens. I've seen things and I've also had parents complain over the years. That the scores and I mean he will tell parents that and parents will approach him to see how their child is going. He gives them the feeling that everything is going extremely well, fine, no worries and then a report will come out and that is something that I say every year, I say no surprises. I don't trust his judgements and what he tells the parents sometimes.*"

Dishonest actions and lies for personal gain are illustrated here as major breaches of the integrity facet of trust:

Principal 3   **"***This person started to reveal that they were untrustworthy. Now what do you do when you come across something like that when somebody gives a pledge that that should, that will be done, and you find that repetitively it isn't done.*

In the actions they were required to do. One instance I suppose, and this brought it to a head. Constantly going to the bank to deposit money and things of that nature. It occurred to me that this was, I had a feeling, that this wasn't being done that leaving the school was to engage in social activities.

Lengthy lunches and things like that. On that occasion, after a few of those sessions I asked to see the bank deposit receipt book. And er, I could see that there were only a few times when this person had gone to the bank. So you can have a suspicion, your trust is being challenged."

Principal 15   *"They had the union and I hadn't even been told the union was coming in. I was just here in the front office and they were calling a meeting. That created other issues, people, some people were crying, some were upset, some thought it was unfair, others were let's get her, that kind of stuff. Anyway, the thing with (names deputy) is that, you know, I did share a lot with him, not in terms of my health, but you know we worked together, we discussed some of the issues, how we were going to deal with it and so on. But what happened over a period of time where I thought the trust was broken down is that he was a union member and so he would say "I'm going to the union meeting because" you know "we need to know what is going on". But others would tell me, were feeding back to me that he said nothing in terms of, I didn't expect him to defend me but in terms of following due process and perhaps picking them up on some things or at least trying to work towards a more productive way of dealing with the issues that they had with me ok. I think, I'm not entirely sure that he was taking their side, I think he had his foot in either side so I'm your friend, you can come and talk to me so therefore I've got them coming to me and I know what the issues are but I'm still in with (names interviewee), I'm your deputy and yeah we'll talk but he was really hedging either way. And I was really um, was really quite hurt by that."*

Principal 3   *"There is an element of trust there but when it reaches, when the suspicious things or you know you suspect that things are not being done according to Hoyle, then it builds a critical mass and it only, and on this instance it turned out this person had actually been lying. Now in this particular scenario there was no come back, the trust was destroyed. Absolutely, with the exception of anything else. There was nothing in that person's character that I felt I could draw upon. There was no effort, and I think this is important because we all make mistakes but there was no essence in that person's behaviour conduct that, that indicated to me that that person wished to redeem themselves. Ok, if there is no attempt to redeem yourself and say look I stuffed up then that person has to go."*

Principal 14   *"Ok, they, there are several strategies they use. One is a go slow, you know, can you come back next week, and so on and so forth? That is an issue. The other one is basic blockading and they're releasing just a little amount of information at a time."*

The intentionality and deliberate obfuscation depicted in the previous examples show the conditions established to undermine the integrity of the trusted relationship and the deleterious effect had on the principals. This intentionality is similarly noted in the work of the following researchers (Lewicki 1983; Trevino and Youngblood 1990; Grover 1993; Eoyang 1994; Neuman and Baron 1997).

The impact of betrayal of trust between principal and staff member may be seen in its effects outside that relationship. The impact on other staff and students raises the level of concern from the interpersonal to that of the wider school:

Principal 7   *"One of our education workers... there were teachers taking photos of him asleep in class, not working with kids. Just we couldn't trust him. So much so that I was considering a clocking on, clocking off. And we went down the road of giving daily tasks he had to come and get us to check them off. That's the ultimate extreme of no trust at all."*

Principal 11   "*Situation was that I had to go to various Principals' Briefings and meetings and obviously I left the school in his (Deputy Principal's) hands. He was given responsibility. But I found there were several incidents that arose when I was out of the school and was a little bit concerned about how it was handled. Mostly with students and there was one occasion where I came back from a meeting and the deputy principal had a confrontation with a student. The student had actually been injured. Allegedly head-butted the laminated glass door but there was suspicion that the deputy principal might have pushed him. So obviously there was a critical incident that went through to the Department and it was queried quite a lot. Well the student in question had been a pretty serious behavioural problem. I was aware of that, I just found it a little bit hard to believe that he would suddenly head-butt a glass panel in a door. Yeah, my concern was that the deputy principal is highly competent and experienced but had a bit of a tendency to be confrontational and rather than play down the situation he would arc up the student. So I'm pretty sure it happened in this case. So that destroyed the level of trust I had.*"

The next theme investigates the actions taken by principals and staff to repair the broken trust and the success in doing so. It raises the crucial elements of the process that must be in place for trust to be restored and the roles the players take in doing so.

4.1.4 Theme 4: The impact of trust repair

Analysis of the principals' recounts of situations in which trust was betrayed showed the emergence of a theme of varying degrees of participation in the repair process by staff members and principals and hence varying degrees of trust repair. The breaking of a trusted relationship may be permanent or not depending on the nature of the breach and the role the other staff member plays in repairing the trust.

All interviewed principals worked with staff members to remediate situations in which they considered the offending staff member had acted so as to subsequently cause the principal to trust them less. Typically, this interaction

involved face-to-face meetings with the staff member during which the trustee's actions leading to the breach of trust were raised and discussed. Where the staff member refuted the accusations, typical responses included the blaming of others, denial or justification for taking such a stance. In these instances repeated efforts by the principal to have the staff member change their ways were met with defiance and a worsening of relationships with the principal. In some instances, where assurances were made to correct future actions, even if responsibility may have been half-heartedly acknowledged, principals reported that relapses back to the same offending behaviour occurred.

The research of Kim, Ferrin et al. (2004); Nakayachi and Watabe (2005); Kim, Dirks et al. (2006) and Ren and Gray (2009) investigates ways trust can be made more positive after a violation and informed the analysis of this study. The work of Goffman (1967) and Ohbuchi (1994) attest to the importance of repair phases identified in effective trust repair. These being: i. the offender offering an account for the breach of trust in an attempt to reduce, deny or explain their culpability, ii. the proffering of an apology that seeks to show regret for the harm caused, iii. admission that the act was destructive and acknowledgement of the other person's feelings, and iv. admitting responsibility for one's actions. However, the 20 school scenarios investigated in this research failed to advance any of the stages identified from research.

A common element in perpetuating the division between the trustor and the trustee was the trustee's lack of apology and steps to repair the trust. Actions in this category reflect the lack of integrity of the staff member in carrying out trusted responsibilities and the subsequent denials show that even when confronted with the facts, the majority of principals reported that the betrayer made no attempts to correct the situation, apologise, or make amends.

The following interview excerpts highlight the actions taken by principals and staff members in repairing trust and notably the absence of acknowledgement or apology for causing the breach of trust:

Principal 12	"*It's not too many people come and apologise and say "I'm sorry, I've messed up on that."*
Principal 17	"*Just denies it again. So, there is not, I don't think there has been one occasion where she has told a furphy where she has actually copped it on the chin and said 'Yeah, I did say that, shouldn't have, but I did'."*
Principal 1	"(Apology) *No, not at all. No, hadn't done the wrong thing.*"
Principal 10	"*No, he's never apologetic. He sort of considers it and then probably says ok it's probably not the way to go, I shouldn't have done that, but he's never apologetic and then he tends to have a chip on his shoulder because then he flies off the handle says ok if you feel that way I'm not going to go to staff meetings, I'm not going to do this and I'm not going to do that. So he takes a defensive attitude.*"
Principal 18	"*He was, you know, he sat there and told me what was acceptable and not acceptable. I found that really affronting. I thought hang on a minute.*"
Principal 17	"*No, because I don't think in her mind she thinks she should be accountable or that she needs to.*"
Principal 16	"*No. No. Um, no in that I don't believe either can see any fault on their behalf.*"
Principal 10	"*He accepts that but there is no apology.*"
Principal 16	"*No. They've both actually said. They've both actually individually said that they're not prepared to do anything differently. So um, when you get that situation I am not sure that you can change that.*"
Principal 13	"(Apology) *No, nothing.*
Principal 14	"*You'll never get an apology. You'll never get an apology for a person's perception of themselves. Because their aura is in the clear as far as they are concerned. But you will get an acknowledgement that things can be embellished, improved, added to even if a policy has been written and it's poor they'll be ok with an appendices being written. Yeah, so basically they're prepared to inflate it but they're not prepared to admit that it's flat to start with.*"
Principal 12	"(Apology) *Not too many do that Peter.*"
Principal 3	"(Apology) *No.*"
Principal 3	"*In a situation where you give a task to someone which you presume is a reasonable task and they comprehend it, they understand it, they presumably have got the qualifications to do that and there is a breakdown or whatever, if that person reveals to me or admits to me, because I've been there we all make mistakes, and in humility said that was a stuff up there is an attempt to redeem oneself then you can ascertain the integrity of that person's character. And I wouldn't call it a breach of trust, that's a cardinal sin but that is ooh I mucked up. And that person says look I admit it, this is where I broke down, it might have been an error of judgement or I overlooked that or I got my day, got the time mucked up, that can be addressed but when you are dealing with someone who is dismissive about the impact that that falling down has on the operations of a school, then that is a serious character flaw. And that element, that person has to be excised from the system.*"
Principal 6	(Apology) "*It doesn't happen.*"

The conditions that give rise to repair of trust were not evident in this research. While principals are identified as undertaking the initial phases of bringing to account the trustee's breaches of trust, no observance is made of the trustees fulfilling the other stages of repair as proposed by the aforementioned researchers. The study therefore concludes that in the absence of an apology for causing the breach of trust, the restoration of the previously trusted relationship is not likely to occur.

It is observed that the effective restoration requires commitment from both parties predicated on the trustee acknowledging causation for the breach of trust to the trustee.

A commonly identified element of the trust repair process was the approach made by the trustor in raising the concern with the trustee–pointing out that the trust had been broken and seeking actions from the trustee to restore the situation. The lack of acknowledgement of causing the breach of trust or apology meant that the conversations instigated by the trustor were very difficult occasions with commonly identified feelings of awkwardness, trepidation and frustration in not being able to have the trustee amend their ways. These excerpts highlight the common theme of principals' actions being met with resistance and lack of commitment to repair by the trustee.

Principal 4	*"He just didn't want to engage, put it that way."*
Principal 16	*"You know, I can talk to them until the cows come home and say to them I don't want you discussing those sorts of things publicly. If there are issues and I have said it to both of them, if there are issues we talk it out in here. And we keep it in-house. Because that's where it should stay, but they're not, because they've got their own purposes to serve."*
Principal 13	*"At any cost. He wasn't flexible regarding his professional approach, he wasn't, he didn't want to change his mode of operation, his professional approach, he still wanted his, he still wanted to do the same type of role. And that's not the role we wanted in the school, we wanted this, and he was um, not willing to change so in hindsight would I have done anything different? I could have, I may have been able to do things differently but the result would have still been the same, may have been delayed."*
Principal 3	*"And I knew this person had the water tight, impregnable, arrogant, dismissive personality that you weren't going to make it, weren't going to be able to sit around and say look we've got some issues you need to do some extra training on such and such. This person very bluntly, very boldly and very blatantly announced on occasions that she wasn't going to do this."*
Principal 13	*"He did, and what it came down to was different styles. He was not willing to make changes. And I can understand, and we did, went out and had*

several meetings with him. Tried to discuss where we were coming from so I built up, or tried to build up a certain amount of background of where I'm coming from, why I'm going, was very open to feedback if he felt that I was compromising the early direction set by he and my predecessor and it was making him feel uncomfortable to voice it to me so we could air those. Because I always said to him I want to provide a united front. So I felt that I had given him ample opportunity to..."

In the face of the trustee's resistance to alter their behaviour and work towards repairing the trust, principals instigated actions to involve the person in restorative practices. A theme of supportive collaboration to identify and remediate areas of concern with the trustee was noted as a dominant method employed, however, the impact of this resistance is noted:

Principal 12   *"Very different, yep, very different, that's right. So how to overcome that? It's going to mean having another conversation I think with her. Um, just the need to reiterate how important that is. But also about her position in the school and about confidentiality and breach of trust. Because you do require loyalty, um you can't always get it, you can't buy it but you've got to work hard at, you know, fostering that relationship."*

Principal 6   *"I modelled it. I have done it with her. Then she took off on leave and didn't, wasn't here for it anyway so I still did it. So this year I've given it to her again, she's got that modelling. I have to put everything in my diary because I do not have any trust, check that this is done. Because in the end the buck stops with me and it reflects badly on me if... I've, look, I can't see, I try. Um, but I'm just waiting for the next. I don't think anyone can trust this person."*

Principal 14   *"Assisting them or using my networks to identify people that can assist them. But the problem with that also is when that trust is broken down especially with middle management and you get someone in like a consultant, then you have to get over a hurdle of a person being insulted because in the end it's about perceptions, they perceive they are doing a good job. But your vision of what you require done is not in sync with what they do."*

Principal 12   *"I do raise that with the person and then I'll raise it again in the admin meeting so that it's minuted and then everybody is on the same page because we all mess up, you know, I'll mess up, there's not a day goes by that you don't make an error. And so you've got to look at it as though everybody is human, human being, we've all got a lot of stuff on our plate."*

Principal 13   *"To talk it through, um, because I'm mindful that you don't want to and I did say that to him, you don't want to come in and I completely undermine what he's previously done because he's got to retain his credibility."*

Principal 10   *"Yeah, and what I do do though is that I get him in to the office later on and I get the deputy female as well so that she can confirm what he said was not the right thing to do."*

Having brought the offending actions to the attention of the trustee principals reported strained interactions and a determined lack of acknowledgement of fault and attempts to restore the trust:

Principal 18   *"Yeah. Yep, yep. Very much. Pretty icy. Very tough to run, a lot of distrust. A lot of you know, Chinese whispers. All that sort of stuff, so you are sort of battling all that and it has um, yeah it's like throwing a stone in a pond, it's really, it has that ripple effect. And you think, you get to the stage really where you think I'll be the bigger person here, I'll do the back down or whatever you want to call it but I just want to see some progress. And so you sort of, you meet with all the people, you talk to the union representative and they talk to you and they talk to the staff and you basically come up with negotiation and that's what we did in the end we came up with a negotiated document that said ok, this is what we've got to do. And, it's really funny because the negotiation at the end of it was all I ever asked for. It was never any more than that and so I ended up with this document, it took me about close to twenty four months to get there. And I thought, why the hell couldn't we have got there in two weeks. You know, I wasn't asking for anymore than that".*

Principal 3   *"They're not accountable. They're not team players. They're out for themselves and things of that nature."*

Principal 10   *"No he doesn't really try and patch it up. However, a day later or two days later his attitude has changed and that goes on for about three or four weeks and then it goes back to normal. But then he, it always falls back to the same old person, so that works for a while then he has to get up and say something. He's, and particularly if someone says something negative that he feels is against him, he seems to have a chip on his shoulder, he'll get up, he must get up and have a go at that person."*

Apology, being an integral requirement for repair processes is rarely offered and if so, the lack of sincerity or any intention to remediate their ways was most notable:

Principal 9   *"He never, ever apologised. He never apologised but he um, I supposed what happened was that after the incident which was about term 3, after the incident we basically didn't talk to each other. Anyway we um, we did talk about it and I knew that it had been dealt with because when we put it out on the table and laid it out on the table he did go bright red.*

Principal 10   *"Occasionally, occasionally. Not often but occasionally. I know one of the ladies came to see me and said "I didn't like your tone of voice and what was said in regards to what we discussed" and he had to think about that one because it could have been quite sexist. So he then felt he had to apologise because that could have been taken further but if he knows the issues couldn't be taken any further well then he um, then he probably wouldn't apologise. And I will say he does have a chip on his shoulder, he thinks people are having a go at him all the time. But they're not. They just want to discuss a concern."*

Principal 8   *"Yeah, but you know this EA I spoke to her every morning, she says good morning we say good morning but in the back of your mind you just think if*

> *we could just convert that saying good morning to being prepared to come and talk about things. Something that might be bothering you or, whatever."*

The lack of engagement in the restoration of trust process by the formerly trusted staff member inevitably led to the trust being irreparable and the result being superficial engagement, avoidance or alternative work arrangements to avoid contact with the person:

Principal 6	*"I've actually had a lot and I actually didn't say that. The thing is that I tend to, because I don't trust, I put a lot of stuff in emails, and I sort of emailed her and I said "Look, we cannot have" I spoke to her and then I backed it up with an email."*
Principal 5	*"I, the conversation was definitely focused on accountability and um you know as a teacher a teacher at this school these are the requirements, this is what you are required to do. That sort of thing yes."*
Principal 17	*"I don't know how you get around that I mean if I could see some improvement. If I could actually see her take accountability for a lack of performance, then I would probably say, fair enough she's working on this. And my trust would be, would grow but at the moment..."*
Principal 1	*"No, I don't think he and I had anything, we were very professional, I was very professional, he was still a bit behind my back saying things but..."*
Principal 5	*"It didn't work very well and then (names teacher) went on sick leave and she was off for quite a long time. Very delicate sort of a person, always having days off. Always having to go to the doctor. Just, everything was too hard for her and she just seemed on edge the whole time. She wanted me not to be involved in her performance, she didn't want me as her performance manager."*

Of note, is the impact on other staff members who may not be aware that repair processes are being implemented and the extra pressure this places on the principal:

Principal 10	*"And I've had another staff come to me and express their concern about the way he um, speaks to me at staff meetings. And I have, the thing is they can't see the work behind the scenes, what I have done to try and solve that problem because I don't do it in front of them at staff meetings. We always come back here I have discussion with the two deputies, we go through all the things the aspects. We ask what could have been done better, why it was said that way and um, and then he doesn't believe that he was in the wrong so the other deputy then says to him "Yes, you were".*

The circumstances described above serve to illustrate a trustee's unwillingness to engage in restorative practices to repair the trusting relationship and the inevitable disintegration of the previously held trust.

Principals, when faced with circumstances of broken trust and the continued requirement to work with the staff member to ensure the tasks required of them were being undertaken, implemented closer scrutiny of the person and

focused management of them. The trustee's reluctance to participate led to strained working relations and the observance that the principal's style became more authoritarian and less engaging when working with this person:

Increased supervision became a dominant method employed:

Principal 16   "*Yeah look, I mean certainly there is a tendency for me to, to respond to that by managing that person a lot more tightly.*"

Principal 7   "*No, not yet. We still go out and check.*"

"*Yep. Had to give at least an hour in the afternoon to the two days he's here. Let alone to remember to do it. Let alone to remember not to schedule meetings because the day I drop the ball on that is the day he's forgotten. He's moved on to something else. You know if you're pinging someone you've got to persevere with it.*"

Principal 6   "*Mmm, and then of course what I have actually done to address that, because I don't have that trust in her. I've actually had um, so we have weekly admin meetings. Um, we have you know, for next week this person is to bring this to the meeting, didn't happen. Next week it was documented that, you know, next week ...*"

Principal 17   "*Now I have had her in here four times so far this year where I've sat down and I've given her three pages of stuff and said this needs to be done, this needs to be done, this needs to be done, and I've given her time. Really laying the law down.*"

Principal 4   "*I like to hover above them to make sure things are going right anyway. Perhaps that is lack of trust on my behalf with all of them but I like to think it is I just like to make sure things are running. I don't trust his judgements and what he tells the parents sometimes. What I have done the last few times, I actually go through the results with him and talk about them from what he's got there.*"

The restructuring of the work environment and the trustee's responsibilities reigned in the possibility of future breaches of trust by nature of new relationships with the employee not requiring the principal to place themselves at risk of being vulnerable to harm. An emphasis on control of the relationship and lack of willingness to trust became the adopted model for these principals:

Principal 13   "*We did, but we talked more, purely just daily operations level, not policy. Definitely not future directions. Definitely not of anything where I felt that I was opening myself up, that we could discus in a confidential manner without it getting back because I just felt that it didn't matter what I said, or that he, didn't matter that he gave me a guarantee that he wouldn't share it with anyone else, there was no trust there so I'm thinking why would I say anything sensitive about staff members of community members or students that I felt could come back, so...*"

Principal 7   "*So it was all about strategy, I don't, the metaphor I constantly use to (names deputy principal) is never not be on top of the hill with the big Vickers machine gun shooting down. Don't be charging up with a knife because you'll never win. Which is why I don't go into hot emotional conversations with people, just give them letters and let them go through those 7 stages, write them out and we'll have a civil conversation. Likewise, I don't go in straight away because I know what my anger is like when I'm fired up. I don't want to yell at a staff member because that is a sign of losing control and weakness.*"

Whilst rarely seen in the study, the notion of retribution is highlighted in the following excerpts and identified as feelings of anger the desire for revenge in the research by Bies and Tripp (1996). Noting a shift from attempts to restore trust to that of punitive retaliation:

Principal 7   "*Yep, and even told her 'you're not doing your job, you're not doing what we require, this is what's going to happen, blah, blah, blah.' What I don't like doing is dumbing down the person's role. Which is what has currently happened with the responsibilities being taken away, which means someone else has to pick them up. And they're getting paid the same wage. I don't do that, I put subtle pressure on them and make them hurt.*"

"*I suppose I'd start rebuilding. I have to assume their confidence would be pretty low too because I make it known that I don't trust them. I don't give them an out. I'm not sneaky and underhanded I say that's not right and I'm disappointed but I'd start building the person up again but it is that insurance, the task I want you to do.*"

Principal 16   "*Look, ahh, there is not a lot I can do really, um you know through performance management obviously I can manage them individually, and work with them on their ability to get on with others. Um, and um, but in terms of actually, I mean I've separated them in offices. Previously the two deputies worked in one office at this school and that was the set up of our office structure. And that has been the case for as long as this school has been in existence from what I am aware of. Um, it was to the point that after four weeks that I said that was enough and I am moving one of you out because this just isn't working.*"

An extreme disengagement from the repair process to that of rigid compliance and an authoritarian stance is seen in the adopted attitude of one principal deeply hurt by a breach of trust:

Principal 7   "*You need to have the processes in place to hammer them quickly. And it is Department policy, it's not hard, you can do it. My style is to write letters. I don't need to meet with people first up. I just write them out the template letter, this is the problem, you've just got 3 days, 5 days to come and see me. That way their emotional part is gone and they usually come in pretty defeated, and I haven't lost yet on that style.*"

The breach of trust also impacted on the willingness for principals to be placed in a vulnerable position again which resulted in the level of interaction with the trustee being reduced or conducted in areas of lesser significance:

Principal 13   "*And he must have sensed it because when we talked about other things I was never as giving of the same information. I probably cut my contact down with him a certain amount because there was no need to have those discussions anymore.*"

"*I never actually really got in to approaching that with him afterwards. I was probably more in troubleshooting mode of how to repair staff perceptions. How to structure the school for the following year. Um, and basically there was a volume of work going through anyway at that time of the year, er, we did talk about his role in the school for the next year. Because it was a teaching component he wanted to do more of like a DOTT (Duties other than teaching) support. Which didn't, I think, support the direction I wanted to go with the school and the way the bigger picture was. And I um, he expressed that he might look at going elsewhere.*"

Principal 6   "*The thing is that I tend to, because I don't trust, I put a lot of stuff in emails, and I sort of emailed her and I said "Look, we cannot have" I spoke to her and then I backed it up with an email.*"

Principal 20   "*So it meant that I was always, it got to the point where I would micromanage the situation. If I wanted him to do something I made sure I dotted every 'i' crossed every 't'. Explained in detail what I wanted done and the other strategy I used was to give him less important jobs, you know, sorting out the Coles vouchers (shopping vouchers) for the sports equipment. If he missed that up it didn't really matter. And I mean that is a sad situation.*"

Principal 13   "*Whilst we still continued, while I continued with the structure that I wanted to have, the distributed leadership there I included him in all the meetings so he was part of that, he was included in all the opportunities for discussion but it was my decision to appoint or nominate people for these roles. So he was always involved and included in it so I was more wary that when he was in these meetings and started to become negative then I was able to cut him off in regards to, particularly to points, particularly if it was I remember a couple of times he tried to inter, not interject but to add comment to why things might not work. And they were often funding, FTE which we had plenty of so it was quite easy to say we've got the funding so we can address that no problem, let's move on.*"

The above descriptions of controlled, constrained communications are also identified in the research of Cloke and Goldsmith (2002) where the exclusion of involvement in decision-making is often shaped by condensed, distorted messages. The reliance on micromanaging staff is identified in the research of Miller (2004) and Solomon and Flores (2001) as a demonstration of disrespect and a lack of trust in the individual.

The severity of the breach of trust was seen to lead to a total breakdown of the working relationship with no chance of repair in some circumstances:

Principal 7   "*But I know with my personality that trust wouldn't come back. Once it's broken it's busted. I think trust is valuable because, well I think it is because I know, it's across the board. If I lose trust in you I lose trust completely and I'd rather not associate with you at all. Maybe that's a bit harsh but that is how it is.*"

> "*I'd be wary, I may not check up on him every day, he's here Tuesday and Friday. It might be every Friday and it would take a long time to stop doing that. But I'd always be putting notes in his pigeon hole – 'You haven't done this, you've been instructed to do this', and that would be with any staff member. If they break that trust. But I put things in to place. I say 'I want you to do this and I want you to see me at 3 o'clock this afternoon and bring it and show me. So I'm not chasing them. So I'm not having to run around but the trust aspect, once you break my trust, it's gone across all aspects of life.*"*

Principal 13   "*Absolutely. I wasn't going to share, and I didn't. I definitely became a closed shop on that.*"

Principal 5   "*Um, and then my trust in her had gone completely because I felt she was playing the things she wanted to.*"

> "*My feeling is that I had no faith in her at the end, no trust at all in any regard professionally and I was never a friend of hers at all and never would be. And so, I didn't feel like I needed to have her back here at this school.*"

> "*it is a very, very long story, but I had no trust in her whatsoever.*"

Principal 6   "*I don't trust her in any areas.*"

> "*I've, look, I can't see, I try. Um, but I'm just waiting for the next. I don't think anyone can trust this person.*"

Principal 3   "*Now in this particular scenario there was no come back, the trust was destroyed. Absolutely, with the exception of anything else. There was nothing in that person's character that I felt I could draw upon. There was no effort, and I think this is important because we all make mistakes but there was no essence in that person's behaviour conduct that, that indicated to me that that person wished to redeem themselves. Ok, if there is no attempt to redeem yourself and say look I stuffed up then that person has to go.*"

The total breakdown of trust led to principals removing the offending trustee from the school as a last resort in the failed restorative actions:

Principal 3   "*And so from that moment I just took steps to remove that person from the school. Now that's the absolute, that's the extreme account of someone where there is a succession of breaches of trust in a secretive, sneaky, cunning fashion. And what you've got to do, you've got to well, get the facts. The three words Get The Facts. It's not good enough to presume you've actually have to, you know say have you got that suspicion that here's been a breach of trust and it's a considerable one and it's having an impact on staff, it's having an impact on the operations of an organisation. There is only one solution to that and that is dismissal or removal.*"

> "*There is only one solution to that and that is dismissal or removal. Now under the discipline dismissal procedures that we have in the Department at the moment that can be a long, lengthy torturous path with no assurance of an outcome that is actually going to put you in a better position. So there are other strategies used that person realised the game was up.*"

Principal 20   "*In the end the way I resolved the situation was that I actually restructured my administration team so I went from two level three deputies to a level four.*"

Principal 5	"Absolutely and I mean it just would have been untenable for her to have returned here just because she wanted to work her own ticket towards using every single skerrick of any leave she did have in the pipeline."
Principal 2	"But, yeah, it is a situation where she is currently on leave and I guess the issue is that um, an outcome for the, an outcome for the grievance was that she move on to another school."
Principal 16	"There is no penalty. I've had some communication with my line manager and put to her that in my opinion the only way to deal with this in an immediate fashion and to reduce the impact on the staff here and the school community here is to move one of them."
Principal 17	"Worst case scenario is I'm going to go down the poor performance... (Moved to another school) Well, yes. Because at the end of the day, in terms of work load, not only for me but for the teachers and the rest of the staff, um you know..."

4.1.5 The impact of trust on the principal, school and community

The study identified three areas of impact on a principal's leadership of their school as a result of trust being broken. The breakdown of the trusted relationship with a staff member was seen to have an impact on the principal's personal health and confidence in their own abilities; it had a major impact on the ongoing working relationship between the two parties and the principal's leadership of that person; and the breach of trust had a marked influence on the work structures within the school, often affecting other staff members.

Personal impact on the principal

Principals had been so deeply hurt by the betrayal of trust that they expressed their personal feelings of shock, anger, disappointment and a sense of personal affront at being treated in such a manner by their colleague. The research of Tschannen-Moran (2004, p.63) also attests to the "stunned disbelief" initial reaction to a violation of trust. The strength of terms voiced in the following excerpts demonstrates the debilitating effect had on the principals:

Principal 1	"Honestly Peter I was fuming when I found that out."
Principal 3	"Well I felt very angry because, I kept that under control, because that was extraordinarily disrespectful. Not only to me as her immediate superior but also to the position of trust of the high office she held within the school

	organisation. And also it just showed lack of respect for everyone on the school site. An arrogant attitude."
Principal 5	*"Well, I was, just to be crude, I was gobsmacked."*
Principal 12	*"When that happens. Disappointed."*
Principal 20	*"Frustrated, undermined, angry, disappointed. Just all those emotions."*
Principal 13	*"Well, I was flabbergasted to start with because as I said I was blindsided, I was completely unaware. He'd never done anything else or intimated anything else prior to this and this was, we were looking, I had been there 3 months. Um, I felt very um, gutted. Basically um, really just, er, trying to think...undermined, definitely undermined, yes. Probably embarrassed because I didn't see it coming. There was never any animosity as far as I was aware, crossed words. Never did I feel like I wanted to kick the bastard out of the school prior to that. (laughs) Well, I just thought where did it come from? The main thing, why? What was his intent? To undermine me and basically put me at odds with him in front of an audience. Because the staff picked up on it. And I thought that if they can see that the administration is not united, in regards to our direction, being a fairly dynamic environment that we were working in at the time with staff and the community I thought well, this is going to make my job a lot harder."*
Principal 5	*"Yes, that's right. And I was really surprised because I've never had anything like that happen to me ever before."*
	"I wasn't really surprised because I think that's the nature of the beast you're dealing with. It's that let's get even. Let's do this, you know."
Principal 1	*"I felt it was against the school but because it was my school it was about me as well and, and that sense of betrayal was pretty strong and the anger was huge."*
Principal 3	*"You asked me how I felt, um, you know, more sleepless nights, more knots in the stomach, more, having to confront someone who is, should have been an asset that was absolutely a major problem."*

Initial shock at the occurrence of the trust betrayal increasingly turned to a questioning of the trustor's own abilities with many querying their leadership of the school; expressing debilitating physical reactions to the events and a sense of futility of their actions.

A common theme of trust betrayal affecting the principal's health was revealed in the study:

Principal 15	*"(I was) the new comer and I also, I guess, over that period of time developed a lot of anxiety so sharing it with you now I'm a lot happier to talk about it, I'm a lot better about it but I got to the point where I was having panic attacks. So I was really ill. I used to drive out here and be really ill before I got here."*
	"Just the stress. And of course none of them would have known so it just would have been the fact that I looked like I wasn't coping. You know, but I was really not healthy enough to deal with it anyway. I had this deputy (names deputy) and I guess in terms as you do with deputies, you meet,"

	you share things, discuss issues with staff. Many of them had been going down to District Office, to complain about me."
Principal 9	*"Anyway, so that was a huge breach of trust. Obviously it causes stress, I wasn't sleeping at night, I was coming to work every morning, yes I did want to go to work but I just didn't want to work with him."*
Principal 16	*"Look at the moment it's really testing. It's um, it's getting to that point, I have days where I can work through that better. You tend to find in situations where there is an incident in the school it is harder to deal with those sorts of things because you haven't got a cohesive team there behind you to deal with it."*
Principal 10	*"Ah, yeah, it has influenced me to a certain extent. I think the staff meetings is a big one because I go out of there really drained, I feel as though, you know, sometimes I just want to throw the towel in. And sometimes my deputy female feels like that when he has a go at her, when she's introducing something. And other staff members are the same. You feel like you've walked out of there, you've achieved nothing, you feel so drained and you just don't want to talk to anyone. Get in the car, go home, go for a run, because you feel so bad."*
Principal 1	*"Oh, yes. Driving along (names road to school) I was thinking I wish he would apply for a promotion, I'd give him a good reference to get him out of the school (laughs). And some mornings you'd wake up and think oh I don't want to face him again. But that's a bit weak too like in your own character because life is about hitting the canvas and it's about how you get up and deal with it. And I'd like to think that I had a little bit of strength of character."*

The theme of doubting one's ability to carry out the role of principal was prevalent in a number of dimensions: i. the ability to do one's job, ii. the impact on their credibility and iii. the impact on well-being and iv. the impact on others.

Principals identified self-doubt that the practices they previously employed were no longer effective and reflected their ability to do the job:

Principal 18	*"Um, really um, really dejected. Yeah, really dejected like pretty powerless to be honest, you sort of, sit there and think well I can't effectively do my job and I don't really see the point to be honest because you're sort of sitting there saying if I can't talk to teachers about the work they're doing in classrooms I don't really see the point of being here."*
Principal 1	*"Absolutely. At many levels...at the time I was thinking am I overreacting to this? Yes, started to doubt you know."*
Principal 8	*"It's almost the stuff is not working anymore."*
	"So anyway, that's the sort of, when you talk about the trust side of it that you expect people to reciprocate um the trust or the faith or whatever it is that you have in them but when you don't get it back it really becomes quite deflating thinking there is just nothing else you can do."
Principal 14	*"Yes, you, firstly there is self-recrimination, this is a wrong line call, I've been around long enough I should have picked it. So after a bit of flagellating, self-flagellating and all the rest of it say ok well it wasn't that. It was just*

sheer duplicity that brought on the issue. Right, so what am I going to do about it? That's the time you have to double back and come up with creative solutions."

Principal 8   *"Well, yeah, you know sometimes you wonder, you think about leadership styles and you see lots of different ones and you see leadership styles where some principals keep people you know, they're black and white, you know and you're not easily spoken to or people can't visit you easily. And you sort of start to wonder whether that really black and white approach to leadership as a principal isn't a much easier one because the more you make yourself available the more people will come so there is that fine balance and that is the interesting thing about this job is trying to get that fine balance right."*

The impact of a betrayal of trust on the principal's credibility as perceived by the principal and others is brought to attention:

Principal 16   *"Yep. It does. Yep, and that's one of my biggest issues with this is you know, the impact on my credibility. Um, and my ability to provide the end-of-line leadership within the school and people's perceptions of how I'm doing that. Um, and you know when they're out there talking about one another and talking about the dysfunctionality of the leadership team, that is my reputation on the line. And in a sense I have no control over that."*

Principal 18   *"Yeah.   And you get this furious sort of (expletive) storm around the whole thing and it just amuses me, and there are some people you would never convince of that. You know they would never believe you if you looked them in the eye. But the job's too difficult and there's too much to do, um I don't have time to sit there and fight with staff. But I find it extremely frustrating that really at the end of the day, principals,...to an extent you're pretty powerless. You know really, when push comes to shove."*

The impact on their personal well-being is seen to be debilitating and physically draining:

Principal 10   *"I think it's as bad and probably worse at times. You go out of that meeting very drained. You feel as though you got nowhere, and the staff relationship you feel as though that's not going the right way as well and then you have to somehow justify what you've been saying."*

Principal 15   *"And I just felt let down again and I guess to me I assumed there should be a trusting relationship, I should be able to trust them to be supporting me. And I just felt extremely let down."*

Principal 18   *"Yeah, it becomes that, but it creates that ill feeling, it creates that distrust and makes it really difficult to deal with because you're trying to work with people and to work with people effectively in classrooms you've got to have trust. They've got to trust you and you've got to trust them."*

Principal 9   *"Yes, yes, that's right. And no it won't be and what it does is that it puts a bad taste in your mouth so that with the new deputy that I have I'm still in that position where I think what can I give and what can't I give?"*

Principal 3   *"Yes, whilst it was a very, very grim situation, everyday was a battle, um a battlefield sort of experience."*

The concern for others is identified in the following quotes which depict the uneasiness experienced by principals and their perception of future engagement:

Principal 2   "Well, I guess the issue is that I'd be loathed to go down that particular pathway again because if the system can't back me up, particularly where staff really need, well, the majority of staff here really need the protection and they deserve the opportunity to have people who work with them, the kind of environment where you've got isolates that going down that pathway makes it very difficult."

Principal 12   "I feel disappointed because you know, just like, you know with your teachers' deadlines etc there are, you know, it impacts upon other people and so therefore the principal's racing around at the last minute trying to assist the school officer to get this right. So I get, probably disappointed but I think that once I've made that point um, it shouldn't happen again, I hope it doesn't."

Principal 8   "You know, we'll work, I'll make sure the kids are being looked after, the right processes are in place in terms of what is happening with that but in terms of, in terms of you know how they work as part of the school and the community as staff is just something that I don't think I'm going to make a dent in."

Principal 19   "I think it is just saving face, and really knowing, what can I do at the end of the day? I can tell her off, I can put a plan in place but she knows, like kids, they all know there is a limited amount."

A notable theme of a sense of futility translating into actual withdrawal is expressed here. The voicing of a level of inevitability and pointlessness is seen in these excerpts:

Principal 8   "It's got to the stage, this year, I've only had one (meeting) because (laughs) I'm sort of at the stage that I'm really quite disenchanted and, and not wanting to make them sort of a negative experience."

Principal 12   "And so that becomes, and then you become the bad guy. But I'm used to being the bad guy (laughs). That's it you wear it."

Principal 7   "Yeah, and the stress and it always spills on to someone else and that person comes in and complains. So it is just that constant, I don't know if it is pressure but the difficulties of this job in dealing with people. That's what it is, it's people management and if you don't have that emotional intelligence, particularly your own emotional intelligence. I know what buttons fire me off so I avoid them being pressed."

Principal 5   "And so, in the end I thought it is just not worth making a great big thing about this so I gave her a year 4 class which is the class she always likes to have year in and year out."

Where principals voiced an inability to cope with the effects of the trust betrayal it was not uncommon to find that they had taken leave to avoid the situation or withdrawn within themselves:

Principal 15	"And things got that bad to the point that in the end I took leave. I had long service leave due and I took it at that point (names director of education) they were happy to let me go I don't think they thought I was going to come back. But I remember telling staff, I didn't tell them I had just applied I said I had applied the year before, because you know you can apply, you know and I had people telling me the staff danced around the table "She's going on leave", you know."
Principal 9	"So the following year I did leave six months into that year. Um, we worked together but the trust was never there so I could never have a discussion that you would have, a confidential discussion with him about individual staff, about individual children, about individual parents, you know and you need to off load..."
Principal 15	"Well, certainly I didn't want to come back after leave. No I didn't want to come back, I wanted to leave the Department, that's it. No, and when I rang up I knew, I know the way, when I worked in (Staffing Officer's name) position, you know, sink or swim. I said send me anywhere except (name of this school)."
	"I called the Police and so on but basically I was on my own again. The Department doesn't advise you, there is no support, it did go to court, and, yeah it went to court, went down, it took a whole year to go to court. The judge goes oh well principals need to be supported, we'll fine you $300. She turns around so the magistrate can't see, blows me a kiss and calls me a slut. But again there was no Department anywhere there, there was no one ringing apart from one phone call are you ok?"

Impact across the wider school

In some instances the maintenance of confidentiality of the breach of trust was able to be had with the staff of the school and community being unaware of the breakdown of the trusted relationship between the principal and the staff member:

Principal 5	"No, No-one would have known anything."

Because the original trust relationship was formed between the principal and the staff member, principals endeavoured to maintain a high degree of confidentiality regarding the other party's actions that caused the trust betrayal. There was a sense of professional probity voiced that assured the staff member's professional image was maintained even at times when the principal's image had been damaged. The principals thus acted to limit any observable repercussions of the breach in the school however, it is noted that in numerous recounts principals identified the staff member's actions causing disruption in the wider school and not just against the principal.

Principals reported their maintenance of professional confidentiality not always being reciprocated and this had a deleterious effect on the school staff.

Principal 3   *"Then uh, you can find that can really upset and spoil because people say she is getting away with that so something needs to be done and there is an overwhelming sense of justice in a healthy organisation and it will reject it.."*

Principal 18   *"And what it does, is it sort of slows the change process in the school and makes it very counterproductive."*

The impact of this was that staff reacted in two ways: to act so as to question interactions with trustee, and to express support for the principal. The following examples demonstrate the impact such acts of betrayal can have across the school:

Reaction to the trustee

Typical responses by staff were to withdraw contact with the person. Staff reacted by limiting their contact to professional interactions only when required because having observed the trustee's actions became wary of any involvement with the person:

Principal 1   *"I think as far as the staff are concerned, um, it ah, they were, very cautious of her as far as that situation is concerned to the point where they began to ostracise her, because um, they felt that perhaps the teamwork wasn't there as far as the expectations that they had."*

           "Mmm. What, it was really, not so much a positive exclusion it was, she was excluding herself by the way she was interacting with staff members. People would pull back. I guess as far as the staff were observing ah, they were wary of her I guess. That comes back to that trust."

Principal 2   *"What, it was really, not so much a positive exclusion it was, she was excluding herself by the way she was interacting with staff members. People would pull back. Maybe because she was, she was trying to be open and friendly as far as the staff was concerned and make amends for issues that um, I guess as far as the staff were observing ah, they were wary of her I guess. That comes back to that trust."*

Principal 3   *"Oh, yeah. The game was up. The final thing was the reserved but clear message from the staff that they found that there were, they had no contact with her. She would close the door. She'd be on personal phone calls. She'd be out of the school. When they needed to speak to her about cost centre management information wasn't forthcoming or they couldn't see her and a whole range of other things and by comparison. And it was all done. The school officer got her feedback. I was involved in 360 degree appraisal, you can't single someone out and say hey we've done a survey on you, you're it. So all teaching staff, the support staff, the kid's attitudes to school, the subjects, the parents survey and then the ministerial staff. She became aware of the, how she was being perceived."*

Principal 17   "*Look I think she can but she is going to have to work to get back and show me that she is actually, she is actually working and that it's not being left to everyone else so because I mean she is impacting on a whole range of staff. So, I mean she is not just impacting on me, she is impacting on the other front office staff. Um, where I've got people who are now stressed out and you know pulled the pin (resigned), because of her and she tries to delegate everything back off.*"

"*So there are things you absolutely have to make sure you've got correct and got right and if you haven't got those things right it's not just one person it's affecting, it's affecting your whole staff. Um, and she has had a major impact on the whole staff. I can't think of one person that I hear on the gossip-vine that hasn't had anything positive to say about her.*"

Principal 13   "*No, because there were one or two other people that became part of that leadership team who were very conscious of our relationship and these people weren't just tapped on the shoulder and just came in, I spent a lot of time facilitating, developing and working with them. So they felt valued and of the attention or the professional attention but also the opportunity and also to be able to provide them with time, that was a big component that built my, that built the trust in them because they felt valued. And hence they would then start to lead and they would see where he was coming from and they tended to cut him off, not me.*"

Principal 3   "*Um, well they weren't so much aware of the main thing that I was aware of. But that dismissive, arrogant, so what approach was picked up by everyone on site and it was causing a, and when you've got a relatively harmonious, mature, professional, enthusiastic, keen, task-oriented, with an enduring or over-all sense of lightness as well and someone comes in as being quite carnivorous or,or um, mercenary about just taking care of themselves.*"

Principal 10   "*Um, I've had a lot of complaints from staff members and ultimately I've had to talk to him on a number of occasions. I've even had intervention of district office where we've had the district superintendent come and see him just to talk to him about the way he conducts himself. He's ok for a while and then he goes back to what he's normally like.*"

Staff support of the principal

Staff members showed a benevolent attitude toward the principal expressing concern for his or her well-being and offering encouragement:

Principal 1   "*And I did get support from the staff. Some staff came and said (names self) how could he do this to you? And I said he hasn't done it to me he has done it to the school as a whole. So I always tried to, when I was talking to other staff I tried to remove it from me. I tried to make it about us. And I think that helped because then we were all in it together.*"

Principal 18   "*So um, that was, I found that really unfortunate because it's sort of, it um, it made teachers, whether they saw it coming or not, I'm not sure, but um, both staff and I then became, the piggy-in-the-middle of the debate and ah, you know it's been, it's taken us quite a few years now to fix that.*"

Principal 9   "*And that's right so staff meetings were absolutely horrendous after that in fact just before I left one of my teachers came up and said (names herself) don't hold another staff meeting before you go, we don't want you to*

> *leave...that taste in your mouth. So that's how passionate my staff was with that."*

Principal 16   '*I still feel as though I've got the staff support and the staff backing and you now, I constantly have staff coming up to me at the moment and go 'I don't know how you're doing it', "I don't know how you're getting through it". You know, "You must be doing well because you're actually surviving at the moment and it couldn't be easy."'*

Reaction of the school community

Principals not only voiced concern that the impact of the betrayal of trust between themselves and another staff member would affect that relationship, affect other members of staff, but also the wider-school community of parents.

Principal 2   "*I'm worried the parents will withdraw their kids like they did last time. There was about half a class that we lost as far as that situation is concerned."*

"*Um, but um, I think in the general community this could be harder to mend because there are issues with parents that those situations have been resolved to a point that if she does come back into the school it's going to reignite some issues."*

Principal 4   "*No, it's just the aspect of his relationship with parents when they come up and then what he tells them and then what comes out in the report. And sometimes it's only little things Peter but it's enough for parents, and you'd be aware most of our parents here are pretty on the ball."*

And in some instances to other schools:

Principal 3   "*This person was actually exploiting their role in the school and ahh, um, you know engaging in social behaviour of an unwelcome nature towards younger female members on staff. And um, that was a breach of trust of his professional obligations. It was also a breach of trust of the way in which one conducts oneself in a professional relationship. And I issued that person, I think it was about four very strict directives as soon as this came to my attention. He breached them and I sought the Director's position, I said this matter needs to be addressed and it went to (department of investigation), but this person was removed. Unfortunately, since leaving this school site went to another school site, same thing happened. Moved to another one and then is now in another school."*

Principal 1   "*So she had the same issues with him not being loyal and confidential within the admin team."*

The betrayal of trust was observed to have impacted upon the principal's relationship with the individual staff member and also, in many instances, at a wider-school level:

Principal 14   "*But you know I was talking about troop uprisings? Peter, these troop uprisings can get progressively worse. Yeah, and they escalate really*

> *quickly. The initial breakdown of trust and the expectation from a project manager, from a group of teachers, the initial evaluation takes much longer to achieve than the acceleration of the discontent. Yes, but it's internalised but the moment people make up their minds as a group or as individuals that are thinking alike, that uprising will run really quickly."*

Principal 18   *"At the time I thought that because you take it very personally and you have one or two, I had one person who was the union rep. At the time come and see me and say "this isn't, it's not against you, this is just um, this is new to staff and this is this" and that sort of thing. And I sort of, while I could sympathise with part of that I also felt that you know, here is an experienced staff, you can't tell me that they've never heard of this before. I'm being upfront, I'm being really honest, and yet I'm not getting that back. I'm getting you know, I'm getting smoke and mirrors here. And it continued, what it did in hindsight, it really soured the waters and made life very, very difficult and sort of became an 'us and them'."*

Principal 10   *"They put ideas up for discussion however, I think there are minimal ideas for discussion. I think others don't really want to risk it or discuss things because they know. What they do is they come to me first and ask if I'll put it up."*

Principal 17   *"Oh, a huge amount of work."*

Principal 10   *"But we felt the best way of overcoming the problem was to have little groups so when there is a decision to be made I've asked my deputy not to be the spokesperson and then we discuss things in small groups and then we have one person as a spokesperson who gives information back to us. Well, most of them clam up as soon as he starts talking, um a lot of the younger teachers, the newer teachers, they won't say anything. And their feelings can't be expressed and they don't cast their vote. And they all come and see me later on and tell me what they think and to get around that what we need to do is put it on paper and send it around to all the teachers so they can vote on the issue."*

Impact between trustee and trustor

A theme of irretrievably broken trust in a staff member and the ongoing requirement to work with this person brought about actions by principals to maintain the good order and functioning of the school as detailed in a previous section.

Work structures were commonly altered to accommodate the person; however, it is observed that the relationship between trustor and trustee saw limited engagement with the other as that person carried out their newly defined role. A portrayal of polite avoidance and the exercising of caution in discussion were frequently encountered:

Principal 5   *"Why would I want to help her?"*

Principal 1   *"It was arm's length for everything. I mean I didn't, I didn't miss treat him, no that's not the word, I always showed respect to him in front of the staff, I never belittled him or did anything like that in front of the staff. Um, the staff didn't like him either."*

Principal 10   "*I have done that but I'm just very cautious that I'm professional in staff meetings and I don't have a go at him. Put him down, do those sorts of things because I feel as though I'm a professional person and I wouldn't do that. Whereas he does.*"

"*Exactly, and that's what we're doing. We feel as though we're working around, you've got to tread lightly and if you don't tread lightly you're likely to hit you know, knocked on the head.*"

"*And I shake my head and there are times when I've got up and just said I don't want to discuss this anymore, you're just going down the wrong path.*"

Principal 12   "*Um, no it's not completely broken but it's something that when we are discussing things I'm more aware of exactly how much I say and about whom.*"

"*It can affect the relationships and discussions.*"

Principal 5   "*She was not open to me at all.*"

Principal 16   "*Yeah I am and look it's an uncomfortable feeling and it's an uncomfortable tension within what is supposed to be the leadership team in the school and certainly it makes you think about what you're saying to them. It makes you think about, whereas you know when I've worked with other deputy principals I've had a good relationship with them and I feel as though I can just say things to them and you know it's going to stay within the leadership team. Um, I doubt very much whether it does. So I'm very careful with what I say.*"

Principals used penalty for breaching trust. They indicated that while they are held accountable for the efficient management and leadership of the school, which includes the role of staff management, they have limited authority to implement disciplinary actions against those who cause breaches of trust, even if those breaches have come about due to significant acts of disruption in the school. Such actions have included violence against students, financial fraud, suicide attempts and division of staff. A common theme that emerged was the emotion expressed by principals that they were not supported by higher authority in dealing with unsatisfactory performance of staff; that disciplinary procedures were long-winded and ultimately saw little change in the offending person's behaviour and that the physical toll of them conducting reparative processes was too demanding emotionally and physically. Many questioned their willingness to be involved to the same extent in similar future scenarios. Most significantly, principals have questioned whether they would follow standard operating procedures again in dealing with future staff disciplinary processes because they felt unsupported by their employer, threatened by staff, parents and the employer. Some principals related situations involving threats of disciplinary

action against them. The resultant emotional strain saw many not wanting to go to work, suffering anxiety attacks and health problems, taking sick leave, bringing forward long-service leave and transferring to another school in order to avoid the situation. Their self-efficacy in running their school was questioned. The limited ability to correct situations causing a breach of trust saw principals using low-level management practices as an only option to control the behaviour of the trustee. Most notable amongst these was the use of penalty:

Common was the use of discretionary powers to withhold reward as form of penalty:

Principal 1   *"Yeah, all I can do is just reiterate it and you know I can be nasty when they want to leave early because they've got a dental appointment at 3 o'clock I can say well you'll have to take half a day sick leave. Whereas other people who do the right thing I say I'll come and take your class it's not a drama. (laughs). That's vindictive isn't it really?"*

"I do hesitate. I do hesitate with those people and they miss out a little bit you know. And one of them actually said to me the second year I was here "You've got favourites in this school". And I said "No I don't, I don't like any of you" (laughs). But what it was is that I had given the teacher next door some extra non-contact time when we had a relief in, but that teacher had come three Tuesday afternoons in a row to work with the Deputy and I on an ICT plan. So of course I'm going to give her something back."

Principal 7   *"Well, you can't go home at 3:00pm you've got to do that. 'I've got a doctor's appointment tomorrow morning', well I'd say no you're not, you've got to come to school and make it later. 'But, but...', 'But, no, your role is here.' 'But you let him go yesterday.' 'Yes, that's because he's here til 5:00pm and he finishes the work I ask him to do.' It's a swings and roundabouts thing. If I can trust you then we'll do all we can to help you and I think in this game it's important."*

Principals voiced a desire to affect change without the coercive use of penalty in a hope that the person would act appropriately without the threat of sanctions:

Principal 10   *"(Punish) No, well I could do but I don't. I don't think that's professional. What I could do, as a principal in the past has done, or probably more principals in the past have done, is to give him more teaching time and less admin time. And um, that would keep him busy in the classroom and he'd have a lot less to say around the school. But to me I'm not that way inclined. I want him to do his job and do it properly, and as I say he does do most of it properly, it's just the way he speaks and the way he holds himself isn't in a professional manner I don't feel anyway."*

Principal 14   *"No you can't do that. I don't do that with middle management. Because the moment you do that with middle management and distributed leadership and leadership teams then you're putting in a wedge and the moment you've got a wedge something that starts off as being a professional breach*

of trust or whatever becomes things like ok right then I'll not do any yard duty and I'm not doing this and I'm not doing that, you know and it gets exponentially pettier. So then you have a them and us and you can't have a leadership team like that, in my view anyway."

The restructuring of work roles was identified as a consequence of trust betrayal and was the most commonly identified punitive strategy used by principals to manage the colleague:

Principal 9   "*Absolutely, I totally changed the way I worked with him. I actually ensured he worked about 70% in the classroom so it took him out of the office, I didn't give him any, you know he had the attendance portfolio, he had all sorts of different areas that I did trust him with and he did really well with it so I basically took that back on board, um I stopped taking him to meetings with me, because we would go, you know a few hours in the car together we'd go to meetings together and I just stopped all of that stuff I didn't want anything to do with him at all and there were a lot of staff that didn't want anything to do with him either. Um, it was disappointing, I was disappointed, in fact I was devastated by it because I trust people and I work very openly and what it did it divided staff."*

Principal 3   "*You can use strategies or tactics whereby that person realises that the game is up. And you really tighten the screws and insist that you do this. It takes a lot of front to do that, it's very disappointing."*

Principal 16   "*Yeah look, I mean certainly there is a tendency for me to, to respond to that by managing that person a lot more tightly."*

An outcome of the altered work practices was the heightened scrutiny of the other party's actions. Principals, having lost trust in a person, instigated mechanisms to check that the person was carrying out the requirements of their role.

Principal 2   "*Yes. Well even to the point of um, giving people directives about what they should do, reporting to particular people in the Department, the directives weren't followed."*

Principal 17   "*No. Absolutely not and my problem at the moment I'm even down to the point where I'm looking at getting movers in for the last week of term to actually move my office from here to the next office up so that I can actually visually see what is going on."*

"*Oh, I doubt her in every area. Yeah, that it's not going to be done correctly. Down to where I make phone calls and I say I want you to come in and check everything. Come in and check everything from a finance point of view because I'm just not confident. And I'm thinking one thing you're (inaudible) for is the money stuff. So my confidence in her is exceedingly being diminished, diminished, diminished because I get the excuse, the excuse, the excuse but she doesn't accept the responsibility and say 'I've stuffed up big time'"*

Principal 7   "*I can keep it at arm's length but it angers me. And compartmentalise it I guess. I know that's the person I need to be a bit more strategic when I get them to do work, I don't let them not do their job, but I just put that safety net around it so I can then say right I've done it. It's no longer a check-up, well it is. It's a check if they've done it. Similarly, I'm thinking of the deputy at (names school), one of the deputies, I couldn't trust her to do the job, which is what led me to buy that book and everything I asked her to do I had to put time frames on it, knowing she wouldn't meet it, and I had to have, so if I wanted it tomorrow or next Wednesday I would have planned three weeks ago and asked her every Wednesday leading up. But once you get that strategy for that person I just keep applying it and I'd email and I'd write. That's what would annoy me, is that I had to remember to keep on top of it to get someone to do the job that they're getting paid for.*"

"*No. And I can't trust that she is dealing appropriately with the people at the front counter, and saying appropriate things and I can't see her or hear her from here.*"

"*Next step is, I've got, basically I'm diarising everything that she needs to get done with a completion checklist and I want that at the end of each week. Saying I've done this and I've done this and I've done this.*"

Principal 12   "*I think it's a veneer at the moment. I think it was good for a bit. You know at the beginning of the year we had a very hard conversation and so forth and then she was very, very good for probably the best part of term one. It's only been as I say the last month I'm starting to pick up on a few things but you know, performance management comes in to those sorts of things and that's one thing we're just going through the performance management now. So I would say to her about that confidentiality and strategies about how to have those conversations but the fine line between friendships, professional friendships and you know, managerial positions where you've actually got to maintain and ensure everything is fair and equitable to everybody.*"

Principal 9   "*So then he's come back at me and what he's saw he took away all that professionalism that I had and made it very personal. So he then, um didn't like the fact that then I had to deal with all of those situations and it ended up going to (Department of investigations) because it got so bad and he got so bad.*"

Principal 14   "*Yeah, micromanagement tends to put people in a straight jacket.*"

PW "*Does it mean you don't trust them then if you are having to micromanage them?*"

"*Yes, so you go in you know, every day and every half day and say "Now how is that going? I think the next step is this.*"

Chapter 5 Conclusion

This chapter revisits the original objectives of this research to remind the reader of the purpose of the study. It brings together and discusses the theoretical perspectives identified in the literature review in the light of the findings of this study. It draws out the conclusions from the analysis of the data so as to create an understanding of the conditions that impact on principals' trust in others and the effect it has on the principals.

Whilst there is a near absence of research that focuses on the principal's place in trusted relationships, this study contributes to the elaboration and expansion of previous research in related areas and also adds to the discussion of the impact of trust on the leadership of schools. It contributes an original standpoint from the perspective of the school principal in identifying and understanding the factors and conditions that permit, promote or diminish a principal's trust in another.

While the findings of this research are not intended to be a model for research that could be applied elsewhere, this does not preclude the findings from being presented as an understanding of a complex phenomenon in educational research. The conclusions generated from the interpretation of the research data cannot claim to be an exhaustive claim to a definitive understanding of conditions that support trust. This research intends to inform, from the multiple perspectives of school principals, the complex nature of trust formation and not to decide upon a single contributing factor. As such this thesis has sought to provide an increased understanding of the role trust plays in the work of school principals, to identify the conditions conducive to trust formation, the benefits of such and the outcomes that occur when trust is prevented or interrupted.

This research set out to answer the main question of the study, that is, "What is the impact of trust on school principals' leadership?" In doing so, the theoretical framework identified the following five aims to be addressed:

1. to contribute to the knowledge of the importance of trust in principals' leadership of their schools
2. to determine the conditions which cause principals to trust or distrust a staff member
3. to better understand the dominant factors that impact on the betrayal of trust
4. to determine how trust is repaired between a principal and a staff member
5. to better understand the impact of restored/unrestored trust.

In addressing these aims this thesis presents an understanding of the dimensions of trust, how it shapes the relationships of school staff and the conditions under which trust is formed or broken. The findings of the investigations conducted as part of this research identify that trust has a marked impact on the working relationships of the principal and school personnel and the principal's leadership of the school. The study provides an opportunity to gain an insight to the importance principals place in trusting other members of their school staff; the conditions for the establishment, maintenance and breaking of trust and the roles of the principal and staff member in repairing broken trust.

These common themes espoused by the cohort of interviewed principals led to the setting out of the theory:

5.1 The importance of trust in the principal's leadership of the school

Principals affirmed that there is a common purpose in their own work and that of their staff members, in that both parties have a joint commitment to achieve the goals of the school. In order to carry out the complex role of managing the school and achieving the desired outcomes they relied upon staff members to cooperate, communicate accurately and freely and through positive, reciprocal relationships avoid manipulative behaviours. Dietz (2004, p.5) notes that the role of trust as a "precondition of partnerships, as the process through which partnership is realised" and it was evident from the scenarios presented by principals that they placed great weight on the

formation of these interactions. The principals' voiced importance of trust in relationships is also echoed in the words of Bryk and Schneider (2002, p.128) "Principals—the single most influential actors in schools—remain dependent on both parents and teachers to achieve success in their work." The findings of this study are also reflected in the comments of Cosner (2009, p.250) that "scholars have empirically identified collegial trust as a social resource that is an important element of school capacity."

In the main, principals preferred a management style of collaboration with their staff, rather than reliance on control mechanisms to accomplish the day-to-day tasks. Principals trusted staff members to act in a way that saw their roles carried out effectively and in a professional manner. They relied upon staff to undertake their teaching or support staff duties with skill and in a manner that portrayed a professional image of themselves and the school and in doing so supported the principal in achieving the goals of the school. Principals often cited that they trusted staff members to act in this way as the many complex facets of their own role meant they could not feasibly achieve all desired ends through their own actions and therefore relied on staff members to contribute in a supportive, collaborative manner (cf. Bromiley and Cummings (1995); McKnight, Cummings et al. (1998). When principals gave their trust to colleagues they placed themselves in a vulnerable position that should the trustee break their trust, it caused harm to them personally; to their reputation, or to their leadership of the school. Principals, in relying on staff received a form of security in the relationship, thus affirming Dietz's (2004, p.10) contention that "recognising the legitimate role and interests of each partner offers some protection against vulnerability by constraining parties' opportunism and promoting 'behavioural integrity', as well as 'demonstrating concern'."

This study finds that trust is considered an important element of the relationship between principal and staff members as it forges a bond that can be relied upon to achieve the purpose of the school; provides a reassurance to the principal that they can rely upon others to act in good faith without the need for rigorous surveillance; and be assured that the trustee's actions will not place the principal at risk of harm. Trusted work relationships therefore

have an impact on the harmony of the school, its effectiveness and personal feelings of confidence of those on staff.

The value of trust in creating cooperative efforts amongst staff was a dominant theme expressed by principals and verified in the research literature. As a 'glue' that "binds organizational participants to one another...trust is essential to fostering these relationships" (Tschannen-Moran 2004, p.15-16).

5.2   The conditions that cause a principal to trust or distrust

The study concludes that the initial predisposition of the principal to trust other members of staff has an impact on whether trust is bestowed and the pace at which trust is taken up.

The conditions determining the formation of a trusted relationship between the principal and a staff member depend on the principal's pre-disposition to trust. This prior willingness to be vulnerable to the actions of others influences the principal's readiness to trust another. Some principals readily placed trust in others, often observed where principals assumed the status or title of the other's position afforded some measure of safety in trusting that person; or a perception that lengthy experience in the role meant a person is more likely to be trustworthy. This finding concurs with Schniter, Sheremeta et al. (2013, p.243) "Trustworthy reputations that have been demonstrated by past actions serve as reliable *cues* upon which investors can make trust-based decisions". This trusted reliance was readily assumed by principals as a safeguard in the face of pressing work requirements. For these principals, their pre-disposition to trust others early in the formation of a working relationship demonstrated their willingness to assume a risk that the other person may let them down, but that the gains to be had by initially trusting them saw faster achievement of desired ends and the establishment of a potentially ongoing trusted relationship. This finding affirms a notion of a pre-disposition to trust affecting one's Trusting Beliefs and Trusting Intention as espoused by McKnight, Cummings et al. (1998) that there are two types of disposition to trust: faith in humanity, and trusting stance. Where the

principals assumed that staff members were typically reliable and well-meaning people they had faith in them acting appropriately; where principals showed a "trusting stance" they believed they would achieve a better interpersonal outcome by trusting the person regardless of whether they were reliable people or not. The pressures of having to quickly establish work routines, especially at the beginning of a new school year and when first working with new staff members, meant that principals had to rely on an untested trust of staff if they were to achieve outcomes. This meant principals had to assume trust in another for the purposes of pressing work requirements and those principals with a pre-disposition to trust undertook this stance readily. The findings also affirm the work of Johnson-George and Swap (1982) and that of Rotter (1980) finding that a person with a high disposition to trust is more likely to see good points and overlook flaws in another person that could threaten the development of trust. The principals made a conscious choice to place trust in their staff. The notion that principals will always make an assessment of the trustworthiness of another irrespective of whether they possess a pre-disposition to trust or not is verified in the work of Dietz (2011, p.215) and "informs a preparedness to be vulnerable...leading to a risk-taking act". These principals, it is noted, made assessments not based so much on evidence as on a lack of evidence, a view supported by Gambetta (1998).

This disposition to trust is very evident in the assessments made of trustworthiness over a period of time. The study finds that some principals, however, are not as inclined to extend trust so readily and take time to be assured that the other is trustworthy before placing any reliance in them. In these circumstances principals observed the conditions under which the teacher or staff member interacted with them personally and with other staff members. The risk of being vulnerable to harm is a factor that influences the principal's decision to trust and for a number of principals the observance of the other's behaviour raised the potential to be harmed and therefore determined that they were unwilling to accept that risk and trust another at all, even after a period of time had elapsed. These principals, when working with staff, used management practices that prescribed how the staff member

was to act in their role, timelines for actions to be completed, routines to be adhered to and were characterised by not showing ongoing trust in that person.

The findings affirm that whilst principals acknowledge the importance of quickly establishing trust in staff for the purposes of achieving the tasks of teaching and managing the school, few principals studied showed they had a pre-disposition to trust their staff. Most preferred to initially engage with staff professionally and courteously whilst at the same time forming opinions of the person's trustworthiness through observation and discussion with them and other staff members. This caution is in-part due to their seeking assurance that the other person is unlikely to cause them harm and also to identify trustworthy qualities in the other person such as the person's reliability, honesty and ability.

These factors are affirmed as major findings of the study and reveal the conditions under which principals placed trust in their staff members. Principals formed trusting relationships with those staff members who demonstrated integrity towards them. These were the people who could be relied upon to act according to the commitments they had given the principal. They acted in an honest manner, told the truth and created a sense of belief that their actions could be counted upon. They had a reputation for maintaining their promises and principals in turn had the confidence that they would not be disappointed by the person. Principals placed great reliance on these people as trusted members of a team and often recounted a personal dependence on them. This finding of integrity, being a dominant factor in forming trusting relationships, is replicated in a number of studies (Dasgupta 1988; Mayer and Davis et al.1995; McKnight and Chervany 1996; Tschannen-Moran 2004). These studies also identify benevolence as a commonly recognised facet of trust and this study's findings concur. The analysis of principals' recounts revealed they placed trust in another staff member if that person demonstrated a sense of caring for the principal's well-being and did not act opportunistically against them. It was this relationship that afforded the principal the confidence that the trusted other would not act so as to cause her/him harm. The importance of this element

of trust is noted in that when forming the much needed reliance on others to collaborate to achieve their common commitments, principals were open and vulnerable to the other party exploiting their relationship. Therefore, principals trusted those staff members who showed genuine concern for them, showed consideration and sensitivity towards them and acted in a manner that could be confidently expected to be maintained in the future. Benevolence is also affirmed as a key facet in the forming of trust in numerous studies (McAllister 1995; Mayer and Davis et al.1995; McKnight and Chervany 1996).

Unlike the findings of leading trust research, this study did not identify 'ability' or 'competence' as being a major facet of trust formation in the cohort of principals studied. For example, Bryk and Schneider (2002, p.23) identify competence as the second criterion for trust discernment and as the "execution of an individual's formal role responsibilities...to achieve desired outcomes". Ability is also raised as a dominant facet of trust formation by Mayer and Davis et al. (1995) and McKnight and Chervany (1996).

The scenarios presented by principals commonly referenced the trustee being secretive, providing restricted information to the principal or deliberately setting out to be tardy, obscure facts and refusing to comply. Principals made little reference to a teacher's ability to carry out the tasks of teaching students. So whilst the principals did not place great emphasis on breaches of trust caused by a teacher being unable to carry out their teaching of students effectively, they raised numerous concerns of the trustee's ability to interact with themselves openly, honestly and professionally, preferring to do what they wanted to do with scant acknowledgement of the principal's requirements. These factors of 'self-interest' were the more dominant perception of the trustee's ability and were far more damaging to the relationship. Thus, in all breaches of trust described in the study, betrayal of the integrity and benevolence facets of trust weighed heavier than those of ability. This was particularly evident in situations of new staff not having the required skills as yet to perform their role as effectively as desired and the principals making allowances for this. Also, when staff members showed they didn't have the required skills to

perform a duty, principals viewed this more in the light of a need for training or skilling of the staff member than a deliberate choice to undermine the confidence the principal had in them. This finding is in concert with the work of Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) that with betrayal being a voluntary violation of the trustor's expectations, a drop in benevolence and integrity is more significant than a drop in ability. If the trustee fails to meet the trustor's expectations because of an inability it implies more of a "can't meet the expectations" rather than a "don't want to meet the expectations" orientation that is inconsistent with the voluntary nature of betrayal.

Thus, more damaging outcomes were had when staff members broke the trust through a dismissive, lack of caring attitude towards the principal or deliberate falsifications, breaches of confidentiality and dishonesty. Dietz and Den Hartog (2006, p.572) similarly affirm this finding "In terms of content, we noted the dominance of judgements on the trustee's integrity and benevolence, and the relatively marginalised status of the trustee's competence and predictability."

5.3 Factors that impact on the betrayal of trust

The study set out to describe the conditions that facilitate the betrayal of trust to occur, and to account for the factors that permit this.

5.3.1 Vulnerability

The study concludes that principals trusted school personnel to act professionally and appropriately, to do their jobs in a manner that wouldn't betray the confidence placed in them and to do so without harming the trustor. This harm can be had because principals have given others responsibility to act, to carry out roles that have been delegated to them and in doing so principals place faith in the other to carry out these responsibilities with skill, honesty and a sense of caring for their colleague. Therefore, in giving this trust the principals relied on their staff to act so as to not exploit the principal's vulnerability nor place them in a harmful position in fulfilling their role in the school. Transgressions influenced principals'

impressions of the staff member and perceived levels of trustworthiness which translated into decisions about future interactions with that person and impacted upon the relationship. "It is the expectation of an ongoing relationship that sustains trust in the actions of others" (Kramer and Tyler 1996, p.3). The positive expectations had of that person when once a trusted relationship existed, disappeared and because of the exposure to the associated risk saw principals unwilling to place themselves in situations of future vulnerability. Dirks, Lewicki et al. (2009) also affirm that in conjunction with a lowering of trust, negative emotions such as disappointment, frustration, anger and outrage are likely and these qualities were certainly prevalent in the experiences of the studied principals to the extent that their health and sense of self-efficacy suffered.

5.3.2 Motivation to betray trust

It was determined that the conditions that most frequently brought about a betrayal of trust were those in which the trustee had deliberately constructed circumstances for personal gain. Self-interest was a common factor in the staff member's betrayal of the principal's trust in them. The potential for personal gain through participation in acts of betrayal was seen as a more compelling preference than maintaining the principal's trust. The preference to act in such a way involved a measure of the potential gain against the probability and severity of penalty. This was most evident in examples of dishonesty and satisfying personal wants where the potential for personal gain was deemed more compellingly attractive than the loss of the principal's trust. These motives were strengthened by the belief that the offending act would most likely go unnoticed through the offender's attempts to cover up their activities; hence the probability of detection was low and the likelihood of penalty low. Data analysis also revealed motivations to betray where the probability of detection was high and the probability of responsibility low. This was particularly evident for example, when confidential information was communicated to intended parties with principals being aware of the publication of the information but not the source of the breach. The motivation to act in such a way was the perceived safety in not being able to

apportion blame and hence the low probability of detection and penalty was considered worthy of the risk. Similarly, acts where attribution of fault could be reasonably made were often defended by simple denial and without witnesses to the events, were difficult to prove. Nevertheless, it is noted that if the principal's doubt is strong enough it was shown that the suspicion of the betrayal of trust was enough to damage the principal's level of trust in that person or potentially extend to complete distrust. In these instances principals have not questioned the person's ability to undertake the role assigned them but have questioned the person's integrity and this is a significant factor in maintaining or betraying the principal's trust. Indeed, findings show that the principals were less likely to forgive a betrayal of trust that involved a person's honesty and integrity; a sense of caring and truthfulness towards them, than they are a person's lack of ability and subsequent errors which cause the principal to be harmed. Principals reference the breaches caused by a lack of integrity as deceptive acts, seen to be wilful and intentional and as such interpreted as disloyalty with potential for a permanent rift and unlikely restoration of the trust.

5.3.3 Intentionality

The study finds that when betraying a principal's trust, staff members made an intentional, voluntary choice to act in such a way. Affirming Elangovan and Shapiro's (1998) research it was noted that the staff member betrayed the trust in them as a result of a deliberate, voluntary, decision-making process in choosing a more attractive option than maintaining the principal's trust.

The actual act of betrayal caused the trustor to question whether they could still rely upon the person to act in the manner expected of them because the trustee's actions had harmed the trustor's perception of them and made them more vulnerable, and brought the trusted relationship into doubt. While the outcome of their actions may or may not have been anticipated, the actual act of causing the betrayal of trust was shown to be either opportunistic or pre-meditated, but nevertheless, deliberate. Opportunistic acts of betrayal were commonly spontaneous and characterised by school personnel acting

impulsively without regard for the repercussions their actions would cause. Examples in which the staff member disclosed confidential information to another serve to illustrate that these acts were not only rashly carried out but done so for self-interest; to gain status in another's eyes by sharing information that they could not otherwise have been privy to. In situations of this nature the intentional act of betraying the trust placed in them was done to achieve quick self-gratification with little regard for the harm the act may have caused the trustor. The trustee's overriding intention was the gain to be had through enhancing their image with the other colleague.

Pre-meditated acts of trust betrayal were identified in situations where staff members intentionally set about to behave in ways that either made trust difficult to be established or saw trust broken once it had been established. In the former, it was found that principals experienced great difficulty in establishing trust with someone when that person was not willing to participate, no matter how willing the principal was to bestow trust in them. This was strongly evident in situations where principals were new to a school and a staff member had a predisposition to distrust the position of principal. Reasons cited for such a stance included previously negative experiences with a prior principal, and a staff member's motivation to act out of self-interest and behave as they saw fit with disregard for the principal. The lack of goodwill toward the principal was evident in these circumstances and demonstrated through aloofness on the part of the staff member, withdrawal from interacting with the principal and strongly voiced opinions of what they were prepared to do. All scenarios showed a degree of disengagement from the principal and an unwillingness to become involved.

The study concludes that staff members' actions causing a betrayal of trust were intentional, sometimes an opportunistic spur-of-the-moment decision, made out of a motivation for personal gain, without regard for the longer-term harm to the relationship with the principal; and at other times pre-meditated deliberate efforts for purposes of self-interest and gain also without regard for the damage caused to the principal. In all instances of betrayal the study concludes that the acts caused the diminishing of trust or total distrust of the other person because they had undermined the agreed expectations the

principal had with the staff member to act so as to not exploit the proffered vulnerability that came with the bestowing of trust.

5.4 Factors that impact on the restoration of trust

Another aim of the study determined the process of restoring trust was invariably initiated by the victim, not the person responsible for the breach. In some scenarios the principals avoided directly presenting the trustee with their concern and it was evident that the principal's reparative process proceeded without the trustee's fully informed involvement. In such situations, the lack of or delay in presenting the principal's concern to the trustee, reduced the chance of successful restoration of trust. The damage to the principal's level of trust in another person was seen as a personal affront to them and acknowledging this harm to the other party was too difficult a situation to face, and so it was left unresolved with the person. This resulted in a state of lessened commitment to the desired outcome as trustees were on the periphery of arrangements to improve relationships and not required to accept responsibility simply because they were not aware of the issue.

Findings revealed no instances of the trustee initiating the repair process and consequently, principals were not confident that the other felt at all contrite about either their actions or that they wanted to make things right.

It is concluded that for trust to be repaired it requires both parties to commit to a process of finding ways to meet the needs that were once met in the trusted relationship. This concurs with Lewicki and Bunker (1996, p.28) that "trust repair is a bilateral process" and that each must be "willing to invest time and energy into the repair process, perceive that the short- and/or long-term benefits to be derived from the relationship are highly valued and perceive that the benefits to be derived are preferred relative to options for having these needs satisfied in an alternative manner."

Acceptance of fault was found to be an important factor in the repairing of trust. Where no acceptance of fault was made, the perpetrator typically

denied involvement, blamed others or endeavoured to lessen the significance of the event by implicating external influences. The lack of ownership of the cause of diminished trust was voiced as a considerable hurdle experienced by principals because without this admission, little if any, progress was made in correcting the situation, thus concurring with the conditions attributed by researchers such as Ohbuchi (1994) as integral to the repair process.

Data analysis revealed that while the trustee may not have admitted causation, the principals acted to remediate the repercussions of the trustee's betrayal and did so despite not receiving acceptance of involvement by the other party.

The study notes that without acceptance of trust betrayal, apologies were not forthcoming and as such hindered the attempts at trust repair. In order to request forgiveness for the harm caused, acknowledgement of involvement would need to be made and apology offered and this was not seen in any of the 20 schools. The lack of acceptance, apology and effort to amend the harm, led to situations where trust was not repaired with the principal. While principals recounted their actions to repair the trust, which often involved formal meetings with the trustee during which the principal's requirements for further actions were clarified, the resultant behaviour of the trustees showed these were not adhered to, paid lip-service to, were aggressively confrontational or passively ignored.

5.5   The impact of restored/unrestored trust

The final aim of the study was to determine the influence on principals' leadership of their school if or when trust was restored in the relationship between themselves and a staff member. The finding that most instances of trust betrayal went unrestored to the levels of the previously trusted relationship revealed that the staff members were unwillingly to repair the trust and that as a result principals were required to implement management strategies to accommodate this ongoing lack of trust in the staff member. It is noted that the principals' actions in attempting to repair the trust with staff

were not reciprocated, that all descriptions of such actions highlighted the principals' efforts at reparation and portrayals of very limited actions by staff members to restore the trust.

The actions of the principals were only partially successful in restoring trust. At one level, the principals' actions of putting in place devices that improved the professional image of themselves or the school, served to ameliorate the negative perceptions held by the wider-school community. These work alternatives provided an outwardly perceived, superficially restored professional image but at another level failed to repair the trust between the two parties. The findings also revealed that principals who were unable to restore the trust with the trustee implemented control mechanisms in the form of policy, rules and work structures that defined how the person was to act. Instances of recreating the trustee's work roles so as to reduce the likelihood of future breaches of trust occurring often involved diminished responsibilities and participation in important decision making.

At best, it is concluded that this form of trust repair is only a 'veneer' or appearance of trust that might superficially allow for continued working relationships but one that doesn't carry any reliance on the other person to act in a trustworthy way towards them. This superficiality in the relationship was characterised by interactions that occurred only when necessary and then only on defined points of need to be discussed. By creating these alternative work arrangements for the previously trusted party, principals were reducing their requirement to trust the other party and with this reduction in dependence on them saw contact with them diminished. Thus, no trusting relationships were maintained. Many studies similarly find the importance of the violator's commitment to the trust repair process and the failure to do so impacting on the relationship (Lewicki and Bunker 1996; Dirks, Lewicki et al. 2009).

The theme of disruptive actions by a staff member rupturing the trusted relationship with the principal is observed to have provoked the principal to implement strategies to ameliorate the public perception of the trustee's action, restore good order in the school and have the trustee act so as to

remediate the damaged situation. The outcome of these actions was determined to be unsuccessful because the trustees did not accept fault and consequently did not act to repair the damage they had caused. Principals, in these instances were noted as trying to maintain the achievement of desired outcomes for the school whilst at the same time bearing the brunt of the personal damage inflicted upon them. The impact on the school included staff ostracising the trustee, supporting the principal, and the implementation of revised work structures that saw trustees' roles redefined so as to have a lesser role in important decision making within the school. It is therefore determined that the impact of a breach of trust resulted in the principal leading the restructuring of the trustee's role so that lessened engagement was required with them. The staff member's work roles were reconfigured so as to have less impact on the outcomes of the school and the work of the principal once implemented. This therefore presented a lowered requirement for the principal to trust the person as the risk of a repeated betrayal of trust was diminished and little or no reliance on them was required.

The study also finds that the impact on the principals' self-beliefs of their own worth and ability to lead the school was substantial. Prevailing reactions of doubt in their own ability were widespread amongst principals. The trusted staff members' actions in breaking the trust, or failing to establish trust caused the principals extensive questioning of their leadership of the school and how they were managing the situation with the offending staff member. A general sense of frustration was expressed that their actions were needed to be carefully planned and executed so as to not breach any industrial rulings, although conversely these were often flaunted by the trustees who refused to comply, withheld their participation and actively sought to be deceptive. These situations led the principals to feel disappointed that what they perceived to be open, frank dealings with the staff were being ignored, delayed and often perceived as not being as willing to remediate as they were.

Principals worked assiduously to maintain a professional demeanour when dealing with the offending staff member whilst suffering personally the damaging effects of the breach of trust. It is noted that they tried to 'rise

131

above' the situation by endeavouring to act professionally in their dealings with the perfidious person, whilst feeling they were not afforded the same professional courtesies. This coupled with commonly voiced feelings of a lack of support from their employers and interference of outside agencies, compounded the principals' doubts of their ability to carry out their role well. The breach of trust was so damaging to the principals' sense of self-efficacy that they questioned whether they would bother to follow a similar path in the future as they considered the desired outcomes to be unachieved and the damage to their confidence too great.

The perceived futility of their actions was brought to light and the impact of this was that principals questioned any future engagement with the staff member. The study notes that with few penalty options available to the principal to penalise the staff member who fails to remediate, and the unsatisfactory outcomes when dealing with intractable staff, the outcome of the reported scenarios was typically the principal taking sick leave to avoid the situation, leaving the school or seeking a transfer for the staff member to another school. All of which impacted on the principal's confidence to lead the school.

The study concludes that the lack of repair to the trusted relationships held between principal and staff member had an impact on the effective functioning of the school, the principal's leadership and their self-efficacy.

5.6 Summary

In answering the research question: "What is the impact of trust on school principals' leadership?" findings of the analysis of data from the interviews with principals of 20 schools and reference to the research literature can be summarised against the five aims of the study:

1. to contribute to the knowledge of the importance of trust in principals' leadership of their schools
2. to determine the conditions which cause principals to trust or distrust a staff member

3. to better understand the dominant factors that impact on the betrayal of trust

4. to determine how trust is repaired between a principal and a staff member

5. to better understand the impact of restored/unrestored trust.

5.6.1 The importance of trust in school principals' leadership

This research concludes that principals recognise there is a common purpose in the work of all school staff, noting the complex environment and the joint commitment required to achieve the goals of the school. Principals place considerable importance in trusting their staff members for reasons of creating a school tone characterised by teachers and support staff who work collaboratively in a harmonious manner. They see the task of achieving the aforementioned too onerous for them to achieve themselves and thus must rely on staff. They rely on their staff members to meet the agreed responsibilities entrusted in them and as such expect that the other party will carry out their role by cooperating, communicating accurately and freely and through positive, reciprocal relationships avoid manipulative behaviours and achieve desired outcomes for the school. Principals need to trust staff will undertake these responsibilities professionally and without harm to the principal. The bond of trust created provides the principal reassurance that the staff member will act in good faith and can be relied upon.

5.6.2 Conditions which cause principals to trust or distrust

This research concludes the following factors impact on a principal's likelihood to trust or distrust another staff member:

- The existence of an expectation of an ongoing relationship that sustains trust needs to be evident for trust to form.
- Whether a principal has a pre-disposition to trust – that is, a prior willingness to be vulnerable and reliant on the actions of another person influences the principal's readiness to trust. Some principals had a disposition to trust their staff members across all situations and

did so with an expectation that they could rely on others to have the work of the school done.

- A clear demarcation was identified between those principals who have a pre-disposition to trust others and do so early in the formation of a relationship and those who show a reluctance to engage with others initially and therefore withheld the giving of trust. Whilst some principals, in the interests of expediency, were prepared to acknowledge a staff member's title or length of experience as a guide to being able to expect competent completion of work requirements, most preferred to observe the other person over a period of time before placing trust in them.

- Other principals, it was found, had a situational disposition to trust and only trusted another under certain circumstances. This was most evident in situations of trust being broken between a staff member and the principal and the latter having no trust in that person being able to undertake that role again. Typically, it was determined that principals, once having their trust in another betrayed saw that prevail across all subsequent encounters with that person.

- Whether a principal has a high disposition to trust or not, principals made a conscious assessment and choice to trust a staff member.

- Principals placed trust in those staff members who demonstrated integrity and benevolence towards them. As such, they trusted those who acted in an honest way, told the truth, showed a sense of caring towards the principal and created a sense of belief that their actions could be relied upon.

- Unlike the findings of leading trust research, this study did not identify 'ability' or 'competence' as being a major facet of trust formation in the cohort of principals studied.

5.6.3 Factors that impact on the betrayal of trust

This research concludes the following factors have an impact on the betrayal of trust:

- Betrayal of trust is considered a voluntary, intentional decision to act by the trustee.
- Betrayal of the integrity and benevolence facets of the trusted relationship was considered significantly damaging because they required a voluntary violation of the trustor's expectations.
- Conditions that most frequently brought about a betrayal of trust were those in which the trustee had deliberately constructed circumstances for personal gain. Self-interest was the most common factor in the betrayal of trust.
- A measure of the potential gain against the probability and severity of penalty determined the staff member's preference for betrayal.

5.6.4 Trust repair between a principal and a staff member

This research concludes the following:

- The process of repairing trust was consistently initiated by the victim.
- In order for trust to be repaired it requires both parties to commit to a process of finding ways to meet the needs that were once met through the trusted relationship. In this study, no attempt at repair of the broken trust was made by the trustee and consequently trust was not restored.
- Repair requires the acceptance of fault, apology and effort to amend the harm caused by the perpetrator and was not evident in this study.
- As no semblance of acceptance, apology or effort to repair trust was made by the trustees, trust was not repaired in any of the studied 20 schools.

5.6.5   The impact of restored/unrestored trust

The findings of this research determined that trust was not restored any of the studied cases and so comment on the impact of restored trust cannot be made. The following conclusions pertain to the situations where trust was not restored:

- In trusting a staff member, the principal relied on the person to not breach the vulnerable position he or she was placed in. The unrestored breach of trust, saw the quality of the working relationship with the previously trusted person deteriorate, and in most cases caused a complete severing of trust in that person for that particular situation and also future relationships.

- That betrayed trust may never be restored in some circumstances leaving suspicion and distrust.

- The principal instigated alternative work roles for the untrusted person thus diminishing their role in decision-making, a reduction in responsibilities and contact with the principal, representing a lowered requirement for the principal to trust that person and a lessened opportunity for the same breach of trust to occur again.

- Principals' doubting self-beliefs of their own worth, questioning their ability to lead the school and of their own management of the situation were common.

- Principals noted the futility of their actions in trying to restore trust and questioned whether they would pursue similar strategies if comparable situations were to arise again.

- Principals typically took leave to avoid the situation or left the school in the face of intractable breaches of trust betrayal.

5.7 Researcher reflections

Whilst there is a near absence of research that focuses on the principal's place in trusted relationships, this study contributes to the elaboration and expansion of previous research in related areas and also adds to the discussion of the role trust plays in the relationships of schools leaders and their staff. It contributes an original position for the understanding of factors and conditions that permit, promote or diminish a principal's trust in another. These findings concur with similar findings in the literature with the links being made explicit earlier in this chapter. While the findings of this study may inform research in a related field, the overriding intention of the work is

to present an understanding of a complex phenomenon in educational research.

The findings have revealed the dynamic nature of relationships between staff members and the often tenuous threads by which trust is maintained in some relationships, the lack of trust in some relationships and conversely, a strong bond to be found in others.

This thesis informs research into the study of trust in schools through meeting its purpose to identify the degree of importance principals place in the need to trust staff members – whether trust is required in another in order for them to conduct the business of the school. It brings forward an understanding that principals desire a school environment that is characterised by a workforce of trusted teachers and support staff, where they can feel safe in the knowledge that their staff are considerate of their views and needs, are supportive of them and care for them and that they can assume some of the workload of the school is carried out in a fashion that does not cause them harm. Principals place great faith in staff that the agreed expectations of their roles will not be broken and it is this reliance on them that binds the team of staff to achieve common goals.

The study also informs research by identifying the conditions which must be present in a working relationship for a principal to place trust in another staff member. Some principals have a pre-disposition to trust and others don't. The principals who demonstrated a reliance on authoritarian adherence to rules and formal, impersonal, communications with staff did not develop trusted relationships with their staff, instead achieving results by requiring them to comply but without having to place themselves at risk by trusting them. Thus, in these circumstances no trust was established between the parties, tasks were completed but no sense of collaborative team work was noted; by way of contrast, an important consideration of those principals who had a disposition to trust others. Principals, in the main, desired a harmonious work environment and chose to trust staff initially without full knowledge of the person. This was partly driven by the pressing nature of the work of the school and an assumption that the person's experience,

qualifications or title gave a degree of safety in trusting them to act appropriately.

The third aim of the study is also met in that it identifies and discusses the dominant factors that cause a betrayal of trust between the principal and the staff member. It notes the conditions that are conducive to trust being damaged and the role of the participants in doing so. The most commonly referenced indicator of betrayal was the staff member seeking to promote themselves for the purpose of personal gain. Whether these actions were driven out of personal desire for notoriety with other staff, personal gain through the dismissal of established school rules, or simple defiance and unwillingness to participate, all had the effect of breaking the trust the principal had placed in them and showed a lack of benevolence and integrity towards the principal. The study notes that the cited betrayals of trust created situations for the principals that were seen to be complex and difficult to resolve.

The fourth aim of the research brought about the recognition of the importance of the steps needed to restore a broken sense of trust; the roles of the participants and the degree to which the trusted relationship is sustained. The most telling of all factors associated with the betrayal of trust was that in none of the 20 schools was there any semblance of repair to the damaged trust, with this being attributed to a lack of acceptance, apology or attempts to repair the breach of trust by the trustee.

The fifth aim of the research, to better understand the impact of restored/ unrestored trust, informs research through the identification of effects had on the principal in terms of their sense of wellbeing and the influence unrestored trust had on the way they led their school, especially noting the changes to management practices as a result. The toll this had on the principals in terms of extensive time commitments, lack of support shown to them and a sense of loneliness in trying to restore the situations was most noticed in the effect it had on their health and sense of self-efficacy. For many, the stance of the previously trusted party's unwillingness to resolve the situation through lack of admission of fault, apology or attempts to repair the trust was debilitating

and resulted in ongoing distrust of the person and the restructuring of roles within the school to accommodate the person and is a salient finding of this study.

This research has been educative and at the same time confronting for the author. Educative, in that the synthesis of voluminous amounts of data through line-by-line interrogation of the transcripts; the subsequent identification of themes, redefining of these themes to determine common core elements across the 20 schools, was very informative and skill developing. The choice of using the Grounded Theory approach to analysing the data is justified in that every interaction between the principal and staff member was identified, coded and subsequently formed themes that addressed the research question, thus ensuring a good depth of inquiry. It is a thorough method that allows for themes to emerge from the generated data and suited this type of research. The author considers the interview data collection method and the use of the Grounded Theory approach to data analysis to be particularly suited to this form of research as it provided the depth of information and a structure for the interpretation of data that allowed for the emergence of strong findings of trust's impact on school leadership – all within an authentic paradigm of the principals' own experiences and beliefs.

The open-ended nature of the interview questioning, whilst allowing for authentic participant responses, took lengthy analysis to fully determine the common themes. Nonetheless, whilst the choice of this interview process generated capacious amounts of data in ensuring everything of importance was captured, it also allowed for the participants to freely express their thoughts.

Personal experience as a school principal and the everyday dealings with staff members resonated with the findings. It was confronting to hear other principals recount similar experiences to my own and in many cases to hear of far worse examples of distrust to any I had experienced as a principal. The challenge to remain impartial to the emotion of the presented scenarios and maintain equanimity in conducting the interview questions was achieved

through taking a stance that portrayed an understanding of what the principal was going through, though still remaining impartial to the impact of their words and endeavouring to encourage ongoing dialogue to further delve into the conditions that caused these situations to arise.

I was particularly taken aback by recounts of broken trust in which the principals endeavoured to maintain professional, civil working relationships, tried to repair the trust with a staff member, but were confronted by a lack of involvement by the other party, being lied to, presented with aggressive assertions or by the deeply moving scenarios of betrayal leading to suicide attempts, theft, doubts about their own ability to carry out their work and the very high incidence of poor health amongst the principals. The futility of their attempts to restore trust with a non-responsive staff member was particularly poignant.

Chapter 6 Recommendations for future research

As little has been known to date about the conditions impacting on principals' perspectives of trust, this study has differed from past work in that it took the perspective of the trustor in identifying the contributing factors that cause trust to be established or damaged. It focused on the identification of conditions for the development of trusting relationships with staff members and those factors that facilitated, interrupted or prevented trust occurring and noted the changes that resulted. This approach generated an understanding of trust's influence on the principals' leadership of their schools by allowing principals to self-select examples from their own experience and to describe in detail their personal reactions to events. The recounts all showed the effects of relationships that did not form due to a lack of initial trust or where trusting relationships had subsequently broken down. None of the recounts referred to situations where trust was effectively re-established to the level previously had. Consideration could be made to further studies in the field of trust to those circumstances in which damaged trust was repaired. The role of the principal and trustee in successfully repairing the trust could be investigated; the actions taken and the outcomes of the repair process and the longevity of this renewed trust could be investigated.

This study focused on the observations of the trustor, a principal, with a particular emphasis on the actions and feelings formed as a result of engaging with a school staff member. This focus satisfied the intention of the study to determine the impact had on a principal's level of trust and intentionally did not set out to provide an in-depth understanding from the perspective of the trustee. Further research could investigate the topic from the point of view of the trustee. That is, the impact trust plays on the work experiences of the trusted colleague. Lines of inquiry might incorporate determining the views of the trustee in the importance of establishing trusting relationships with the principal; how the trustee maintains the principal's trust in them; reasons for breaking trust with the principal and the consequences of breaking this trusted relationship. This alternative view of trust may also

highlight lines of inquiry to do with the subordinate/superordinate relationship not investigated in this study.

Appendix Consent Form

![Durham University logo]

CONSENT FORM

Title of Project: The Impact of Trust on School Principals' Leadership.

Name of Researcher: Peter Wood

Purpose of the Study: As part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Durham University, UK I am required to carry out a research study. The study is concerned with identifying factors that impact on school principals' trust of their staff.

What will the study involve? The study will involve individual face-to-face interviews of approximately 20 principals with each interview taking approximately 30 minutes. Each participant will be asked to reflect upon the importance of trusting staff members and asked to provide an example of a professional relationship with a staff member and describe how trust was developed, maintained and/or broken.

Do I have to take part? No, participation is totally voluntary. By signing the consent form you agree to take part in the study and allow your data to be kept and used in the study, however, if you wish, you have the option of withdrawing at any stage or discontinuing after data collection has started and you can ask to have any data destroyed.

Will your participation in the study be kept confidential? Yes, I will ensure your confidentiality in the thesis by removing any identifying reference to your name and that of the school and staff. Any extracts from what you say that are quoted in the thesis will be entirely anonymous. No individual will be named.

What will happen to the interview recording? The interview recording will be transcribed and analysed. The results will be presented in the thesis. The thesis will be seen by my supervisors and external examiners. The thesis may be published in a library and read by future students.

Any further queries? Please contact me on (telephone number obscured) if you require any further information.

Please initial box

1.	**I confirm that I have read and understand the information dated 1 May 2011 for the above study.**	
2.	**I have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask any questions.**	
3.	**I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason.**	
4.	*I understand that the interview will be audio recorded and that the recordings will be stored securely. On completion of the study, the audio recording will be retained for a further five years and then destroyed.*	
5.	*I understand that my data will only be accessed by those working on the study.*	
6.	*I understand that my data will be anonymised prior to being included in the study.*	
7.	**I agree to take part in the above study.**	

Name of Participant   Signature   Date

Name of Researcher   Signature   Date

Peter Wood

References

Anderson, J. C. and J. A. Narus (1990). "A model of distributor firm and manufacturer firm working partnerships." Journal of Marketing **54**: 42-58.

Aquino, K., S. L. Grover, et al. (2003). "When push doesn't come to shove: Interpersonal forgiveness in workplace relationships." Journal of Management Inquiry **12**: 209-216.

Arrow, K. J. (1974). The limits of organization. New York, Norton.

Atwater, L. E. (1988). "The relative importance of situational and individual variables in predicting leader behavior: The surprising impact of subordinate trust." Group and Organizational Studies. **13**: 290-310.

Baier, A. C. (1986). "Trust and antitrust." Ethics **96**: 231-260.

Baier, A. C. (1994). Moral prejudices. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Baldwin, M. W. (1992). "Relational schemas and the processing of social information." Psychological Bulletin. **112**(3): 461-484.

Barber, B. (1983). The logic and limits of trust. New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press.

Battaglio, R. P. and S. E. Condrey (2009). "Reforming public management. Analyzing the impact of public service reform on organizational and managerial trust." Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory **19**(4): 689-707.

Berg, J., J. Dickhaut, et al. (1995). Trust, reciprocity, and social history., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Berscheid, E. (1994). "Interpersonal relationships." Annual Review of Psychology **45**: 79-129.

Bies, R. J. and T. M. Tripp (1996). Beyond distrust: "Getting even" and the need for revenge. Trust in organizations. R. M. Kramer and T. R. Tyler. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage**:** 246-260.

Bigley, G. A. and J. L. Pearce (1998). "Straining for shared meaning in organization science: Problems of trust and distrust." Academy of Management Review **23**(3): 405-421.

Bintliff, R. L. (1994). Crime-proofing your business. New York, McGraw-Hill.

Birner, L. (1992). "Betrayal: A major psychological problem of our time." Psychotherapy patient **8**: 41-52.

Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York, John Wiley.

Bonoma, T. V. (1976). "Conflict, cooperation, and trust in three power systems." Behavioral Science **21**(6): 499-514.

Bottom, W. P., K. Gibson, et al. (2002). "When talk is not cheap: Substantive penance and expressions of intent in rebuilding cooperation." Organization Science **13**: 497-513.

Bradfield, M. and K. Aquino (1999). "The effects of blame attributions and offender likableness on revenge and foregiveness in the workplace." Journal of Management **25**: 607-631.

Brandach, J. L. and R. G. Eccles (1989). Price, authority, and trust: From ideal types to plural forms. Annual Review of Sociology. W. R. Scott and J. Blake**:** 91-118.

Braun, K. A., R. Ellis, et al. (2002). "Make my memory: How advertising can change our memories of the past." Psychology and Marketing **19**: 1-23.

Breckenridge, J. (2009). "Demystifying theoretical sampling in grounded theory research." The Grounded Theory Review **8**(2): 113-126.

Bromiley, P. and L. L. Cummings (1995). Transactions costs in organizations with trust. Research on negotiations in organizations. R. J. Bies, B. H. Sheppard and R. J. Lewicki. Greenwich, CT, JAI Press. **5:** 219-247.

Bryk, A. S. and B. Schneider (2002). Trust in Schools: A core resource for school improvement. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Bryk, A. S. and B. Schneider (2003). "Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform." Educational Leadership **60**(6): 40-44.

Burt, R. S. and M. Knez (1996). Trust and third-party gossip. Trust in organizations. R. M. Kramer and T. R. Tyler. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage**:** 68-89.

Butler, J. (1991). "Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: evolution of a conditions of trust inventory." Journal of Management **17**: 643-663.

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

Carnevale, D. G. and B. Wechsler (1992). "Trust in the public sector: Individual and organizational determinants." Administration & Society **23**: 471-494.

Clark, M. S. and K. Chrisman (1994). Resource allocation in intimate relationships. Perspectives on close relationships. A. Weber and J. Harvey. Boston, Allyn and Bacon**:** 176-192.

Cloke, K. and J. Goldsmith (2002). The end of management and the rise of organizational democracy. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Coleman, J. S. (1990). Foundations of social theory. Cambridge, MA, Press of Harvard Univserity Press.

Corazzini, J. G. (1977). "Trust as a complex multi-dimensional construct." Psychological Reports **40**: 75-80.

Corbin, J. and A. Strauss (1990). "Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria." Qualitative Sociology **13**(1): 3-21.

Cosner, S. (2009). "Building organizational capacity through trust." Educational Administration Quarterly **45**(2): 248-291.

Crotty, M. (1998). The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process. London, SAGE.

Cummings, L. L. and P. Bromiley (1996). The organizational trust inventory: OTI. Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research. R. M. Kramer and T. R. Tyler. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage**:** 302-330.

Currall, S. C. and T. A. Judge (1995). "Measuring trust between organizational boundary role persons." Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes **64**(2): 151-170.

Dasgupta, P. (1988). Trust as a commodity. In Gambetta, D. (Ed.) Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations. New York, Blackwell.

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**(2): 123-139.

Deutsch, M. (1962). Cooperation and trust:Some theoretical notes. Nebraska symposium on motivation. Lincoln, Nebraska University Press.

Deutsch, M. (1973). The resolution of conflict. New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.

Dietz, G. (2004). "Partnership and the development of trust in British workplaces." Human Resource Management Journal **14**(1): 5-24.

Dietz, G. (2011). "Going back to the source: Why do people trust each other?" Journal of Trust Research **1**(2): 215-222.

Dietz, G. and D. N. Den Hartog (2006). "Measuring trust inside organisations." Personnel Review **35**(5): 557-588.

Dirks, K. T., R. J. Lewicki, et al. (2009). "Repairing relationships within and between organizations: Building a conceptual foundation." Academy of Management Review **34**(1): 68-84.

Dobing, B. (1993). Building trust in user-analyst relationships., Carlson School of Management, University of Minnesota.

Driver, M. J., G. Russell, et al. (1968). Studies of the social and psychological aspects of verification, inspection and international assurance. Technical Report #4.1. Lafayette, IN, Purdue University.

Duck, S. (1988). Relating to others. Bristol, England, Open University Press.

Eayrs, M. A. (1993). "Time, trust and hazard: Hairdressers' symbolic roles." Symbolic Interaction **16**: 19-37.

Ekeh, P. P. (1974). Social exchange theory. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Elangovan, A. R. and D. L. Shapiro (1998). "Betrayal of trust in organizations." Academy of Management Review **23**(3): 547-566.

Emerson, R. M. (1962). "Power dependence relations." American Sociological Review **27**: 31-41.

Enz, C. A. (1988). "The value of role congruity in intra-organizational power." Administrative Science Quarterly **33**: 284-304.

Eoyang, C. (1994). Models of espionage. Citizen espionage: Studies in trust and betrayal. T. Sarbin, R. Carney and C. Eoyang. Westport, CT, Praeger**:** 69-91.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: youth and crisis. New York, Norton.

Folger, R. and R. Cropanzano (1998). <u>Organizational justice and human resource management.</u> Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Fox, A. (1974). <u>Beyond contract: Work, power and trust relations</u>. London, Faber.

Frost, A., D. V. Stimpson, et al. (1978). "Some correlates of trust." <u>The Journal of Psychology</u> **99**: 103-108.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). <u>Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity</u>. New York, Simon and Schuster.

Gabarro, J. J. (1978). The development of trust, influence, and expectations. <u>Interpersonal behavior: Communication and understanding in relationships.</u> A. G. Athos and J. J. Gabarrow. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall**:** 290-303.

Gambetta, D. (1988). <u>Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations</u>. New York, Blackwell.

Gamoran, A., R. Gunter, et al. (2005). Professional community by design: Building social capital through teacher professional development. <u>The social organization of schooling</u>. L. V. Hedges and B. Schneider. New York, Russell Sage**:** 111-126.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). <u>Studies in ethnomethodology.</u> Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

Gargiulo, M. and M. Benassi (1999). The dark side of social capital. <u>Corporate social capital and liability</u>. R. Leenders and S. Gabbay. Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers**:** 298-322.

Geis, G. (1994). Trade secret theft as an analogue to treason. <u>Citizen espionage: Studies in trust and betrayal.</u> T. Sarbin, R. Carney and C. Eoyang. Westport, CT, Praeger**:** 127-142.

Giacalone, R. and J. Greenberg (1997). <u>Antisocial behavior in organizations</u>. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Giffin, K. (1967). "The contribution of studies of source credibility to a theory of interpersonal trust in the communication process." <u>Psychological Bulletin.</u> **68**(2): 104-120.

Glaser, B. (2011). <u>Getting out of the data: Grounded theory conceptualizations</u>, Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. and A. L. Strauss (1967). <u>The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research</u>. Chicago, Aldine.

Glaser, B. G. (1978). <u>Theoretical sensitivity</u>. Mill Valley, CA, Sociology Press.

Goddard, R. D. (2003). "Relational networks, social trust, and norms: A social capital perspective on students' chances of academic success." <u>Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis</u> **25**: 59-74.

Goddard, R. D., W. K. Hoy, et al. (2000). "Collective Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning, Measure, and Impact on Student Achievement." <u>American Educational Research Journal</u> **37**(2): 479-507.

Goddard, R. D., M. Tschannen-Moran, et al. (2001). "A Multilevel Examination of the Distribution and Effects of Teacher Trust in Students and Parents in Urban Elementary Schools." <u>The Elementary School Journal</u> **102**(1): 3-17.

Goffman, E. (1967). <u>Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.</u> Garden City, NY, Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1971). <u>Relations in public.</u> New York, Basic Books.

Golembiewski, R. T. and M. McConkie (1975). <u>The centrality of interpersonal trust in group processes</u>. London, John Wiley and Sons.

Good, D. (1988). Individuals, interpersonal relations, and trust. <u>Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations.</u> D. Gambetta. New York, Blackwell**:** 31-48.

Gove, P. B. (1981). Webster's third new international dictionary of the English language. P. B. Gove. Springfield, MA, Merriam-Webster.

Granovetter, M. (1985). "Economics action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness." <u>American Journal of Sociology</u> **91**: 481-510.

Greenberg, J. (1997). The STEAL motive: Managing the social determinants of employee theft. <u>Antisocial behavior in organizations</u>. R. Giacalone and J. Greenberg. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage**:** 85-108.

Grootaert, C. and T. van Bastelaer (2002). <u>The role of social capital in development: An empirical assessment</u>. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.

Grover, S. L. (1993). "Lying, deceit and subterfuge: A model of dishonesty in the workplace." <u>Organization Science</u> **4**: 478-495.

Grover, S. L. (1997). Lying in organizations: Theory, research and future directions. Antisocial behavior in organizations. R. Giacalone and J. Greenberg. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Hargreaves, A. (2007). Sustainable professional learning communities. Professional learning communities: Divergence, depth and dilemmas. L. Stoll and K. S. Louis. London, Open University: 181-195.

Hargreaves, D. H. (2001). "A capital theory of school effectiveness and improvement." British Educational Research Journal 27: 487-503.

Harris, G. M. (1994). Trust and betrayal in the workplace: The subordinate's point of view. Salt Lake City, University of Utah.

Hazan, C. and P. R. Shaver (1994). "Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships." Psychological Inquiry 5(1): 1-22.

Hogan, R. and J. Hogan (1994). The mask of integrity. Citizen espionage: Studies in trust and betrayal. T. Sarbin, R. Carney and C. Eoyang. Westport, CT, Praeger: 107-125.

Holton, J. A. (2010). "The coding process and its challenges." The Grounded Theory Review 9(1): 21-40.

Hope-Hailey, V., R. H. Searle, et al. (2012). "Organisational effectiveness: How trust helps." People Management.Co.UK(March).

Hosmer, L. T. (1995). "Trust: the connecting link between organizational theory and ethics." Academy of Management Review 20: 379-400.

Hoy, W. K. and M. Tschannen-Moran (1999). "Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation inurban elementary schools." Journal of School Leadership 9: 184-208.

Huston, T. L. (1983). Power. Close Relationships. H. H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensenet al. New York, W.H. Freeman: 169-219.

Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). Shattered assumptions. New York, Free.

Johns, G. (1996). Organizational behavior: Understanding and managing work at life. New York, Harper Collins.

Johnson-George, C. and W. C. Swap (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. and J. M. George (1998). "The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork." Academy of Management Review **23**(3): 531-546.

Jones, W. and M. P. Burdette (1994). Betrayal in relationships. Perspectives on close relationships. A. Weber and J. Harvey. Boston, Allyn and Bacon**:** 243-262.

Kee, H. W. and R. E. Knox (1970). "Conceptual and methodological considerations in the study of trust and suspicion." Journal of Conflict Resolution **14**: 357-366.

Kim, P. H., K. T. Dirks, et al. (2006). "When more blame is better than less: The implications of internal vs. external attributions for the repair of trust after a competence- vs. integrity-based trust violation." Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes **99**: 49-65.

Kim, P. H., D. L. Ferrin, et al. (2004). "Removing the shadow of suspicion: The effects of apology vs. denial for repairing ability- vs. integrity based trust violations." Journal of Applied Psychology **89**: 104-118.

Kochanek, J. (2005). Building trust for better schools: Research-based practices. Thousand Oaks, CA, Corwin Press.

Kramer, R. M. (1994). "The sinister attribution error: Paranoid cognition and collective distrust in organizations." Motivation and emotion **18**: 199-230.

Kramer, R. M. (1999). "Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions." Annual Review of Psychology **50**(1): 569.

Kramer, R. M. and T. R. Tyler (1996). Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research. Thousand Oaks, SAGE.

Krishna, A. and N. Uphoff (2002). Mapping and measuring social capital through assessment of collective action to conserve and develop watersheds in Rajasthan, India. The role of social capital in development: An empirical assessment. C. Grootaert and T. van Bastelaer. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press**:** 85-124.

Kumar, R. (2011). Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners. LA, SAGE.

Lake, T. and A. Hills (1979). Affairs: The anatomy of extramarital relationships. London, Open Books.

Leana, C. R. and H. J. Van Buren (1999). "Organizational social capital and employment practices." Academy of Management Review **24**: 538-555.

Lewicki, R. J. (1983). Lying and deception: A behavioral model. Negotiating in organizations. M. Bazerman and R. J. Lewicki. Beverly Hills, CA, Sage**:** 68-90.

Lewicki, R. J. and B. B. Bunker (1995). Trust in relationships: A model of development and decline. Conflict, coorperation and justice. B. B. Bunker and J. Z. Rubin. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass**:** 133-173.

Lewicki, R. J. and B. B. Bunker (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research. R. M. Kramer and T. R. Tyler. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage**:** 114-139.

Lewicki, R. J., D. J. McAllister, et al. (1998). "Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities." Academy of Management Review **23**(3): 438-458.

Lewis, J. D. and A. J. Weigert (1985). "Trust as a social reality." Social Forces **63(4)**(967-985).

Lin, N. (2001). Social capital: A theory of social structure and action. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, Y., S. A. Lynham, et al. (2011). The Sage handbook of qualitative research. London, SAGE.

Lindskold, S. and R. Bennett (1973). "Attributing trust and conciliatory intent from coercive power capability." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology **28**: 180-186.

Locke, K. (2001). Grounded theory in management research. London, Sage.

Louis, K. S. (2007). "Trust and improvement in schools." Journal of educational change **8**(1): 1-24.

Luhmann, N. (1979). Trust and power. Chichester, England, Wiley.

March, J. G. and H. A. Simon (1958). Organizations. New York, Wiley.

Mayer, R. C. and J. H. Davis (1999). "The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: a field quasi-experiment." Journal of Applied Psychology **84**(1): 123-136.

Mayer, R. C., J. H. Davis, et al. (1995). "An integrative model of organisational trust." Academy of Management Review **20(3)**: 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.

McEvily, B., V. Perrone, et al. (2003). "Trust as an organizing principle." Organization Science **14**(1): 91-103.

McGregor, D. (1967). The professional manager. New York, McGraw-Hill.

McKnight, D. H. and N. L. Chervany (1996). Trust formation in new organizational relationships, Carlson School of Management, University of Minnesota.

McKnight, D. H. and N. L. Chervany (2001). Trust and distrust definitions: One bite at a time. Trust in cyber-societies. R. Falcone, M. Singh and Y. H. Tan. Berlin and Heidelberg, Springer-Verlag**:** 27-54.

McKnight, D. H., L. L. Cummings, et al. (1998). "Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships." Academy of Management Review **23**(3): 473-490.

McLain, D. L. and B. K. Hackman (1995). Trust and risk taking in organizations., Virginia State University.

Mellinger, G. D. (1956). "Interpersonal trust as a factor in communication." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology **52**: 304-309.

Meyerson, D., K. E. Weick, et al. (1996). Swift trust and temporary groups. Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research. R. M. Kramer and T. R. Tyler. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage**:** 166-195.

Miles, M. B. and A. M. Huberman (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source book. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Miller, G. J. (2004). Monitoring, rules and the control paradox: Can the good soldier Svejk be trusted? Trust and distrust in organizations. R. M. Kramer and K. S. Cook. New York, Russell Sage Foundation**:** 99-126.

Mishra, A. K. (1993). Breaking down organizational boundaries during crisis: The role of mutual trust, Pennsylvannia State University.

Mishra, A. K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research. R. M. Kramer and T. R. Tyler. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage**:** 261-287.

Misztal, B. A. (1996). Trust in modern societies. Cambridge, MA, Blackwell.

Morris, J. H. and D. J. Moberg (1994). <u>Work organizations as contexts for trust and betrayal. In T.Sarbin, R. Carney and C. Eoyang (Eds)</u>. Westport, CT, Praeger.

Muijs, D. and A. Harris (2006). "Teacher-led school improvement: Teacher leadership in the UK." <u>Teaching and Teacher Education</u> **22**: 961-972.

Mulford, B. (2007). Building social capital in professional learning communities: Importance, challenges and a way forward. <u>Professional learning communities: Divergence, depth and dilemmas</u>. L. Stoll and K. S. Louis. London, Open University**:** 166-180.

Nakayachi, K. and M. Watabe (2005). "Restoring trustworthiness after adverse events: The signalling effects of voluntary "hostage posting" on trust." <u>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</u> **97**: 1-17.

Neuman, J. and R. Baron (1997). Aggression in the workplace. <u>Antisocial behavior in organizations.</u> R. Giacalone and J. Greenberg. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage**:** 37-67.

Neuman, W. L. (2000). <u>Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches</u>. Boston, Allyn & Bacon.

Ohbuchi, K. (1994). The role of apology in accounts to victims of destructive action. State University of New York, Buffalo.

Ohbuchi, K., M. Kameda, et al. (1989). "Apology as aggression control: Its role in mediating appraisal of and response to harm." <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u> **56**: 219-227.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). <u>Qualitative evaluation and research methods</u>. Beverly Hills, CA, Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). <u>Qualitative research and evaluation methods</u>. Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). <u>Making democracy work:Civic traditions in modern Italy</u>. NJ, Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). <u>Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.</u> New York, Simon and Schuster.

Read, W. H. (1962). "Upward communication in industrial hierarchies." <u>Human Relations</u> **15**(3): 3-15.

Rempel, J. K., J. G. Holmes, et al. (1985). "Trust in close relationships." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology **49**: 95-112.

Ren, H. and B. Gray (2009). "Repairing relationship conflict: How violation types and culture influence the effectiveness of restoration rituals." Academy of Management Review **34**(1): 105-126.

Riessman, C. K. (1993). Narrative analysis. Newbury Park, CA, Sage.

Riker, W. H. (1971). The nature of trust. Perspectives on social power. J. T. Tedeschi. Chicago, Aldine**:** 63-81.

Ring, P. S. and A. H. Van de Ven (1994). "Developmental processes of cooperative interorganizational relationships." Academy of Management Review **19**: 90-118.

Riordan, C. A., N. A. Marlin, et al. (1983). "The effectiveness of accounts following transgression." Social Psychology Quarterly **46**: 213-219.

Robinson, S. and R. Bennett (1995). "A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multi-dimensional scaling study." Academy of Management Journal **38**: 555-572.

Rotter, J. B. (1967). "A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust1." Journal of Personality **35**(4): 651-665.

Rotter, J. B. (1980). "Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility." American Psychologist **35**(1): 1-7.

Rousseau, D. M., S. B. Sitkin, et al. (1998). "Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust." Academy of Management Review **23**(3): 393-404.

Sarbin, T. R. (1994). A criminological approach to security violations. Citizen espionage: Studies in trust and betrayal. T. Sarbin, R. Carney and C. Eoyang. Westport, CT, Praeger**:** 107-125.

Scanzoni, J. (1979). Social exchange and behavioral interdependence. Social exchange in developing relationships. R. L. Burgess and T. L. Huston. New York, Academic Press**:** 61-98.

Scheibe, K. (1994). The temptations of espionage. Citizen espionage: Studies in trust and betrayal. T. Sarbin, R. Carney and C. Eoyang. Westport, CT, Praeger**:** 1994.

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations. Monterey, CA, Brooks/Cole.

Schlenker, B. R., B. A. Pontari, et al. (2001). "Excuses and character: Personal and social implications of excuses." Personality and Social Psychology Review **5**: 15-31.

Schniter, E., R. M. Sheremeta, et al. (2013). "Building and rebuilding trust with promises and apologies." Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization **94**: 242-256.

Schoorman, F. D., R. C. Mayer, et al. (2007). "An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future." Academy of Management Review **32**(2): 344-354.

Searle, R. H. and G. Dietz (2012). "Editorial: Trust and HRM: Current insights and future directions." Human Resource Management Journal **22**(4): 333-342.

Seligman, A. B. (1997). The problem of trust. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Serageldin, I. and C. Grootaert (2000). Defining social capital: An integrating view. Social capital: A multifaceted perspective. P. Dasgupta and I. Serageldin. Washington, DC, World Bank**:** 40-58.

Shapiro, D. L., R. J. Lewicki, et al. (1995). When do employees choose descriptive tactics to stop unwanted change? A relational perspective. Research on negotiation in organizations. R. Lewicki, B. Sheppard and R. Bies. Greenwich, CT, JAI Press. **5:** 155-184.

Shapiro, S. P. (1987). "The social control of impersonal trust." The American Journal of Sociology **93**(3): 623-658.

Shepard, J. and L. Hartenian (1991). "Egoistic and ethical orientation of university students toward work-related decisions." Journal of Business Ethics **10**: 303.

Simons, T. L. (1999). "Behavioral integrity as a critical ingredient for transformational leadership." Journal of organizational change **12**: 89-104.

Simpson, J. A. (2007). "Psychological foundations of trust." Current Directions in Psychological Science **16**(5): 264-268.

Sitkin, S. B. and R. J. Bies (1993). "Social accounts in conflict situations: Using explanations to manage conflict." Human Relations **46**: 349-370.

Sitkin, S. B. and N. L. Roth (1993). "Explaining the limited effectiveness of legalistic "remedies" for distrust/distrust." Organizational Science **4**: 367-392.

Slovic, P. (1993). "Perceived risk, trust, and democracy." Risk Analysis **13**: 675-682.

Smith, P. A., W. K. Hoy, et al. (2001). "Organizational health in high schools and dimensions of faculty trust." Journal of School Leadership **12**: 135-150.

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.

Solomon, R. C. and F. Flores (2001). Building trust in business, politics, relationships, and life. New York, Oxford University Press.

Strauss, A. and J. Corbin (1998). Basics of qualtitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE.

Swan, J. E., I. F. J. Trawick, et al. (1988). "Measurig dimensions of purchaser trust of individual salespeople." Journal of personal selling and sales management **8**(1): 1-9.

Taylor, R. G. (1989). "The role of trust in labor-management relations." Organization Development Journal **summer**: 85-89.

Trevino, L. K. (1986). "Ethical decision-making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model." Academy of Management Review **11**: 601-617.

Trevino, L. K. and S. A. Youngblood (1990). "Bad apples in bad barrels: A casual analysis of ethical decision-making." Journal of Applied Psychology **75**: 378-385.

Troman, G. (2000). "Teacher stress in low-trust society." British Journal of Sociology of Education **21**(3): 331-353.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). "Collaboration and the need for trust." Journal of Educational Administration **39**: 308-331.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004). Trust matters. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). "Fostering teacher professionalism in schools." Educational Administration Quarterly **45**(2): 217-247.

Tschannen-Moran, M., A. W. Hoy, et al. (1998). "Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure." Review of Educational Research **68**(2): 202-248.

Tschannen-Moran, M. and W. K. Hoy (2000). "A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust." Review of Educational Research **70**(4): 547-593.

Tzafrir, S. S. (2005). "The relationship between trust, HRM practices and firm performance." International Journal of Human Resource Management **16**(9): 1600-1622.

Uline, C., D. Miller, et al. (1998). "Underlying dimensions of school effectiveness." Educational Administration Quarterly **34**: 462-483.

Uphoff, N. (2000). Understanding social capital: Learning from the analysis and experience of participation. Social capital: A multifaceted perspective. P. Dasgupta and I. Serageldin. Washington, DC, World Bank**:** 215-259.

van Houtte, M. (2006). "Tracking and teacher satisfaction: Role of study culture and trust." Journal of Educational Research **99**: 247-254.

Van Maele, D. and M. Van Houtte (2009). "Faculty trust and organizational school characteristics." Educational Administration Quarterly **45**(4): 556-589.

Webb, E. J. (1996). Trust and crisis. Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research. R. M. Kramer and T. R. Tyler. Thousand Oaks, Sage**:** 288-301.

Weick, K. E. and K. Roberts (1993). "Collective mind in organizations: heedful interrelating on flight decks." Administrative Science Quarterly **38**: 357-381.

Whitener, E. M., S. E. Brodt, et al. (1998). "Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior." Academy of Management Review **23**(3): 513-530.

Williamson, O. E. (1993). "Calculativeness, trust, and economic organization." Journal of Law and Economics **36**: 453-486.

Worchel, P. (1979). Trust and distrust. The social psychology of intergroup relations. W. G. Austin and S. Worchel. Belmont, CA, Wadsworth.

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. (1991). Interpersonal trust and attitudes toward human nature. Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes. J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver and L. S. Wrightsman. San Diego, Academic Press. **1:** 373-412.

Zand, D. (1972). "Trust and managerial problem solving." <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u> **17**: 229-239.

Zand, D. E. (1997). <u>The leadership triad:knowledge, trust and power.</u> New York, Oxford University Press.

Zeffane, R. and J. Connell (2003). "Trust and HRM in the new millenium." <u>The International Journal of Human Resource Management</u> **14**(1): 3-11.

Zucker, L. (1986). "Production of trust: Institutional sources of economic structure, 1940-1920. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.)." <u>Research in organizational behaviour</u> **8**: 53-111.