2010

Student and faculty perceptions of trust and their relationships to school success measures in an urban school district

Dennis M. Moore Jr.
College of William & Mary - School of Education

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd

Part of the Educational Leadership Commons, Educational Sociology Commons, and the Elementary Education Commons

Recommended Citation
Moore, Dennis M. Jr., "Student and faculty perceptions of trust and their relationships to school success measures in an urban school district" (2010). Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects. Paper 1539618717.
https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.25774/w4-nsq0-8w67

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.
NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI
STUDENT AND FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF TRUST AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO SCHOOL SUCCESS MEASURES IN AN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the School of Education
The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

By
Dennis M. Moore Jr.

December 2009

Committee Chair: Dr. Megan Tschannen-Moran
Committee Members: Dr. Michael DiPaola
Dr. Christopher Gareis
STUDENT AND FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF TRUST AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO SCHOOL SUCCESS MEASURES IN AN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore the concepts of student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients and their influence on attendance, behavior, and student achievement. Successful schools are often associated with indicators such as high attendance rates, low rates of discipline referrals, and high-standardized test scores. The hypothesis that guided this study was that urban elementary schools, that successfully serve students, are able to effectively foster trusting relationships between students and teachers, and that trusting relationships help create the context in which participants can fully tap into the potential for success. Student trust in teachers was measured using the Student Trust in Teachers Survey (Adams & Forsyth, 2008) while faculty trust in clients was measured using the Faculty Trust in Clients subscale of the Faculty Trust Survey (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). A strong positive correlation was found between student trust in teachers and faculty trust in clients ($r = .60, p<.01$). In addition, student trust in teachers was found to have a strong positive relationship to reading achievement ($r = .61, p<.01$) and math achievement ($r = .61, p<.01$) and a moderate relationship to student attendance ($r = .38, p<.05$). The relationship between student trust and the number of behavior referrals in schools was non-significant. Faculty trust in clients was strongly related to student achievement in reading ($r = .75, p<.01$) and mathematics ($r = .78, p<.01$). Moderate correlations were found between faculty trust in clients and student
attendance rates \( r = .43, p < .05 \) and the behavior referral rate in a school \( r = - .45, p < .01 \).

Regression analysis indicated that teacher trust in students and socioeconomic status explained the most variance in achievement levels as measured by Virginia’s Standards of Learning reading and math scores. These results suggest that fostering strong, trusting relationships between teacher and students is critical for schools to meet their goals.
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Student and Faculty Perceptions of Trust and Their Relationships to School Success Measures in an Urban School District
CHAPTER 1: THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Elementary schools that successfully serve students are able to effectively blend leadership skills, technical skills, and social skills to create a school environment that supports student achievement. Successful schools are often associated with high standardized test scores, high attendance rates, and low rates of student discipline referrals. In many schools that demonstrate superlative ratings in the above areas, both teachers and students contribute significantly to the positive interpersonal relationships that shape the working environment of the school. Effective schools harness the power of positive and trusting relationships between the school’s stakeholders and focus those attributes on creating school success (Hoy & Tarter, 1995; Hoy & Tarter, 2004).

Background

A great deal of attention has been given to the accountability movement and effective school practices during the last few years. Much of that attention has been focused on creating equitable school systems that meet the needs of all students. The accountability movement is a continuation of other earlier reform movements in education. Gaining initial momentum in the 1950s, the last five decades have shown incremental progress toward ensuring better educational opportunities for all students (Smith, 2005).

Educational opportunity has not always been available equally to all students. Federal legislation designed to address the educational achievement of all students includes the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. According to the United States
Department of Education (USDOE), NCLB was designed as an educational reform initiative that would support accountability for results, encourage proven educational methods and require measurable outcomes (NCLB, 2002; USDOE, 2002). Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is an achievement indicator associated with the No Child Left Behind Act that sets yearly improvement goals for school districts and schools, with a proposed goal of one hundred percent proficiency for all students by the 2013-14 school year. AYP requires that each state develop and implement a statewide accountability system to ensure yearly progress. In the state of Virginia, Standards of Learning scores are used as a primary means of measuring academic achievement and progress for individual students as well as for schools and school districts. Additional NCLB indicators for monitoring ongoing progress include discipline and attendance data. While there is some debate about whether NCLB is as effective as it was envisioned, the impact of the legislation on the way that education is practiced in the United States cannot be denied (Black, 2007).

For school districts and individual schools to continue making improvements, it may require that they maintain the focus on NCLB compliance while increasing attention on building trust and organizational capacity (Daly, 2009). Many schools and school districts have spent a lot of time and effort in recent years attempting to identify and use instructional practices that they feel will get them closer to meeting the goals set forth by NCLB legislation. As schools get closer to achieving their goals, and incremental progress gets harder and harder to achieve, many schools may find that they need to look beyond their instructional practices and increase the focus on the interpersonal relations that influence the school environment.
Understanding social interactions in the school community is increasingly becoming more recognized as a powerful tool for increasing success in schools (Croninger & Lee, 2001). Trust has been shown to influence and encourage positive relationships between stakeholders including students, teachers, administrators, and parents (Daly & Chrispeels, 2008).

**Theoretical Framework**

**Trust**

A positive school atmosphere is related to the quality of interpersonal relations between faculty, staff, administration, and the school community (Tschannen-Moran, Parish, & DiPaola, 2006) and student achievement can be significantly influenced by the academic environment and the relationships that exist on school campuses (Flippen, 2001; Kelley, Thornton, & Daugherty, 2005). Effective working relationships between students, teachers, and other staff members are typically grounded in trust. Trust can be described as a party’s willingness to risk vulnerability due to their confidence that those that they are interacting with are operating in a way that is open, benevolent, reliable, competent, and honest (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Trust is essential for building healthy relationships in schools. It is important that school leaders, teachers, and students develop trusting relations so that they can concentrate on the work of teaching and learning, rather than expending excessive energy worrying about interpersonal dynamics and distractions.

While this study does not address all relational elements of the school environment, it does focus on trust between students and teachers, and its connection to school success. The dynamic interplay between students and teachers serves as the
backdrop for student academic success and appropriate student conduct. The cumulative effects of the core academic and social relations that students have with their teachers can be additive and productive in nature, but the relationship can also be undermined by poor experiences (Ryan, Stiller, & Lynch, 1994). A trusting relationship is needed to fully tap into the potential that is available. When students are pushed to achieve in a supportive environment, they are more likely to become vested participants and contribute to achieving favorable outcomes (Lee & Smith, 1999).

**Student Trust in Teachers**

In the last decade or so, there has been a body of research that has been done regarding the impact of interpersonal relationships and school trust. Specific areas investigated include faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, faculty trust in clients (students and parents) (Hoy, Gage, & Tarter, 2006; Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990; Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Tschannen-Moran, 2004; Tschannen-Moran, Parish, & DiPaola, 2006) and parent trust in the principal (Adams, Forsyth, & Mitchell, 2009).

Research dedicated to student trust in teachers is very limited (Adams & Forsyth, 2008; Forsyth, 2008; Lee, 2007). Because students spend a large percentage of their school hours interacting with teachers, it is reasonable to think that the relationship between the student and teacher is important and may be critical to the success of students (Adams & Forsyth, 2008). When students view their teachers as legitimate and trustworthy authority figures, teachers are more likely to earn the respect and cooperation of their students, potentially increasing their capacity to achieve.

**Teacher Trust in Clients**
One of the focuses of this study is faculty trust in clients, which is a concept that has been conceptualized through prior research (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999) and includes both faculty trust in students and faculty trust in parents. While faculty trust in students and parents are separate concepts in theory, research efforts to describe and quantify them show that they are nearly indistinguishable from one another and form one factor measurement. In practice it means that teachers view the actions of students along very similar lines as they view the actions of parents.

Teachers play an important role in fostering high-quality relationships among students and parents (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). As schools ponder the importance of positive interpersonal relationships to the teaching and learning process, trust has been shown to play an important part in increasing student achievement (Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

**School Success Measures**

In an attempt to address the impact of trust on school success, student variables that will be addressed include Virginia Standards of Learning reading and math scores, school discipline referral rates, and school attendance rates. The student data will be generated from the third, fourth, and fifth-grade students at thirty-five separate elementary schools.

**Trusting Relationships - Achievement Model**

In the model proposed for this study, SOL reading and math scores are viewed as the indicator of academic achievement for students in schools. According to the model, a primary influencing variable on achievement is the student-teacher relationship. The student-teacher relationship is thought to be grounded in trust and is based on the
interactions of students and teachers. In this study, student perceptions of trust in teachers and teacher perceptions of trust in clients are thought to serve as the foundation for productive relationships to develop between students and teachers that provide an impetus for academic achievement to develop. The trusting relationship between students and teachers is theorized as where the “rubber meets the road” when attempting to create academic achievement for students.

Other variables that are theorized to influence and to be influenced by the student teacher relationship include the socioeconomic status of the student and intermediate school success measures including student discipline referral rates and student attendance rates. Socioeconomic status is an underlying variable that influences all components in the system. In this study, free and reduced lunch rates serves as the representative for student socioeconomic status. Student socioeconomic status is a relatively fixed component that depends on the student’s specific life circumstances and is influenced by the amount of resources that are available for the student to utilize. Socioeconomic status serves as the backdrop for many of the interactions that occur in school buildings and has been shown to influence academic achievement (Forsyth, 2008). While student discipline referral rates and student attendance rates are school success measures by themselves, they are intermediate in nature and are theorized to serve as necessary precursors for success on SOL reading and math assessments, which serve as the proxy for academic achievement in this study. It is suggested that all of the school success measures are influenced by the student-teacher relationship.

Problematic student behaviors, represented by student discipline referral rates, influence the environment of the classroom through negative interactions between
students and their peers and students and teachers. They also influence the environment due to the amount of time that the teacher has to devote to managing behavioral disruptions. Attendance issues are a concern because students that don’t attend school regularly aren’t exposed to the curriculum and instruction that they need to be successful academically. Increased absences may also lay the groundwork for less relationship building with teachers as students have less time to interact with their classmates and the teacher.

Both student discipline referrals and student attendance rates and the behaviors associated with them have the ability to impact student-teacher relationships. Negative interactions between students and teacher may erode the foundation of the student-teacher relationship over time. Students primarily contribute to effective student-teacher relationships through their attitudes and their behaviors. Teachers primarily contribute to successful student-teacher relationships through effective instructional methods and conscientious efforts to be fair, equitable, and cognizant of individual student needs (Robertson & Miller, 2007). For both students and teachers, their ability to create and nurture productive relationships is influenced by their attitude toward their counter-part in the relationship, their prior experiences, their motivation to relate positively, and the skill sets that they have developed through the combination of innate ability and training. Trusting relationships between students and teachers represented by student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients are important because they are hypothesized as significantly influencing the effectiveness of the educational process, as measured by student achievement.
In summary, the forces that influence student achievement, being examined in this study, includes student socioeconomic status, student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, students discipline referral rates, and student attendance rates. In the model, SES is thought to influence all intermediate variables in the system including student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, students discipline referral rates, and student attendance rates. Student attendance rates and discipline referral rates are theorized as variables that are influenced by student trust in teachers and teacher trust in students but they also contribute to the development of trust in a reciprocal manner. Positive student-teacher interactions, characterized by both student trust in their teachers and teacher trust in their students, are hypothesized to be significant contributors to student academic achievement.

![Diagram showing the relationship between SES, student trust, teacher trust, discipline, attendance, reading achievement, and math achievement.](image)

Figure 1: Student socioeconomic status in relation to the full set of variables and their explanation of student achievement.
Statement of the Problem

Over the last few decades there has been increasingly more attention paid to the achievement of all students. With the passage of NCLB, and the associated gathering and reporting of assessment data needed to make AYP benchmarks, many school districts are still having difficulty making progress. In order to make the gains needed, it is theorized that a better understanding of the impact of the quality of interpersonal relationships on student achievement would benefit the teaching and learning process. In particular, it may be beneficial to examine the impact of trusting relationships between teachers and students to see its connection to measures of school success. Examining the relationship between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients on indicators of school success including student discipline referral rates, student attendance rates, and Standards of Learning scores might serve as a mechanism to demonstrate the power of positive, trusting school relationships on increasing student achievement.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to use quantitative research methods to look at the relationship between school trust and elementary student rates of attendance, student rates of school discipline, and Standards of Learning reading and math scores. The unit of analysis in this study is the urban elementary school. This study will use the data generated by an urban public school system that has surveyed third, fourth and fifth grade students at thirty-five elementary schools as well as the teachers in the same schools.

Research Questions
1. What is the relationship between student trust in teachers and reading and math Standards of Learning scores, student rates of discipline, and student rates of attendance at the elementary school level?

2. What is the relationship between teacher trust in clients and reading and math Standards of Learning scores, student rates of discipline, and student rates of attendance at the elementary school level?

3. What is the relationship between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients?

4. What are the relative weights of student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, student attendance rates, student discipline rates, and student socioeconomic status when attempting to explain variance in composite measures of reading and math student achievement measured by SOL reading and math scores?

**Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1**

Student trust in teachers will be positively correlated to student achievement on reading and math SOL scores in grades 3, 4, and 5, and attendance rates, and student trust in teachers will be negatively related to discipline referral rates. Thus, higher student trust will be related to higher achievement and attendance and lower discipline referral rates.

**Hypothesis 2**

Teacher trust in clients will be positively correlated to student achievement on reading and math SOL scores in grades 3, 4, and 5, and attendance rates, and teacher trust in clients will be negatively related to discipline referral rates. Thus, higher teacher trust
in clients will be related to higher achievement and attendance and lower discipline referral rates.

**Hypothesis 3**

Student trust in teachers will be positively correlated with teacher trust in clients.

**Hypothesis 4**

Student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients will explain more variance in a composite measure of student reading and math achievement than student attendance rates, student discipline rates, and student socioeconomic status.

**Definition of Terms**

**Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)**

The annual improvement that states, school districts, and schools make in educating all students to grade-level standards, as reflected in state accountability assessments. The goal of NCLB is 100% proficiency on state standards and AYP represents the gradual, incremental progress toward that goal. Failure to meet AYP can result in sanctions (USDOE, 2002).

**Benevolence**

Confidence in knowing that the personal well being or something that one party cares about will be protected and not harmed by a trusted second party. In trusting relationships between teachers and students, students assume that teachers, serving in a benevolent manner, will act in their best interest (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

**Competence**

Being able to feel comfortable that those you are working with will have the skills and abilities to complete the task needed to be done. While good intentions may facilitate
good feelings in relationships between two parties, they can be limited if one or both parties doesn’t have the ability to complete what was proposed (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

**Cultural Capital**

In an educational context, cultural capital can be viewed as the cultural elements of status that make a difference in school interactions and impact achievement (DiMaggio, 1982).

**Honesty**

Trust can develop when one party is able to assume that the other has good character, integrity, and is authentic. Those that are honest can be relied upon to do what they say and those working with honest people can believe that what they are told is accurate (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

**Openness**

Based to some degree on reciprocal trust, openness is the willingness of parties in relationships to share information with others. Trusting relationships can develop when parties are willing to share information with others that could open them up to being vulnerable (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

**Opportunity Gap**

Unequal access to the opportunity to receive an educational benefit usually associated with socioeconomic status. Unequal opportunities may serve as a precursor to an achievement gap (Flores, 2007).

**Reliability**
A sense of confidence that one's needs will be met based on the benevolent and predictable behaviors of a second party. In situations where interdependence is required to complete tasks, relationships become stronger when the two parties don't have to worry or waste energy wondering if their needs will be met (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

**Trust**

One party's willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter examines the impact of trust between urban elementary school students and teachers and its relationship to Standards of Learning reading and math scores, school attendance rates, and school discipline referral rates. When looking at urban schools that have demonstrated an ability to achieve at high levels, positive relationships between stakeholders is often seen as a precursor (Goddard, Salloum, & Berebitsky, 2009). Examining school levels of trust between students and teachers in urban schools, and looking to see if they correlate with school success measures including superior Standards of Learning reading and math scores, above average levels of student attendance and low levels of discipline, may provide powerful insights into effective school processes and practices.

Socioeconomic Status

A child’s educational achievements are strongly linked to the parents’ social and economic background (Merrett, 2006). According to English (2002), socioeconomic status (SES) is part of the concept of cultural capital, and this form of capital is a potent predictor of student success and appreciation for education. Cultural capital can be thought of as a symbolic expression of wealth, but is not necessarily associated with actual financial wealth. It can also be associated with the mindset of those that seek opportunities and experiences and the desire to rise above problems associated with disadvantage. Those that benefit from cultural capital find it valuable and worthy of nurturing (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu, 1986). Cultural capital has been linked with increased academic achievement (DiMaggio, 1982; Orr, 2003).
Concerns related to poverty include, but are not limited to, increased levels of reported child abuse, teenage pregnancy, violence, and drug use commonly seen in urban school districts (Sharpton, Casbergue, & Cafide, 2002). The issues described impact student achievement. Benson and Borman (2007) found that “school and neighborhood social contexts exacerbated family-based learning inequalities in ways that resulted in a double disadvantage for many students from low-SES families and a double advantage for many students from high-SES families” (p. 29).

Policy interventions aimed at improving school quality for children from disadvantaged families have the potential to increase social mobility by reducing the transmission of low socioeconomic status from parents to children through education (Mehana & Reynolds, 2004). Economically disadvantaged students usually attend schools with less community resources and less experienced and less qualified teachers than those that children from more affluent families attend. When poor families do not have access to higher quality schools, the status quo is maintained and the transmission of low socioeconomic status from parents to children is reinforced (Rouse & Barrow, 2006).

Lack of economic opportunity not only affects the individual student but future generations. According to Orr (2003),

“The lack of wealth among certain individuals and segments of the population has important consequences for these individuals and groups, as well as for the society as a whole. When an entire group has limited access to wealth, it has decreased access to the opportunities, resources, and power that wealth confers. These limitations can serve to disenfranchise an entire segment of the population;
making it difficult for the segment to participate fully in societal institutions and to exercise influence in such areas as politics and the economy” (p 298).

When working to educate economically disadvantaged students, one must be cognizant of potential roadblocks to success. Differences between the background of advantaged and disadvantaged children can be significant. Many children from advantaged background have more opportunities for experiencing supportive and academically stimulating environments when compared to less advantaged peers. Research suggests that early, vigorous interventions can reduce the effects of an impoverished environment on a child’s cognitive development and achievement (Perez-Johnson & Maynard, 2007). Achievement gaps related to socioeconomic status are often paired with opportunity gaps, partially explaining the higher achievement of students with more resources. When students are given the same opportunities and support as advantaged peers, it is possible for children of a lesser socioeconomic strata to achieve at the same levels (Flores, 2007; Kitchen, DePrce, Celedón-Pattichis, & Brinkerhoff, 2007).

**No Child Left Behind (NCLB)**

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), renamed the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB, 2002), and its subsequent reauthorizations, is federal legislation that establishes goals that are intended to raise standards and increase accountability for the educational achievement of all children, regardless of their background or ability. NCLB increases the federal government’s role in kindergarten through twelfth grade education by setting educational policy for state and local stakeholders to follow. The intended purpose of the legislation is to close achievement
gaps, raise the achievement levels for all students, increase parental collaboration, and to
develop and promote research-based instructional practices (NCLB, 2002).

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

NCLB suggests that setting high standard for all students and all schools is crucial
for fairness and equity. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is one of the cornerstones of the
federal No Child Left Behind Act and serves as the key indicator of progress toward
NCLB goals. Schools and school divisions that meet the annual objectives required by
the federal education law are considered to have made adequately yearly progress (AYP).

Since the 2002-2003 school year, individual schools and school divisions as a
whole have been held accountable for reaching state-established target goals for the
percentage of students proficient in reading and mathematics. Each state is responsible
for creating their own set of AYP goals. These goals are then raised over time until all
students are proficient. NCLB legislation requires that proficiency occur by the year
2014.

For a school division or an individual school to make AYP under NCLB it must
meet or exceed all requirements including participation in statewide testing, achievement
in reading and mathematics, and attendance (elementary and middle schools) or
graduation (high schools). Goals are set for the overall population as well as for NCLB
subgroups including major ethnic / racial groups, students with disabilities, English
language learners, and economically disadvantaged students (free and reduced lunch).

Standards of Learning Assessments

Standards of Learning tests are criterion-referenced tests, given to students in the
state of Virginia to determine whether those assessed meet minimal levels of subject
proficiency. As a criterion-referenced assessment, the Standards of Learning tests have a cut score of 400, which is required for a student to be considered passing. Students are not ranked by their position in relation to other students as they would be on a norm-referenced assessment. For a specific school to be considered proficient, ever increasing percentages of the total population, as well as NCLB subgroups, must be proficient at the school. The goal is for all students to become proficient. In Virginia schools, subjects assessed at the elementary level include reading, math, writing, science, and social studies.

There are many reasons that some schools do not meet their AYP targets. Among the reasons are schools providing poor services, diverse student enrollments with various needs and multiple performance targets for subgroups, the level of rigor that individual states use to implement AYP, and improvements in achievement that don’t quite rise to the level of AYP success required (Rose, 2004).

**NCLB and School Success Measures**

School success measures addressed specifically in this study include reading and math SOL scores, school discipline rates, and school attendance rates. While low discipline rates and high rates of attendance can all be considered measures of school success in their own right, the model for this study suggests that low discipline rates and high attendance rates serve as precursors for the desired outcome of schools, which is a high level of student achievement. In this study, the proxy for student achievement is reading and math SOL scores.

**Achievement**
Achievement can be described as the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that can be used to forward the needs, wants, and future goals of students, their families, and the community at large. For purposes of this study, the specific student success measures being examined include student attendance rates, student discipline referral rates and academic achievement, represented by Standards of Learning reading and math scores. While student attendance rates and student discipline referral rates are school success measures themselves, they are viewed, in this study, as being intermediate in nature and serving as precursors for academic achievement.

Curriculum can be viewed as what we teach. Instruction is how we teach and evaluation is to what degree students have learned what we have taught (Gareis & Grant, 2008). Achievement is influenced by factors including student and teacher behaviors. Curriculum, instruction, and evaluation, influence and feedback on each other as academic achievement is created. It is theorized that the relationship between students and teachers is critically important for generating student achievement.

Urban Schools and Achievement

Urban school districts commonly present challenges specific to the socioeconomic status of the students that make up its population. While not all students in an urban district have limited resources, many urban students share those characteristics or they have concerns associated with this population. In order to increase achievement in these students, school systems need to develop specific strategies for working with students of limited socioeconomic means and actively apply those strategies to the teaching and learning process (Brown & Medway, 2007; Turner, 2005).
The future of every community; whether city, state, or nation, depends on its ability to educate its youth. All children can achieve, and all children deserve the chance to succeed. When students are sent to ineffective schools, communities, parents, and students are impacted due to the academic and employment capacity that can potentially be limited (Krajewski, 2001).

Because academic learning is a process that builds upon itself, it is beneficial that students have success early in their academic careers and receive the curricular and environmental foundations that they will need for continued success in later years. Children who enter school not yet ready to learn, whether because of academic, social, or emotional deficits, continue to have difficulties later in life (Reynolds et al., 2007). While educational practices and attitudes of educators must be addressed, the students, their families, and the communities that they come from must also change and grow.

**Socioeconomic Status and Achievement**

In the urban school system, a variable input whose influence was investigated in this study is the socioeconomic status of the student. The stand-in for socioeconomic status in this study is the free and reduced lunch rate at each school studied. Student socioeconomic status is a relatively fixed component that depends on the student’s specific life circumstances and is influenced by the amount of resources that are available for the student to utilize. While socioeconomics influences all populations, its effect on academic achievement is more pronounced in some groups than in others (Mayer, 2008).

When examining the influence of socioeconomic status on achievement using National Assessment of Educational Progress data, it reveals that while all groups are achieving at higher levels than in years past, not all achievement gaps have been
eliminated (Lee, Grigg & Donahue, 2007). Students from disadvantaged backgrounds, regardless of their racial identification, typically do not perform as well academically as those from advantaged backgrounds, thus poor students are especially vulnerable to achievement and opportunity gaps (Owens & Sunderman, 2006). While these students theoretically have equal access as their more advantaged peers, they do not necessarily enjoy the same quality of experience (Parsons, 2005). Even though the standards movement has increased the focus on disproportionality in achievement, achievement gaps remain.

Students from urban schools are not preordained to succeed or fail based on their group membership. Many schools filled with students that based on statistical indicators would not be predicted to perform very well, are able to achieve at very high levels. There is a growing field of research literature that focuses on increasing achievement with not only students with advantage and opportunity, but also students that have historically had less opportunity and had a harder time achieving academic success (Carpenter, Ramirez, & Severn, 2006; USDOE, 2007).

Educational achievement gaps referred to in the literature start in the home and sometimes continue in the educational system. By the time that children start kindergarten, low SES students, on average, enter school with academic skills that lag behind those of more advantaged students (Duncan & Magnuson, 2005). If students are in schools that are not properly addressing the needs of their population, then it is very possible that the gap will continue to grow as children matriculate through elementary school.

**Attendance and Achievement**
Student attendance is important for urban student to achieve. In order for students to do well at school they need to be exposed to the instruction that they will be held accountable for. This means that students should be present in class and their focus should be on trying to master the material. If the focus of the school is not on effective instruction because of distracting issues including inappropriate priorities, less than effective interpersonal relationships, excessive mistrust between students and teachers, and behavioral issues that interfere with the academic objectives, students will not achieve at their full potential (Spillane, Diamond, Walker, Halverson, & Jita, 2001). Students may be less willing to attend school regularly if they do not see a clear benefit or if their relationship with teachers and peers is problematic.

**Student Discipline and Achievement**

It is not uncommon for urban schools to demonstrate disproportionately higher rates of problematic student behaviors (Ferguson, 2000; Gregory & Mosely, 2004; Gregory & Weinstein, 2008; Skiba & Rausch, 2006; Wentzel, 2002). Students that participate in problematic behaviors can become entrenched in negative interactions with their teachers that limit the potential productivity of the relationship. Perceived defiance, disruption, and increased levels of rule breaking by students and the disciplinary measures associated with the infractions can lead to students missing instructional time and further disengagement from the educational process (Lovey, Docking, & Evans, 1994).

For students to be successful, it is advantageous if they are actively engaged in the teaching and learning process. Engagement in schoolwork involves both behavioral elements such as persistence, effort, and attention, and attitudinal elements such as
motivation, enthusiasm, and interest (Akey, 2006). As student become more engaged in the activities of an effective classroom and less influenced by negative distractions, it is more likely that they will develop academically.

Interpersonal Relationships and the Urban School Environment

To raise student achievement, it is suggested that educators recognize the inherent social complexity associated with educational processes and critically focus on examining the processes to better understand them (Bainbridge & Lasley, 2002). Van Maele and Van Houtte (2009) support the premise that organizational trust is partly explained by organizational culture, organizational size, and organizational group composition. If this it true, then those that are attempting to develop educational reform initiatives, should take those variables into consideration.

To facilitate a teaching and learning environment where students from urban environments can thrive and achieve, attention should be paid to the atmosphere of the school to ensure that it supports the needs of this specific population. By being purposely mindful of meeting the needs of the school community including the psychosocial components, it may be possible to increase levels of achievement (Brown & Medway, 2007).

Student and Teacher Attitudes

According to Lubienski (2002), the differential instructional practices experienced by different SES populations, which influence achievement, may be partially attitudinal in nature and can manifest itself as lower expectations for lower SES students. Chronic low expectations result in long-term losses of educational opportunity and possible reduced academic and economic prospects when extended over time. Diffily and Perkins
have asserted that teachers should strive to better understand inter-group and intra-group cultural differences and the culture of poverty and be able to reflect on their own personal values and ability to teach diverse students. Even when teachers are “highly qualified”, that does not mean that they are prepared for dealing with the problems associated with low SES students (Talbert-Johnson, 2006). Student trust in teachers at school is associated with teachers acting in the best interest of the students that they are serving. When teachers make assumptions that certain groups cannot achieve as other groups do because of their socioeconomic status, those assumptions should be viewed as a breach of trust. In order to address students with limited resources and the problems associated with that status, schools need to be mindful of student circumstances. If students or the families of students with less socioeconomic means feel that they are not being addressed appropriately, trusting relationships will be difficult to develop.

Trust

Schools are comprised of a complex web of social exchanges with different groups that depend on each other to realize the mission of the school, which is to educate students (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Understanding social dynamics in schools is relevant because it is easier to adjust the atmosphere of a school than it is to fix the socioeconomic status of the community (Hoy & Hannum, 1997). Trust is an important factor to be considered when developing positive school environments and has been associated with increases in academic achievement, which is a primary success measure in schools (Hoy, 2002).

Trust between stakeholders can contribute to positive school relationships. Trust has been shown to be part of the social context related to interactions within and between
groups (Adams, 2008). When members of the school community including administrators, teachers, students, parents, and the community work together to develop trusting relationships, positive results are more likely in the social, behavioral, and academic realms.

**What is Trust?**

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) describe trust as one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent. Trust has been found to contribute to school effectiveness (Uline, Miller, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998) and is related to a climate of openness, collegiality, professionalism, and authenticity (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998; Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Baier (1986) defined trust as a reliance on others’ competence and their willingness to look after rather than harm what is entrusted to their care.

School trust can be conceptualized as a collective property of all school stakeholders that develops through affective, cognitive, and behavioral norms (Adams, Forsyth, & Mitchell, 2009). An absence of trust is viewed as an impediment to progress and without trust, a students’ energy is diverted toward self-protection and away from learning. A proliferation of rules stemming from a lack of trust can cause resentment and alienation among teachers and students. When distrust pervades a school culture, it is unlikely that the school will be able to reach its full potential (Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Follow-through is a key component of factors associated with trust including reliability and integrity. Follow-through can be difficult because it involves the execution of promises made despite roadblocks that can and do emerge as students and teachers
attempt to work together to achieve academically. The ability to complete what is promised is vital to trust building (Brewster & Railsback, 2003; Chhuon, Gilkey, Gonzalez, Daly & Chrispeels, 2008; Sebring & Bryk, 2000)

Why is Trust Important?

Trust, which is comprised of benevolence, reliability, competence, integrity, openness, and respect, is strongly connected with school performance and student outcomes (Tschannen-Moran, 2004) Trust makes schools better places for students to learn, perhaps by enabling and empowering productive connections (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001). Trust is also important for furthering educational endeavors and is thought of as a multi-level concept that is impacted by both the task being undertaken and depth of the relationship between the stakeholders working together (Bottery, 2004).

Trust impacts the way that schools function. Organizational characteristics of schools have been shown to be related to trusting relationships between school stakeholders (Van Maele & Van Houtte, 2009). Even when accounting for the socioeconomic status of the school community, a trusting environment can serve as a predictor of internal school conditions (Forsyth, Barnes, & Adams, 2006). Trust is essential for developing positive interpersonal relations among all school stakeholders (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989). Faculty trust in the principal, colleagues, and the community tend to be inter-related. When faculty members trust their principal, they are more inclined to trust other teachers and members of the community including students and parents (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003).

Developing Trust
Researchers have proposed that trust is not created instantaneously, but developed in stages (Child, 2001; Williams, 2001). Owens and Johnson (2009) propose that the development of trusting relationships may take place in stages including calculation, courtship, and contribution. In this research, calculation involves the possibility of teachers and students working together in an inter-dependent manner that requires both parties to examine the risk of putting forth an appropriate amount of effort. Courtship was described as a commitment period in which both teachers and students signal to each other their willingness to accept personal risk and not exploit the other as they attempt to work together. Contribution can be thought of as the maturation of authentic interpersonal relationships that have been tested by frequent fruitful interactions over an extended period of time. Owens and Johnson (2009) also suggest that the innate capacity of individual people to create and nurture comprehensive trusting relationships differs from person to person and must be taken into account.

**Trust and Urban Students**

Trust is a central element of social capital (Mulford, 2007). When addressing urban schools, school relationships with students and the community can take on even more importance. Urban schools present their own unique issues and problems that must be addressed in a manner that is appropriate to the population. While urban schools districts may have pockets of wealth and privilege, many urban districts have large segments of students with limited socioeconomic means. Conditions of poverty are seen to some degree or another in most, if not all urban districts. Poverty creates a variety of problems that cannot be ignored by schools and school personnel. Intervention efforts that address the needs of urban schools rely to some degree on confidence and trust,
where teachers have confidence that their students can learn, and trusting students believe their teachers will not betray them. A learning community can be created that successfully addresses the challenges of poverty when there is a relationship between stakeholders that is based on respect, confidence, and trust (Willie, 2000).

Trust is important for developing relationships with parents of urban students. Parents place their children in the school’s care for a significant amount of time and trust that the school’s staff will prevent harm from occurring to their children and that the school will act in their child’s best interest in the parent’s absence. Parents trust that the teacher will meet the expectations of the role obligations associated with being a teacher (Kochanek, 2005; Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Parents work under the assumptions that teachers will want to work with their children in a productive and diligent manner, despite the fact that, at least in the formative stages of student-teacher relationships, the teacher and student have a minimal connection at best. If teachers do not have a desire to make a deeper connection, trust between teachers, parents, and students can be stunted and academic achievement limited (Putnam, 2000).

**Student Trust in Teachers**

A study of youth-adult partners in school based learning communities found that contexts that enable positive relationships include fostering trust and respect among group members, creating meaningful (not equal) roles, and building the capacity for youth to be successful (Mitra, 2009). Mechanisms for building trust with at-risk students may include taking a personal interest in each student, developing meaningful communication, and purposely maintaining a caring and respectful attitude. Trust may
take time to develop as students become more willing to risk vulnerability as relationships develop (Owens & Johnson, 2009). Brown and Skinner (2007) suggest that specific actions for building trust include active listening, validating students, helping students to problem solve difficulties, maintaining a positive regard toward students, and instilling a sense of hope. Teacher use of a relational approach to student discipline and students' perceptions of teacher trustworthiness have been found to mediate student defiance (Gregory & Ripski, 2008).

Active listening and unconditional positive regard have long been used in the realm of counseling to help build trust and rapport (Rogers, 1992). Using unconditional positive regard when working with students may help teachers to maintain a professional mindset and focus on the positive aspects of students, rather than the perseverating on the problems associated with the student's status as an inner city youth. A potential result associated with a humanistic approach to relationship building is that student trust may develop as rapport grows. Successful relationships between students and teachers require that both parties are able to give and take in a reciprocal manner. Of course, it is the professional responsibility of the teacher to initiate and facilitate a successful working environment where fruitful interactions can develop (Owens & Johnson, 2009).

According to Adams and Forsyth (2008) student trust in teachers is not necessarily representative of a single student's view regarding a single teacher but more accurately the collective orientation manifest in students' shared views of teachers. Efforts by Adams and Forsyth to develop an instrument that measures student trust resulted in the Student Trust Scale. Student trust is a latent condition that cannot be directly measured, but measured indirectly through the conceptual indicators that
function as observable variables. Those conceptual indicators or “facets” as described by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) include openness, benevolence, reliability, competency, and honesty. The facets were used to generate survey questions that could result in a score that represents a general belief or understanding of the teachers’ trustworthiness from the students’ perspective.

**Teacher Trust in Clients**

Adams (2008) provides a model that describes teacher-client trust as a result of contextual conditions, trust mechanisms, and discernments of trust facets. Contextual conditions described include prior academic achievement, school size, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Trust mechanisms include functions of the behavioral, cognitive, and affective realms. Discernments of trust facets include honesty, benevolence competence, reliability, and openness. It was suggested that the contextual conditions indicated above are sometimes viewed as factors that negatively influence school outcomes but can be moderated by teacher and student cognitive, social, and behavioral processes that promote trust.

Faculty trust is a collective property, which represents the groups’ willingness to risk vulnerability when working with other groups including administration, other teachers, parents, and students. When faculty members are willing to be vulnerable to working and relating to others, that means they trust that those that they are working with are benevolent, reliable, competent, open, and honest (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003).

The Faculty Trust in Clients subscale was developed as Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003) attempted to develop an instrument to measure faculty trust levels of principals, fellow teachers, parents, and students. When developing questions for each of
the subscales, they attempted to capture the five facets of trust including benevolence, reliability, competency, openness, and honesty in the questions under development. When the results of the analysis were examined regarding the scales under development it was found that as they were attempting to develop scales that measured faculty trust in parents and faculty trust in students separately that there was not enough difference between faculty trust in parents and faculty trust in students to make a distinction. Therefore the two factors were merged together to form a single factor referred to as faculty trust in clients. Thus, when teachers are administered the Faculty Trust in Clients Scale and results indicate that teachers trust students, it also suggests that the teachers trust the parents of the student as well.

Teacher Trust in Students

Teachers that believe in the capabilities of their students and trust them to rise to their potential are able to create learning environments that facilitate student achievement. Goddard, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) and Forsyth (2008) have demonstrated that increases in student trust resulted in increases in student achievement in reading and math, even when accounting for socioeconomic status.

When teachers develop trusting relationships with their students, the support can be used as a mechanism to overcome student disadvantages associated with poverty (Watson & Ecken, 2003). While fostering relational trust is a laudable goal in its own right, it also serves as a precondition that facilitates more effective student engagement (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). Engagement, in turn, can positively influence student behavior and achievement. While trusting relationships between students and teachers have been shown to be beneficial and impact students on a daily basis, Bryk and
Schneider's (2002) long term study of urban schools found that trust in students has also been shown to predict student achievement longitudinally.

Teacher Trust in Parents

Adams, Forsyth, and Mitchell (2009) found that relationships between schools and parents is more dependant on social norms that address the emotional and affective needs of parent than the contextual conditions of schools including high poverty and at risk populations. Trusting relationships between the school and parents is centered within the social network of individual schools. While ethnic and economic diversity can create relational barriers that make effective communication between teachers and parents challenging, those barriers can be offset by structures, policies, and practices that promote harmonious social exchanges.

Social interactions are the means by which parents gain appropriate influence in schools. Contextual conditions, such as socioeconomic status, school size, diversity, and so forth, influence parent trust to the degree that they shape social exchanges within the relational network. Suggestions for building trust between schools and parents include bridging relational gaps and improving communication. Communicating perceived risks and vulnerabilities between the parties is thought to be beneficial for allaying fears and building positive, collaborative interactions (Adams, Forsyth & Mitchell, 2009).

Parents are important variables in school success and cultivating trusting relationships with them is important (Abdul-Adil, & Farmer, 2006). Schools can build and sustain parent trust by aligning policies and practices that meet the district’s needs but still address the affective needs of parents, possibly reducing parents' perceived vulnerabilities and risks within the parent-school relationship (Adams, Forsyth, &
Mitchell, 2009). When working with parents of students, the way that rules are applied can influence the relationship between teachers and parents and impact both parties’ willingness to collaborate. In cases where contextual conditions are fixed and cannot be altered, prior efforts to increase trust will come into play and possibly mitigate potential hard feelings (Adams, & Forsyth, 2007).

The link between the school and the community needs to be nurtured in order for positive working relationships to develop. Without communication, a lack of understanding, or even a level of distrust may develop between the two entities. When attempting to increase parental participation and involvement of low-income parents, tensions can arise as disagreements surface over resources, power sharing and institutional decision-making (Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007). Care should be taken to ensure that parents and the community are actively involved while still guarding institutional integrity.

Adams and Christenson (2000) indicate that the perception of solid trusting relationships between teachers and parents is not always related to the actual amount of contact between the parties, indicating that the quality of the relationship may be more important than the quantity. Care should be taken to ensure that parents are not only welcomed but also viewed as an important part of each individual student’s educational experience. Trusting parents and keeping them involved in the school makes them vested in the process and provides additional human capital to get things done.

Trust and its Influence on Academics

Trust and Standards of Learning
In the State of Virginia, Standards of Learning assessments, and the student scores associated with them, are perceived as very important academic achievement indicators for the individual student, the individual school, and the individual school district. While Standards of Learning scores are not the only indicator of academic achievement, for the most part they are the only ones that are receiving much attention. Because they are used as the proxy for achievement in the State of Virginia’s accountability system, they are monitored very closely by stakeholders throughout the state and the nation.

All vested stakeholders associated with public schools feel pressure to perform at a high level in order to meet objectives set by local, state, and federal guidelines. Many efforts have been undertaken to understand how students can perform at a higher level on the SOL assessments. Because of the importance and impact of students receiving an appropriate education that will prepare them for their futures, communities and parents rely on their children’s schools and trust that the school district will do what needs to be done to prepare their children not only to pass state accountability exams but to set them up for productive futures (Kochanek, 2005).

**Student Trust in Teachers and its Influence on Academic Achievement**

Historically, much of the research base related to trust has directly involved stakeholders other than students including faculty trust in peers, school administrators, and clients (parents and students) (Adams & Christensen, 2000; Tarter, Bliss & Hoy, 1989; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). While faculty trust in students has been examined, much less work has been done with student trust in teachers.

Work by Lee (2007) suggests that student trust indicators have indirect impacts on academic performance through school adjustment and academic motivation. In the study
by Lee, 318 middle school students from Seoul, Korea were surveyed using the Student Trust in Teacher Scale and the results were analyzed against other measures that quantified school adjustment, academic motivation and grade-point averages for the individual students. Results of the study indicated that student trust in teachers was found to be indirectly associated with academic achievement through the intermediate variables school adjustment and academic motivation.

In this study of student trust in teachers and its influence on academic achievement, Standards of Learning reading and math scores at the elementary level, served as the indicator for academic success. For students to want to do well on SOL tests they need to be prepared properly and they need to buy into the importance of the assessments. Part of this process is trusting that the teacher is asking them to do well not just for the teacher's benefit, but also for the benefit of themselves. As teachers provide more positive feedback to students and actively attempt to meet the needs of students with academic challenges, student trust in teachers may increase and anxiety may decrease (Mukhopadhyay & Chugh, 1979).

Standards of Learning are forcing many teachers to operate under increased amounts of pressure as continued progress is expected for all students. As the focus on incremental improvement in scores takes hold, many teachers are prompted to spend less time building relationships with their students and less time focusing on the student's social and emotional growth (Watson & Ecken, 2003). Many teachers complain that the Standards of Learning tests are creating an atmosphere that requires teaching to the test at the expense of other items including social skills (Higgins, Miller & Wegmann, 2006).
The quality of student-teacher interactions can be influenced by interpersonal variables that are related to the individual personalities of the student and teacher. Urban students are capable of working collaboratively and productively with teachers to generate academic success when they trust that the teacher is working in their best interests (Owens & Johnson, 2008). For schools to facilitate increases in student trust toward teachers, so that students can achieve at higher levels, they need to focus their efforts in a more purposeful manner and actively work to eliminate barriers that limit trusting relationships (Young, 1998).

Students have remarkable abilities to read the relational tenor of their classrooms including teacher trust in their ability to learn (Raider-Roth, 2005). Trusting relationships influence achievement by promoting positive student-teacher interactions and encouraging students to be compliant and responsible (Wentzel, 1991). Students with teachers that demonstrate increased levels of sensitivity, empathy, and praise are more likely to establish strong relationships with their teachers (Rey, Smith, Yoon, Somers, & Barnett, 2007).

Trust is a dominant theme that strongly influences whether or not students support programs and work hard for teachers (Roessingh, 2006). When working with students of minority and low socioeconomic status, commonly seen in urban populations, student investment in the program is sometimes linked to their comfort level with the teacher (Roessingh, 2006). Student achievement orientations can be associated with the relationships between teachers and students (Levy-Tossman, Kaplan, & Assor, 2007) and trust is important in helping teachers to better understand students and for developing
effective instructional approaches appropriate for them (Kastberg, Norton, & Klerlein, 2009).

Teacher responsiveness is associated with increase levels of student trust in the teacher (Wooten & McCroskey, 1996). Teachers that use a relational approach are often rewarded with students that perceive the teacher as demonstrating their authority in an appropriate manner (Gregory & Ripski, 2008). Cooperative behavior is important for well-functioning school classrooms in which students trust their teachers and actively engage in academic tasks. By cultivating the trust and cooperation of students, teachers may be able to use the relationships that they have developed to prevent discipline problems and increase academic achievement (Gregory & Ripski, 2008).

**Teacher Trust in Students and its Influence on Academic Achievement**

Trust in general, and student-teacher trust specifically, has been shown to contribute to increasing the academic performance of students (Lee, 2007). A study that included 452 teachers, 2,536 students, and 47 urban elementary schools by Goddard, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001), found that faculty trust in clients (students and parents) is a positive predictor of variance in school achievement even after differences in student characteristics including race, gender, SES, and past achievement were taken into account. While a trusting environment in general is beneficial to creating a positive environment that supports teaching and learning (Forsyth, Barnes, & Adams, 2006), faculty trust in clients has been specifically correlated to student achievement (Hoy, 2002; Lee, 2007).

Teacher trust in both students and parents is associated with academic achievement. In a study by Goddard, Salloum, and Berebitsky (2009), schools were
systematically and randomly selected and stratified by location, prior achievement, SES, and size to represent all traditional public elementary schools across Michigan and the teachers were surveyed. The intent of the teacher survey was to measure levels of trust in schools. A path analysis was conducted at the school level to model variation in trust and the proportion of students passing the state mathematics and reading assessments. The study indicated that there is a relationship between teachers' trust in students and parents and academic achievement and that trust is most tenuous in schools serving large populations of minority students and students that are socio-economically disadvantaged.

The impact of a good teacher on student behavior and academic achievement cannot be overestimated. Research by Wenglinsky (2002) demonstrated that the effects of classroom practices, when added to those of other teacher characteristics, are comparable in size to those of student background. This suggests that teachers can contribute as much to the student learning process as the students themselves. Teacher trust in students influences the attitudes and actions of teachers and plays an important role in how students perceive them. Teacher trust in students can play a significant role in shaping the classroom environment and is central to positive student experiences.

Teacher Trust in Parents and its Influence on Academic Achievement

Trust does not occur by accident but needs to be nurtured in order to flourish. Trust is needed between teachers and clients because the work done by schools is interdependent in nature and the parties rely on each other to fulfill the mission of the school (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). In a study by Adams and Christenson (1998), data were collected from parents and teachers of special and regular education students. A
significant and interesting finding regarding trust was that parent trust in the school was found to be significantly higher than teacher trust in the parents.

Faculty trust in parents has been shown to predict a strong degree of parent-teacher collaboration (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). To some degree, teachers rely on parents even before teachers meet the students as kindergartners. Proactive parents are beneficial to teachers because they can help their future students develop positive work habits before the students even get to school. Examples include efforts of parents to help students transition into kindergarten (Carter, 2002) and parents that serve as cheerleaders for early literacy (Snow, Burns & Griffin, 1998). In urban schools, efforts to overcome challenges associated with low socioeconomic status are most beneficial when they are initiated before school starts. When parents don’t send their children ready to learn starting in kindergarten, it sends a signal to the teacher, potentially damaging the trust that teacher has in the parent, even before the teacher-parent relationship has a chance to develop.

While socioeconomic status may influence the difficulties noted at a particular school, teacher trust in parents is not inherently deficient in schools with social and contextual challenges. High poverty is not a predictor for the breakdown of trust between teachers and parents. Trust however can be diminished by formalized and centralized structures that treat parents as outsiders and lowers their participation rate (Adams, Forsyth & Mitchell, 2009). Although parents and community members are very important stakeholders, they are sometimes not utilized or encouraged to participate in the process. Teachers may not trust parents and community members to be actively involved in educational decisions and sometimes have a tendency to regard certain issues
as professional decisions. In many schools the bureaucratic structures and idea that the “professionals know best” can shut parents out. In worst-case scenarios, a lack of trust in parents can actively keep them out of the teaching and learning process. While it is understandable to assume that teachers and administrators do have some knowledge and expertise that parents do not, parents are capable of contributing constructively. Using a deficit model when considering parent contributions undermines parent potential and damages possible relationships (Young & Levin, 2000). Waggoner and Griffith (1998) found that much of what parents perceive as supporting the school and contributing to their children’s success is often discounted. While nurturing and supporting their children may be all that parents can do or are willing to do, this laudable function is sometimes not valued as a direct contribution to schools by teachers.

**Trust and its Influence on Students Discipline**

**Urban Students and Discipline Concerns**

Problems with disruptive behaviors by students at urban schools can be related to a lack of positive social skills. If students in urban setting have been excessively exposed to family and community violence and other antisocial behaviors, school outcomes can be negatively impacted. Drug use by the student and/or a family history of substance abuse problems can serve as potential precursors for future drug use and other behaviors that are detrimental to school success (Kramer, Han, Leukefeld, Booth, & Edlund, 2009). Students with discipline issues are also more likely to have negative experiences associated with school including low achievement (Arcia, 2006), retention (Civil Rights Project, 2000), multiple discipline referrals (Skiba & Noam, 2002), and feelings of dissatisfaction and alienation (Loyey, Docking, & Evans, 1994). Early classroom
behavior problems have been shown to correlate with problems later in students’ academic careers and suggest high-risk behavior patterns (Spivack, Marcus, & Swift, 1986).

A primary concern in many urban schools is that behavior problems are more likely to be addressed through removal from class than interventions to attempt to correct the behaviors. Because infractions of behavior policies are assumed to be the fault of the student, schools may take on a very limited role in attempting to correct the problem. If problem behaviors are viewed as the student’s or parent’s fault, some schools may view themselves as released from their duty to provide an education for the student and yet not feel as though they are actively contributing to the problem (Epp & Epp, 1998). For chronically troublesome students, the strategy of excluding them through removal from class and suspension results in students that are in and out of school and missing a lot of class time. Missed class time results in ever-increasing learning deficits and further inappropriate behaviors as academic frustration takes hold (Netolicky, 1998).

**Teacher-Student Interactions**

Several risk factors including low socioeconomic status, language barriers, and home challenges of some students in urban districts may influence the student’s disposition to trust and may complicate the social context in which his or her relationship with educational organizations are embedded (Owens & Johnson, 2009). Teacher-student relationships can be stressful interactions that have the potential to be perceived as threatening by both parties (Stevenson, 2008). Students may view teacher responses to inappropriate behavior as an attempt by the teacher to dominate them and teachers may view the same interaction as a threat to their authority. When addressing behavior issues
at school, the issue of trust becomes meaningful from a number of different perspectives. Those that are getting in trouble are hopeful that the teacher and the administration will provide them with due process and administer dispositions in an equitable manner. Students in the classroom that are not misbehaving trust that the teacher and administrators will protect their instructional time, limit the amount of distractions allowed in the classroom, and ensure a safe environment, free of violence and intimidation.

When addressing students and potential behavioral issues, many teachers work along the continuum ranging from using excessive politeness to applying extreme pressure and directive behavior in an attempt to maintain order in the classroom (Pace, 2006). How discipline events unfold in the classroom can vary based on the relationship between the student and the teacher (Pianta, 2006). Many students may decide whether to obey directives given by teachers based on the quality of the relationship with that authority figure (Laupa, Turiel, & Cowan, 1995). In many instances, responses to potential challenging behaviors and student disengagement tend to be restrictive or punitive despite limited evidence that such strategies are effective in changing behavior, attitudes, or achievement of rule breaking students (Covell, 2009; Dixon-Floyd, & Johnson, 1997).

**Student Trust in Teachers and its influence on Student Behavior**

Many students respond positively and develop a level of trust and a willingness to cooperate when teachers demonstrate a caring attitude, maintain a safe environment, and have high academic expectations (Frank, 2001). Strained relationships between students and teachers can influence student behavior. Trust develops as students internalize the
supportive nature of those that work with them. When teachers demonstrate benevolence, reliability, and competence, which are components of trust in their working relationships with students, students may feel more comfortable in being vulnerable, demonstrate a willingness to take on additional risk, and more readily work through the initial reluctance that many students have due to impediments such as attachment issues (Owens & Johnson, 2009).

Teachers may earn the trust and cooperation of students if they use relationship building to prevent discipline problems (Gregory & Ripski, 2008). In a study by Gregory and Weinstein (2008), it was shown that teachers that elicit trust from students are able to develop productive relationships with them, while those that do not elicit trust have less productive relationships. Even when addressing students that have broken rules or acted inappropriately, trust developing teachers are able to create a sense of obligation to their authority through the development of positive and cooperative relationships with the very students perceived as defiant, unruly, and out of control by their colleagues.

In general, the better the organizational trust of a school, the more students feel safe and comfortable (Smith & Birney, 2005). Higher levels of student satisfaction are associated with teachers that have caring and supportive relationships with students and a positive classroom environment (Baker, 1999). Predictors of student trust in teacher authority include caring attitudes by teachers and high expectations (Gregory & Weinstein, 2008). Students behave more defiantly and less cooperatively with teachers perceived as untrustworthy. The attitude of students that have demonstrated difficult behaviors is sometimes related to how teachers interact with them.
Research has indicated that behaviorally inappropriate students that become disengaged during instructional interactions tend to receive negative responses from teachers. These negative interactions with teachers further undermine the student’s motivation to act appropriately and see the value of education (Skinner & Belmont, 1993). The net effect can be a cycle of student actions and teacher reactions that results in less than effective teachers and disengaged students performing below their fullest potential.

Attachment Theory and Student Trust in Teachers

Attachment theory, when applied in educational settings, suggests that the development of children and their socialization is strongly tied to the child’s relationship with the caregivers in their lives. When the process goes well, a cooperative relationship can develop between the child and the caregiver in which the adult helps the child accomplish the tasks of development (Watson & Ecken, 2003). Insecure attachments have been described as insecure avoidant, insecure resistant, and disorganized. Children with insecure avoidant orientations tend to avoid child teacher interactions. Children with insecure resistant orientations tend to seek out interaction, but the student/teacher interaction tends to be negative. Disorganized orientations can be viewed as a mixed pattern of ineffective interaction with teachers (Howes & Ritchie, 2002). Attachment theory suggests that children with a history of insecure attachments to their caregivers withdraw from social relationships or become focused on satisfying their own needs through acting in a dependent, controlling, or aggressive manner. In attempts to test how much they are cared for, some children refuse to comply with even reasonable requests and act in inappropriate ways (Watson & Ecken, 2003). Haberman (1995) suggests that if
we want students to trust that we care for them, we need to serve them in a fashion that demonstrates care and compassion without expecting something in return for it.

Teacher Trust in Students and its Relationship to Student Behavior

Teachers should make attempts to understand their students so that they can better respond to their individual needs. Howes and Ritchie (2002) suggest that when creating harmonious relationships with students that teachers should consider actively developing and enhancing the student’s internal disposition toward compliance and mutually reciprocated relationships. This could be beneficial as it would help students become more socially appropriate in a collaborative environment. Because some children have behavior issues due to previously developed attachment issues (Howes & Ritchie, 2002; Watson & Ecken, 2003), it is sometimes required that teachers serve as coaches and models for developing the desired social skills.

The teacher’s willingness to address the needs of individual students, rather than their own personal needs to be comfortable and stress free, is important as teachers develop and maintain a professional orientation toward students. Watson and Ecken (2003) state, “Unless our beliefs about individual children are working models, subject to consistent revision, and unless we consciously strive to understand the qualities of each student, we are likely to resent children that are troublesome” (pg. 37). Reaching difficult students sometimes requires that teachers work harder and smarter to better understand the issues impacting their students. If the goal is to reach all students, teachers will need to improve their skills sets so that they will be better prepared to do so. Teachers may also need to reflect on their own personal history to ensure that issues that impact them
personally are not projected onto the relationship that they have with students and impacting their ability to create productive relationships with students.

Teachers sometimes have confrontational relationships with urban students from lower socioeconomic strata. This is especially true when teachers are not equipped to understand students that may be different from themselves. Professional development may be necessary for new and long-serving teachers to help them develop behavior management strategies that work for all students (Stevenson, 2008).

By combining effective whole-school reforms with attendance and behavioral interventions, student discipline can be improved and achievement rates can be increased (Balfanz, Herzog, & Mac Iver, 2007; Segal, 2008). As schools evolve their practices in an attempt to adjust to increasingly higher demands for student achievement accountability, most recognize that they must address issues above and beyond just academics.

A comprehensive approach to building trusting relationships between students and teachers would most likely include enhancing the classroom teachers' capacity for addressing social, emotional, and behavioral concerns (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004; McNeil & Herschell, 1998). When considering how to improve behavior in troublesome students, the attitude that teachers have toward students is a good starting point (Gregory & Weinstein, 2008). Teachers can mediate defiant behavior by students, commonly described in urban populations, by serving as trustworthy authority figures (Croninger & Lee, 2001). Teacher trust in students profoundly impacts students and their feelings of comfort and safety. When teachers create a calm and trusting environment in the classroom, they are more likely to be actively involved in the process of monitoring
student behaviors and keeping the classrooms safe (Smith & Birney, 2005). When teachers demonstrate increased levels of organizational trust, less student bullying is usually evident.

In order to build trusting relationships and positive regard with reluctant students, Walsh (2006) suggests teachers take an interest in their students and get to know them as they serve in the capacity of an important role model. When teachers prevent their antagonism and inaction to deter them from making a connection with students, trusting relationships develop that forward the mission of the school.

**Teacher Trust in Parents and its Influence on Student Behavior**

When trust breaks down between teachers and parents, it is more likely that parents will disengage from the process and possibly not be as supportive as needed (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). When students misbehave at school, the options available to address the behavioral issues can be severely limited without the follow up and support from the parents at home. If students come to the conclusion that their parents are not on the same page as their teachers, they may not feel the need to comply with teacher directives. Among the reasons that trust can break down is when parents perceive that teachers are not acting in the best interest of their child or when the parents feel that the teachers are acting in an abusive or punitive manner. When teachers align themselves with the parents early in the relationship and maintain positive interactions with the parents, it may help to minimize breakdowns in trust.

Trust can also be encouraged when district-wide codes of behavior are developed in conjunction with all stakeholders in the community. Using a collaborative approach to developing discipline policies and practices helps to ensure that the policies and practices
of the district will be fully understood and accepted by teachers, students, and parents. When all stakeholders are properly informed of school policy and school employees act in a manner consistent with those policies when addressing behavior concerns, disagreements and feelings of mistrust may be minimized (Brown & Beckett, 2006).

**Student Attendance Rates**

When compared statistically, high school dropouts and those that graduate exhibit different behaviors as early as kindergarten and the developmental progression of dropouts and graduates continue to diverge over time (Hickman, Bartholomew, Mathwig, & Heinrich, 2008). Many students in urban schools become disengaged by the start of middle school, which greatly reduces the odds that they will eventually graduate. High school failure can be predicted by earlier incidence of deviant behavior, poor academic achievement, low family SES, and tobacco use (Newcomb, Abbott, Catalano, Hawkins, Battin-Pearson, & Hill, 2002). Excessive poor attendance, misbehavior, and course failures by students as early as sixth grade can be used to identify sixty percent of the students who will not graduate from high school (Balfanz, Herzog, & Mac Iver, 2007).

While students tend to drop out of school at the high-school level, dropping out is usually the culminating event that occurs after years of academic, social, familial, and community problems that led to that point. In order to address the variety of underlying issues associated with attendance, interventions to reduce attendance problems must combine strategies that address the problems of individual students, the students' home life, and the school's relationship with the students (Doyle & Levine, 1984).

Excessive school absences by students are viewed as a significant problem, with potential negative consequences for individual students, their families, and the
community at large. Research has shown that there are significant correlations between the number of absences by students and student academic achievement and graduation from high school (Carruthers, 1993; Easton & Engelhard, 1981; Roby, 2004). Students with attendance issues are in peril of falling behind academically and sometimes require extra help to catch up. This may be problematic for other students in the class as well because when teachers have to spend extra time with students that are behind due to their absences, they have less time to move the class forward.

States, cities, and local school boards promote school attendance because of its associations with academic achievement and pro-social behaviors (Sheppard, 2007). Starting as early as pre-k, students need to be present and engaged in order to learn. According to Chang and Romero (2008), children with chronic absences in kindergarten had the lowest performance in reading and math in fifth grade. Unless students attain these essential reading and math skills by third grade, they often require extra help to catch up, have more discipline issues, and have an increased risk of eventually dropping out of school.

School districts in some of the largest metropolitan areas of the country report student absences and criminal activity as both related and significant concerns (Heaviside, Rowand, Williams, Farris, Burns, & McArthur, 1998). Absenteeism is strongly linked to higher rates of delinquency and studies have shown that chronic truants engage in more serious forms of delinquency than students who attend school regularly. This is partially due to the opportunity and time available to students when they are not attending schools (Stouthamer-Loeber & Loeber, 1988). Criminal activities that truants
engage in at higher rates include substance abuse, gang activity, burglary, auto theft, and vandalism (Dryfoos, 1990).

**Reasons for Students Missing School**

Students fail to attend school for a variety of reasons. Many students fail to attend as a result of academic difficulty (Barth, 1984; Rumberger, 1983). Other students that are suspended or expelled may find that bureaucratic processes make it difficult to get back in school (Bowditch, 1993). Truancy sometimes becomes a problem at times of major transitions including entry into school at kindergarten, moving to a new home, entry into a new school, beginning a new year in a new class, transition from elementary to middle or middle to high school, re-entry from suspensions, expulsions, or juvenile detention, and exiting special education and being placed in a regular education setting (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2008). Schools that are more willing and able to address school, community, student, familial, and transitional issues may have more success at keeping students engaged in the educational process and attending school regularly (Center for Mental Health in Schools, 2004).

**Attendance and Dropouts**

Almost one-third of all American public high school students, and one-half of African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans, fail to graduate from high school with their class in the four years that students usually take to graduate (Bridgeland, Dilulio, Streeter, & Enterprises, 2007). While many states have compulsory attendance laws that require student to attend until their eighteenth birthday, not all states do. In order to ensure that individual states and the country as a whole stays globally
competitive, many states are actively pushing to raise their compulsory age of attendance to eighteen (Bridgeland, Dilulio, Streeter, & Enterprises, 2007).

**Truancy and School Dispositions**

While some students may drop out, others are “pushed out” by less than supportive teachers and administrators. Many truancy-reduction efforts commonly used are punitive in nature. Punishments for unexcused absences and truancy include denying the student the opportunity to make up work (Bishop, 1989), imposing in-school suspensions and Saturday schools for chronically absent students (Kube & Ratigan, 1992) and the enforcement of compulsory attendance laws that are designed to hold parents civilly or criminally liable for the misbehavior of their children (Geis & Binder, 1991; Siegel, 2002).

For chronically troublesome students, the strategy of excluding them through removal from class and suspending them results in students that are in and out of school and missing substantial amounts of class time. Missed class time results in ever-increasing learning deficits and further inappropriate behaviors as academic frustration takes hold (Netolicky, 1998).

**Trust and Student Attendance Rates**

School refusal behavior refers to a student's refusal to attend school or difficulty remaining in classes for an entire day. The problem is pervasive and exacts a heavy toll on students and school systems if left unaddressed. Unfortunately, school resources are limited which restricts the amount of interventions that can be provided to students and families in need (Kearney, & Bates, 2005).
Academic failure is among the primary predictors of attendance and truancy problems. Students sometimes don’t attend school regularly or drop out when they feel that teacher do not care about their futures and they have no hope (Testerman, 1996). Helping youth to overcome their sense of disconnection is very important in order to reduce the school dropout rate (Naylor, 1987). Teachers in schools can positively influence the self-esteem of at-risk students through facilitative environmental characteristics such as trust, respect, cooperation (Conant, 1992), and active communication with parents (Chang and Romero, 2008).

**Improving Relationships to Improve Student Attendance Rates**

Strategies for reducing absenteeism include making school more engaging, having more dialogue with parents, and providing intervention/support services. Addressing students and families from an early age is recommended as a mechanism to address issues before they become problems that affect students’ academic lives (Ford & Sutphen, 1996). Proactive measures are preferred to reactive measures because they address potential issues before they become established problems. Children addressed at earlier ages are less likely to become low academic achievers or dropouts (McMillan & Reed, 1994) and are also less likely to engage in antisocial or delinquent behaviors (Zigler et al., 1992). When schools and teachers establish relationships with students early in the students’ academic career, it is easier to maintain those good relationships than trying to develop solid relationships after students have grown averse to schools and academics.

Addressing the emotional health of students has been associated with positive school behaviors. In one study, high levels of subjective well being (wellness) was
related to optimal functioning during adolescence, including better reading skills, school attendance, academic self-perceptions, academic-related goals, social support from classmates and parents, self-perceived physical health, and fewer social problems (Suldo & Shaffer, 2008).

Understanding student behavior is a tool that teachers can use to work with students more effectively. Attachment theory, mentioned earlier, may provide some insight that teachers can use if they choose to try and understand it and put it into practice. The theory suggests that teachers will increase their chances of building warm, caring, and trusting relationships with students if they keep in mind that most students, even those students that appear to be indifferent toward the school and teachers, want to be loved and protected by caring adults. If teachers view student behavior as rational to the student themselves, because it is based on the student’s previous experiences with the prominent adults in their lives, then teachers may be better able to understand and react appropriately to inappropriate student behavior (Watson & Ecken, 2003).

While teachers play an important role in the lives of students, methods to manage student attendance are not a subject regularly addressed through professional development (Reid, 2007). Possible mechanisms to get students in school and keep them there include efforts to improve the school climate, increased use of technology, academic supports and community interventions (Gullatt & Lemoine, 1997). In order to help facilitate safer schools, administrators and teachers should attempt to create a positive school climate and develop a fair and consistent discipline system (Mueller, & Stoddard, 2006; Stephens, 1990). Because at-risk students may feel alienated from school, educational reforms that create a more supportive school environment may help
students feel less alienated. Meaningful interactions with adults at school, at home, or in the community can positively influence student attendance patterns (Volkmann & Bye, 2006).

Summary

While the concept of trust is a significant research topic in education, some aspects of trust have been examined more than others. Trusting relationships between teachers and administrators and teachers and colleagues have been examined as specific concepts for at least the last decade or so (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Student trust in the principal has been addressed (Forsyth & Adams, 2004) as well as trust between the school and parents (Adams, Forsyth, & Mitchell, 2009; Mitchell, Forsyth, & Robinson, 2008). The study of positive relationships and trusting interactions between students and teachers and its influence on school success measures is something that is making its way to the forefront, but empirical studies on the subject are limited. With the recent development of a scale to measure student trust in teachers (Adams & Forsyth, 2008), more information should be forthcoming. This study attempted to add to the research base by looking at the influence of student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients on schools success measures including academic achievement, student discipline referral rates, and student attendance rates. The study also attempted to determine if a relationship exists between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research study is to examine aspects of the quality of social relationships in schools including student trust in teachers and teacher trust in students and their relationship to school success measures in thirty-five urban elementary schools.

Research Questions

The research study is intended to investigate student perceptions of trust in teachers and teacher perceptions of trust in students and their relationship to specific indicators of school success including reading and math Standards of Learning scores, rates of student attendance, and student discipline rates. The research study was designed to explore the following research questions.

1. What is the relationship between student trust in teachers and reading and math Standards of Learning scores, student rates of discipline, and student rates of attendance at the elementary school level?

2. What is the relationship between teacher trust in clients and reading and math Standards of Learning scores, student rates of discipline, and student rates of attendance at the elementary school level?

3. What is the relationship between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in students?

4. What are the relative weights of student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, student attendance rates, student discipline rates, and student socioeconomic status when attempting to explain variance in a composite measure of student achievement?
Data Collection

Sample

The population sampled in this study consists of all teachers and approximately half of all 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students at thirty-five elementary schools during the 2008-09 school year. The school district is in an urban area located in southeast Virginia. The teachers surveyed are full-time faculty members. Teachers selected included regular education, special education, and resource teachers. Paraprofessionals and other classified staff members were not surveyed. Survey results were received from 4,716 students and 1,288 teachers.

Procedures

Survey development was initiated by the school district in November of 2008 and finalized in March 2009. The Research and Testing department in the division asked for guidance from Dr. Megan Tschannen-Moran, a professor at the College of William and Mary, who helped them to develop research-based themes that were relevant to the specific needs of the district. A primary interest to the district was the impact of relationships among stakeholders on the school climate and school success. Once the surveys were developed, all school district policies were followed as the district administered the surveys to teachers, parents and students in grades three through twelve. Packets of teacher and student surveys were delivered to all schools in the district in mid April, administered by a school representative, and collected three weeks later. Teacher surveys were administered during a faculty meeting after directions were given to the teachers informing them about the confidential nature of the study and reminding them that they could quit any time or skip questions that they were uncomfortable answering.
Student surveys were administered by homeroom teachers after they gave the students directions and answered any questions that they had. For purposes of this study, only surveys administered to teachers and students at the elementary level were utilized.

School success measures examined in the study include reading and math Standards of Learning scores, school discipline rates, and school attendance rates. The information needed to assess these measures were provided by the school district.

**Instrumentation**

**Student Trust in Teachers**

The Student Trust Scale is a thirteen-item survey developed in order to facilitate the study of the relative importance of student trust within the environment of schools. The original pilot test was based on a sample of 315 students from one school district of which forty-seven percent of the sample qualified for free and reduced lunch (Adams & Forsyth, 2008). The thirteen question set for the Student Trust Scale was developed using other proven scales of trust as a model including the Trust Scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999) and the Parent Trust Scale (Forsyth, Adams & Barnes, 2002). Discussions were held about how the questions addressed and incorporated five previously identified facets of trust including benevolence, reliability, competence, honest, and openness. All thirteen of the questions from the Student Trust Scale were included in the District Stakeholders Survey used in this study with only two very slight changes. The first change reversed the order of words in the question from “Teachers at this school are easy to talk to” to “Teachers are easy to talk to at this school”. The second change removed the phrase “at this school” from the original survey item. The original item was “Teachers at this school always do what they are supposed to do” The revised question became
“Teachers always do what they are supposed to do”. The two changes were minor and very unlikely to alter the results generated from the survey instrument.

To generate individual student scores for student trust in the teacher, a mean score of the thirteen questions was calculated. School scores were generated by finding the average of all individual student scores. Sample survey questions from the student version of the Stakeholder Survey addressing student trust in teachers are below. The full scale is listed in Appendix C.

- Teachers are always ready to help
- Teachers at this school have high expectations for all students

In the original study, one factor emerged with an eigenvalue greater than 1 and explained 59 percent of the variance. This indicated that the Student Trust Scale is a one-factor measure in which the conceptual identifiers of trust (the facets of openness, honesty, benevolence, competence, and reliability) converge around one dominant factor. Factor loadings were consistently high, with a range of .62 to .85. Cronbach alpha measurements of .90 indicated internal item consistency (Adams & Forsyth, 2008).

**Faculty Trust in Clients**

The Faculty Trust in Clients Scale measures the level of faculty trust in students and parents and is a sub-component of the Faculty Trust Scale (Hoy, W. K. & Tschannen-Moran, M., 2003). The nine items from the faculty Trust in Clients subscale were incorporated into the Teacher Stakeholder Survey. To generate individual student scores for faculty trust in clients, a mean of the nine survey items was calculated. School scores were generated by finding the average of all individual student scores. The full
scale is listed in appendix D. Sample survey questions addressing faculty trust in clients are as follows:

- Students care about each other.
- Teachers can count on parental support.

The norms for the Faculty Trust Scales are based on a sample of 146 elementary schools in Ohio. The reliability of the Faculty Trust in Clients subscale of the Omnibus Trust Scale was determined to be alpha = .94. Factor analytic studies of the Faculty Trust Scale support the construct validity of the measure (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003).

**School Success Measures**

In an attempt to address the correlation of trust on school success, student variables that will be monitored include Virginia Standards of Learning reading and math scores, school discipline referral rates, and school attendance rates. The student data was generated from the third, fourth, and fifth grade students at thirty-five elementary schools.

**Standards of Learning Reading and Math Scores**

The Virginia Department of Education has developed the Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools as a measure used to monitor expectations for student learning and achievement in grades K-12. The standards are based on a broad consensus of what parents, classroom teachers, school administrators, academics, and business and community leaders believe schools should teach and students should learn. In the state of Virginia, a curricular framework has been developed that provides specific details of the knowledge and skills students must acquire to meet the standards in the four core areas of English, mathematics, science, and history/social science (Virginia Department of
The attainment of knowledge and skills that students must acquire is partially assessed by the Virginia Standards of Learning tests.

The Standards of Learning tests are designed to measure student understanding of the subject matter taught. Raw cut scores are developed that correspond with failing, passing, and advanced proficient scores. While the test is modified each year, the intent is to maintain the same difficulty level as the first form constructed (the forms that the standard was set on). Scaling and equating are the tools VDOE uses to ensure that each student receives a fair and equitable score on the test. A score below 400 is a failing score, 400 and above is passing, and a score of 500 or more is considered advanced proficient. A perfect score is a 600 (Virginia Department of Education, 2009b).

Validity testing of SOL assessments using Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients indicated that SOL English: Reading and Writing - 3rd grade correlated with Stanford 9 Total Reading at a .78 level. SOL English: Reading/Literature and Research – 5th grade correlated with the Stanford 9 Total Reading at a .78 level. SOL Mathematics – 3rd grade correlated with Stanford 9 Total Mathematics at a .75 level. SOL Mathematics – 5th grade correlated with the Stanford 9 Total Mathematics at a .74 level (Virginia Department of Education, 1999).

Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients for the SOL reading assessments were .90 for 3rd grade and .89 for 5th grade. Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients for the SOL math assessments were .91 for 3rd grade and .88 for 5th grade (Virginia Department of Education, 1999).

The Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools describe the Commonwealth's expectations for student learning and achievement in grades K-12.
Standards of Learning reading and math scores from individual 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students from each school were collected from the district. The individual scores from the students in all three grades were averaged to generate a mean score in reading for the school. The same process was used to generate an average mean math score. The reading and math mean scores were used to compare schools and look for statistically significant relationships with student and teacher perceptions of trust.

**Attendance Rates**

In order to examine the relationships between student trust and teacher trust with attendance rates, attendance data was needed. The required information was collected from district sources. Data used were the average daily attendance rate. The rate is a calculation of the total of all student days attended divided by the total of student days that were possible to be attended at each school. The calculation generates a percentage representing student rates of school attendance that can be compared from school to school. Attendance at elementary schools in the district is typically taken on a daily basis and recorded for each student by the homeroom teacher.

**Discipline Referral Rates**

In order to examine correlations between student trust and teacher trust with discipline referral rates, data were collected from district sources. Data collected by the district included the number of referrals for discipline infractions reported from each school for all students during the 2008-09 academic school year. To generate a value that could be compared from school, the number of total discipline referrals per school was divided by the same school's average daily membership resulting in the number of
referrals per student during the 2008-09 academic year. This value was useful because it allowed for the comparison of schools with different population sizes.

While the calculation did allow for comparison of discipline referral rates from school to school, differences in the way that individual schools handle discipline could introduce a potential concern to the study. The manner that teachers and administrators view discipline issues can be related to the number of referrals that they write. While district policy lends itself to a consistent manner of practice, different schools may not always respond to behavioral concerns in a uniform manner.

**Socioeconomic Status Data**

The socioeconomic status data is represented by the free and reduced lunch rates from each elementary school in the district. Free and reduced lunch rates are not a direct measure of the socioeconomic status of a school community, but an indirect indicator. While many parents of students with economic difficulties do apply for free and reduced lunch assistance, the process is completely voluntary in nature. It is up to the parent whether to apply or not. It is possible that the free and reduced lunch rate at a particular school under-represents the actual number of students that could potentially qualify. The data regarding free and reduced lunch rates were collected from the state of Virginia after they were reported by the district.

**Data Analysis**

The quantitative surveys responses were answered on a Scantron sheet. While individual teachers and students took the surveys, the unit of analysis will be the thirty-five individual schools. Data were aggregated to the school level allowing for comparisons.
Research Question 1

What is the relationship between student trust in teachers and reading and math Standards of Learning scores, student rates of discipline, and student rates of attendance at the elementary school level? Data sources to answer the question include survey items from the Student Stakeholder Survey that addressed student trust in teachers, SOL reading scores, SOL math scores, student attendance rates, and student discipline rates. Statistical methods used to analyze the data were correlation analyses using Pearson R.

Research Question 2

What is the relationship between teacher trust in clients and reading and math Standards of Learning scores, student rates of discipline, and student rates of attendance at the elementary school level? Data sources to answer the question included survey items from the Teacher Stakeholder Survey that addressed teacher trust in students, SOL reading scores, SOL math scores, student attendance rates, and student discipline rates. Statistical methods to analyze the data were correlation analyses using Pearson R.

Research Question 3

What is the relationship between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients? Data sources to answer the question included survey items from the Student Stakeholder Survey that addressed student trust in teachers and survey items from the Teacher Stakeholder Survey that addressed faculty trust in clients. Statistical methods to analyze the data were correlation analysis using Pearson R.

Research Question 4

What are the relative weights of student trust in teachers, faculty trust in clients, student attendance rates, student discipline rates, and student socioeconomic status when
attempting to explain variance in composite measures of reading and math student achievement measured by SOL reading and math scores? Data sources to answer the question included survey items that addressed student trust in teachers and teacher trust in students. Additional sources included SOL reading scores, SOL math scores, student attendance rates, student discipline rates and socioeconomic data. Statistical methods to analyze the data were regression analysis.

Table 3.1 – Data Analysis Chart summarized the information that was analyzed and the statistical methods that were used to study the relationships between student and teacher trust and school success measures.
Table 3.1 – Data Analysis Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the relationship between student trust in teachers and reading and math Standards of Learning scores, student rates of attendance, and student rates of discipline at the elementary school level?</td>
<td>Student Trust Survey instrument addressing student perceptions of trust in teachers 35 elementary schools - SOL reading scores, SOL math scores, Student attendance rates, Student discipline rates</td>
<td>Correlation analysis using Pearson R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the relationship between teacher trust in clients and reading and math Standards of Learning scores, student rates of attendance, and student rates of discipline at the elementary school level?</td>
<td>Faculty Trust in Clients instrument addressing teacher perceptions of trust in clients 35 elementary schools - SOL reading scores, SOL math scores, Student attendance rates, Student discipline rates</td>
<td>Correlation analysis using Pearson R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the relationship between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients?</td>
<td>Student Trust Scale instrument addressing student perceptions of student trust in teachers Faculty Trust in Clients instrument addressing teacher perceptions of teacher trust in clients</td>
<td>Correlation analysis using Pearson R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What are the relative weights of student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, student attendance rates, student discipline rates, and student socioeconomic status when attempting to explain variance in composite measures of student achievement measured by SOL math and reading scores?</td>
<td>Student Trust Scale instrument addressing student perceptions of trust in teachers Faculty Trust in Clients instrument addressing teacher perceptions of faculty trust in clients 35 elementary schools - SOL English scores, SOL math scores, Student attendance rates, Student discipline rates, Socioeconomic Data</td>
<td>Regression Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethical Safeguards

The district associated with this research administered the survey according to their established district policies. Prior to administration of the surveys, those taking the surveys were made aware that their participation was voluntary in nature and that no individual’s information was singled out for examination by the school’s administration. The Department of Research and Testing administered the survey according to district policy, which includes keeping information secure and confidential. Teacher and student information was not identifiable as having come from any particular individual. Because the unit of analysis was the individual school, neither individual students nor teachers were identified in the data analysis.

This project was found to comply with appropriate ethical standards and was exempted from the need for formal review by the College of William and Mary Protection of Human Subjects Committee (Phone 757-221-3966) on 2009-05-22 and expires on 2010-05-22.

Delimitations and Limitations

Delimitations imply limitations on the research design that a researcher has imposed deliberately. Limitations refer to restrictions in the design over which the researcher has no control (Rudestam & Newton, 2001). The study was delimited by the selection of the thirty-five schools under study. Because the schools in this sample are confined to elementary schools within a single urban school district, the results are not generalizable to all schools, but may be illustrative for other schools working with a similar population. Limitations of the study include the voluntary nature of the survey responses. Because teachers and students do not have to answer the surveys, the response
rate may be limited and consequently introduce some systematic error. Teachers may also self-report in a way that reflects on themselves more favorably with regard to school behaviors on surveys responses.

A potential factor that may have a limiting effect on the study is the measure being used to compare student discipline rates from schools to school. While the student discipline referral rate may, on the surface, appear to be a fairly straight-forward variable to compare from school to school, the differences in how different schools write referrals to address problematic behaviors may vary greatly. Because it is more desirable for schools to report lower numbers of school discipline, some schools may feel pressured to deal with discipline issues in ways other than writing referrals.

Another possible limiting factor is my status as an employee in the district under investigation. While the data has been supplied to me by the district, with minimal interaction between me and the students and teachers actually being surveyed, it is possible that my interpretation of the results could be influenced by information that I have due to my status as an employee in the district.
CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of student trust in teacher and teacher trust in clients on school success measures including reading and math Standards of Learning (SOL) scores, student discipline rates, and student attendance rates in an urban school setting. Academic achievement is the primary goal of public schools and Standards of Learning scores in reading and math serve as the stand-in measures for academic achievement in this study. While Standards of Learning scores are not the only indicator of academic achievement that are used in schools, they do serve as a measure that is based on a common curriculum within the State of Virginia and can be compared from school to school. While high levels of student attendance and low levels of discipline are school success measures in their own right, for purposes of this study, they are viewed as behaviors that influence trusting relationships between students and teachers and ultimately influence the target outcome which is student achievement.

Response data from the study was entered into Microsoft Excel to organize the data and the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for analysis. Pearson Product Moment correlations were conducted to examine the relationships between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients and with school success measures including SOL reading and math scores, student attendance rates, and school discipline rates. Regression analysis was used to determine the relative weights of student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, student attendance rates, student discipline rates, and student socioeconomic status when attempting to explain variance in composite
measures of reading and math student achievement on the Virginia Standards of Learning assessments.

Data sources to answer the research questions include survey items from the Student Trust Scale that were administered to students in grades 3-5 to address student trust in teachers as well as survey items from the Teacher Trust in Clients instrument administered to elementary teachers in the same schools to address teacher trust in clients. Additional information collected from the urban school district includes SOL reading scores from students in grades three through five, SOL math scores from students in grades three through five, student attendance rates, student discipline rates, and student socioeconomic data.

**Descriptive Summary of Sample**

**Student Sample**

In total 4,716 student responses were gathered from 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade elementary students in an urban school district consisting of thirty-five elementary schools. All thirty-five elementary schools in the district were represented in the study. The student homerooms surveyed in the study were randomly selected. Approximately half of all students in grades three through five were surveyed.

**Teacher Sample**

In total 1,288 elementary teacher responses were collected from the thirty-five elementary schools represented in the urban school district. All full-time instructional staff including regular education, special education, and resource teachers were included. Paraprofessionals, classified staff members, and administration were not included. All thirty-five elementary school were represented in the study.
Table 4.1

Descriptive Data – Mean Scores, Standard Deviations and the Range of the 35 School Average Data Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>35 School Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Surveyed</td>
<td>134.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>76 – 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Surveyed</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19 – 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Trust in Clients</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.82 – 3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Trust in Clients</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.83 – 4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading SOL Exam</td>
<td>469.09</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>422.55 – 511.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math SOL Exam</td>
<td>478.89</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>429.15 – 528.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Referral Rates</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02 – 0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Rates</td>
<td>96.23</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>95.0 – 97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (F/R Lunch %)</td>
<td>64.75</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>27.48 – 97.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means, standard deviations, and ranges in Table 4.1 were generated using the data collected (individual school means) from the thirty-five elementary schools addressed in the study. A few of the variables had very small standard deviations relative to their means suggesting limited variability and a level of consistency between schools on those measures.

Research Question 1 and Associated Data Results

Research Question 1 examined the relationship between student trust in teachers and reading and math Standards of Learning scores, student rates of discipline, and
student rates of attendance at the elementary school level. The research question was addressed by running Pearson Product Moment correlations using SPSS between student trust in teachers and reading SOL scores, math SOL scores, student attendance rates, and student discipline referral rates. The results indicate a significant relationship between student trust in teachers and Reading SOL scores (r = .61, p<.01) and Math SOL scores (r = .61, p<.01). The results indicate a moderately significant relationship between student trust and attendance (r = .38, p<.05). A significant relationship was not found between student trust and discipline (r = -.31). Thus the predicted relationship was found for three of the four variables, but did not hold for discipline referrals. Results are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2.
Correlation (Pearson r) between Levels of Student Trust in Teachers and School Success Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student Trust</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reading</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Math</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the p<0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the p<0.05 level (2-tailed).
N=35 schools
Research Question 2 and Associated Data Results

Research Question 2 examined the relationship between teacher trust in clients and reading and math Standards of Learning scores, student rates of discipline, and student rates of attendance at the elementary school level. The question was addressed by running Pearson Product Moment correlations using SPSS between teacher trust in clients and reading SOL scores, math SOL scores, student attendance rates, and student discipline referral rates. The results indicate a strong relationship between teacher trust in clients and Reading SOL scores ($r = .75, p<.01$) and Math SOL scores ($r = .78, p<.01$). The results indicate a moderately significant relationship between teacher trust in clients and student attendance rates ($r = .43, p<.05$) and a moderate negative relationship between teacher trust in clients and discipline referral rates ($r = -.45, p<.01$). Thus the predicted relationship was found for four of the four variables. Results are shown in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3.

Correlation (Pearson r) between Levels of Teacher Trust in Clients and School Success Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher Trust</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>-45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reading</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-35*</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Math</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the p<0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the p<0.05 level (2-tailed).
N=35 schools

**Research Question 3 and Associated Data Results**

Research Question 3 examined the relationship between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients. The question was addressed by running a Pearson Product Moment correlation using SPSS software on data associated with student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients. The results of the correlation analysis indicate a strong significant relationship (r=.60, p<.01) between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients. Thus, the predicted relationship between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients was found.

**Research Question 4 and Associated Data Results**
Research Question 4 examined the relative weights of student trust in teachers, faculty trust in clients, student attendance rates, student discipline rates, and student socioeconomic status when attempting to explain variance in a composite measure of grades 3-5 reading achievement and a composite measure of grades 3-5 math achievement measured by SOL reading and math scores.

Two regression analyses were performed explaining variance in reading and math achievement scores respectively, with student socioeconomic status, student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, student attendance rates, and student discipline rates entered as predictors. For both reading and math achievement, stepwise regression analyses were completed. In the first regression analysis, SES was entered alone. In the second regression analysis, the combination of SES, student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, student attendance rates, and student discipline referral rates were entered. The amount of variance explained by SES alone was compared to the amount of variance explained by the complete set of variables.

**Reading Results**

A regression analysis was completed examining the combination of variables influencing reading achievement. Variables examined include student SES, student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, student discipline referral rates, and student attendance rates. When all five variables were included in the analysis, two of the variables, teacher trust in students and student SES were found to make an independent contribution to the explanation of variance, while the other three, student trust in teachers, student discipline rates, and student attendance rates, did not. A stepwise regression analysis of the variables influencing SOL reading achievement indicates that the
variables with the most effect include teacher trust in clients ($\beta = .45, p<.05$) and student SES ($\beta = -.35, p<.05$). The results of the stepwise regression analysis indicated that student SES alone explained 50% of the variance while the combination of student SES, student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, student discipline referral rates, and student attendance rates explained 67% of the variance in SOL reading scores. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4

Regression Analysis Indicating the Influence of Variable Combinations on Reading SOL scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.709</td>
<td>-5.776</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.544</td>
<td>-3.502</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Trust</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>-2.021</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Trust</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Trust</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>3.012</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.357</td>
<td>-2.132</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Trust</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Trust</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>2.349</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-0.725</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.347</td>
<td>-2.090</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Trust</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Trust</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>2.578</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-0.808</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-1.235</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01 level *p<0.05 level N = 35

Math Results

A regression analysis was completed examining the combination of variables influencing math achievement. Variables examined include student SES, student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, student discipline referral rates, and student attendance rates. When all five variables were included in the analysis, two of the variables, teacher trust in students and student SES were found to make an independent contribution to the explanation of variance, while the other three, student trust in teachers, student discipline rates, and student attendance rates, did not. A stepwise regression analysis of the variables influencing SOL math achievement indicates that the variables with the most
effect include teacher trust in clients ($\beta = .52$, $p<.01$) and student SES ($\beta = -.38$, $p<.05$).

The results of the stepwise regression analysis indicated that student SES alone explained 59% of the variance while the combination of student SES, student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, student discipline referral rates, and student attendance rates explained 72% of the variance in SOL math scores. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Analysis Indicating the Influence of Variable Combinations on Math SOL scores</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj. $R^2$</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.766</td>
<td>-6.842</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.637</td>
<td>-4.445</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Trust</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.407</td>
<td>-2.895</td>
<td>.007 **</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Trust</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Trust</td>
<td>-.468</td>
<td>3.450</td>
<td>.002 **</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.385</td>
<td>-2.565</td>
<td>.016 *</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Trust</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Trust</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>3.255</td>
<td>.003 **</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.382</td>
<td>-2.507</td>
<td>.018 *</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Trust</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Trust</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>3.233</td>
<td>.003 **</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-0.448</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01 level**

**p<0.05 level**

**N = 35**

**Summary**

This chapter presented and analyzed research data that describes the relationship between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients and the impact of the two
trust measures on student attendance rates, student discipline referral rates, and ultimately student academic achievement represented by Standards of Learning reading and math scores. The impact of student SES was also examined to compare its influence on student achievement with other variables including student trust in teachers, teacher trust in clients, student attendance rates, and student discipline referral rates.

In this study, 4,716 elementary student and 1,288 elementary teacher responses were utilized to generate the results. The student and teachers responses came from 35 elementary schools in an urban school district in Virginia.

**Research Question 1 – Correlates of Student Trust in the Teacher**

- There is a strong significant correlation relationship between student trust in the teacher and Standards of Learning reading scores.
- There is a strong significant correlation relationship between student trust in the teacher and Standards of Learning math scores.
- There is a moderately significant correlation relationship between student trust in the teacher and student attendance rates.
- Student trust in the teacher was not significantly correlated to lower levels of student discipline rates.

**Research Question 2 – Correlates of Teacher Trust in Clients**

- There is a strong significant correlation relationship between teacher trust in clients and Standards of Learning reading scores.
- There is a strong significant correlation relationship between teacher trust in clients and Standards of Learning math scores.
There is a moderately significant correlation relationship between teacher trust in clients and student attendance rates.

There is a moderate inverse correlation relationship between teacher trust in clients and student discipline rates.

**Research Question 3 – The Relationship between Student Trust in Teachers and Teacher Trust in Clients**

There is a strong significant correlation between student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients.

**Research Question 4 - Regression Analysis Results**

- Stepwise regression analysis for both the reading and math SOL scores indicated that SES accounted for the highest amount of variance, followed by teacher trust in students.
- Beta weights were highest for teacher trust in students, followed closely by SES for both reading and math.
- Stepwise regression analysis determined that student trust in teachers, student attendance rates, and student discipline rates did not independently account for a significant amount of variance on reading and math SOL scores.

**Other Results - Student Attendance Rates**

- There is not a significant correlation relationship between student attendance rates and Standards of Learning reading scores.
- There is not a significant correlation relationship between student attendance rates and Standards of Learning math scores.

**Other Results - Student Discipline Referral Rates**
- There is a moderately significant correlation relationship between lower rates of student discipline and Standards of Learning reading scores.
- There is not a significant correlation relationship between lower rates of student discipline and Standards of Learning math scores.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

Discussions, Implications, and Recommendations

The final chapter summarizes the findings of the study. Included in the discussion are possible conclusions and implications from the results in addition to recommendations for future research. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the statistical relationships found between the variables in the study to see how they might apply to both research and practice. The primary variables examined in this study include student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients. Student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients were hypothesized as correlates of student academic success as measured by Standards of Learning reading and math scores. Additional student success measures that were examined included student attendance rates and student discipline rates. Pearson R correlations were completed looking at the relationships between the following variables:

- Student trust in teachers and student attendance rates, student behavior referral rates, and reading and math SOL achievement
- Teacher trust in clients and student attendance rates, student behavior referral rates, and reading and math SOL achievement
- Student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients

In addition, to determine which variables explained the most amount of variance when looking at both reading and math achievement as measured by SOL scores, regression analyses were performed that included student trust in teachers, teacher trust in...
clients, student attendance rates, student discipline referral rates and the socioeconomic status of students.

**Discussion of Research Findings**

The conceptual framework and model discussed in this study theorizes that trusting relationships between students and teachers serves as the backdrop for student academic achievement, which is described as a school success measure and a target outcome. Student-teacher trusting relationships including student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients, are not developed in a vacuum, but are influenced by other variables including student attendance rates and student discipline referral rates, which are intermediate success measures and precursors for academic achievement. In the model, it is theorized that all of the above variables are influenced by student socioeconomic status, which is an underlying variable. In order to test the hypotheses, correlation and regression analyses were run to look at the relationships between the variables and their influence on student achievement.

**Correlation Analysis of Student Trust in Teachers**

**Academics.** Historically, much of the research base related to trust has involved the perceptions of stakeholders other than students (Forsyth, 2008). Major topics have included faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in teachers, and faculty trust in clients, which includes both parents and students (Adams & Christensen, 2000; Tarter, Bliss & Hoy, 1989; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Research has also been undertaken that describes antecedents of parent trust toward schools (Adams, Forsyth, & Mitchell, 2009).

While faculty trust in students has been examined, much less work has been done with the reciprocal relationship, student trust in teachers. Research looking at the effects
of student trust in teachers has been in short supply with an instrument to measure it only recently being developed (Adams & Forsyth, 2008). Research related to student trust in teachers is largely novel information. While intuitively one might think that student trust in teachers would result in students achieving at higher levels, that argument has not been fully developed empirically in the educational literature base.

While empirical research directly linking student trust in teachers with school success measures including academic achievement is in short supply in the literature (Adams & Forsyth, 2008), there is some research that examines topics related to student trust in teachers. Lee (2007) suggests that student trust in teachers is indirectly linked to student performance through school adjustment and academic motivation. In another article, Mitra (2009) proposed that when students view their teachers as legitimate and trustworthy authority figures, teachers are more likely to earn the respect and cooperation of their students, potentially increasing the students' capacity to achieve.

In this study, correlation analysis confirmed that student trust in teachers is strongly correlated to state-wide standardized reading and math scores. This is important information for a couple of reasons. The first is that the information is a novel contribution to the research base regarding trust in schools. The second is that the research provides a new perspective on a mechanism that can be used to improve student achievement. In the age of NCLB accountability, the expectation is that all children will achieve and timelines have been set for one hundred percent proficiency. As schools get closer to one-hundred percent, it gets harder and harder to make incremental progress as more obvious fixes have been implemented. While instructional practices can and should always be a focus for improvement, continuous progress may require that relational
elements also be addressed. Solid instructional practices, combined with an increased focus on improving relational elements, may provide a synergistic boost to academic achievement that is greater than the sum of the individual parts.

**Student Attendance Rates.** Correlation analysis also confirmed that student trust in teachers is correlated in a moderately significant manner to student attendance rates. This makes sense if one thinks about building trust as a process that requires time and energy to develop and strengthen over time. Students that are present in the classroom are able to participate in the activities, interact with their teachers and classmates, and potentially develop interpersonal relationships that will make them more likely to want to continue coming to school. Those students that are absent excessively miss out on instruction and the opportunity to build trusting relationships with the teacher. Missed instruction due to absences puts students at risk for academic failure and decreased self-esteem. While higher levels of student trust can be correlated with higher attendance rates, the correlation would also suggest that a lack of student trust in the teacher could result in poor student attendance. If students do not feel that the teacher is acting in their best interests, they may show more reluctance to attend school on a regular basis.

This information is important because student trust in teachers and its relationship to attendance is an area that has not been developed in the research base regarding trust (Forsyth, 2008). This correlation shows that the development of strong interpersonal relations, where students trust teachers, may serve as a mechanism to improve attendance rates. Because an abundance of time, energy and resources are used to monitor
attendance and retrieve students with truancy concerns, insight into a potential
mechanism that could improve attendance rates is welcomed information.

**Discipline Referral Rates.** It is important to consider the power differential
between students and teachers in the discipline referral writing process. The attitude that
teachers have towards students is important to the discipline referral writing process.
Teachers drive the referral writing process. While students may initiate the process by
their inappropriate behaviors, students do not control if the referral is written or not. The
volume of referrals written can be influenced by teacher attitudes towards students. While
students may trust their teachers, their trust does not necessarily translate to influence on
the number of discipline referrals written.

Correlation analysis did not find a significant relationship between student trust in
teachers and lower student discipline rates. While the correlation between student trust in
teachers and discipline referral rates does not rise to a level of significance, it would not
be wise to assume that a relationship does not exist. It is possible that a relationship does
exist but the measure used to capture the rates of student discipline referrals may be
flawed. While the policies of the district may provide a framework for teacher and
administrators to operate under, it is possible that individual schools handle discipline
referrals in a disparate manner, with some schools writing and acting on referrals more
willingly than others. If certain schools handle discipline concerns using unorthodox
methods, it is possible that their actions could skew the data in such a manner that it
could influence the outcome of this study.

While there is not a strong body of research specifically linking student trust in
teachers to student behaviors at school, there is a reasonable amount linking the
importance of strong interpersonal relations to improvements in behavior (Brown and Skinner, 2007; Gregory & Ripski, 2008; Owens & Johnson, 2009; Rey, Smith, Yoon, Somers, & Bamett, 2007; Watson & Ecken, 2003). Mechanisms suggested in the literature for building trust with students that present with behavior problems include taking a personal interest in students, developing positive communication with students, and maintaining a respectful attitude toward students (Owens & Johnson, 2009). Brown and Skinner (2007) suggest using techniques commonly associated with mental health counseling in which rapport is built through active listening and unconditional positive regard. While it can be a Herculean task to maintain positive regard with students whose behavior is disruptive, aggressive, or belligerent, developing student trust in the teacher may lead to productive interactions, improvements in behavior, and increased levels of achievement.

**Correlation Analysis of Faculty Trust in Clients**

**Academics.** Correlation analysis confirmed that faculty trust in clients is related in a strongly significant manner to statewide standardized reading and math scores. The results of this study aligns with the claims of earlier research that suggests that faculty trust in clients is correlated with student achievement in math and reading achievement at the elementary school level (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001). Faculty trust is a collective property, which represents the group's willingness to risk vulnerability when working with other groups including administration, other teachers, parents, and students. When faculty members are willing to be vulnerable to others, they are confident that those they are working with are benevolent, reliable, competent, open, and honest (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003).
Prior research has shown that teachers play an important role in fostering high quality relationships among students and parents (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). As schools examine the importance of positive interpersonal relationships to the teaching and learning process, trust has been shown to play an important part in increasing student achievement (Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). As teachers develop trusting relationships with their students, the support that students receive can be used to moderate student disadvantages associated with poverty (Goddard, Salloum, & Berebitsky, 2009; Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001; Watson & Ecken, 2003). Fostering relational trust serves as a precondition that facilitates more effective student engagement (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003), which in turn influences student behavior and achievement.

**Student Attendance Rates.** Correlation analysis also confirmed that teacher trust in clients is moderately correlated to student attendance rates. This is significant because the work of schools is inter-dependent by nature and faculty trust in clients provides a springboard for a reciprocal relationship to develop. Faculty trust in clients suggests an understanding by teachers that students are capable of academic achievement and appropriate behavior. Attendance influences this relationship because as students attend school and interact with teachers, the reciprocal trust that students and teachers have in each other can be reinforced. Poor attendance by students results in fewer interactions with the teacher and is commonly associated with lower levels of achievement. Because interaction between parties is a prerequisite for trusting relationships to be built, low levels of interaction may influence the quality of the teacher-student relationship.
This finding is significant because as the bond between students and teachers builds due to the time and energy invested by both parties, students are more likely to experience success at school. When students feel connected to others at school, it is more likely that they will not only attend school, but they will spend less time worrying about safety and security issues, and more time engaged in productive activities (Irving & Parker-Jenkins, 1995).

**Discipline Referral Rates.** Correlation analysis also confirmed that teacher trust in clients is moderately correlated to lower student behavior referral rates. This suggests that teachers may be able to limit discipline problems by cultivating trust and cooperation through relationship building (Gregory & Ripski, 2008). This information is meaningful because strained relationships between students and teachers can influence student behavior. Benevolent, reliable, and competent teachers can help students to feel more comfortable in potentially vulnerable situations and increase the students' capacity to be successful even when students are caught in challenging circumstances (Owens & Johnson, 2009). Because trust tends to be reciprocal in nature, if teachers adjust their behavior and become more supportive of students as faculty trust in students develops, students may internalize the supportive nature of their teachers and become more willing to develop a level of trust and cooperation with other students and their teachers (Frank, 2001).

Faculty trust is important to students because trust in an organization is associated with feelings of safety and comfort (Smith & Birney, 2005). Higher levels of student satisfaction are associated with teachers that have caring and supportive relationships with students and a positive classroom environment (Baker, 1999). By combining
effective whole-school reforms that include more attention to school relationships, in combination with interventions that address behavior and attendance, it is possible that student discipline can be improved and achievement rates can be increased (Balfanz, Herzog, & Mac Iver, 2007; Segal, 2008).

**Correlation Analysis of Student Trust in Teachers and Teacher Trust in Clients**

Correlation analysis confirmed that student trust in teachers is correlated in a strongly significant manner to teacher trust in clients. While this correlation is a novel relationship in the trust literature, it is not especially surprising when one looks at related items in the research base. Previous research by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) has shown that many aspects of trust between stakeholders in schools tend to be inter-related and overlapping.

Both student trust in teachers and faculty trust in clients are concepts developed around the same five facets of trust including benevolence, openness, competency, honesty, and reliability. With both having similar origins, it would be reasonable to suggest that they are tightly related. Because both student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients were addresses in the study, the significant correlation suggests the possibility of a mutual relationship between the two variables, where presence of one infers the presence of the other. The finding is important because trust between stakeholders in the school building has been shown to be part of the social context related to interactions within and between groups and can contribute to positive school relationships and increased school success (Adams, 2008).

**Regression Analysis of Factors Influencing Reading and Math SOL Achievement**
The hypothesized results were that student trust in teacher and teacher trust in clients would account for more variance than socio-economic status when accounting for achievement measured by statewide standardized reading and math scores. The actual results of the analyses for both reading and math scores showed similar outcomes with SES accounting for more variance than other variables. In both the reading and math analyses, SES and teacher trust in clients accounted for a significant amount of variance, while the other three variables; students trust in teachers, student referral rates, and student discipline rates, did not independently account for a significant amount of variance. It appears that when teachers believe in the capabilities of their students and trust them to rise to their potential, teachers and students are able to collaboratively create learning environments that facilitate student achievement.

The results of the study are in alignment with other studies that have demonstrated the power of teacher trust in students to influence student achievement (Forsyth, 2008; Goddard, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). In both analyses, teacher trust was found to explain a large percentage of the variance, even after adjusting for SES, when looking at student achievement in reading and math. While student trust in teachers accounted for some of the variance on the statewide standardized achievement measures, it did not account for as much as SES.

In the regression analysis, SES explained more variance in math (.587) than it did in reading (.503). A possible reason for this difference may be the focus of instruction in primary grades (K-2), which tends to center around literacy skills. With less attention paid to math instruction, math results may be swayed to a greater degree by the influence of issues associated with socioeconomic status.
Recommendations for Further Research

Student Trust in Teachers

Due to the lack of empirical studies involving student trust in teacher, it is an area that should be developed further. The Student Trust Scale instrument (Adams & Forsyth, 2008) could be very useful for examining levels of student trust in teachers at other school levels including middle and high school. It would be interesting to repeat the current study at the middle or high school level to determine if the relationships between trust and school success measures differ in outcome or intensity when compared to the elementary level.

Because the Student Trust Scale is designed to be used as a measure of the collective views of groups, it might also be interesting to see how the data would look if researchers attempted to compare different groups rather than overall school populations. Groups that might be considered include NCLB subgroups such as special education, ethnic minority, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficient students. Because different groups may have different experiences, it is very possible that they may view the school experience from completely different lenses with regard to trust. It may be possible to tease out information about relationships involving different groups that could be used to develop more trust and better instructional programming for these various groups.

Teacher Trust in Clients

With the recent development of the Student Trust Scale (Adams & Forsyth, 2008), it might be beneficial to use this new tool, in conjunction with the Faculty Trust in Clients instrument to look at the presence or absence of reciprocal trusting relationships
in a wide variety of subgroups to generate a better understanding of student-teacher
dynamics across different populations.

While correlation analysis did indicate that there is a relationship between both
student trust and teachers and teacher trust in clients with academic success, the
regression analysis indicated that teacher trust in students accounted for a significant
amount of variance in achievement while student trust in teachers accounted for less. It
might be interesting to dig a little deeper to examine why that is the case. While both are
based on the same five facets of trust, it appears that teacher trust in clients correlates to a
stronger degree with academic achievement. Further development of insight into why the
two differ might make a contribution. One might think that they are different sides of the
same coin, but the data indicate that there may be more to it.

School Attendance Rates

Attendance was found to have a moderately significant correlation with both
student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients. It would be interesting to look at the
subgroup of students with excessive absences to address them more in depth to address
their specific issues and examine the state of their relationships with teachers along with
co-morbidity issues that they may have including behavior, achievement, and social
concerns.

School Discipline Rates

While a moderate significant correlation was found between teacher trust in
clients and discipline referral rates, a statistically significant relationship was not found
between student trust in teachers and student discipline referral rates. Further research
into the reasons that a difference exists might be an interesting challenge for future researchers.

While most students do not have major discipline concerns, for the smaller percentage of students with serious behavior problems, their views on trusting relationship between student and teachers might be significantly different that those of their well behaved peers. Taking a more careful look at the subset of students that have demonstrated behavior concerns using a qualitative or mixed design method to look more specifically at their concerns and how they are related to trusting interactions could also be interesting.

Implications for Practice

As educators increasingly work in a more collaborative manner, it is likely that trust will develop if conditions are appropriate. Schools are more likely to sustain high levels of capacity if they promote effective practices, create structures that promote achievement, and establish trusting relationships (Youngs & King, 2002).

Trust, as described in the study, has been shown to positively explain variance in student achievement. In order to facilitate the growth of trusting relationships between students and teachers a wide variety of practices can be implemented. Practices that have potential for facilitating trusting relationships include maintaining an equitable school environment, improving teacher preparation programs, increasing opportunities for professional development, and addressing student psycho-social needs.

Maintaining an Equitable School Environment

In urban schools, minority students and students coming from depressed socioeconomic backgrounds often make up a large segment of the student population. In
order to better serve those that have historically been underserved, House and Martin (1998) suggest that more attention be paid to educational equity in urban schools. When school districts create the expectation that all children will be treated with dignity and respect in regards to both academic and discipline matters, trusting relationships between students and teachers are more likely to develop, which may promote student success. When children feel that their teachers act in a benevolent and equitable manner regardless of their socioeconomic status, gender, ethnic make-up, or disability status, they may be more willing to risk putting forth the effort required to initiate productive relationships with their teachers and commit to working through difficulties that arise (Enright, Schaefer, Schaefer, & Schaefer, 2008; Owens & Johnson, 2009).

In this study, socioeconomic status was shown to be a powerful indicator of school success. If teacher trust in the student is not present, and students are subjected to the default influence of their socio-economic status, this could be problematic, as many students in urban settings have difficult home lives and limited access to resources. A potential mechanism to foster teacher trust in schools would be a dedication to fairness and equity. When teachers are mindful of the impact of variables, such as socioeconomic status, gender, ethnic make-up, or disability status, and act in a way that helps ensure that they are not limiting factors, then teachers are acting in a way that promotes trust.

When fairness and equity are not the norm in a school, students may withdraw their trust when their needs and their expectations are not met (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Equity and fairness can be manifested in schools in a number of ways including teacher responsiveness to the needs of students and the way that discipline concerns are handled. Failure on the part of teachers to act in an equitable
manner can be problematic because the students that have the most academic difficulties or exhibit the most severe behavior issues are probably the students that would benefit the most from an increase in trusting relationships between students and teachers.

**Improving Teacher Preparation Programs**

The first few years of teaching for new teachers can be especially challenging if teachers are not prepared to work effectively with their students (Wong & Wong, 1998). In order to help teachers address the huge learning curve that they need to overcome during their first few years of teaching, it might be useful if the curriculum for teachers in training incorporated the importance of interpersonal relations as early in the program as possible. By setting the importance of trusting relationships early in the program, possibly as part of an educational foundations course, it may be possible to set the tone for future training as they matriculate through the program. Looking at curriculum, instruction, and evaluation, through the lens of positive interpersonal relations, might help future teachers become more effective at assisting students achieve behavioral and academic excellence.

Because of the importance of interpersonal relationships in the teaching and learning process, it may be beneficial for potential teachers to be encouraged to examine their orientation toward students in general and their ability to engage students in positive interpersonal relationships. While a specific personality type is not required to be an effective teacher, the research indicates that certain skill sets, such as the ability to engage students in trusting relationships and fruitful interactions, should be considered as basic pre-requisites (Kaplan & Owings, 2003; Stronge, 2002).

**Increasing Opportunities for Professional Development**
Great teachers are able to create and maintain a balance between knowledge of the school curriculum and the ability to build relationships with students (Young, 2009). For some teachers the ability to form relationships with students comes naturally, while for others it is a challenge. The first step in changing teacher behaviors regarding how they interact with students is to adjust their mindset. Changing teacher mindsets to a more inclusive and collaborative model, based on trusting interactions between teachers and students will require that many teachers rethink their own practices and develop new classroom roles and expectations. This may be difficult for some teachers because it necessitates that teachers work in a manner that may be different than their previous modes of operating and is based on a model that they may never have experienced personally as students (Darling-Hammond & Mclaughlin, 1995).

When schools want to develop, articulate, and communicate a vision for the school that includes a focus on equitable practices and trusting relationships, training may be necessary to help develop this mindset. For administrators, teachers, and other faculty members to realize their potential for addressing students in an equitable manner, they may need additional training in understanding diversity issues associated with the students that they work with. As teachers learn more about diversity issues and become more self-aware, they become better equipped to address students in a more equitable manner (Kose, 2007).

**Addressing Student Psychosocial Needs**

Being attentive to the school environment and proactively creating safe places where trusting relationships can develop between students and teachers helps to promote feelings of well-being and allows students to concentrate on their studies rather than
being distracted by other issues (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Some students, due to circumstances largely beyond their control, have to overcome barriers and require extra support to perform at an optimal level. This support can come in the form of mentoring relationships or in the form of assistance from mental health practitioners. A focus on communal interactions, mentoring relationships, and formal therapeutic interventions can make a profound difference in the lives of students in need and may result in increased academic achievement (Murray & Malmgren, 2005) and decreases in delinquent behavior (Payne, 2008).

Practices associated with attachment theory, described earlier may be useful for building trusting relationships between students and teachers. Because a sense of attachment and trust are partial mediators for depression and self-esteem issues, efforts taken to promote trusting relationships between students and their teachers should be actively pursued. If schools and teachers are able to facilitate the development of prosocial skills in students, the students may be better equipped to engage in productive relationships with their teachers (Bosacki, Dane, & Marini, 2007; Watson & Ecken, 2003).

School-based intervention programs that address the emotional concerns of students can have a net result of increased comfort and less anxiety in the school setting (Griffith, 2003; Mifsud & Rapee, 2005). Possible mechanisms for implementing these practices include increased access to teachers, school social workers, school counselors, school psychologists, community service agencies, and mentors. When those with influence over students at schools take on a more proactive role and serve as advocates
for their students, they help them to overcome potential barriers to success (House & Martin, 1998).

**Final Thoughts**

The correlation analysis of the impact of student trust in teacher and teacher trust in clients with school success measures showed that eight of the nine hypothesized relationships suggested in this study were found to be significant. Student trust in teachers was correlated with SOL reading results, SOL math results, and student attendance rates. Teacher trust in clients was correlated with SOL reading results, SOL math results, student attendance rates, and student discipline referral rates. Student trust in teachers and teacher trust in clients were also correlated to each other.

The results of this study show a correlational relationship between measures of student trust and teacher trust with Standards of Learning reading and math scores, which serve as indicators of student achievement. Student trust in teachers, which was found to be strongly correlated with student achievement, is a measure of trust from the perspective of students. Trusting relationships between students and teachers are inter-dependent in nature and associated with one parties' willingness to be vulnerable in potentially risky situations. Students need teachers to help them complete the developmental and academic tasks required of school age youth. Developing the ability to form productive, trusting relationships with others is an important developmental task. While this task may be initiated with the student's parent, the task is embellished through the interactions that students have with their teachers. Failure on the part of parents or teachers to support children in an appropriate manner can influence the child's ability to relate to others effectively.
As teachers prove themselves to be benevolent, competent, reliable, open, and honest, students are able to open up to potential relationships with teachers. The relationship develops further as students and teachers overcome obstacles and grow increasingly more trusting of each other. As the relationship develops, students are able to spend less time worrying about potential breeches in trust and spend more time focusing on productive endeavors. While a certain amount of trust might be given to teachers freely as a function of their position as an adult and teacher, true trust must be developed and earned over time as the teachers help students work through common problems and prove themselves to be trustworthy.

When examining the results of the correlation and regression analyses, teacher trust in clients was shown to be a very powerful variable in each and every analysis. When teachers truly believe that their students can achieve, and act in the students' best interests, they demonstrate the power of trusting relationships. In urban school districts, this teacher trait is particularly useful. As students in urban settings attempt to overcome obstacles in their path, teachers need to understand that by acting in a trusting and trustworthy manner and operating under a mindset that focuses on serving students in a benevolent, open, competent, honest, and reliable manner, they will be able to make a difference in the lives of children.
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Appendix A

Survey Instructions for Students

The surveys were administered by the district with limited input from the author of this study. The district followed their policies and procedures for administering surveys in the district.

Teacher information - Your homeroom was selected at random to participate in the annual District Stakeholder Survey. Please distribute the surveys to students in your homeroom and return all forms to your representative when completed. Special education students may complete the survey if they are included in your homeroom and are capable of completing the survey.

Please have students fill in their grade. If a student has no opinion on a question, they should leave it blank. Please share with the students that the survey is voluntary in nature and the confidentiality of the responses will be protected.

Any question that you may have should be directed to the Department of Strategic Evaluation, Assessment, and Support at 628-3836.
Appendix B

Survey Instructions for Teachers

The surveys were administered by the district with limited input from the author of this study. The district followed their policies and procedures for administering surveys in the district.

Instructions for Administering School Representative - Teachers Surveys

Confidentiality of responses is critical. The teacher Survey is to be administered to full-time teachers and other full-time faculty or certified educators working in the school - all persons who have a teacher contract. Included: teachers (classroom, special ed., etc) or other professional faculty (librarian, counselors). Excluded: principal, assistant principals, teacher aids, health care, transportation or security employees, and classified employees (all).

Please distribute the surveys to the professional faculty as described above. When finished, the teachers should return the survey to the designated representative. Please have the professional staff fill in their school code number. If a teacher has no opinion on a question, they should leave it blank. Please share with the teachers that the survey is voluntary in nature and the confidentiality of the responses will be protected. Please let the teachers know that any question or concerns that cannot be sufficiently addressed by the school representative can be addressed by the Department of Strategic Evaluation, Assessment, and Support at 628-3836.
Appendix C

Student Trust Survey Questions

48. Teachers are always ready to help
49. Teachers at this school have high expectations for all students
50. Teachers are easy to talk to at this school
51. Students are well cared for at this school
52. Teachers always do what they are supposed to do
53. Teachers at this school really listen to students
54. Teachers at this school are always honest with me
55. Teachers at this school do a terrific job
56. Students can believe what teachers tell them
57. Teachers at this school do not care about students
58. Teachers at this school are good at teaching
59. Students learn a lot from teachers in this school
60. Students at this school can depend on teachers for help
Appendix D

Faculty Trust in Clients Questions.

B1. Students care about each other.

B8. Teachers can count on parental support.

B9. Teachers think that most of the parents do a good job.

B12. Students can be counted on to do their work.

B13. Parents are reliable in their commitments.

B17. Teachers trust the parents.

B21. Teachers here believe that students are competent learners.

B23. Teachers believe what parents tell them.

B25. Teachers trust their students.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marking Instructions**
- Use a No. 2 pencil only.
- Do not use ink, ballpoint, or felt tip pens.
- Make solid marks that fill the response completely.
- Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.
- Make no stray marks on this form.

Please indicate your level of agreement with each item below by assigning a "letter grade" to each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students respect others who get good grades.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students try hard to improve.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This school is serious about learning.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students work hard to get good grades.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel proud of being part of my school.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The only time I get attention at school is when I cause trouble.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. School is one of my favorite places to be.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. School is more important than most people think.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There are adults at school who are interested in me.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Most of the things we learn at school are worthless.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I can get a good job even if my grades are bad.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Going to school is a waste of time.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teachers control classroom behavior.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The content of my courses are challenging.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My teachers believe that I can learn.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Good grades are recognized.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The principal/assistant principal visit classrooms.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I am responsible for what I learn.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My teachers have prepared me for the next grade and the future.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. There is at least one adult at school who I can talk about personal matters.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The school staff are friendly and helpful.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Gangs are a problem at my school.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I respect my teacher(s).</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The school guidance counselor helps me if I need it.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. If I don't understand something, the teacher will work with me until I get it.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I can get extra help at school, if needed.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I enjoy coming to school.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I feel like I am a part of my school.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My teachers care about me.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Teachers care about students.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Teachers treat me fairly.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I fit in with the students at this school.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. My teachers keep me informed about my progress.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

< Over to page 2 >
Please indicate your level of agreement with each item below by assigning a "letter grade" to each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. I feel safe inside the school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I feel safe outside and around the school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I have been threatened or bullied</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I stay home sometimes because I don't feel safe at school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The noise in the school disrupts my learning</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I have trouble learning because there are too many students in my classroom</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Stealing is a problem in this school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Discipline problems are handled fairly</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The rules in this school are clear</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. My school is clean and well maintained, even if it may be old</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Students fight a lot</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Teachers respect me</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Students are picked on or teased</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Students treat each other with respect</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Teachers are always ready to help</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Teachers at this school have high expectations for all students</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Teachers are easy to talk to at this school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Students are well cared for at this school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Teachers always do what they are supposed to do</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Teachers at this school really listen to students</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Teachers at this school are always honest with me</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Teachers at this school do a terrific job</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Students can believe what teachers tell them</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Teachers at this school do not care about students</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Teachers at this school are good at teaching</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Students learn a lot from teachers in this school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Students at this school can depend on teachers for help</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Students bring drugs or alcohol to school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DURING THIS SCHOOL YEAR**

Have you participated in any of the following activities outside of regular class hours? (check all that apply)

1. Arts or music group (ex. Band, Chorus, Orchestra, Theater or Photography Club)
2. Academic club or competition (ex. Academic Decathlon; Science, Spanish, Book Club; Math Team; National Honor Society; Debate Team)
3. Club or organization that provides community service (ex., Key Club)
4. School yearbook, newspaper, or literary magazine
5. Student council or student government
6. Naval Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (NJROTC)
7. Athletics
8. Other club, committee, or organization not included in this list (ex., Chess Club, Computer Club)
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### Years Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Years Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>21+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marking Instructions
- Use a No. 2 pencil only.
- Do not use ink, ballpoint, or felt tip pens.
- Make solid marks that fill the response completely.
- Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.

### Questions

**How much can you do to:**

| A1. Control disruptive behavior in the classroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A2. Motivate students who show low interest in school work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A3. Calm a student who is disruptive or noisy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A4. Help your students value learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A5. Craft good questions for your students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A6. Have students follow classroom rules |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A7. Have students believe they can do well in school work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A8. Establish a classroom management system with each group of students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A9. Use a variety of assessment strategies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A10. Provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A11. Assist families in helping their children do well in school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A12. Implement alternative teaching strategies in your classroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**How much can teachers in your school do to:**

| A13. Produce meaningful student learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A14. Get students to believe they can do well in school work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A15. Make expectations clear about appropriate student behavior |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A16. Establish rules and procedures that facilitate learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A17. Help students master complex content |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A18. Promote deep understanding of academic concepts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A19. Help students think critically |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A20. Foster student creativity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A21. Help students feel safe while they are at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A22. Control disruptive behavior |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A23. Get students to follow school rules |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A24. Respond to defiant students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

< Next Page >
Please indicate your opinion on each item below by selecting a number for each item ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (6) Strongly Agree.

### In your school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Students care about each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Teachers typically look out for each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Teachers have faith in the integrity of the school's administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Even in difficult situations, teachers can depend on each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5. The school's administration typically acts in the best interests of the teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6. Teachers can rely on the school's administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7. Teachers trust each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8. Teachers can count on parental support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9. Teachers think that most of the parents do a good job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10. Teachers trust the school's administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11. Teachers are open with each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12. Students can be counted on to do their work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13. Parents are reliable in their commitments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14. The school's administration does not tell teachers what is really going on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15. The school's administration does not show concern for teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16. Teachers have faith in the integrity of their colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17. Teachers trust the parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18. Teachers are suspicious of each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19. When teachers tell you something you can believe it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20. Teachers do their jobs well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21. Teachers believe that students are competent learners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22. Teachers are suspicious of most of the school's administration actions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23. Teachers believe what parents tell them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24. The principal is competent in doing his or her job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25. Teachers trust their students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### To what extent is each of the following a problem at your school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1. Physical conflicts among students (fighting)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Drug activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Disorder in classrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4. Disorder in hallways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5. Threats of violence toward teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6. Students threatening other students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7. Students intimidating other students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8. Bullying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9. Students in this school fear other students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10. Students in this school make fun of other students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please indicate your opinion on each item below by selecting a number for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. Our school makes an effort to inform the community about our goals and achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Our school is able to maintain community support when needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. The interactions between faculty members are cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5. The school sets high standards for academic performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6. Students respect others who get good grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7. The principal is friendly and approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8. The principal puts suggestions made by the faculty into operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9. Parents and other community members are included on planning committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10. Community members are responsive to requests for participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11. Teachers help and support each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12. Teachers in this school exercise professional judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13. Teachers are committed to helping students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14. Academic achievement is recognized and acknowledged by the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15. Students try hard to improve on previous work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16. The principal explores all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17. The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18. Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19. Teachers &quot;go the extra mile&quot; with their students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20. Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21. The learning environment is orderly and serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22. Students seek extra work so they can get good grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23. The principal is willing to make changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D24. The principal lets the faculty know what is expected of them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D25. The principal maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26. Community members attend meetings to stay informed about our school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D27. Organized community groups (e.g., PTA, PTO) meet regularly to discuss school issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D28. School people are responsive to the needs and concerns expressed by community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D29. Teachers help students on their own time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30. Teachers take initiative to introduce themselves to substitutes and assist them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D31. Teachers waste a lot of class time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D32. Teachers volunteer to sponsor extra-curricular activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D33. Teacher committees in this school work productively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D34. Teachers make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of our system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35. Teachers voluntarily help new teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D36. Teachers volunteer to serve on committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D37. Teachers arrive to work and meetings on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D38. Teachers begin class promptly and use class time effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D39. Teachers give colleagues advanced notice of changes in schedule or routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D40. Teachers give an excessive amount of busy work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please indicate your opinion on each item below by selecting a number for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1. Faculty morale is good at this school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. I am satisfied with my job at this school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. I feel safe while at school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4. My school is kept in good condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5. Parents cooperate with teachers in addressing the academic performance and discipline of their children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6. I have planning time at least three days a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7. Student absenteeism is a problem in my class(es)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8. Students feel safe in this school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9. The school’s administration actively monitors the quality of teaching in this school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10. The school’s administration is proactive and addresses support issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11. The school’s administration knows what’s going on in my classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12. The principal promotes and nurtures leadership among the staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13. The principal promotes shared decision-making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14. The school’s administration takes a personal interest in the professional development of teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15. The teacher salary structure and benefits are equitable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many teachers in your school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Almost Full</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Nearly All</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1. Help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just their classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2. Take responsibility for improving the school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3. Feel responsible that all students learn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4. Really care about each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5. How many of the parents of your students support your teaching efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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