THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DECISION MAKING AND TRUST: A STUDY OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN EDINBURG, TEXAS

by

Benito Garza

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Capella University

July 2005

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DECISION MAKING AND TRUST: A STUDY OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN EDINBURG, TEXAS

by

Benito Garza

has been approved

July 2005

APPROVED:

ROBERT RODRIGUEZ, Ph.D., Faculty Mentor and Chair

KEITH GRANT, Ph.D., Committee Member

CURTIS BRANT, Ph.D., Committee Member

JERRY PULLEY, ED.D., Committee Member

BRENNAN MAHONEY, Committee Member

ACCEPTED AND SIGNED:

ROBERT RODRIGUEZ, Ph.D.

Kurt Linberg, Ph.D.
Executive Director, School of Business

Abstract

This was an exploratory study bounded by geograpahic location. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between trust and decision making among principals and teachers in schools employed in Edinburg, Texas. The purpose was also to examine the impact of gender and race on that relationship. The Pearson product-moment correlation between trust and decision making among teachers and principals was found to be significant. Gender and race did not serve as moderating variables in this relationship. It was recommended that future studies be conducted with a more diverse sample population and additional school districts to further validate the findings of this study.

Dedication

This is dedicated to my dad, Vidal Garza Jr. II. He taught me to listen to my elders.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to a wonderful person, Lydia Ramos Garza. She taught me the value of an education. Also, to all the members of my dissertation committee-Dr. Robert Rodriguez, who knows the value of being honest. Dr. Keith Grant, who made me a better writer. Dr. Curtis Brant, who is my friend. Dr. Jerry Pulley, my favorite education professor. Brennan Mahoney, my fellow learner, who encouraged me throughout this intellectual pursuit.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

Leadership in the educational environment has reflected many of the same trends and changes that are presented in the leadership literature in business and society. One trend that has been the subject of considerable educational research in recent years is teacher empowerment in the form of decision making (Anderson, 2003; Davis & Wilson, 2000).

In the business arena, empowerment in the form of decision making is based on the premise that individuals who are closest to the effects of the decision should be included in the decision-making process (Schmoker, 1992). Research in business and education has shown that participation in the decision-making process improves accountability, motivation, and morale (David, 1989; Peters, 1990; White, 1989).

As applied to education, an early study by Rappaport (1987) described empowerment as "a joining of personal competencies and abilities to environments that provide opportunities for choice and autonomy in demonstrating those competencies" (p.122). Dunst (cited in Short & Rinehart, 1992) suggested that

> empowerment consists of two issues: (a) enabling experiences, provided within an organization that fosters autonomy, choice, control, and responsibility, which (b) allow the individual to display existing competencies as well as learn new competencies that support and strengthen functioning. (p. 952)

Shared decision making (SDM) is a term used in education to describe empowering models of decision making. The rationale of SDM is that those who are closest to student learning are best equipped to make educational decisions; therefore, teachers play key roles in

determining school policies and practices (Peterson, Kubilary, & Martin, 1995). With empowerment, a teacher's autonomy is enhanced (Lange, 1993). While decentralizing and restructuring educational organizations have opened the door for greater participation and involvement in decision making, research has revealed both positive and negative aspects of decision-making (Chase, 1991; Conley, 1991; Elenbogen & Hiestand, 1989; Huddleston, 1991; Liontos, 1994; Reyes, 1992; Sebring & Camburn, 1992; Weiss, 1992, 1993). The perceptions of teachers and administrators toward shared decision making also differ. In some cases the teachers perceive having little influence, while their principals perceive teachers as having a great deal of influence (Peters, 1990). Further, shared decision-making initiatives require administrators to trust the discretion of teachers making decisions (Smylie & Hart, 1999). Trust is critical if schools are to function cooperatively and cohesively and in a way that maximizes student learning (Goldring & Rallis, 1993; Louis, Kruse, & Marks, 1996). This study focused on the degree of trust teachers in one district in Texas have in their principals relative to their involvement in decision making.

Background of the Study

A predominant theme in the literature since the late 1980s and in the 1990s has been school restructuring to decentralize power and redistribute it down to the individual school-based administrators and teachers in terms of shared decision making (Bergman, 1992; Brost, 2000; Comer, 1993; Conley & Bacharach, 1990; Lange, 1993). Shared decision making is one approach to school restructuring and is based on the theory of participative decision making in which authority for some important decisions is shared by administrators with members of the

organization and key stakeholders (Brown & Hunter, 1998; Goldman, Dunlap & Conley, 1993; Hart, 1995; Hoy &Tarter, 1993).

In shared decision making in schools, input is obtained from teachers, parents, administrators, and members of the community for key educational policy decisions. In this way, all who are involved in the decision making become empowered to affect the quality of education for children (Keedy & Finch, 1994).

Shared decision making in the schools is important because teachers, parents, and community members all have a voice in determining school policy. Supporters of shared decision making argue that it has the potential to encourage more democratic school organization (Bergman, 1992; Cranston, 2000; Hart, 1995; Hoy & Tarter, 1993; Quinn & Troy-Quinn, 2000).

Some of the benefits of shared decision making that have been cited in the literature include the following: (a) facilitates better decision making and encourages teachers to assume greater responsibility for what happens in a school (Keith & Girling, 1991); (b) increases teacher job satisfaction (Flannery, 1980); (c) enhances acceptance of selected decisions by all stakeholders (Keith & Girling, 1991); (d) increases teacher efficacy (Briggs & Wohlstetter, 1999); (f) and contributes to improved student achievement (Dismuke, 1993).

However, shared decision making has been criticized as superficial and untruthful because in many instances teachers are asked to be involved in decisions that are already a foregone conclusion (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990). In schools where shared decision making takes place, investigative research has shown that teachers' willingness to participate actively in shared decision-making varies according to the nature of the relationship between teachers and principal (Smylie, 1992). Willingness also varies according to the nature of school-wide issues,

such as the school's mission and selection of instructional materials (Griffin, 1995; Livingston, Slate, & Gibbs, 1999).

Briggs and Wohlstetter (1999) asserted that there is a need for a more genuine shared decision making where principals and teachers make decisions jointly and where teacher's competence and insights are actually taken into consideration in the decision-making process. This means that principals, teachers, and other stakeholders must learn new roles and exhibit new ways of leadership; teachers lend their expertise, and principals become facilitators rather than authoritative managers (Blasé & Blase, 1999; Clift, Veal, Holland, Johnson & McCarthy, 1995).

It is generally acknowledged that the principal plays an important role in shared decision making (Brown, 1990; Clift et al., 1995; Smylie, 1992; Strusinksi, 1991). Shared decision making requires a shift in the leadership role by the principal. Liontos (1994) emphasized that the idea behind shared decision making is not to replace the principal as a school leader, but to incorporate the principal into a decision-making team. Principals are most effective on shared decision-making teams when they share decision-making power rather than exercise authoritative power (Goldman et al., 1993; Heller & Firestone, 1995) and when they guide the process of establishing a vision for reform efforts in teaching, learning, and innovation (Goldman et al., 1993; Heller & Firestone, 1995; Keedy & Finch, 1994; Weiss & Cambone, 1994).

Shared decision making and teacher empowerment as new forms of school governance that have emerged as a result of school restructuring depend on trust (Anderson, 2003; Dunn, 1996). The Hoy and Tarter (1995) model of shared decision making suggests that principals must trust their faculty before teachers will be willing to engage in the collaborative activities that are part of shared decision making. Trust plays an important role in overcoming barriers to

collaboration, including conflict avoidance, destructive competitiveness, and low levels of teacher efficacy (Leonard, 1999). When principals trust teachers, teachers, in turn, show a greater level of trust in the principal (Dunn, 1996).

Statement of the Problem

In theory, the classroom is a naturally empowered decision-making environment for teachers. Teachers are able to maintain student discipline and civility and provide instruction. In the ideal situation, teachers are the center of the educational organization with the support network in place where needed. For true empowerment to take place, teachers are involved in decisions that directly affect their work. This allows teachers to maintain their natural supports, such as other teachers, and not be dependent upon and controlled by the administration.

The problem relative to teacher decision making is threefold, however. First, administrators often disempower teachers by limiting the decisions they are allowed to make. For example, Spaulding's (1994) study of one principal found that on the surface, he appeared to participate in shared decision making at his school. In reality, however, he was consciously manipulating the decision-making process by planting ideas, pressuring opponents, and showing favoritism to supporters. His view of himself as the chief source of decisions in effect disempowered teachers.

Second, administrators' perceptions of the decision-making power of teachers may often differ from the reality of that power. Enderlin-Lampe's (2002) examination of teacher perception of level of participation in shared decision making illustrated not only the general confusion that exists about the types of decisions that can or should be by teachers but also a gap between

administrators and teachers regarding expectations of the level and influence of teacher decision making.

Third, public schools are highly regulated and bureaucratic and not conductive to an environment of trust (Calgary Board of Education, 1999; Fukyama, 1995). In such environments principals cannot sufficiently empower teachers and draw out the best in them (Blasé, Blasé, Anderson, & Dungan, 1995; Sergiovanni, 1990). As a result, teachers who do not experience being empowered are unlikely to have the emotional energy to empower their students toward achievement (Dunn, 1996; Lee & Smith, 1994)).

Purpose of the Study

Trust is a multifaceted concept and functions in many ways. This elusive construct has long been considered important for a variety of organizational processes including organizational communication (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 1999). It has a far ranging influence on many other organizational factors such as job satisfaction, positive organizational behaviors, and cooperation, just to name a few. According to the research, trust is a key factor for successful collaborative relationships. It also increases cooperation, thereby leading to openness in communication and information sharing (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 1999).

In addition, there are different types of trust. Competence trust, for example, emphasizes reliance on team skills (or the skills of those with whom a collaboration contract has been initiated such as the relationship between the school principal and teachers) and professional knowledge (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 1999). Predictability trust, on the other hand, emphasizes reliability in collaborators' consistent behaviors that provide sufficient knowledge for the decision maker to make predictions and judgments due to prior experiences. Thus, a chain of

positive consistent behaviors makes collaborating partners reliable, predictable, and therefore trustworthy.

But trust is believed to have an even greater influence on the decision making of others and in this context, was perhaps the most important concept especially to the present research. However, more empirical research is necessary to confirm the importance of this relationship in specific educational facilities and in terms of the degree and level to which it exists. In today's more turbulent educational environment filled with change in processes and organizational relationships, there has been a renewed interest in organizational trust, especially as it relates to job satisfaction and organization effectiveness (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 1999). While change is inevitable and constant in a school organization, change effort will result in both collective and individual growth whenever it has been planned, is positive, and is influenced by trust leading to high levels of communication.

Thus, the purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between trust and decision making among principals and teachers in schools in Edinburg, Texas. It also examined the impact of gender and race on the relationship between trust and decision making. Trust has been extensively explored by a variety of disciplines, including education, economics, social psychology, and political science. In addition, trust and its relationship to shared decision-making has been the subject of numerous journal articles and books (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Blasé et al., 1995; Cranston, 2000). Some studies have attempted to measure trust between teachers and principals (Bulach & Peterson, 1999; Ceyanes & MacNeil, 1998). However, few empirical studies have addressed the relationship of teachers' participation in shared decision making and their level of trust in their principal. Therefore, this study examined the relationship between

trust and decision making among principals and teachers in schools in Edinburg, Texas and included an examination of the impact of gender and race on that relationship. Questions pertaining to whether or not a relationship exists between levels of trust and shared decision making and whether or not gender and race impact that relationship and have any effect on an individual's perception of decision-making power were answered by the present research.

Research Rationale and Questions

Trust and its relationship to participatory decision making, the two major variables under study in this investigation were selected because theory and research suggest they may be related (Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Tschannen-Moran & Goddard, 2000; Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998). Researchers on decision making have indicated that for principals to be effective leaders and collaborate effectively and successfully with teachers, for example, they need to learn to demonstrate an ability to work collectively with their staff (Anderson, 2003; Blasé, Blasé, Anderson, & Dungan, 1995; Cranston, 2000). This type of leadership has been defined as participative management style. Researchers have also indicated that trust will facilitate this ability because it leads to improved communication, information distribution, job satisfaction, and a number of other related variables (Eaker, DuFour, & Burnette, 2002; Fairholm, 1994; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

Trust, especially as it influences successful and effective decision making in the school organization, has been noted in the literature as one of the most commonly recognized and widely defined philosophical concepts (Bryk & Schneider, 1996; Shaw, 1997). As previously noted, trust and its relationship to shared decision making in the business world has been the subject of numerous research studies, investigations, books, and reports (Blasé & Blase, 1999;

Blasé et al., 1995; Cranston, 2000). But in spite of its position and noted importance, especially within the current education system, little focus and empirical attention has been given to identifying the relationship of the levels of trust to teacher and principal decision making in today's educational institutions. Of interest is the fact that teacher participation in school decision making emerged back in 1990 as a most important and central theme in the educational reform movement of the times (Anderson, 2003).

Even fewer investigative research studies were found that have attempted to measure trust between teachers and principals (Bulach & Peterson, 1999; Ceyanes & MacNeil, 1998). No empirical studies were found that explored the depth or level of the relationship between trust and decision making among teachers and principals and focused on one school or school system in particular. This paucity of data on the subject at hand lends importance and significance to the present research investigation.

While consensus appears to be building concerning the importance of the relationship between trust and decision-making participation in the educational environment, the literature still provides little substantive guidance concerning the meaning of participation and the level of the association. Nevertheless, building trust and shared decision making are important processes in organizations, regardless of their type or client base (Daft, 2000; Davis & Wilson, 2000; Fairholm, 1994). They are important elements in the social relationships that occur. They are a part of the dynamics of organizational life, in that they are major components of change.

Clearly, generating trust in the educational environment is a complex and uncertain process, depending on the individuals or groups involved and the degree of social exchange that is present which leads to improved communication (Hoy & Tarter, 1995; Hoy & Tschannen-

Moran, 1999). Researchers and practitioners have defined decision-making participation in a variety of ways, but often not aware of the tremendous influence of the variable of trust (Ceyanes & MacNeil, 1998). It would seem that the research has not moved much beyond depicting decision making as a function of managerial tasks. Researchers have also concluded that cooperation and communication are links to trust and trust building, and that an organizational environment is the key to encouraging trusting behavior (Brost, 2000; Daft, 2000). But in the educational environment, little information in this regard can be found. Yet it is known that in social exchange, when trust is high, styles that empower others can be used. These include problem-solving, flexible compromising, firm compromising, conceding, and yielding. When trust is low, styles that protect the individual's own power are safer; for example, forcing, contending, protecting, smoothing, and withdrawing (Kuku & Taylor, 2002; Patterson-Weston, 2000).

It becomes apparent that there is an important relationship between trust and decision making, especially in the school environment and especially as related to levels of communication. To achieve the purpose of the study and resolve the study problem, as stated above, two important research questions were developed for this investigative study by this researcher: These are stated as follows: Is there a relationship between trust and decision making and if so, what direction would that relationship be? In addition, how would factors such as gender and race affect that relationship?

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because one person alone cannot solve the problems facing public schools and their respective school systems in the new millennium. Rather, effective

solutions will require collaborative efforts (Clift & McCarthy, 1995; Leonard, 1999; Tschannen-Moran & Goddard, 2000). Not only are educational institutions facing greater changes and at a faster rate than ever before, but it is a predicted fact that the rate of such change will probably continue to increase (Anderson, 2003; Brost, 2000; Kuku & Taylor, 2002; Patterson-Weston, 2000).

Because educational facilities today are facing greater changes at a more rapid pace than ever before, the relationship between trust and shared decision making assumes an even greater importance. Diversity among student populations in terms of race and ethnicity has significantly expanded, for example. Teachers and principals must now deal with many cultures, many languages, and many different types of students, including the disabled and mentally challenged. Clearly, this rate of such change will probably continue to increase for quite some time.

In shared decision making, principals collaborate with teachers and make use of their "front line" expertise to solve problems and work toward creating schools that will produce successful students. But many teachers feel a general sense of powerlessness and helplessness-that is, they feel that their decisions do not really count (Brost, 2000; Dunn, 1996). Teachers must believe that their decision-making power contributes to meaningful change both personally and within their own respective schools. Such change is most likely to be more permanent when those who are involved in it feel a sense of ownership and responsibility for the process.

Research on trust in the school context and on the relationship of trust and shared decision making is scarce and as a result, there are a number of unanswered issues and questions. Understanding trust and how it works between the various organizational levels in schools is important. While in this study the focus is on trust between teachers and principals, it is

important to recognize that such trust also impacts the relationship between teachers and students and ultimately, student achievement.

The research study was also significant for several additional reasons. For example, the relationship and level of trust between principals and teachers and the use of participatory decision making at a school district was specifically addressed. Also, the results of the study will enable educators to assess the level and dimensions of participatory decision making and trust behavior as perceived by a sample of teaching staff. In addition, results from this research investigation will assist in the development of future relationships and collaboration between principals and teachers and thus the future direction of the school system in general. Indeed, the results will provide guidance to those within the Edinburg, Texas school system who sincerely want to become more effective change agents.

Definition of Terms

Several terms are unique in the study. The following are defined to convey the meaning and the definitions that are given to them in the research investigation:

Decision making. This term refers to the participation of teachers in critical decisions that directly affect their work, such as budgets, teacher selection, scheduling, curriculum, and other programmatic areas (Koch & Fisher, 1998). The general decision-making scale used in the study operationalizes the degree of teacher participation in decision making.

Empowerment. This term relates specifically to the results of meaningful decision making with regard to the power it provides to teachers; that is, it is used to describe meaningful decision making and the extent to which teachers are enabled to display existing competencies (Bass, Dellana, & Herbert, 1996). In this study decision making provides empowerment.

Faculty Trust (in the principal). "The degree of confidence that the principal will keep his/her word and will act with the best interest of teachers in mind" (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985, p. 2). The Trust Scale (T-Scale) instrument used in this investigative research study operationalizes the degree of teacher trust in the principal.

Gender. In this study, the term gender refers to the physical sex of respondents (i.e., male or female).

Leadership. This designation is defined as the process in which one person such as the principal sets the purpose or direction for one or more other persons such as schoolteachers, and gets them to participate together with him/her and with each other in that direction with competence and full commitment (Schein, 1997). There are various types of leaders, however. An autocratic principle is a leader who centralizes authority, does not share decision making, assumes control over others, and relies on legitimate and coercive power to manage others (Schein, 1997). A democratic principal, on the other hand, delegates authority to teachers and other personnel, encourages others to participate in decisions, and allows others to control various aspects of their own work (Schein, 1997).

Trust. In a general context, this term refers to the reliance on the integrity, ability, or character of a person or thing. Trust varies between the rational and the emotional. Shaw (1997) says that trust is based in part on faith. It has been suggested that trust can be divided into four basic categories: (a) as an individual attribute, (b) as a behavior, (c) as a situational feature, and (d) as an institutional arrangement. In the present study, however, trust is primarily examined in the last context (Sitkin & Roth, 1993).

This study adopts the definition of this variable as stated by MacNeil and Blake (1995). Specifically, trust in this present research study is defined as "The reliability of the relationship that exists between people, developed over time, caused by behaviors that are formed by principles and competencies of a person." (p. 3)

Assumptions

There were a number of assumptions associated with this research. For example, this study assumed that the job titles are standardized in academic institutions throughout the country and therefore throughout academic institutions for principals and teachers in Edinburg, Texas. Thus teachers and principals employed in educational facilities in Edinburg, Texas were assumed representative of those throughout the country.

This researcher also assumed that all the respondents in this investigation have similar access to opportunities within their educational organizations. Also, it was believed that the participants of the study would complete the survey questionnaires conscientiously and accurately.

In addition, statisticians assume that individuals responding to a survey of this nature do not differ significantly from those who fail to respond (Babbie, 2003; Zikmund, 2003). Also, it is believed that characteristics of the respondents employed by the academic institutions selected for this study were similar to the characteristics of individuals employed by academic institutions in the rest of the nation.

This researcher also made two other assumptions. The first is that the instruments selected for this study were reliable and valid. Therefore, the instruments were able to yield data to test the hypotheses of the study adequately. The second was that respondents with less

than one year of tenure with the academic organization were unable to determine their level of trust within that limited period. For this reason these individuals were not included in the data set.

Limitations

The following were limitations to the study. Even though research on trust and decision making as separate variables and in combination has been widespread, as evident in the literature of the last twenty years (Bryk & Schneider, 1996; Short & Rinehart, 1992), research had not combined these variables in the high school setting. Also, the literature and research was systematically extended to educational institutions in Edinburg, Texas as is the focus of the present investigative study.

Another limitation related to the self-reporting methodology. Responses might have been partly influenced by social desirability. Participants might respond as they think they should and not as they feel (Babbie, 2003). To address concerns about socially desirable responding and method bias, future research study and investigative research should gather job characteristics ratings from school administrators and coworkers as well.

There were also limitations in the use of survey questionnaires to provide evidence. Despite assurances of confidentiality, participants might have felt compelled to inflate their levels of trust and decision-making. As Glesne and Peshkin (1992) noted, participants might not give an accurate assessment of their beliefs, feelings, attitudes or behaviors and answer according to what they feel the correct response should be, not how they really felt. In addition, participants might respond by always marking the most neutral possible answer. Thus, the data was legitimate only to the extent that participants were completely honest. However, Maxwell

(1996) observed that subjectivity is inevitable in any study, whether qualitative or quantitative, and researchers should consciously seek it out during their entire study.

In regard to the common variance problems that exist in survey questionnaires such as respondents' genders and race, reverse causality may exist. This served as a limitation. Also, there might have been a bias of which of the educational facilities in Edinburg, Texas participated in this study.

In addition, this exploratory study was bounded by geographic location and was limited to the number of principles and teachers employed by the selected academic institutions located in Edinburg, Texas. For these reasons the ability to generalize from the research study to the larger population was a limitation. Generalization was also restricted by the number of survey questionnaires that were being completed.

A final limitation was the influence of the researcher on the participants studied (Babbie, 2003). Eliminating the actual influence of the researcher was impossible, of course. However, the goal and objectives of any researcher and research study was to understand the influence and use it wisely. Accordingly, this researcher attempted to maintain a perspective of critical subjectivity. This perspective was best defined by Reason (1994) as

> a quality of awareness in which we do not suppress our primary experience; nor do we allow ourselves to be swept away and overwhelmed by it; rather, we raise it to consciousness and use it as part of the inquiry process. (p. 325)

Organization of the Remaining Chapters

The first portion of this paper introduced the subject of concern, stated the problem and purpose of the study, noted the importance and significance of the research, and defined

important terms that were uniquely used in the study. Also included were the major research questions and explanations of assumptions and limitations of the research.

Chapter 2 examines the relevant and pertinent literature about the decision-making process in schools and trust. It discusses literature that provides a framework for the problem as was described in the first chapter. This literature was intended to support the purpose of this investigative study. It includes a general overview of decision making and the decision-making process, followed by a discussion of decision-making models in schools and their advantages and disadvantages. It also includes a discussion of the concept and definition of trust, ways of building and maintaining trust, and trust in schools.

The purpose of chapter 3 is to describe the study methodology and design. It is important in research to identify which approach was selected and why. Included is an explanation of the settings and subjects, test instruments, and method of data collection as well as a discussion of sample techniques. Chapter 4 describes the data collection process and data analysis. Chapter 5 describes the findings, discussions, recommendations, and conclusions.

CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

As noted in chapter 1, proponents of school reform have supported greater empowerment of teachers by decentralizing decisions that affect the school, students, and the learning process to teachers (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Malen et al., 1990; Murray, 1993*).* The education literature has shown a concern about the relationship of empowerment and decision making in schools. Studies have examined the basic school conditions needed for empowerment and the optimal school conditions where democratic organization can enable teaching staffs to become professional communities (Briggs & Wohlstetter, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Levin, 1991).

Despite calls for decentralization, school organizations typically remain centralized, with the principal acting as chief decision maker and teachers carrying out decisions (Brost, 2000). There has not been widespread recognition or action on the presumed benefits of increasing teachers' influence (Dunn, 1996). Further, their structures have permitted little time for teachers to interact around new information or knowledge and to reflect on their implications for practice (Cranston, 2000).

For teachers to be successfully empowered to actively participate in the decisions that affect the quality of education, and for principals to encourage empowerment, both principals and teachers need to be prepared for new responsibilities in the school decision-making process. Teachers need a knowledge base in decision making, training, willingness, ability to take risks, and experience to assure sound decision making; otherwise, faulty thinking may result in poor decisions (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998; Louis, Toole, & Hargreaves, 1999). Within this context, it is important to understand the nature of the decision making and of decision-making process.

In shared decision making between teachers and principals, trust is an important element. Unfortunately, lack of trust is an obstacle to shared decision making because of the traditional management practices in schools that have supported rigidity and individual hidden agendas rather than shared interests and goals, greater effectiveness, and greater flexibility to changing demands and environmental pressures (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). If true shared decision making is to occur, principals must trust teachers to use appropriate discretion in making decisions. Also, teachers must trust that principals are protecting their interests and acting for the good of the school (Taylor, 1996).

This chapter begins with a general overview of decision making and the decision-making process. A discussion of decision-making models in schools and their advantages and disadvantages follows. Finally, the concept and definition of trust, ways of building and maintaining trust, and trust in schools is discussed.

Overview and History of School Decision Making

In 1990, teacher participation in school decision making emerged as an important theme in the educational reform movement. Various reports between 1986 and 1990 called for greater teacher involvement in a wide range of decisions previously set aside for school administrators and boards of education. While the call went out, investigative research did not provide sufficient guidelines for implementation. While consensus appeared to be building concerning the importance of shared decision making and participation in school administration, the literature provided little substantive guidance concerning the meaning and contents of participation. Researchers and practitioners defined participation in a variety of ways, often not aware of the conceptual framework within which they were operating. Additionally, empirical understandings

of what shared decision making really meant were equally vague. Investigators simply depicted decision making as a function of technical and managerial tasks, but nothing more.

A review of the literature revealed several definitions of a decision and decision making. According to Harrison (1999), "A decision… is a moment in an ongoing process of evaluating alternatives for meeting an objective, at which expectations about a particular course of action impel the decision maker to select that course of action most likely to result in attaining the objective (p. 5)." Daft (2000) defined a decision as "a choice made from available alternatives" (p. 268). Bazerman (1986) looked at a decision as a judgment whereby a single option is evaluated and a choice made between two or more options.

What these definitions have in common is the concept of choice, a high point in the decision-making process. It is, however, only part of the process and not, as is often assumed, the entire process. There are numerous models of choice, which are not discussed in this section. Harrison (1999) pointed out that while decision making and problem solving are often regarded as the same, they are different. Problem solving is a component of decision making. Some decisions are made that do not involve problem solving; likewise, problems may be identified and solved with little or no decision making.

Several models of decision making have been applied to school organizations over the years. As explained by Estler (1996), the rational view of decision making came about as a result of the development of modern schooling during the Industrial Revolution. Schools were faced with exceptional urban growth, interference in various types of school affairs on the part of school boards, and growing efficiency in school management from growing, powerful business communities. Under these types of pressures, the prevailing principles of Frederick W. Taylor's

(1911) "scientific management" and professionalism provided a basis for school administrators to insist on autonomy in the administration of schools during those times (Bradley, 1993).

The rational-bureaucratic model of the past offered useful tools for decision making when goals were well defined, when the means for achieving them were well understood, and where organizational components were well integrated (Bradley, 1993; Schmeichel, 1999). But the rational model today serves merely as an "ideal" model that is unattainable by teachers and principals in the real world setting and in real world educational institutions.

The organizational model was the next to emerge in the school system. Although it represented a significant departure from the previous model, there were basic similarities between the two. Assumptions of shared goals, goal-driven choices based on information, professional expertise, and organizational structure make organizational models a subset of rational bureaucratic model. Both were oriented toward short-term, immediate results and both operated within certain constraints. The organizational model was constrained by internal policies and procedures of the school organization (Patterson-Weston, 2000).

Unlike the rational model, the organizational model recognized that rational processes are not always used. During those times that they are, they view problems too simplistically and in a way that ignores the complexity of the organization and the situation (Reyes, 1992). According to the literature, the organizational model suggested that decision making is characterized by the following deficiencies: lack of information on what the problem is, alternatives, criteria, and the effect of choosing particular alternatives on particular criteria; time and cost constraints; imperfections of the decision maker's perceptions; inability of decision makers to retain large amounts of information in their memories; and limitations of intelligence that prevent the

decision maker from making the best decisions, given the available information (Clift, Veal, Holland, Johnson, & McCarthy, 1995; Eaker, Dufour, & Burnette, 2002).

A third decision-making model surfaced in the 1950s and 1960s. It was called a political model in that it stemmed from external conditions that existed in the 1950s and 1960s. The environment of the schools became increasingly complex and volatile as a result of such unique events as the Supreme Court's *Brown v. Board of Education* decision and the civil rights movement. Related demands for decentralization and citizen participation in school policy and concerns about schooling triggered by the Soviet launch of Sputnik resulted in federal legislation and federal funding affecting state and local levels, and in teacher unionization (Yee & Cuban, 1996). As a result, decisions became complex and involved many people. Disagreement and conflict over problems and solutions were normal. A favorable decision was one with an outcome that is acceptable to many external constituencies.

In the school environment of the 1980s, claims to professionalism among teachers and the theme of organizational decision making started to appear once again. Tensions grew between bureaucratic values represented by the rational decision-making model and professional values that were represented by the organizational decision-making model that related to school decision making (Goldring & Rallis, 1993). This, in turn, provided the impetus of the movement toward unionization in the 1960s (Dornbusch, Glasgow, & Lin, 1996). Overall, this led to a more sophisticated understanding of the complex nature of educational decision making and its role in organizational life.

Current Decision Making Models Used in Schools

In the 1980s and 1990s, there was a shift from the practice of educational decision making being left largely to the profession and decisions about the art of teaching being left largely to the classroom teacher. In the past, matters of management and direction were assigned to senior administration and the school principal. However, in the past decade, decision making has become more contested and more political. As noted by Dunn (1996), traditional patterns of authority were challenged from outside of the profession by politicians, business people and parents, and from within by more expert and politicized teachers.

This has contributed to some rethinking of the concept and practice of decision making in education, particularly the role of teachers in decision making. There has been substantial interest evolving over the recent years concerning the role of the teacher in decisions made in the operation of schools (Hess, 1994; Husband & Short, 1994; Keedy & Finch, 1994; Morrison, Wakefield, Walker & Solberg, 1994).

A particular area of focus for this study is shared decision making. To best understand this model it is important to discuss the other decision-making models that often have an impact on shared decision making. In the sections that follow these decision-making models-school-based management, site-based management, and shared decision making-are discussed.

School-Based Management

School-based management (SBM), a form of shared decision making, is a strategy to improve education by transferring significant decision-making authority from state and district offices to individual schools. SBM provides principals, teachers, students, and parents greater control over the education process by giving them responsibility for decisions about the budget,

personnel, and the curriculum (Briggs & Wohlstetter, 1999). Through the involvement of stakeholders, that is, teachers, parents, and other community members, in these key decisions, SBM can create more effective learning environments for children.

The idea of SBM emerged during the 1960s and 1970s, when researchers of school administration reported on new methods of decision-making as a reform strategy to achieve better schools (Black, 1996). Subsequent calls for reform refocused attention on alterations to the traditional bureaucratic structures of education in the United States.

There are at least two major steps in the initiation of SBM. First, the primary power for decisions in the areas of budget, curriculum, and personnel must be transferred to the local site. Second, the decisions shifted to the local site must be shared among the stakeholders at the site so all stakeholder groups are active and empowered (Wohlstetter & Mohrman, 1994).

It is believed that the involvement of diverse stakeholders provides a number of benefits to the school. It allows the school to make its own decisions and make the most efficient use of the resources available to the local unit. SBM also provides a greater range of individual participation and empowerment in the decision-making process (Summers & Johnson, 1994). Such empowerment should give those with the most investment at the local school the ability to affect how the school is performing.

Most districts create school management councils at each school that include the principal, representatives of parents and teachers, and, in some cases, other citizens, support staff, and--at the secondary level--students. The council conducts a needs assessment and develops a plan of action that includes statements of goals and measurable objectives, consistent with school board policies. In some districts, the management council makes most school-level

decisions. In other districts, the council advises the principal, who then makes the decisions. In both cases, the principal has a large role in the decision-making process, either as part of a team or as the final decision maker.

Herman and Herman (1993) maintained there is a growing movement among school districts to adopt SBM as a part of overall reform or restructuring. A possible explanation for the widespread acceptance of SBM is its adaptability to different settings and situations, although results have been varied.

It appears that a number of characteristics must be present to promote an effective SBM model. From the beginning, the school board and superintendent must be supportive of SBM. They must trust the principals and councils to determine how to implement the district's goals at the individual schools. It is important to have a written agreement that specifies the roles and responsibilities of the school board, superintendent and district office, principal, and SBM council. The agreement should explicitly state the standards against which each school will be held accountable (Brown & Hunter, 1998). Guthrie (1986) stated that each school should produce an annual performance and planning report covering the extent to which the school is meeting its goals, using its resources, and the school's plans for the future.

Training in such areas as decision making, problem solving, and group dynamics is necessary for all participating staff and community members, especially in the early years of implementation. To meet the new challenges of the job, principals may need additional training in leadership skills (Clift et al., 1995).

Wohlstetter and Mohrman (1994, 1996) summarized the characteristics of successful SBM implementation as (a) long-term commitment, (b) a focus on educational change rather

than governance, and, (c) sufficient support during the adoption process to minimize conflict among the stakeholders. Incorporating these characteristics allows schools to present different programs that can focus on effectiveness and excellence, as well as meet the needs of their communities.

Sharing of information among stakeholders is another important element of SBM. A study by Wohlstetter and Mohrman (1996) suggested that an important strategy for the effective SBM initiative is to create a well-developed system for sharing information among a broad range of stakeholders. The schools that worked best in this study used many communication mechanisms to share information. In these schools, information not only flowed to the school from the central office, but also within the school and out to the community. In addition, more kinds of information were regularly disseminated in successful SBM schools, including information about innovations in other schools and about school performance. In the end, the satisfaction of the various stakeholder groups was of paramount importance to the successful SBM unit.

Most states encourage participation in SBM; as a result, hundreds of school districts across the country have experimented with aspects of SBM, including (a) Cherry Creek, Colorado. This district, located near Denver, has refined its school-based management system over a number of years. Individual schools perform many duties that traditionally fell within the domain of the central office. Commitment, trust, and a sense of ownership are cornerstones of the system at Cherry Creek; (b) Portland, Oregon. This district's school-based management operation can be characterized as a "hybrid." Although both budget authority and personnel selection are decentralized, the district has adopted a basic text for each subject but allows

individual schools to retain control over teaching methodology and selection of supplementary instructional materials; (c) Martin County, Florida. Individual schools have near-complete autonomy; food service is the only area that is centralized. After soliciting ideas from teachers, staff, and advisory groups, the principals make final decisions about budget, curriculum, and personnel.

Although SBM has been implemented in a variety of settings for some time, its advantages and disadvantages are still under discussion. According to the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) (1988), SBM: (a) allows competent individuals in the schools to make decisions that will improve learning; (b) gives the entire school community a voice in key decisions; (c) focuses accountability for decisions; (d) leads to greater creativity in the design of programs; (e) redirects resources to support the goals developed in each school; (f) leads to realistic budgeting as parents and teachers become more aware of the school's financial status, spending limitations, and the cost of its programs; (g) improves morale of teachers and nurtures new leadership at all levels.

However, participatory decision making sometimes creates frustration and is often slower than more autocratic methods. Councils must be able to work together on such matters as planning and budget. This leaves principals and teachers less time to devote to other aspects of their jobs. Teachers and community members who participate in the councils may need training in budget matters; some teachers may not be interested in the budget process or want to devote time to it. Members of the school community must also beware of expectations that are too high. According to the AASA/NAESP/NASSP (1988), districts that have had the most success with

SBM have focused their expectations on two benefits-greater involvement in making decisions and making "better" decisions.

Wohlstetter and Odden's (1992) research suggested that school-based management (a) "is everywhere, but nowhere" (p. 34), (b) comes in a variety of forms, (c) is created with no clear goals or real accountability, and (d) exists in a state and district policy context that often gives mixed signals to schools.

Wohlstetter and Buffet (1992) found that district-initiated SBM programs were not in accord with state rules and regulations. Likewise, state-initiated SBM reforms, even when implemented by some schools, also did not follow district rules and regulations. When districts and superintendents do not support and do not have complementary policies for state initiated SBM, site teachers and administrators get mixed signals or contradictory support from different levels of the policy system, ranging from budgeting, curriculum, and teaching to student learning. This can hinder true school-based decision making (Opfer & Denmark, 2001). Thus, there is still a need for further information and research on the various aspects of SBM.

Site-Based Decision Making

Sited-based decision making (SBD) is a way to structure school site/district relationships to place more power, authority, and accountability in the school. SBD is similar to SBM; however, SBD is more focused on decision-making's role in improving student performance and enhancing accountability.

The basic premise of SBD is that those who will actually implement the decisions make the most effective decisions. The belief is that people involved at the campus level have a greater opportunity to identify problems and develop problem resolution and change strategies than

people located off-campus. SBD concepts also recognize that people at the campus level are more likely to internalize change and to support its implementation if they are involved in the decision making than if they are not (Goldman et al., 1993).

Thus, SBD differs significantly from traditional school organization practices in the following ways: (1) goals are determined on a campus level from a campus needs assessment and outcome data; (2) activities are self-initiated and self-directed by the campus staff; (3) budget development and allocation of resources are campus-controlled; (4) staff selection criteria are guided by standards developed by a campus within the context of state and district guidelines; (5) campus organization structure is arranged functionally to encourage and facilitate shared team decision-making and input; (6) the campus staff verify that site-based decision making is established and working; (7) central administration plays a support role in site-based decision making through planning, providing alternative strategies, developing evaluation mechanisms and obtaining resources (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998).

There are four models of SBD. These are supported by different groups and therefore reflect different interests (Conley & Bacharach, 1990; Gordon, 1992; Hess, 1994; Purkey & Smith, 1985). The first is collegial, participatory, democratic management, which involves all the staff of the school in making the decisions, whether through committees or full-staff processes. The second is principal-directed site-based management, which may involve some consultation with staff and parents, but is ultimately controlled and directed by the principal and other administrators. The third is a parent committee operating somewhat as a board of governors. The last is some form of school-based committee that operates with a limited mandate, but that may have significant influence in a particular area.

Specifically, SBD attempts to decentralize four key resources: power, knowledge and skills, information, and rewards. Power means that a well-informed, competent faculty has the authority to make decisions about the best application of resources and the best educational practices to use. The school team has authority over the budget, which it can spend in any way that it chooses, subject only to limits on the total amount. It also has authority to recruit, select, develop, and evaluate personnel. Moreover, the school site involves all teachers in decision-making roles through vertical (math, science, language arts, student discipline) and horizontal (sub-school, grade level) decision-making teams (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998).

Knowledge and skills in at least four areas help teachers achieve high performance and improve outcomes: (a) interpersonal or team skills for working together effectively; (b) expert knowledge and skills for providing new technologies; (c) curriculum and instruction expertise; (d) breadth skills for engaging in multiple tasks, especially tasks like; (e) curriculum and staff development that have been "decentralized" to the work team; (f) business knowledge and skills for managing budgets and other fiscal matters (Smylie & Hart, 1999).

Developing such knowledge and skills implies a substantial, ongoing investment in human resource development that could approach two to four percent of revenue (Smylie & Hart, 1999). It also implies a school wide capacity for change, a sense of professional community, and a shared curriculum and instructional knowledge base (Eaker, Dufour, & Burnette, 2002).

Clearly, site-based decision making has a number of advantages. However, it also has disadvantages as well. According to Callahan (1990) and Enderlin-Lampe (1997), supporters of SBD point to administrative efficiency, educational effectiveness, and participant influence as

positive aspects. Administrative efficiency arguments are largely drawn from the business world: "Get the decisions about how to run the firm down to the people who know best what needs to be done" (Daft, 2000, p. 78). These positions often flow from an ideological belief that market approaches and competition are inherently more efficient than planning approaches. However, these do not take into account inefficiencies created where school administrators have much of their time taken up in dealing with administrative tasks like purchasing supplies and services rather than education administrative tasks. Further, Lewis (1994) observed that

> SBD has been trivialized because people do not have or do not want the power to make significant changes. Figuring out how to assign spaces in the parking lot or how to divide up field trip funds are decisions that need to be made but real changes in the lives of students and colleagues do not hinge on such decisions (Daft, 2000, p. 356).

Educational effectiveness proponents' hope that decentralization will produce increased student achievement. They expect this to happen though more flexible curriculum offerings that are tailored to the students in a particular school. They characterize the current system as controlled by a bureaucracy that imposes from the outside a one-size-fits-all policy.

Many of these proposals for SBD are a call for decentralization involving people at the school level in making some decisions about the school. However, determination about that is involved and what they are to make decisions about vary greatly. Some argue for local-involvement decision making that has a focus on teachers (Odden & Clune, 1995).

Critics identified a number of problems. Malen et al. (1990) showed that SBD programs applied to schools prior to 1990 rarely decentralized significant portions of the budget, provided substantive personnel authority, were comprehensive, or improved student achievement.

According to Weiss, Cambone, and Wyeth (1992), as more cuts in resources in education are called for, SBD creates a situation where the decision about what to eliminate gets pushed down to teachers and administrators, and sometimes parents. This produces new conflicts as different teachers and programs are placed in a position of competing for reduced resources. This conflict also produces pressures that intensify the work of teaching.

Shared Decision Making

Educational reform efforts of the 1980's focused on organizational, curricular, and instructional changes necessary to improve the quality of education. Numerous national reform reports advocated enhanced teacher involvement in decision making as a means of fostering necessary changes within schools. In 1986, an association of teachers' unions and administrators' organizations jointly produced a report calling for teacher participation in identifying the purposes, priorities, and goals of the school (National Education Association/National Association for Secondary School Principals, 1986). That same year the Carnegie Commission called for giving teachers a greater voice in decisions that affect the school (Carnegie Commission, 1986). A second report based on a national survey of public school teachers found that a majority of teachers are not asked to participate in such critical matters as teacher evaluation, staff development, and budget (Carnegie Foundation, 1988). A general consensus emerged among school reformers that teachers deserved to play a greater role in school governance, and shared decision making (SDM) became a significant part of school reform efforts.

SDM has significant implications and far reaching effects. Basically, it alters the balance of power in schools. When decision making is shared with teachers, it empowers teachers with a

certain degree of authority. When schools shift to a system of SDM, some of the principal's authority is transferred to the teacher-administrator decision-making group. Weiss and Cambone's (1994) study of principals of six SDM high schools found support for the SDM process. Principals not only were in favor of the process, but they also cooperated with teachers in the new arrangements. However, it is important to point out that the position of principal in the schools studied by Weiss and Cambone (1994) was voluntary and, therefore, SDM was not imposed on them. The difference among the six principals was the degree to which they saw SDM as a way to improve teaching and learning. Half of the principals studied believed this would encourage better teaching for all students. The remainder supported SDM for its ability to democratize schools and share power.

Weiss and Cambone (1994) suggested that principals and policy-makers must understand the extent of the change that SDM involves. In shifting the decision-making authority, the power of the principal is reduced. Establishing democratic processes in schools is a significant reform in itself. In addition, the researchers suggested that principals consider separating issues of governing the school from that of classroom curriculum and instruction.

As with other types of decision-making forms, numerous journal articles have discussed positive outcomes of SDM (Chase, 1991; Reyes, 1992; Sebring & Camburn, 1992; Weiss, 1993). According to Liontos (1994), SDM can "improve the quality of decisions; increase a decision's acceptance and implementation; strengthen staff morale, commitment, and teamwork; build trust; help staff and administrators acquire new skills; and increase school effectiveness" (p. 25).

In a survey conducted by Brodinsky and Neill (1983), a majority of school administrators and teachers cited three policies that effectively improved morale and motivated their staffs, one

of which was shared governance. Murray's (1993) comparative analysis of teacher perceptions of empowerment as a result of SDM found that teachers regarded the following conditions as being conducive to SDM: school climate, staff development, competency requirements, program content and implementation patterns. Research by Levin (1991) and Lange (1993) further supported the enhancement of teacher effectiveness with the use of SDM. Levin's findings indicated that school staff at the site level should make crucial decisions regarding curriculum, teaching strategies and personnel. Lange's (1993) 15-month study of six schools revealed that teachers were more autonomous and made better decisions with SDM than would have been achieved under centralized school management. A higher level of trust also emerged as faculty gained understanding of management complexities and principals learned to respect faculty judgment.

A study by Taylor and Bogotch (1994) of teachers in a school in Dade County, Florida, revealed that teachers reported that "collegiality" was increasingly characteristic of SDM schools. Trust increased as staff gained understanding of management complexities and principals learned to respect faculty judgment. New decision-making patterns effectively empowered building-level educators and community members over many resources.

Not all research has supported the shared decision making, however. Several studies cited the negative effect on the attitude of teachers following implementation of participatory decision making (Conley, 1991; Huddleston, 1991; Weiss, 1992). In an examination of the relationship between teacher decision-making and teacher efficacy, Keedy and Finch (1994) found that SDM had little impact on teachers' self efficacy. A study by Johnson and Pajares (1996) to assess the effect of leadership style on teacher motivation showed that teachers who work for democratic

administrators do not show significantly higher motivation than those working for dictatorial administrators.

From Conley and Cooper's (1991) point of view, debates on participative management tend to offer an image of schools that is consistent with both bureaucratic and professional models of school organizations with a human relations element. The bureaucratic or administrative model emphasizes the formal authority of administrators to delegate responsibilities to subordinates, formulate rules to govern subordinate behavior, and implement centralized control, planning, and decision-making. The object of participation is to gain teacher compliance with administrative decisions (Gordon, 1992). The professional model, on the other hand, stresses the professional expertise of teachers in diagnosing and addressing student learning needs (Bacharach & Conley, 1986). The professional model suggests that the aim of participation is to give teachers the rights they expect as professionals in the workplace.

Both of these perspectives coexist with a human relations model of school organizations that views employee job satisfaction and morale as primary aims of participation. However, different researchers emphasize different aspects of the needs of the organization depending on whether the researcher adheres to the administrative or the professional model. The administrative model emphasizes the importance of participation for the administrative supervision of teachers and building teacher loyalty to superiors. Thus teacher loyalty to administrators and teacher acceptance and compliance with administrative decisions are critical goals and rationales of participation. The professional model views employee satisfaction, morale, and workplace democracy as ends in themselves rather than as means to compliance. Studies following administrative models have demonstrated that teacher-principal relationships

are strengthened-and teachers are more accepting of administrator's directives-when administrators adopt a participative or human relations management style (Hoy & Brown, 1988). However, because this literature tended to focus on the "blind" acceptance of management directives by teachers, it seemed out of touch with the more current emphasis on genuine teacher participation in decision-making.

Studies based on the professional model orientation developed the argument that the image of the professional teacher is that of an individual who is committed to helping all children by providing more challenging educational content (Chase, 1991; Reyes, 1992). The research pointed out that teachers and the challenges of their work are different than what existed for teachers of the early 20th century. Professionals now emphasize professional standards and ethics over organizational goals (when in conflict), informal authority rather than formal, and evaluation by peers rather than subordinates.

In schools, professionalism is an important factor that implied indirect control because tighter management control creates two issues. First, teachers are in essence "de-skilled" when management control is tight because teaching requires flexibility and imagination. Second, when teachers' participation in and control over decision making is limited by tighter controls, they may believe that they are being treated less fairly (Connel, 1994).

But a professional orientation, while allowing teacher flexibility and facilitating commitment, generally fails to address the organizational constraints on decision making that exist in schools. It also suggests that empowerment alone will not solve educational problems (Miller, 1995).

Teacher Participation in Shared Decision Making

School reform initiatives have encouraged school administrators to include teachers and parents in their decision making for key decisions (Hoy & Tarter, 1995). Teachers have been urged to become less isolated and more autonomous and to become more collaborative (Marks & Louis, 1997; Louis & Kruse, 1995). However, the findings in the SDM literature are mixed and unclear. This may be because it is difficult to analyze the level and extent of actual SDM occurring in schools. In some cases, there is a wide gap between the rhetoric that suggests that SDM is in place and the reality of SDM being in place. This clearly illustrates the difficulty of effecting change and of merging the two competing policy ideologies of authoritarian versus democratic management. At the pragmatic level, the unclear or contradictory expectations surrounding decision making have resulted in frustration and failure of teachers to take an active role in participatory management (Goldman, 1992; Grant, 1991).

An early study by Malen, Ogawa, and Kranz (1988) argued that the teacher's working relationship with the principal has a significant influence on teacher participation in school decision making. Their argument was supported in later research by Smylie (1992), who studied participation in decision making in a Midwestern metropolitan K-8 school district. According to his study, teachers appeared more willing to participate in all areas of decision making if they perceived their relationships with their principals as more open, collaborative, facilitative, and supportive. They were less willing if their relationship with the principal was closed, exclusionary, and controlling. Smylie concluded that teachers' willingness to participate in school decision making was influenced most by their relationship with their principals and by the principal's leadership style. These views are also supported by Keaster, Kirby, and Wimbelberg

(1992). They concluded that teacher empowerment depended on need, expectation of principals, schools, and districts.

Johnson (1990) pointed out that principals vary significantly in their attitudes toward involving teachers both formally and informally in decision making. She suggested that teachers are less willing to participate in decision making under the following conditions: (a) where principals are closed to formal and informal influence; (b) where principals fail to be receptive and take ideas and suggestions of teachers seriously; and (c) where principals are very controlling. Teachers are more willing to participate in environments where (a) principals are more open to teacher's ideas, and (b) principals use teachers' ideas and implement them into school programs and policies. Therefore, teachers' willingness to participate in decision making may be related to the principal's leadership style, organizational structure of the school, school socialization network, and fear of professional and social sanction.

As expected, teachers are pleased when their views influence school decisions, leading them to feel both respected and empowered. Collaborative efforts are often taken seriously, and decisions are more likely to be supported. In addition, less teacher absenteeism occurred in schools where teachers were actively involved in decision making (Griffin, 1995; Weiss, 1993).

However, Weiss (1992) found that SDM often created conflict among teachers. Disagreements that could formerly be politely ignored now had to be resolved. New teachers sometimes had as much influence as veteran teachers, which shifted the balance of power.

According to Malen et. al. (1990), SDM may involve teachers and principals in decision making, but it does not appear to substantially alter teachers' policy-making influence. Further, Malen et al. argued that principals seem to be reluctant to extend genuine influence to teachers

and parents, perhaps assuming that they do not have the expertise to make valuable contributions or because they do not trust them to make decisions in the best interest of the school. Teachers may be resentful of the investment of time asked of them when they perceive that their actual influence is limited (Bartunek & Keyes, 1979; Duke, Showers, & Imber, 1980). In a survey of teachers conducted by Bacharach, Bauer, and Shedd (1988) respondents indicated that they had become skeptical of participating in decision making because they did not feel they had much influence, although they believed that they should be more involved in school and district decision making, especially when the issues related to their teaching responsibilities.

Dunn (1996) observed that few school systems have actually increased decision making authority of teachers. While there is substantial evidence that teachers' want more decision-making authority in the school site, the factors that influence teachers' willingness to participate in different areas of decision making are largely unknown.

Malen et al. (1990) noted that progress has been painfully slow in changing the structure and culture of schools to support SDM. Weiss (1993) explained that it may take several difficult years before participants learn to work with a new SDM approach. Weiss noted that she and her colleagues did not observe "linear progression" in the SDM schools they studied: "Everywhere there were ups and downs, movement and relapse, optimism and disenchantment.... SDM is not a process that, once introduced, necessarily matures and flowers" (p. 89).

A more recent study that revealed interesting findings with respect to perceptions of participation in decision making and the relationship of leadership style and years of teaching experience to SDM may provide newer insight than the previous studies cited that were undertaken over a decade ago. Kuku and Taylor (2002) compared the perceptions of school

leaders and teachers regarding actual and preferred faculty participation in decision making across nine dimensions of school governance, goals/vision/mission, budgeting, staffing, operations, standards, curriculum/instruction, facilitating procedures and structures, staff development, and spiritual matters. Using the Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale 2 (TIPS 2) developed by Russell, Cooper, and Greenblatt (1992, cited by Kuku & Taylor, 2002), the researchers collected data from 165 school leaders and teachers working in 11 Seventh-Day Adventist secondary schools in North Philippines.

The results of the study revealed that levels of faculty decision making preferred by teachers were significantly greater on all TIPS 2 dimensions than the levels they perceived currently existed, with greater effect sizes in the areas of staffing, budgeting, and staff development. Data collected from school leaders were consistent with these results. Both teachers and school leaders agreed that faculty participation in decision making is important for school improvement, better school morale, increased job satisfaction, and increased professionalism. Both groups also identified a domineering management style as the major impediment to faculty participation in decision making, followed by poor interpersonal relationships, insufficient resources, inadequate support, and poor communication. School leaders cited commitment of teachers and frequent consultation as significant factors that can enhance faculty participation in SDM. Findings also revealed that teachers who had 11 to 20 years of teaching experience were more actively involved than their peers in decision making related to staff development and to curriculum and instruction.

The Decision-Making Process

Just as there are varying definitions of a decision, there are varying perspectives on the decision-making process. A review of the literature revealed that some view the process in terms of elements of decision making. Others look at decision making as a process of stages or steps; still others focus on decision-making as an interrelated and dynamic process. Simon (1960) presented three phases of decision making: finding occasions for making a decision, finding possible course of action, and choosing among courses of action. Daft (2000) described six steps in the decision-making process: (1) recognition of decision requirement-confront a decision requirement in the form of either a problem or opportunity; (2) diagnosis and analysis of causes-analyze the causes associated with the decision situation; (3) development of alternatives-generate possible alternative solutions that will respond to the needs of the situation; (4) selection of desired alternative-select the most promising course of action; (5) implementation of chosen alternative-ensure that the chosen alternative is carried out by using managerial, administrative and persuasive abilities; (6) evaluation and feedback-gather information to tell how well the decision was implemented and whether it was effective in achieving goals (p. 277).

Bateman and Snell (1999) also described stages in the decision-making process: (1) identifying and diagnosing the problem; (2) generating alternative solutions; (3) evaluating alternatives; (4) making the choice; (5) implementing the decision; (6) evaluating the decision (p. 83).

Harrison (1999) believes in a more interrelated and dynamic view of the decision-making process and views it three-dimensionally: from the perspective of each function of the process; as a total process with its interrelationships among each functions and by certain properties of its

own; and in terms of the dynamism of the total process, which is a product of the properties and relationships of the individual functions and the total process.

According to Harrison, the components and functions of decision making are the same: (1) setting managerial objectives. The decision-making process starts with setting objectives, and, upon reaching the objectives set, beginning the cycle again; (2) searching for alternatives. After scanning the internal and external environments of the organization, relevant information is formulated into alternatives that seem likely to fulfill the objectives; (3) comparing and evaluating alternatives. Alternatives are compared based on the certainty or uncertainty of cause and effect relationships and the preferences of the decision maker for various probable outcomes; (4) the act of choice. The decision maker chooses a given course of action from among a set of alternatives; (5) implementing the decision. Implementation is carrying out the chosen course of action; (6) follow-up and control. This function is intended to ensure that the implemented decision results in an outcome that is consistent with the objectives set (p. 39).

Harrison believed that making successful decisions depends on the synergy that can be created from the effective interactions of the functions that make up the respective process. That synergy is not possible from simply performing a series of independent actions. As such, Harrison's decision-making process is applicable to the nonprogrammed decisions; programmed decisions do not require all the steps.

Trust and Decision Making

As noted earlier, public schools are managed bureaucratically and under tight controls. A very formal chain of command, codes, policies, specialists, formalized recruiting, and sequential arrangement of student progress ensure that the goal of standardization is met (Blasé & Blasé,

1999). This traditional organization of schools often poses obstacles that inhibit the development of trust. Trust is a multi-faceted concept that has a different definition for each application and discipline (Shaw, 1997). Psychologists working from personality theory view trust as a psychological construct or trait that individuals develop in varying degrees, depending on personal experiences and prior socialization. In social learning theory, trust has been defined as a generalized expectancy held by an individual that the word, promise, oral or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon (Shaw, 1997).

It is clear that all the definitions provided above deal with uncertainty as well as action. Teachers and principals in the school environment rely upon each other to perform in a specific way without any assurance that it will be so. Clearly, trust is every individual's greatest desire and their biggest disappointment. Trust can be ambiguous, altruistic, uncertain, and discretionary. It can place teachers and principals in vulnerable situations where they are unable to monitor the actions of others and thus rely on their expectations. Thus it can be said that trust is ultimately an act of faith.

In a very general sense these constructs point to the social basis for trust. The psychological construct and the social learning theory definitions of trust have important implications, especially in today's school environment. In this section the concept and definition of trust, building and maintaining trust, and what trust looks like in schools are discussed.

What is Trust?

In contemporary times individuals and groups, especially teachers and school principals, regard one another with suspicion. It is this mistrust that creates less productivity and more litigation. Yet one of the values most honored in people is their trustworthiness. By the

philosophy of managing for the good of all people-students, parents, teachers, principals, and the overall school system district itself-the most rewarding and productive attitude in any school system is to trust everyone. Trust is believed to have a powerful and pervasive influence on overall organizational performance, regardless of the type of organization. There is a growing awareness of the importance of trust among groups and within organizations (Marcic, 1997; Shaw, 1997). In many ways, trust is the key to productive teams. A better understanding of trust helps to create a more effective organization in the end. According to Shaw (1997), trust is a means of enhancing business performance over time. The same can be said of the school environment. In the business world, this is essential at the group or team level in order for an organization to grow and prosper. In the educational environment, this is essential for teamwork to take place and for the facilities to meet its growing objectives of providing an adequate education for all children.

Trust is essential in an increasingly complicated work life in the business world. The same applies to the educational world as teaching jobs and administrative duties become increasingly more complex. In addition to trust, power plays an important role within educational facilities as well as business organizations. It is an essential facet that must be understood in light of the development of trust within group processes. Since power and trust are closely linked in research studies, with all power variables significantly related to trust, a deeper understanding of power-especially as related to the acts of decision-making-assists in the study of trust. A combined understanding of trust and decision making can be used to explore organizational dynamics. It is now generally accepted that trust has a powerful influence on overall organizational performance, regardless of the type of organization, and there is a growing

awareness of the importance of trust among groups within organizations (Senge, 1990). In many ways, trust is the key to productive employee teams. A better understanding of trust building helps create more effective organizations in the end.

While there is much discussion of trust in a variety of literature, there is little agreement about what trust is or how to achieve trust. Rotter's (1980) early definition of trust is a "generalized expectancy that we can rely on the word, the promise, the verbal or written statement of another person" (p. 102). According to Shaw (1997), trust is a means of enhancing performance over time. Shaw (1997) says that trust is based in part on faith. He suggests that there are four basic categories of trust: (a) as an individual attribute, (b) as a behavior, (c) as a situational feature, and (d) as an institutional arrangement.

In the view of Shaw (1997), trust varies between the rational and the emotional. Also, it is based in part on faith. Trust is a mix of feeling and rational thinking, and it involves a cognitive familiarity that is somewhere between total knowledge and total ignorance. High emotion and rationality results in ideological trust, while low emotion and rationality results in routine trust. Lewis and Weigert (1985) express these concepts in Table 1.

Table 1
Emotion and Rationality

		Emotion		
		High	Low	Absent
	High	Ideological Trust	Cognitive Trust	Rational Prediction
Rationality	Low	Emotional Trust	Routine Trust	Problem Anticipation
	Absent	Faith	Fate	Panic

Note. From "Trust as a Social Reality," by J. D. Lewis and A. Weigert, A., 1985, *Social Forces*, 63 (4), pp. 967-985. Copyright by APA. Reprinted by permission.

In the context of this study, trust is influenced by individual teacher expectations, interpersonal relationships within the school system, social structures, and ethical principles. Baier (1986) defines trust as the reliance on others' competence and their willingness to look after rather than harm what is entrusted to their care. Similarly, MacNeil and Blake's (1995) definition of trust (which is the definition used in this study) is as follows: "The reliability of the relationship that exists between people, developed over time, caused by behaviors that are formed by principles and competencies of a person" (p. 3).

According to McKnight, Cummings, and Chervany (1998), some individuals have a "disposition to trust"; in other words, these individuals are more inclined to be trustful of others, believe that others are typically well-meaning and reliable, and that trust can be a self-fulfilling prophecy. For example, a trusting individual would deal with an unreliable person as being

reliable, because the trusting individual would believe that by giving the unreliable person the "benefit of the doubt" he or she can become reliable. Thus, individuals with a high disposition to trust are more likely to see good points and to overlook flaws in another person or situation; however, this could threaten the development of trust (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998).

In summary, trust, as an attribute, is one of the most commonly recognized and widely defined philosophical concepts. But in spite of its position and importance, especially in the academic world, little focus has been given to the concept of trust and its relationship to decision-making in the educational research literature. The present study attempts to add to the paucity of information in this respect.

Building and Maintaining Trust

People cannot demand the trust of another. It must be earned and developed over time. Thus, building and maintaining trust is an incremental process that starts with creating a culture based on shared values that people believe in. In this environment mutual trust can develop, as commonly shared values, honesty and integrity are the foundation for trust between individuals (Covey, 1991; Fairholm, 1994). If a culture based on shared values has been established, individuals will be more committed to the organization since they believe in the organization's goals (Eaker et al., 2002). A culture based on shared values and trust also fosters leadership that uses guidance, support and direction, and not mandates, to reach goals and ultimately empower individuals (Eaker et al., 2002). For leaders, Bennis (1994) suggests that building trust is important for not only gaining support, but also maintaining that support. Allowing individuals increased participation in the decision-making process, sharing information openly, and

providing employees with meaningful work will aid in improving employee commitment and morale (Argyris, 1990; Fairholm, 1994; McGregor, 1960). Bennis (1994) identified four characteristics of leaders who are able to build and maintain trust: (1) constancy: leaders confront surprises that they face without creating additional surprises for the rest of the group; (2) congruity: leaders do what they ask others to do; (3) reliability: leaders provide when it is necessary and important to do so; (4) integrity: leaders honor their commitments and promises.

Creating a culture based on shared values and empowering employees requires building open relationships based on honesty, integrity and a genuine concern for others (Fairholm, 1994; Sonnenburg, 1994). For trust to develop members of the organization must feel safe within their environment to honestly communicate with colleagues and management (Morin, 1990).

Schindler and Thomas (1993) identified the following factors as essential for developing and maintaining trust: (1) integrity, defined as honesty and truthfulness (Covey, 1991; Fairholm, 1994; Schindler & Thomas, 1993; Sonnenburg, 1994); (2) competence, defined as the technical and interpersonal knowledge and skills required to do one's job (Fairholm, 1994; Schindler & Thomas, 1993; Sonnenburg, 1994); (3) consistency, defined as reliability, predictability and good judgment in handling situations (Fairholm, 1994; Schindler & Thomas, 1993; Sonnenburg, 1994); (4) loyalty, defined as benevolent motives, the willingness to protect and save face for a person (Fairholm, 1994); (5) openness, defined as mental accessibility and the willingness to share ideas and information freely (Fairholm, 1994; Schindler & Thomas, 1993; Sonnenburg, 1994).

Trust and Schools

In schools, trust is a part of the roles and actions that create and maintain social and educational patterns of the school. Because trust implies confidence in the consistency of action on the part of others in the school, it must be fostered in schools (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). A culture of trust is dependent upon both the actions of the principal and behavior of teachers and is based on open relationships (Leonard, 1999). Both principals and teachers have important roles in the development of trust. For the school to work effectively, a principal must balance the demands of the school system organization with the professional desires of the teachers (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

The role of the principal is to develop a supportive environment in which teachers are confident enough to take risks, try new things, and make mistakes. In such schools teachers are more like to develop open relations with their peers, trust the principal, and eventually trust each other (Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995). This ultimately leads to more effective schools. Teachers are more likely to exercise better professional judgment when they believe they can depend on the principal even in difficult situations (Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995).

To better understand trust in schools it is important to discuss trust behaviors among principals and teachers. Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998) suggested five behaviors that can cultivate trust: (1) consistency, (2) integrity, (3) concern, (4) communication, and (5) sharing control. In schools, teachers will have greater confidence when they feel they can predict the behavior of their principal and when they believe their principal to be a person of integrity. Integrity means telling the truth and keeping promises (Morin, 1990) and authenticity, or accepting responsibility for one's actions and avoiding distorting the truth in order to shift

blame to another (Fairholm, 1994). Authenticity has been linked to trust in principals in schools (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998).

Evans' (1996) study of leadership in schools found that trust developed from consistency in personal beliefs, organizational goals, and work performance. Similarly, other studies found that consistency, competence, and evenhanded behavior on the part of the principal promoted strong and healthy school communities (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Bryk, Lee, & Holland, 1993; Bryk & Schneider, 1996).

Another key element underlying trust is open communication. Thorough explanations and timely feedback on decisions lead to higher levels of trust (Morin, 1990). Free exchange of ideas and thoughts between principal and teachers also builds trust (Butler, 1991). Principals can foster trust by actively encouraging their teachers to voice their frustrations candidly, which include criticisms of the principal's own decisions (Bryk et al, 1993; Rosenholz, 1989). Roberts and O'Reilly (1974) found that when there was a high level of trust between superiors and subordinates, subordinates expressed high levels of confidence in the accuracy of information coming from the superior, a desire for interaction with the superior, and satisfaction with communication with the superior. When there was low trust, subordinates had a tendency to withhold information to distort upward communication. Thus, empirical evidence supports the premise that trust is affected by the amount and quality of communication in a relationship (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

An aspect of open communication that contributes to trust is a willingness to apologize for mistakes or misdeeds (Greenberg, 1993). Tschannen-Moran (1998) found that the story of a principal's willingness to apologize for an unfair remark to a teacher was well-known among the

faculty in a school and helped to cultivate trust in the principal even among those who had not received such an apology.

Research has shown that subordinates perceive greater trustworthiness on the part of superiors who share control, including participation in decision making and delegating control. Teachers' trust has been found to be positively related to empowerment and shared decision making (Short, Greer & Melvin, 1994; Tschannen-Moran & Goddard, 2000). Authentic empowerment provides greater protection of the employee's interests and reduces the risk of opportunism on the part of superiors. In addition, such collaboration allows teachers greater responsiveness to student needs (Mark & Louis, 1997). Schools in which the principals engage in authentic shared decision making also produced high levels of faculty trust in students (Short, Greer & Melvin, 1994; Tschannen-Moran & Goddard, 2000). Sharing and delegation of control also has a symbolic value, because when principals share control, they are in effect saying to their teachers that they trust them (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

While the focus of this study is the relationship between principals and teachers, it is important to note the effect of building and maintaining trust on students. Teacher behavior has a more direct impact on student learning. Studies of teachers in schools have suggested that in high trust settings, teachers expressed support for their school and for their colleagues in a variety of ways: by covering classes for one another, socializing outside of school, or taking meals to families that were experiencing illness, and even contributing sick days to allow a seriously ill (Tschannen-Moran, 1998). In high trust schools, teachers were more open with each other, less isolated, and more willing to share professional secrets, successful teaching strategies, materials, and equipment in the interest of helping students learn (Tschannen-Moran, 1998). In high trust

schools, everyone was presumed to be honest; however, when that trust was violated, regaining it was difficult (Tschannen-Moran, 1998).

Building trust requires demonstrating reliability, honesty, openness, and competence. The nature of the interactions between principals and teachers is such that each of these aspects of building trust has been found to be a significant part of judgments of trust (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

McKnight et al. (1998) noted that because trust is a judgment, it may be easy to understand as a concept but difficult to measure as a construct. Judgment is an interactive process between the person doing the judging and whatever is being judged. The perspective, values, needs and capacities of the individual making the judgment influence their idea of trust. Someone may be highly trustworthy by certain standards, and yet not be trusted by people with different needs, standards, or levels of understanding. Likewise, as noted previously, someone may be highly untrustworthy by common standards, yet be trusted by individuals who believe that everyone is inherently honest (McKnight et al., 1998).

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between trust and decision making among principals and teachers in schools in Edinburg, Texas. It also examined the impact of gender and race on the relationship between trust and decision making. This chapter describes the research design, subjects of the study, variables, hypotheses, instrumentation, and data collection and analysis.

Research Design

This study was an exploratory study (bounded by geographic location) with the dependent variable Trust and the independent variable Decision Making. This study correlated the degree of trust teachers have in their principal with the amount of their involvement in decision making. Data were collected from schools in Edinburg, Texas, from the administration of a three-part survey consisting of two established instruments and a demographic section. The survey method was chosen because, according to Blaxter, Huges, and Tight (1996), surveys are useful when there is a need to quickly obtain information in a non-threatening way. Their advantages include anonymity, low administrative cost, and easy comparison and analysis of data (Marshall & Rossman, 1999).

The demographic section collected data, such as age, gender, level of education, ethnicity, years of teaching experience, and grade level taught, which was used to establish a relationship between trust and decision making. The data were subjected to a correlation analysis using Pearson Correlation Coefficients to determine the correlation coefficient of trust and decision making.

Characteristics and Size of Sample

This was an exploratory study designed to examine the relationship between trust and decision-making among principals and teachers in schools in Edinburg, Texas. The researcher was interested in examining this particular group of individuals because of the unique aspects of this geographic location. The Edinburgh Consolidated Independent School District, a Texas Education Agency "Recognized District," has three high schools, four middle schools, one alternative campus, and 27 elementary schools. The district has approximately 3,904 employees, of which 2,063 are certified professionals. Understanding how this group of individuals perceived trust and the general orientation they had in relation to decision making was the basis for this exploratory study. A sample of teachers from the district was taken.

Yaffee (1997) found it is necessary to conduct a power analysis to make sure that the sample size is large enough that statistical tests can actually detect the differences that they claim to find. Thus, power analysis guards against failure of a study from insufficient data. Similarly, Bland and Altman (1994) also found that it is important to calculate sample size calculations to ensure results with the required precision or confidence. Accordingly, if the sample size is too low, the standard statistical tests do not have the statistical power to detect differences that really exist (Yaffee, 1997). Stelzl (2000) supported this idea, stating that smaller sample sizes should not be considered because of the lack in statistical power that would result. Yamane's (1967) formula listed below was used to calculate the appropriate sample size for this study (p. 886):

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N\,(e)^2}$$

Table 2
Yamane's Formula for Analyzing Sample Size-Example

Sample Size for ± 5%, ± 7%, ± 10%, Precision Levels Where Confidence is 95%

Size of Population	Sample Size (*n*) for Precision (e)		
	± 5%	± 7%	± 10%
400	201	135	81

Table 2 above provides an example of how the formula can be used to determine the precision level of a study, given a specific confidence level. The example in Table 2 shows that for a population of 400 *(N* = 400), a study would need a sample size of 201 *(n* = 201) to achieve a precision level of ±5%, when the confidence level is set at 95%. To obtain a precision level of ±7% and ±10%, a study would need a sample size of n = 135 and n = 81 respectively, if the same confidence level of 95% is set.

Variables

Trust was the dependent variable of this study, and Decision Making was the independent variable. Trust was operationalized by the Trust Scale (T-Scale) (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2002); and Decision Making was operationalized by the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) (Russell & Cooper, 1992). The moderating variables, Gender and Race, help identify characteristics of the respondents.

The number of years respondents have been in their current position was also collected. This was because this study was designed to exclude those respondents that have less than one year of tenure in their respective academic organizations. This was based on the assumption that they cannot fully determine their levels of trust within that limited time.

Hypotheses

The dependent variable for the current study was Trust and the independent variable was Decision Making. The relationship between Trust and Decision Making was examined using Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the statistical analysis.

To determine if a significant relationship existed between Trust and Decision Making, the following hypotheses were created and presented in their null and alternate forms for statistical testing purposes. The null hypothesis is generally an assertion that no effects are present, or that effects are somehow equal across a number of independent variables (Babbie, 2003). This assertion is held as true until there is sufficient statistical evidence to conclude otherwise. If statistical computations provide values that are significantly different, then the null form of the hypothesis is rejected and its alternative form is accepted.

H1: There is a significant relationship between trust and decision making among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale).

$H1_0$: There is no significant relationship between trust and decision making among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale).

H2: There are significant differences in the relationship between trust and decision-making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of gender, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale).

$H2_0$: There are no significant differences in the relationship between trust and decision-making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of gender, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale).

H3: There are significant differences in the relationship between trust and decision-making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of race, as determined through

administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale).

$H3_0$: There are no significant differences in the relationship between trust and decision-making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of race, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale).

Instrumentation

Established survey instruments were used to measure the variables. The Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS), created by Russell and Cooper (1992), was used to collect data pertaining to the variable of Decision Making. The Trust Scale (T-Scale), developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) was used to collect data pertaining to Trust. These two instruments plus a demographic section were combined to create a three-part survey.

Decision-Making Measure

The Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS), a 50-item instrument, was developed for assessing teacher participation in shared decision making (Russell & Cooper, 1992). It presented a series of statements in eight subcategories. The subcategories and their corresponding items were as follows: (1) Goals/Mission/Vision: Items 1 – 9; (2) Standards: Items 10 – 14; (3) Curriculum/Instruction: Items 15 – 24; (4) Budget: Items 25 – 30; (5) Staffing: Items 31 – 34; (6) Operations: Items 35 – 38; (7) Facilitating Procedures and Structures: Items 39 – 45; (8) Staff Development: Items 46 – 50.

An example of an item from the Goals dimension of the scale is: "Teachers and parents have developed the same shared vision for this school." An example from the Operations dimension of the scale is: "Teachers working together set their own standards."

The respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement with each statement or item using a Likert scale. The use of the Likert scale for the TIPS provided quantified data to measure teacher participation over the past year in decision-making in general and in each of the eight dimensions. The scale ranged from "*strongly disagree*" (1) to "*strongly agree*" (6). As the categories moved from one to the next (for example, from strongly disagree to disagree), the value increased by one unit. In other words, the Likert scale on which the questionnaire test scores were based, had equal units, assigned values as the categories move from most negative to most positive. The reason this scale was chosen was that it provides an efficient and effective means of quantifying the data and of obtaining shades of perception.

The score for each subcategory dimension of the TIPS survey was the sum of all of the related item responses. No items were reversed scored. The Total TIPS Score equaled the sum of all the items. The Total TIPS Score as well as the individual subcategory scores were used as values for the independent variable.

The TIPS instrument has been demonstrated to be both reliable and valid for measuring shared decision making (Russell, 1992). The instrument has a Cronbach's Alpha of .9572 indicating a satisfactory level of reliability.

TIPS were used in this study because it can be a useful tool in assessing the level of shared decision making in schools. The data obtained from the TIPS reflect the perceptions of staff members concerning their involvement in decision making in eight key areas. It is

important to point out that this study did differ from previous studies because this study also examined the level of trust in the principal. It was hoped that some relationship would be found between and among the collected data.

Trust Measure

In addition to using the TIPS in this study, this researcher also used the Trust Scale (T-Scale), a 37-item instrument for determining trust in the principal and in colleagues. This instrument was developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) as an operational measure of three subscales of trust: Faculty Trust in the Principal, Faculty Trust in Colleagues, and Faculty Trust in Clients. Faculty Trust in the Principal has been defined as "the degree of confidence that the principal will keep his/her word and will act with the best interest of the teachers in mind." (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985, p.2)

A 6-point Likert scale was developed, ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (6). This scale was similar in format to the TIPS. The total T-Scale score was the sum of all the items. The score for each of the three subscales was equal to the sum of the item responses relating to that subscale. In particular, items pertaining to Faculty Trust in Principal were number 1, 4*, 7, 10, 13*, 16*, 19, 22, 25, 28*, and 30 (* indicates items that were reversed scored). Faculty Trust in Colleagues was determined by items 2, 5, 8*, 11, 14, 20, 23, 26 (8* was reverse scored). Faculty Trust in Clients was in items numbered 3, 6, 9*, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 27, 29, 31, 32* (again, * indicates items that were reversed scored). The Faculty Trust in Principal was used for the dependent variable Trust in the analyses.

Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) used pilot testing and hypothesis testing to check for reliability and validity of the T-Scale. Both were completed using a six-point scale, ranging from

strongly disagree to strongly agree, for 37 questions that relate to faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues and faculty trust in clients. The reliabilities of the three subscales typically range from .93 to .98. Factor analytic studies of the T-Scale support the construct validity of the concept.

The T-Scale was used to collect data pertaining to trust in the principal. This data was compared to scores from the administration of the TIPS to determine if there was a relationship between trust and shared decision-making.

Demographic Factors

Participants also completed the demographic section of the survey. Demographic information, such as age, gender, level of education, race, years of teaching experience, and grade level taught, were collected. The data collected on gender and race, the moderating variables of the study, were used to determine the correlation with the results of the TIPS and the T-Scale. These data were collected because studies have shown that gender (Bulach & Peterson, 1999; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998) and race (Jones, 2002; Mabokela & Madsen, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998) have an effect on trust and teachers' tendency toward participation in decision-making. While information on age, level of education, years of teaching experience, and grade level taught were not be correlated with the test instruments, they were included in the demographic section to indicate areas for possible further study.

Data Collection and Analysis

This researcher administered the survey instruments at Site-Based Decision-Making (SBD) Council Meetings and professional after-school meetings (mandatory every Wednesday of the school week) to all high school teachers in Edinburg, Texas who were in attendance. On-

site surveying has several advantages: (1) it facilitates the prompt collection of data; (2) it has the advantage of increasing the response rate; and (3) it is less costly than other approaches such as mail-outs or other means of distribution.

Power calculations performed for this investigation revealed that a power of 90% or more, depending on the sample size, should be applied so that the study did not miss a real effect. Therefore, a significance level of 10% ($p = .10$) was used for this study.

This researcher wanted to obtain more than 150 completed questionnaires to have a large enough sample size for valid statistical analysis. Permission was obtained from the appropriate authorities, and all potential participants were assured of anonymity. This researcher attended meetings and asked teachers to participate until a sufficient number of completed forms were received. Those who returned completed survey questionnaires became the study's sample.

Pearson Correlation Coefficients were used to determine the correlation between Decision Making and Trust. The independent variable was Decision Making as measured by the Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS). The TIPS assessed perceived levels of shared decision making. The relationships of trust with all the TIPS subscales were examined as well as the total TIPS score. The dependent variable was Trust as measured by scores on the Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) scale of the Trust Scales (T-Scale).

Hierarchical regression analysis was used to determine the moderating effects of gender and race on the relationship between trust in the principal and involvement in decision making (Jose, 2004). The dependent variable was Trust as measured by the Faculty Trust in Principal Scale (FTP) of the Trust-Scale. The independent variable was Decision Making as measured by

the total score for the Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS). The moderating variables were Gender and Race.

CHAPTER 4: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

This study addressed the issues of trust and decision making in school settings. Specifically, the study looked at the relationship between trust and decision making among teachers and principals in high schools in Edinburg, Texas. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the data collection process, data analysis, and findings of the study. The research questions guiding this study were: (1) Is there a relationship between trust and decision making among teachers and principals? (2) If there were a relationship between trust and decision making among teachers and principals, would it be a positive or negative relationship? (3) How do factors such as gender and race affect the relationship between trust and decision making among teachers and principals?

The answers to the research questions were found by analyzing the data collected through administration of a survey questionnaire to the designated sample of study subjects. The first section of this chapter discusses the method of data collection and describes the survey instruments that were used. The second section presents the research data, describes the demographics of the sample, and presents the data analysis of the survey questions. Answers to the research questions based on the data analysis are presented in the last section.

Data Collection

This study examined the relationship between trust and decision making among principals and teachers in schools in Edinburg, Texas. The study also investigated the impact of gender and race on the relationship between trust and decision making in that same study sample.

This was an exploratory study, bounded by geography. Data were collected from teachers in high schools in Edinburg, Texas. The researcher was interested in examining this particular group of individuals because of the unique aspects of this geographic location. The Edinburg (Texas) Consolidated Independent School District has three high schools and thirty-two lower-level schools. There are approximately 3,904 employees, of which 2,063 are certified professional educators. Understanding how this group of individuals perceived trust and the general orientation they had in relation to decision-making was the basis for this exploratory study. Data were gathered from a sample of teachers from the district to provide the basis for the present research study.

The Superintendent of the school district granted permission to distribute and collect surveys and all three high school principals agreed to participate in this study. This researcher administered the survey instruments at Site-Based Decision-Making (SBD) Council Meetings and professional after-school meetings to all high school teachers in Edinburg, Texas who attended. This researcher wanted to obtain more than 150 completed questionnaires to have a large enough sample size for valid statistical analysis. The total population consisted of 448 teachers. All potential participants were assured of anonymity. The questionnaire was administered on-site to ensure quick results and to increase participation. This researcher attended teachers' meetings and requested teachers to participate until a sufficient number of completed forms were received. Those who returned completed survey questionnaires became the study's sample population.

This researcher collected data during the dates of March 14-28, 2005. The distribution of the survey questionnaires at the first high school resulted in 50 collected questionnaires, out of

152 teachers who could have filled it out. Therefore, the response rate was 76%. At the second high school, a total of 54 survey questionnaires were collected out of 147, resulting in a response rate of 79%. A total of 47 survey questionnaires out of 149 were collected at the third high school, a return rate of 70%.

Two established survey instruments were used to measure the items of interest called variables. The Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS), created by Russell and Cooper (1992), was used to collect data pertaining to the variable of Decision Making. The Trust Scale (T-Scale) developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) was used to collect data pertaining to the variable of Trust. Both TIPS and the T-Scale surveys have been judged reliable and valid. This researcher to create a three-part survey, which each participant completed, combined these two instruments plus a demographic section. Participants had to complete all three sections in order for the survey to count. All surveys collected had all three sections completed.

Data Analysis

Data were collected for the present study through administration of two standardized instruments: the Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) of Russell and Cooper (1992) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale) of Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), with the addition of a section on demographic information. These data were subjected to a correlation analysis using Pearson Correlation Coefficients to evaluate the degree of trust teachers have in their principal with the amount of their involvement in decision-making.

According to Cooper and Schindler (2003), when trying to make a decision about significance levels, a researcher attempts to decide criteria for accepting or rejecting a

hypothesis. A critical part of that decision is evaluating whether a losing potential finding because the criteria were too stringent is worse than over interpreting the data because they were too liberal. Because this was an exploratory study bounded by geographic location and specific objectives, it would be worse to miss potential findings than to over interpret the data. The results therefore were reported to a .10 level in order to avoid potential findings.

Trust was the dependent variable for the calculation in this study, and Decision Making was the independent variable. Trust was operationalized by the Trust Scale (T-Scale) (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2002); and Decision Making was operationalized by the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) (Russell & Cooper, 1992). The moderating variables, Gender and Race, were identifying characteristics of the respondents and were determined from their responses to the demographic questions.

Pearson Correlation Coefficients were used to determine the correlation between Decision Making and Trust. One variable was Decision Making as measured by the Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS). The TIPS assessed perceived levels of shared decision-making. The relationships of trust with all the TIPS subscales were examined as well as the total TIPS score. The other variable was Trust as measured by scores on the Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) scale of the Trust Scales (T-Scale).

Hierarchical regression analysis was used to determine the moderating effects of Gender and Race on the relationship between trust in the principal and involvement in decision-making (Jose, 2004). The dependent variable was Trust as measured by the Faculty Trust in Principal Scale (FTP) of the Trust-Scale. The independent variable was Decision Making as measured by

the total score for the Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS). The moderating variables were Gender and Race.

Research Findings

The major objective of the present research was to examine the relationship between trust and decision making among principals and teachers. The study also examined the impact of gender and race on the relationship between trust and decision making. This section describes the findings of the data analysis and the research results.

Demographics

The sample consisted of 151 high school teachers in the Edinburgh Consolidated Independent School District, in Edinburgh Texas. Table 3 provides the demographics of the study's sample. As indicated, 71 were female (47.7%) and 78 were male (52.3%). Of the total, 66.2% (n=100) indicated race as "White" and 33.8% (n=51) indicated their race as "other." In answering about ethnicity, 131 (86.8%) said they were Hispanic and 20 (13.2%) said they were "other."

The respondents ranged in age from 20 years old to over 60 years old. Twenty-four percent, or 36 respondents, were 20-29 years old. Thirty-three

Table 3
Sample Descriptives

Variable	Number	Percent	Variable	Number	Percent
Sex			Age		
Male	78	52.3	20 – 29	36	24.0

Female	71	47.7	30 – 39	50	33.3
Race			40 – 49	33	22.0
White	100	66.2	50 – 59	26	17.3
Other	51	33.8	60 +	5	3.4
Ethnicity			Experience		
Hispanic	131	86.8	1 – 5	42	27.8
Other	20	13.2	6 – 10	40	26.5
Years in Current School			11 – 15	24	15.9
< 1	11	7.4	16 – 20	12	7.9
1 – 5	78	52.3	20 +	33	21.9
6 - 10	31	20.8	Participate in Decision Making		
11 - 15	19	12.8	very little	45	29.8
16 - 20	3	2.0	somewhat	89	58.9
20 +	7	4.7	very much	17	11.3

percent, or 50 respondents, were 30-39 years old. Twenty-two percent (33 respondents) of those answering the survey were 40-49 years old. Seventeen percent (26 of those surveyed) were 50-59 years old. There were 3 % (5 respondents) over 60 years old.

The teachers were surveyed about their years of experience. The details of distribution for this category are also provided in Table 3. The majority (82 respondents or 54.3%) had less than 10 years teaching experience. Twenty-four percent had 11 to 20 years of experience, and 22% (33 teachers) had more than 20 years experience in the schools.

The demographic survey also asked about years in the current school. This question was asked because the study was designed to exclude those respondents who had less than one year of tenure in their respective academic organizations, based on the assumption that they could not fully determine their levels of trust within that limited time. Eleven respondents, or 7.4%, had been in their current school less than one year; these were excluded from the statistical evaluation. Seventy-eight respondents (52.3%) had been in their current school for one to five years. Thirty-one respondents (20.8%) indicated that they had been in their current schools for six to 10 years. Nineteen teachers (12.8%) had been in the current school 11-15 years, and three respondents (2%) had been in the current school 16-20 years. Finally, seven respondents (4.7%) had been in their present schools for more than 20 years.

The final demographic question asked the teachers about their perception of how much they participated in school decision making. Most (58.9% or 89 respondents) said that they participated "somewhat." Forty-five teachers (29.8%) thought they participated "very little," and 17 (11.3%) replied that they participated in decision making "very much."

In summary, the demographics of the study's sample population indicate the majority were men. Most indicated that their race was "White" and their ethnicity was Hispanic. The majority age groups were between 30 and 39. The greater part had between one and ten years of experience teaching and had been in their current school one to five years. A high percent indicated that they participated in their school's decision making "somewhat." Therefore, the profile of the average respondent in this study was a white Hispanic man between the ages of 30 and 39, who had from 1 to 10 years experience teaching and had been in his current school 1 to 5 years. The average respondent indicated that he participates "somewhat" in school decision

making.

Analysis of Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis One posited that there was a significant relationship between trust and decision making among teachers in Edinburg High Schools as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale). The null hypothesis stated that there was no significant relationship between trust and decision making among teachers as determined through administration of the TIPS and T-Scales. To analyze the data, correlation between Trust and Decision Making was examined using the Pearson Correlation.

With regard to the coefficients, the one variable was Trust, as represented by the Faculty Trust in Principal scale (FTP) of the Trust Scale (T-Scale). The other variable was Decision Making. For Decision Making, the total scale score of the Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and each TIPS subcategory scale score were used and calculated independently.

See Table A1 in Appendix for results of the Pearson Correlation Coefficients analysis of Hypothesis One. Some of the scale scores had missing values because some of the respondents did not answer all of the questions. The Pearson Correlation Coefficients were calculated with the missing values excluded pair-wise. The number of respondents with Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) total scale score or each TIPS subcategory scale score ranged from n = 129 to n = 151.

It was determined using Pearson Correlation Coefficients calculations that there was a significant correlation between Total TIPS - Scale score and Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) score from the Trust-Scale instrument. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient r-value was [r (n =

135) = .586, p = .000]. That is to say, there is a strong relationship in the positive direction between teacher participation in decision making and teacher trust in the principal.

It is also important to note additional findings associated with this particular hypothesis. Further inspection of A1 shows that there is a group of subcategories with high Pearson Correlation Coefficients r-values. The highest correlation of Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) score with TIPS subcategory scale scores were with subcategories designated Goals/Vision/Mission, Standards, Curriculum/Instruction, and Staff Development.

As indicated by the calculation of the Pearson Correlation Coefficient r-value, the Goals/Vision/Mission subcategory correlation to FTP was [r (n = 141) = .686, p = .000]. The correlation for the Standards subcategory with FTP was [r (n = 140) = .496, p = .000]. The Curriculum/Instruction subcategory had a correlation score with FTP of [r (n = 139) = .462, p = .000]; and finally, the Staff Development subcategory score with FTP was [r (n = 142) = .442, p = .000].

Looking at Table A1, notice the lowest Pearson Correlation Coefficients r- values. The lowest Pearson Correlation Coefficient values were between the Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) score of the Trust Scale and TIPS scale scores relating to the subcategories designated Facilitating Procedures & Structures, Budget, Staffing, and Operations. The Pearson Correlation Coefficients relationship of FTP with the subcategory Facilitating Procedures & Structures was [r (n = 129) = .405, p = .000]. The subcategory Budget had a correlation with FTP of [r (n = 141) = .356, p = .000]. Subcategory Staffing's correlation with FTP was [r (n = 142) = .279, p = .001]. Finally, the subcategory Operations and FTP had a correlation of [r (n = 142) = .244, p = .003].

The Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) scale of the Trust-Scale instrument correlated more highly with TIPS subcategories that involved instruction and staff issues. The instruction and staff issue subcategories included Goals/Vision/ Mission, Standards, Curriculum/Instruction, and Staff Development. These subcategories had the highest Pearson Correlation Coefficient r-values to the Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) scale of the Trust-Scale survey given to the High School teachers of Edinburg, Texas. Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) correlated less well with TIPS subcategories that involve administrative issues. The administrative issues subcategories included Facilitating Procedures & Structures, Budget, Staffing, and Operations. These subcategories had the lowest Pearson Correlation Coefficients to the Faculty Trust in Principal scale of the Trust-Scale instrument given to the High School teachers of Edinburg, Texas.

Hypothesis One posited that there is a significant relationship between trust and decision making among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale). The null hypothesis form stated that there is no significant relationship between trust and decision making among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale). The calculations of the Pearson Correlation Coefficients r-values based on the present research indicated that there was a significant relationship between trust in the principal and decision making among teachers. Based on these results, the null hypothesis stating that there was no significant relationship between trust and decision making among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools was rejected. The alternative Hypothesis One was accepted. The research results indicate that there is a significant relationship between trust and decision making among

teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale).

Analysis of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis Two posited that there are significant differences in the relationship between trust and decision-making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of Gender, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale). Null Hypothesis Two stated that there are no significant differences in the relationship between trust and decision-making scores among teachers who work in Edinburgh High Schools for the moderating variable of Gender, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale). To analyze this hypothesis, hierarchical multiple regressions were performed on the research scores from the TIPS survey, the Trust Scale survey, and the demographic survey given to the teachers in Edinburg High Schools for this research project.

The hierarchical multiple regressions that were calculated to test Hypothesis Two were based on the dependent variable Trust, the independent variable Decision Making, and the moderating variable Gender. The dependent variable Trust was represented by the Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) scale of the Trust Scale (T-Scale). The independent variable was Decision Making. For Decision Making, the total scale score of the Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) was used. The moderating variable was Gender (female or male), which was determined from the respondent's answers on the demographic section of the survey instrument.

To test for the possibility of a moderating effect on the relationship between the dependent variable Trust and the independent variable Decision Making by the moderating variable Gender, three regression equations were calculated according to Baron & Kenny (1986) and Jose (2004). The first equation regressed the dependent variable Trust on the independent variable Decision Making. The second equation regressed the dependent variable Trust on the independent variable Decision Making and the moderator Gender. The third equation regressed the dependent variable Trust on the independent variable Decision Making, the moderator Gender, and the interaction between the independent variable Decision Making and the moderator Gender. If the regression equations were to show a significant interaction, that would indicate the moderator variable was present.

See Table 4 for the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis for Hypothesis Two. The dependent variable Trust was represented by the Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) scale of the Trust Scale (T-Scale). The independent variable Decision Making was defined by the total score of the Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS). The moderator

Table 4
Hierarchical Regression Analysis Trust in Principal Regressed on Decision-Making Involvement and Gender

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Decision-Making Involvement	0.25	0.03	0.59**

Step 2			
Decision-Making Involvement	0.25	0.03	0.59**
Gender	-0.96	1.95	-0.04
Step 3			
Decision-Making Involvement	0.22	0.10	0.51*
Gender	2.50	9.81	0.10
Interaction	0.02	0.06	0.15

Note. R^2 = .344 for Step 1; ΔR^2 = 0 for Step 2; ΔR^2 = .001 Step 3
*p < .05 **p < .01

Gender was calculated with male = 0 and female = 1. The results of regression equation calculations showed that there was a significant relationship between Trust (FTP) and Decision Making (TIPS total score) equal to [F (1,122) = 63.9, p = .000]. The R^2 value for Step 1 was 0.344. The addition of Gender (0 = male, 1 = female) in Step 2 gave an R^2 value of 0.344.

It is important to note that the interaction of all the variables-Trust, Decision Making, and Gender-resulted in an R^2 value for Step 3 of 0.345. The addition of Gender in Step 2 and the interactions of all of the variables in Step 3 did not result in any significant changes in R^2. Therefore, Gender was not significantly related to Trust (FTP). The interaction between Gender and Decision Making (TIPS) was also not significant. This means that Gender is not a moderating variable between the dependent variable Trust and the independent variable Decision Making.

Hypothesis Two posited significant differences in the relationship between Trust and Decision-making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of Gender, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale). Null Hypothesis Two stated that there are no significant differences in the relationship between Trust and Decision-Making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of Gender, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale). Based on the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis for the survey scores of this research, Gender does not moderate the relationship between Trust, as represented by FTP, and Decision Making, as represented by TIPS total score.

From this analysis, it can be seen that the alternative Hypothesis Two (that there are significant differences in the relationship between Trust and Decision-Making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools) for the moderating variable of Gender, was rejected. Similarly, the null Hypothesis Two was accepted-that is, the research results in this case indicated that there are no significant differences in the relationship between Trust and Decision-Making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of Gender, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale).

Analysis of Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis Three posited that there are significant differences in the relationship between trust and decision-making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of Race, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement

and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale). Null Hypothesis Three stated that there are no significant differences in the relationship between trust and decision-making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of Race, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale). To investigate this hypothesis, hierarchical multiple regressions were performed on the research scores from the TIPS survey, the Trust Scale survey, and the demographic survey given to the teachers in Edinburg High Schools for this research project.

The hierarchical multiple regressions that were calculated to test Hypothesis Three were based on the dependent variable Trust, the independent variable Decision Making, and the moderating variable Race. The dependent variable Trust was represented by the Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) scale of the Trust Scale (T-Scale). The independent variable was Decision Making, which used the total scale score of the Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) for its values. The moderating variable was Race ("White" or "other"). Race was determined from the respondent's own answers on the demographic section of the survey instrument.

To test for the possibility of a moderating effect on the relationship between the dependent variable Trust and the independent variable Decision Making by the moderating variable Race, three regression equations were calculated according to Baron & Kenny (1986) and Jose (2004). These calculations were similar to those for Hypothesis Two. The first equation regressed the dependent variable Trust on the independent variable Decision Making. The second equation regressed the dependent variable Trust on the independent variable Decision Making and the moderator Race. The third equation regressed the dependent variable Trust on

the independent variable Decision Making, the moderator Race, and the interaction between the independent variable Decision Making and the moderator Race. If the regression equations were to show a significant interaction that would indicate the moderator variable Race was present.

Table 5 provides the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis for Hypothesis Three. The dependent variable Trust was represented by the Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) scale of the Trust Scale (T-Scale). The independent variable Decision Making was defined by the total score of the Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS).

The presumed moderator Race was calculated with "White" equal to 1 and "other" equal to 0. The results of the multiple regression calculations clearly showed that there was a significant relationship between Trust (FTP) and Decision Making (TIPS total score) equal to [$F(1,122) = 63.9$, $p = .000$]. The R^2 value for Step 1 was 0.344.

The addition of Race (0 = other, 1 = White) in Step 2 gave an R^2 value of 0.348. The interaction of all the variables—Trust, Decision Making, and Race—in Step 3 resulted in an R^2 value of 0.350. The addition of Race in Step 2 and the interactions of all of the variables in Step 3 did not result in any significant changes in the value of R^2. Therefore, Race was not significantly related to Trust (FTP). The interaction between Race and Decision Making (TIPS) was also not significant. This means that Race is not a moderating variable between the dependent variable Trust and the independent variable Decision Making.

Hypothesis Three posited significant differences in the relationship between Trust and Decision-making scores among teachers who work in

Table 5
Hierarchical Regression Analysis Trust in Principal Regressed on Decision-Making Involvement and Race

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Decision-Making Involvement	0.25	0.03	0.59**
Step 2			
Decision-Making Involvement	0.25	0.03	0.58**
Race	1.72	1.98	0.06
Step 3			
Decision-Making Involvement	0.27	0.05	0.63**
Race	6.89	9.55	0.26
Interaction	-0.04	0.06	-0.20

Note. R^2 = .34 for Step 1; ΔR^2 = .004 for Step 2; ΔR^2 = .002 for Step 3
**p < .01

Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of Race, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale). The null form of Hypothesis Three stated that there are no significant differences in the relationship between Trust and Decision-Making scores among teachers for the moderating

variable of Race, as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale).

Based on the results of the hierarchical multiple regression calculations for the survey scores of this research, Race did not moderate the relationship between Trust, as represented by FTP, and Decision Making, as represented by TIPS total score. Therefore, the alternative Hypothesis Three, which stated that there were significant differences in the relationship between Trust and Decision-Making scores among teachers for the moderating variable of Race, was rejected. Similarly, the null form of Hypothesis Three was accepted; that is, the results of this research project indicated that there are no significant differences in the relationship between Trust and Decision-Making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of Race as determined through administration of the Teachers Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) and the Trust Scale (T-Scale).

Summary of Data Analysis

The purpose of this research was to study the relationship between trust and decision making among principals and teachers in schools in Edinburg, Texas. It also examined the impact of gender and race on the relationship between trust and decision making. A total of 151 respondents participated in the study. Three hypotheses were presented for analysis.

Hypothesis One posited a significant relationship between Trust and Decision Making among teachers as determined through administration of the two test instruments of the investigative study. Pearson Correlation Coefficients r-values were calculated on the results of the present research. The analysis indicated that there was a significant positive relationship between trust in the principal and decision making among teachers. Therefore, alternative

Hypothesis One was accepted. Additionally, the Trust-Scale scores correlated more highly with TIPS subcategories that involved instruction and staff issues and correlated less well with TIPS subcategories that involved administrative issues.

Hypothesis Two posited significant differences in the relationship between Trust and Decision-Making scores among teachers who work in Edinburgh High Schools for the moderating variable of Gender. Hierarchical multiple regression equations were analyzed for the survey scores. Based on the outcome of these regression analyses, Gender did not moderate the relationship between Trust and Decision Making. Therefore, the null form of Hypothesis Two, which stated that there were no significant differences in the relationship between trust and decision-making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of gender, was accepted.

Hypothesis Three posited significant differences in the relationship between Trust and Decision-Making scores among teachers for the moderating variable of Race. Hierarchical multiple regression equations were also analyzed for this variable based on survey scores. Calculations indicated that Race did not moderate the relationship. Accordingly, the null form of Hypothesis Three that stated that there were no significant differences in the relationship between trust and decision-making scores among teachers who work in Edinburg High Schools for the moderating variable of race was accepted.

Answers to Research Questions

As a result of the analysis, the questions of the study can now be answered. Research question 1 asked, “Is there a relationship between trust and decision making among teachers and

principals?" The present research indicates that there was indeed a relationship between teacher participation in decision making and teacher trust in the principal for this study sample.

The second research question asked if there were a relationship between trust and decision making among teachers and principals, would it be a positive or negative relationship. It was found that there is a strong relationship in the positive direction between trust and decision making among teachers and principals. The final research question asked how did factors such as gender and race affect the relationship between trust and decision making among teachers and principals. No affect of gender or race was found for the relationship between trust and decision making among teachers and principals.

CHAPTER 5: RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This research study examined the relationship between trust and decision making among high school principals and teachers in schools in Edinburg, Texas. It also examined the influence of gender and race on the relationship between trust and decision making. Chapter 4 presented the research findings that showed that there is a relationship between trust and decision making among principals and teachers in the schools under study. This relationship was found to be strongly positive. Finally, the present research indicated that there is no influence of gender or race on the relationship between trust and decision making in this group of respondents.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the significance of these findings. It also represents the final portion of the investigative research and thus serves to bring together the separate components of the study. Conclusions are thus provided as well as limitations of this present study. In addition, suggestions are provided for further research.

Educational Theories Confirmed

This researcher chose to study the interaction of trust and decision making because theory and research suggest they may be related (Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Tschannen-Moran & Goddard, 2000; Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998). In fact, the present investigation strongly supports the concept that trust and decision making are related and is therefore a significant addition to the theory literature. There have been a few studies, which have attempted to measure trust between teachers and principals (Bulach & Peterson, 1999; Ceyanes & MacNeil,

1998). The results of the present research extended those findings with additional demographic data and a focus on one particular school system.

The present investigation focused on schools because of the national concern in education. Of interest is the fact that teacher participation in school decision making emerged over a decade ago as an important and central theme in the educational reform movement (Anderson, 2003). However, there have been few empirical studies that have addressed the relationship of teachers' participation in shared decision making and their level of trust in their principal. Thus, the present research provides a strong beginning for filling the gap in the literature of the relationship between trust and decision making in education.

Shared Decision Making

The present research study is based on data from a single school district in Edinburg, Texas. This school district has implemented Site-Based Decision-Making (SBD) Council Meetings for shared decision making. There is extensive literature on the effectiveness and desirability of SDB management (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998; Athey, 1998; Smylie & Hart, 1999) and also the disadvantages of such systems (Callahan, 1990; Enderlin-Lampe, 1997). The perceptions of teachers and administrators toward shared decision making also differ. In some cases the teachers perceive having little influence, while their principals perceive teachers as having a great deal of influence (Peters, 1990). In schools where shared decision making takes place, investigative research has shown that teachers' willingness to participate actively in shared decision making varies according to the nature of the relationship between teachers and principal (Smylie, 1992). Therefore, the present research is significant because it adds to the information available on SDB school districts. In particular, this study demonstrates that there is a positive

relationship between trust and decision making; that is, as the variable trust increased, the variable of decision making increased. The study also shows that there are no effects of race and or gender on those relationships. This is contradictory to most current theories of race relations in the United States and needs to be further investigated.

The effectiveness of SDB depends on the teachers' willingness to participate actively in shared decision making and on their trust in the principal. Participation in decision making also depends on the nature of school-wide issues, such as the school's mission and selection of instructional materials (Griffin, 1995; Livingston, Slate, & Gibbs, 1999).

The current research supports and extends these findings. Specifically, the results of Hypothesis One showed that the Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) scale of the Trust-Scale instrument correlated more highly with TIPS subcategories that involved instruction and staff issues, including Goals/Vision/Mission, Standards, Curriculum/Instruction, and Staff Development. The Faculty Trust in Principal (FTP) scores correlated less well with TIPS subcategories that involve administrative issues such as Facilitating Procedures & Structures, Budget, Staffing, and Operations. Thus, the current research may help principals and district administrators in designing SBD organizations that encourage teachers to participate in decision making in an empowering way.

Limitations of the Study

The findings and conclusions of the present research study may be limited in how much they can be generalized. Since the sample size was relatively small and drawn from a limited geographic area, the results of this study may not be conclusive even though the statistical

analysis fully supported Hypothesis One and definitely did not support Hypotheses Two and Three.

The respondents in the current study were only those high school teachers who attended Site-Based Decision-Making (SBD) Council Meetings and mandatory professional meetings in this particular school district. It is possible that teachers who attended such meetings were more likely to want to participate in decision making or was more likely to have trust in the principal. In addition, this school district already had some participatory decision making in place (as evidenced by the fact that these were "decision-making" council meetings). The results of a similar survey might be very different in another school system without site-based decision-making procedures already in place.

This researcher wanted to study the school district in Edinburg, Texas because of its unique geographic and cultural features. For a bounded exploratory study such as this one, where there are characteristics that may impact the outcome of the study, perhaps a higher percentage of the sample population should be surveyed to ensure that validity is not compromised. The very uniqueness of the Edinburg school system may have biased the outcome. For example, the respondents were overwhelmingly white Hispanics. In other school systems with either a single race or many more ethnicities present, trust and participatory decision making might be more elusive. The data representing the moderating influence of race may not hold up in other school cultural situations.

Future Research Recommendations

This study investigated the relationship between trust and decision making among teachers and principals in the schools of Edinburg, Texas. The analysis was done with Trust as

the dependent variable and Decision Making as the independent variable. The conclusions of this study open opportunities for further studies: (1) It would be interesting to perform the calculations in the other direction-with Trust as the independent variable and Decision Making as the dependent variable-to see if there was directional causation. Does participating in decision making create trust in principals or does trust in principals create a desire to participate in decision making; (2) The research instruments used in this study collected a great deal of demographic information. It would be interesting to investigate other demographic variables, such as years of teaching experience, to see what effect they have on the relationship between trust and decision making; (3) There was no moderating effect of gender or race on the relationship between trust and decision making according to the present research. This is contradictory to most assumptions about gender and racial discrimination in the schools. It would be interesting to look at the effect of gender and race or ethnicity on the level of participation in decision making or on trust in principal as separate effects; (4) Additional studies could look at the correlation between gender of the teacher and gender of principal in the relationship of trust and decision making; that is, do teachers trust a principal more who is of their own gender? ; (5) Likewise, look at the correlation of the race or ethnicity of the principal to race or ethnicity of the teacher on the issues of trust and decision making; (6) Additional research is needed to consider the principal's point of view on the relationship between trust and decision making. The principal's leadership style also impacts teachers' participation in school decision making and should be further investigated; (7) The research survey must also be extended to other populations to verify the conclusions of the present study. Thus, this represents another recommendation. Other school districts, large and small, and other geographic locations should

be investigated; (8) another recommendation for further research also should include administrators, teachers and parents; (9) it would be interesting to investigate the variables associated with the No Child Left Behind Act, enacted by Congress on January, 2002. The central and overaching theme of NCLB is accountability and related results. NCLB supports school districts to exercise discretion in decision making locally to find solutions to problems (Simpson, La Cava, Graner, 2004).

In bringing this investigative research study to a close, it is important to note that this research study examined the relationship between trust and decision making in a school district in Edinburg, Texas with the use of standard survey instruments. Analysis of the research results confirms a significant relationship between teachers' participation in decision making and their trust in the principal. This study can contribute to creating more satisfactory work environments for educators and a more effective learning atmosphere for all.

REFERENCES

American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, and National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1988). *School-based management: A strategy for better learning.* Arlington, VA: Author.

Anderson, L. W. (2003). *Enhancing the quality of teacher decision making*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Argyris, D. (1990). *Organizational perspectives*. New York, NY: University Press.

Ashton, P., & Webb, K. B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement.* New York, NY: Longman Press.

Babbie, E. (2003). *The practice of social research*. New York: Wadsworth Publishing.

Bacharach, S.B., Bauer, S., & Shedd, J.B. (1988). The work environment and school reform. *Teachers College Record, 88,* 241-56.

Bacharach, S. B. & Conley, S. C. (1986). Education reform: A managerial agenda. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*, 9, 641-645.

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

Bartunek, J.M., & Keyes, C.B. (1979). Participation in decision making. *Urban Education, 14*, 52-75.

Bass, K. E., Dellana, S. A., & Herbert, F. J. (1996). Assessing the use of total quality management in the business school classroom. *Journal of Education for Business,* 71, 6, 339-344.

Bateman, T. and Snell, S. (1999*). Management: Building competitive Advantage*. (4th ed.). New York, NY: Irwin-McGraw-Hill.

Bazerman, M. H. (1986). *Judgment in managerial decision making.* New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Bennis, W. G. (1994). *On becoming a leader*. New York, NY: Addison Wesley.

Bergman, A. B. (1992). Lessons for principals from site-based management. *Educational Leadership, 50,* 48–54.

Black, S. 1996. Share the power. *Executive Educator*, 30, 2, 24-26.

Bland, J. M., & Altman, D. G. (1994). One and two sided tests of significance. *British Medical Journal, 309,* 248.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1999). Shared governance principals: The inner experience. *NASSP Bulletin, 83,* 81–90.

Blase, J., Blase, J., Anderson, G. L., & Dungan, S. (1995). *Democratic principals in action: Eight pioneers*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Blau, J. R. & Scott, F. (1962). *The structure of organizations*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Blaxter, L., Huges, C., & Tight, M. (1996*). How to research*. New York: Open Press University.

Bradley, A. (1993). The balance of power: Shifting the lines of authority in an effort to improve schools. *Education Week, 12*, 9-14.

Briggs, K. L. & Wohlstetter, P. (1999). *Key elements of a successful school-based management strategy.* Working Paper. Available from: http://www.usc.edu/dept/education/cegov/publication.html#schoolbased

Brodinsky, B., & Neill, S. B. (Eds). (1983). *Building morale. Motivating staff: Problems and solutions.* (AASA Critical Issues Report No. 12). Sacramento, CA: Education News Service.

Brost, P. (2000). Shared decision-making for better schools. *Principal Leadership*, *1*, 58–63.

Brown, F., & Hunter, R. C. (1998). School-based management: Involving minority parents in shared decision-making. *Urban Education, 33,* 95–122.

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

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

Bryk, A. S. & Schneider, B. (1996). *Social trust: A moral resource for school improvement.* Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Bulach, C., & Peterson, T. (1999). *Levels of openness and trust: Do principals "walk the talk"*? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Hilton Head, North Carolina. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 428443).

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

Calgary Board of Education (CBE) (1999). *Learning Environment Action Plan Report (LEAP*). Calgary, Canada: Calgary Board of Education.

Callahan, R. (1990). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. New York, New York, NY: Holt Books.

Carnegie Commission on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A *nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Hyattsville, MD: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988). *Teacher involvement in decision making: A state by state profile*. Washington, DC: Ferrara.

Ceyanes, J., & MacNeil, A. (1998). *How teachers create trusting relationships with their principals.* . (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 417965).

Chase, A. M. (1991). *School level factors predicting teachers' sense of professional engagement, efficacy, commitment, and job satisfaction: An application of structural equation modeling.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347 693).

Clift, R. T., Veal, M. L., Holland, P., Johnson, M., & McCarthy, J. (1995). *Collaborative leadership and shared decision making*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Comer, J. (1993). *School power: Implications of an intervention project*. New York: Free Press.

Conger, B., & Kanungo, C. (1998). Local decision-making: A report from the trenches. *Educational Leadership*, 4, 50-52.

Conley, S. (1991). Review of research on teacher participation in school decision-making. In G. Grant (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (pp. 225-226). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Conley, S. C., & Bacharach, S. B. (1990). School-site management. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72,* 539–544.

Conley, S. J., & Cooper, K. H. (1991). Power, teachers and students. Who is really in control? *American Journal of Education*, 93, 234-244.

Connel, R. W. (1994). Poverty and education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64 2, 125-145.

Covey, S. R. (1991). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York, NY: Doubleday Press.

Cranston, N. (2000). The impact of school-based management on primary school principals: An Australian perspective. *Journal of School Leadership*, *10*, (3), 214-32.

Daft, R. L. (2000). *Management* (5th ed.). Orlando, FL: The Dryden Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1989). Accountability for professional practice. *Teachers College Record*, 91, 59-80.

David, J. J. (1989). *An empirical investigation of the schools as community.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Davis, J., & Wilson, S. M. (July 2000). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. *The Clearing House, 73*(6), 349-358.

Dismuke, D. (1993). Renaissance school. *NEA Today, 11*(9), 15-17.

Dornbusch, S. M., Glasgow, K. L., & Lin, I-Chun. (1996). The social structure of schooling. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 47, 401-416.

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

Dunn, R. J. (1996). Controlling teacher militancy: Will recent empowerment efforts have any impact? *Government Union Review*, 17(1), 1-12.

Eaker, R., DuFour, R., & Burnette, R. (2002). *Getting started: Reculturing schools to become professional learning communities.* Indiana: National Educational Service.

Elenbogen, J.C., & Hiestand, N. (1989). *Shared decision making in local school planning: An urban school system's experience.* Boston, MA: American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 564).

Ellis, K., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (1999). *Communicating with management: Relating trust to job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness*. Paper presented at National Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL, November, 1999.

Enderlin-Lampe, S. (1997). Shared decision-making in schools: Effect on teacher efficacy. *Education*, 118, 1, 150-156.

Enderlin-Lampe, S. (2002). Empowerment: teacher perceptions, aspirations and efficacy. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*. Retrieved December 2004, from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FCG/is_3_29/ ai_91707789

Estler, S. E. (1996). *Systematic analysis and university decision-making: The case of sexual equity*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of *The Association for the Study of Higher Education*. Washington D.C.: ERIC EN 187211.

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

Fairholm, G. W. (1994). *Leadership and the culture of trust.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Flannery, D. (1980). *Teacher decision involvement and job satisfaction in Wisconsin high schools. (*Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1980). From UMI Proquest No. AAT8023406.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Goldman, J. P. (1992). When participatory management attracts no buyers. *School Administrator*, *49*, 15.

Goldman, P., Dunlap, D. M., & Conley, D. T. (1993). Facilitative power and nonstandardized solutions to school site restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 29,* 69–92.

Goldring, E. B., & Rallis, S. F. (1993*). Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Gordon, S. (1992). Perspectives and imperative: Paradigms, transitions, and the new supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 8, 62-76.

Grant, L. (1991). R. L. Sullivan High School: success by exhibition. Urbana, IL: National Center for School Leadership. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 360 685)

Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Griffin, G. (1995). Influences of shared decision making on school and classroom activity: Conversations with five teachers. *Elementary School Journal*, 96, 1, 29-45.

Guthrie, J. W. (1986). School-based management: The next needed education reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *68*, 305-9.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice.* London: Tavistock.

Harrison, E. F. (1999). *The managerial decision-making process* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Hart, A. W. (1995). Reconceiving school leadership: Emergent views. *The Elementary School Journal, 96,* 9–28.

Heller, M. J., & Firestone, W. A. (1995). Who's in charge here? Sources of leadership for change in eight schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96, 65–86.

Herman, J., & Herman, J. (1993). *Holistic quality: Managing, restructuring, and empowering schools.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Hess, G. A. (1999). Understanding achievement and other changes under Chicago school reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21, 67-83.

Hess, G. A. (1994). The changing role of teachers: Moving from interested spectators to engaged planners. *Education and Urban Society*, 26, 248-63.

Hoy, W. K. & Brown, B. L. (1988). Leadership behavior and the zone of acceptance of elementary teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 26 (1), 23-38.

Hoy, W. K., & Kupersmith, W.J. (1985). The meaning and measure of faulty trust. *Educational and Psychological Research, 5,* 1-10.

Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (1993). A normative theory of participative decision making in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 31,* 4–19.

Hoy, W. K. & Tarter, C.J. (1995). *Administrators Solving the Problems of Practice: Decision making concepts, cases, and consequences.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 9* (1), 84-208.

Huddleston, J. (1991). Participative decision-making can capitalize on teacher expertise. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin,* 75, 80-85.

Husband, R. E & Short, P. M. (1994). Interdisciplinary teams lead to greater teacher empowerment. *Middle School Journal*, 26, 58-61.

Johnson, M. J., & Pajares, F. (1996). When shared decision making works: A three year longitudinal study. *American Educational Research Journal, 33,* 599-627.

Johnson, S. M. 1990. *Teachers at work achieving success on our schools. New* York, NY: Basic Books: New York.

Johnston, G. S., & Germinario, V. (1985). Relationship between teacher decisional status and loyalty to the principal. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *23* (1), 91-105.

Jones, C. (2002). Teachers' perceptions of African American principals' leadership in urban schools. Peabody Journal of Education, *77* (1), 7-34.

Keaster, R., Kirby, P.C., & Wimbelberg, R. (1992). Teacher empowerment depends on need, expectation of principals, schools, districts. *NASSP Bulletin*, *76*, 89-95.

Keedy, J. L. & Finch, A. M. (1994). Examining teacher-principal empowerment: An analysis of power. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, *2*, 162-75.

Keith, S. & Girling, R. (1991). Education management and participation: New directions in educational administration. New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Koch, J. V., & Fisher, J. L. (1998). Higher education and total quality management. *Total Quality Management*, *9* (8), 659-669.

Kuku, M., & Taylor, J.W. (2002). Teacher participation in decision making: A comparative study of school leader and teacher perceptions in North Philippine Academies. *InFo, 5* (1), 19 - 46

Kunz, D. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1976). Leadership style of principals and the professional zone of acceptance of teachers. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 12 (3), 49-64.

Lange, J. T. (1993, January). Site-based, shared decision making: A resource for restructuring. *NASSP Bulletin, 76,* 98–107.

Lawler, E. E. (1990). *Strategic pay: Aligning organizational strategies and pay systems.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. B. (1994). *High school restructuring and student achievement. Issues in restructuring schools*. (Tech. Rep. No. 7). Madison : University of Wisconsin.). Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Leedy, P. D. (1997). *Practical research: Planning and design* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Leonard, P. E. (1999, November). *Do teachers value collaboration? The impact of trust.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Leithwood, K. A., & Menzies, T. (1998). Forms and effects of school-based management: A review. *Educational Policy*, 12, 325-346.

Levin, H. M. (1991). *Building school capacity for effective teacher empowerment: Applications to elementary schools with at-risk students*. New Brunswick, NJ: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Lewis, A. C. (1994). Reinventing local school governance. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75: 356-357.

Lewis, J. D., & Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces, 63* (4), 967-985.

Liontos, L. B. (1994*). Shared decision-making*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 034)

Livingston, M. J., Slate, J., & Gibbs, A. (1999). Shared decision making: Beliefs and practices of rural school principals. *Rural Education, 21,* 20–26.

Louis, K.S., & Kruse, S.D. (1995). *Professionalism and community* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Louis, K. S., Kruse, S., & Marks, H. M. (1996). School-wide professional community: Teachers' work, intellectual quality and commitment. In F. W. Newman & Associates (Eds.), *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual* quality (pp. 179-203). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Louis, K.S., Toole, J., & Hargreaves, A. (1999). Rethinking school improvement. In J. Murphy & K. S. Lewis (Eds.), *Handbook for education administration* (pp. 201-232). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Mabokela, R.O., & Madsen, J.A. (2003). Intergroup differences and their impact on African American teachers. *Urban Education, 38* (6), 725-749.

MacNeil, A.J., & Blake, M. (1995*). Principal leadership, trust, and quality of schools.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Houston, Clear Lake, TX.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). Teacher empowerment: A step toward professionalization *NASSP Bulletin*, 72, 52-59.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R. T., & Kranz, J. (1988). Site-based management: Unfulfilled promises. *The School Administrator*, 47, 30-59.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R. T., & Kranz, J. (1990). What do we know about SBM? *Choice and Control in American Education*, 2, 289-342.

Marcic, D. (1997) *Managing with the wisdom of love: Uncovering virtue in people and organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Marks, H. M., & Louis, K. S. (1997). Does teacher empowerment affect the classroom: The implications of teacher empowerment for instructional practice and student academic performance. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 9, 245-275.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research (*3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Maxwell, J. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

McKnight, D. H., Cummings, L. L., & Chervany, N. L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *The Academy of Management Review, 23* (3), 473-490.

Miller, E. (1995). Shared decision-making by itself doesn't make for better decisions. *The Harvard Education Letter*, 11, 1-4.

Miskel, C. G., Fevurly, R., & Stewart, J. (1979). Organizational structures and processes, perceived school effectiveness, loyalty and job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15, 97-118.

Mohrman, A.M., Mohrman, S.A., & Odden, A. (1995). Aligning teacher compensation with systemic school reform: Skill-based pay and group-based performance rewards. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 17, 350-365.

Morin, W. J. (1990). *Trust me*. New York: Drake Beam Morin Inc.

Morrison, G.M., Wakefield, P., Walker, D., & Solberg, S. (1994). Teacher preferences for collaborative relationships: Relationship to efficacy for teaching in prevention-related domains. *Psychology in the Schools*, 2, 221-230.

Murray, D. R. (1993). *On the road to empowerment: A comprehensive analysis of teacher involvement in decision making processes*. Eastern Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 232)

National Education Association/National Association for Secondary School Principals. (1986). *Ventures in good schooling: a cooperative model for a successful secondary school*. Reston, VA: Ferrara.

Odden, A., & Clune, W. (1995). Improving educational productivity and school finance. *Educational Researcher*, 12 (6), 10-22.

Opfer, V. & Denmark, V. (2001). Sorting out a sense of place: School and school board relationships in the midst of school-based decision-making. *Peabody Journal of Education,* 76 (2), 101-118.

Patterson-Weston, L. (2000). *The relationship of decentralization, principal behavior, and perceptions of empowerment among middle school teachers in selected New York City Public Schools.* **(**Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 2000). From UMI Proquest No. AAT9968441).

Peters, G. (1990). Classroom context and student ability influences on teacher perceptions of classroom control. *American Educational Research Journal*, 16, 189-196.

Peterson, K., Kubilay, G., & Martin, V. D. (1995). Principals' *skills and knowledge for shared decision making*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Purkey, S., & Smith, M. (1985). Effective schools: A review. *The Elementary School Journal*, 85, 427-52.

Quinn, T.K. & Troy-Quinn, D. (2000). When should teachers participate in decision making? *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *36* (2), 58-60.

Rappaport, J. (1987). Terms of empowerment/exemplars of prevention: Toward a theory for community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 15, 121-148.

Reason, P. (1994). Three approaches to participative inquiry. In N. .K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 324-339). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reyes, D. J. (1982). Supervision and motivational theory: Some implications. *Catalyst for Change*, 11, 21-24.

Reyes, P. (1992). *Preliminary models of teacher organizational commitment: Implication for restructuring the workplace.* Madison, WI: Center of Organization and Restructuring of Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 349 680)

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

Rotter, J. (1980). Trust and gullibility. *Psychological Abstracts, 102*, 35-41.

Rozenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' workplace*, Longman, New York.

Russell, J. J. (1992). *Theory into practice: The realities of shared decision-making*. (Doctoral Dissertation Fordham University-New York, 2000). From UMI Proquest No. AAT9328427

Russell, J. J., & Cooper, B. S. (1992). How do you measure shared decision making? *Educational Leadership; 50* (1), 39-41.

Schein, E. (1997). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schmeichel, J. D. (1999). *Devolution of power through shared decision making. (*Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University). From UMI Proquest No. AAT9923744.

Schindler, P., & Thomas, C. (1993). The structure of interpersonal trust in the workplace. *Psychological Reports, 73,* 563-573.

Schmoker, M. (1992). What schools can learn from Toyota of America. *Education Week*, 11, 23-25.

Sebring, P. & Camburn, E. (1992*). How teachers are engaging reform in Chicago, IL: Differences among schools*. San Francisco, CA: American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 349 713)

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1999). *Rethinking leadership*. Illinois: Skylight Training and Publishing.

Shaw, R. B. (1997). *Trust in the balance: Building successful organizations on results, integrity, and concern*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 951-961.

Simon, H. A. (1960). *The new science of management decision*. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

Simpson, R. L.; LaCava, P. G.; & Graner, P. S. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act: Challengers and Implications for Educators. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 40 (2), 67-74.

Sitkin, S. B., & Roth, N. L. (1993). Explaining the limited effectiveness of legalistic "remedies" for trust/distrust. *Science, 4*, 367-392.

Smylie, M. A. (1992). Teacher participation in school decision making: Assessing willingness to participate. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14 (1), 53-67.

Smylie, M. A., & Hart, A. W. (1999). School leadership for teacher learning and change: A human and social capital perspective. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (pp. 421-441*).* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sonnenburg, F. K. (1994). *Managing with a conscience* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Spaulding, A. M. (1994). *The politics of the principal: Influencing teachers' school based decision making.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Stelzl, I. (2000). What sample sizes are needed to get correct significance levels doe log-linear models? A Monte Carlo study using the SPSS-procedure "Hiloglinear." *Methods of Psychological Research Online, 5* (2), 96-116.

Strusinski, M. (1991). *Shared decision-making in school-based management: Characteristics of those who become its leaders*. Chicago, IL: American Educational Research Association (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 331 183)

Summers, A. A. & Johnson, A. W. (1994). *A review of the evidence on the effects of SBM planning*. Paper presented at the Conference on Improving the Performance of America's Schools: Economic Choices, Washington, D.C.

Tarter, C. J., Sabo, D., & Hoy, W. K. (1995). Middle school climate, faculty trust and effectiveness: A path analysis. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29, 41-9.

Taylor, D. L. & Bogotch, I. E. (1994). School-level effects of teachers' participation in decision making. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 16, 302-319.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management.* New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). *Trust and collaboration in urban elementary schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Goddard, R. D. (2000). *Building collective efficacy and trust in schools.* Unpublished working paper, The College of William and Mary.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, W. K. (1998). A conceptual and empirical analysis of trust in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 36,* 334-352.

Weiss, C. (1992). Trouble in paradise: Teacher conflicts in shared decision-making. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 350-367.

Weiss, C. (1993). Shared decision-making about what? A comparison of schools with and without teacher participation. *Teachers College Record*, 95, 69-92.

Weiss, C. H. & Cambone, J. (1994). Principals, shared decision-making, and school reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 6 (3), 287-301.

Weiss, C., Cambone, J., & Wyeth, E. (1992). Are administrators ready to share decision-making with teachers? *American Educator*, 11 (1), 5-44.

White, L (1989). Programs for school improvement: An overview. *Educational Leadership*, 4-11.

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *The Academy of Management Review, 23* (3), 513-530.

Wolstetter, P., & Buffet, T. (1992). Decentralizing dollars under school based Management. *Educational Policy*, 6 (1), 35-54.

Wohlstetter, P., & Mohrman, S.A. (1994). *SBM: Promise and practice*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.

Wohlstetter, P., & Mohrman, S.A. (1996). *Assessment of school-based management.* Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California.

Wohlstetter, P., & Odden, A. (1992). Rethinking *school-based management policy and research.* Educational Administration Quarterly, 28 (4), 529-49.

Yaffee, R. (1997). *The perils of insufficient statistical power. Statistics and social sciences.* Retrieved December 15, 2004 from http://www.nyu.edu/its/pubs/connect/archives/97fall/yaffeeperils.html

Yamane, T. (1967). Statistics: *An introductory analysis* (2nd Ed). New York: Harper and Row.

Yee, G., & Cuban, L (1996). When is tenure long enough? A historical analysis of superintendent turnover and tenure in urban school districts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32, 615-630.

APPENDIX

Table A1

Trust in Principal Correlations with Decision Making

Variable[a]	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. FTP	.59**	.69**	.50**	.46**	.36**	.28**	.24**	.41**	.44**
2. TIPS	--	.79**	.75**	.83**	.67**	.63**	.56**	.79**	.73**
3. Goals		--	.74**	.64**	.38**	.33**	.27**	.49**	.55**
4. Standards			--	.70**	.38**	.31**	.25**	.47**	.49**
5. Curriculum				--	.49**	.37**	.31**	.59**	.58**
6. Budget					--	.51**	.51**	.43**	.31**
7. Staffing						--	.58**	.42**	.40**
8. Operations							--	.45**	.27**
9. Procedures								--	.66**
10. Development									--

[a] FTP = Faculty Trust in the Principal Scale (total score) TIPS = Teacher Involvement and Participation

**p < .01