1 Introduction

Making a Case for Trust

When we want others to cooperate with us, we can coerce them with threats of punishment, or we can entice them with promises of rewards. This punishment-reward system works well when we are able to tell whether or not others are cooperating with us. For example, in a typical outing to a family restaurant, we might witness some parents warning their children that if they do not behave in the restaurant, they will be going to bed early. We might see other parents compelling their children's good behavior with a promise of dessert after dinner. In this example, either system works fairly well, as the parents can easily judge whether or not their children have lived up to the bargain and either are free from punishment or merit their reward.

We experience many situations in which it is not so clear whether or not others are cooperating with us. In these cases, the punishment-reward system alone does not suffice. In taking the car to the mechanic, most of us are unable to assess if either the diagnosis of the problem or the proposed resolution is correct. To make matters worse, we realize that the mechanic has a significant monetary incentive to not cooperate fully with us and propose more work than is necessary. In such cases, we must form a trust relationship with others as part of our decision to interact with them. In the car mechanic example, we might initially choose to trust a mechanic based on a neighbor's recommendation, the appearance of the garage, or the personal attributes of the mechanic. If the initial outcome seems positive, we might eventually build trust based on knowledge of the mechanic's past behavior, and concerns about potential rewards and punishments become less important when deciding whether or not to leave our car in the mechanic's care.

WHY IS TRUST IN SCHOOLS SO IMPORTANT?

The role of trust between a car mechanic and his or her customer is similar to that of trust between school professionals and parents. Most parents lack the knowledge necessary to judge if a teacher is doing his or her job well. Even if they did have training in child development and pedagogy, most parents are unable to spend a significant amount of time in the classroom to truly evaluate a teacher. Instead, parents entrust their children to teachers and principals based on recommendations, the appearance of the school, and, sometimes, the appearance of the teacher or principal. Over the course of the academic year, parents may place their trust based on successful interactions with their child's teacher or student outcomes that indicate to them that the teacher must be doing a good job.

While the car mechanic example works pretty well, there are some important differences between garages and schools with regard to trust. As Bidwell (1970) noted when comparing doctors and teachers, normally the bond between the professional and the client is a voluntary, one-on-one bond that involves a fee for service. In schools, however, students enter on an involuntary basis, teachers work as single professionals interacting with dozens of students at once, and the clients receive the services for free (in the case of public education).

Bidwell (1970) argues that the special organizational properties of the school as a client-serving organization have implications for the formation of a trust relationship between professional and client. The involuntary nature of schooling constrains the options of students and teachers in forming professional relationships. If a patient does not trust his or her doctor, the patient may choose another. However, a student is placed in a classroom—and often even a school—without a choice. If the student does not trust the ability of the teacher, the student has few options. Because the student cannot easily move to another classroom or school the most readily available alternative is to remain in the classroom but withdraw cooperation and support. The teacher also suffers in this example by having to cope with a student who does not trust the teacher's abilities and is therefore not cooperative.

The issue of judging competence that was highlighted in the car mechanic example is even more severe in schooling. As noted by Bryk and Schneider (2002) in *Trust in Schools,* the goals of schooling are far reaching and not easily agreed on. Whereas the car mechanic is expected to keep the car running smoothly, some parents expect schools to teach academic knowledge solely, while others also expect schools to promote certain value systems and develop cultural awareness. Business leaders want schools to produce good workers, while community members expect

schools to produce good citizens. While expectations vary, there is little open discussion or debate within communities about what should be the aims of schooling and how schools might accomplish them.

Bryk and Schneider (2002) further assert that even if the aims of schooling were defined and agreed on, there is no consensus among school professionals on how to produce them. Extensive research on effective instruction has not produced a professional knowledge base that dictates specific teaching practices for specific outcomes. Neither instructional methods nor curricula have uniformly been successful in producing increased academic knowledge or improving students' character development. The authors argue that even if best practices were identified, it would be difficult to enforce their use throughout the school since the organization of schools prevents parents and even administrators from effectively monitoring teaching practices. This leaves principals and fellow teachers in a similar situation to parents. Classroom visits can be made for periodic monitoring. However, teachers cannot be constantly observed or assessed to ensure that they are following a specific instructional plan.

In research on organizational structure, the lack of agreement on organizational goals and the inability of management to judge whether or not workers are doing their jobs lead the organization to separate performance from outcomes, or to decouple (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Rather than judging an individual's performance based on a set of outcomes, organizations under these conditions develop expectations for behavior. If individuals meet these expectations for behavior, they are thought to be doing their job. Meyer and Rowan call these expectations for behavior institutionalized myths. They argue that America's schools are filled with examples of institutionalized myths. We expect schools to be divided into classrooms, with one teacher assigned to a group of twenty to thirty students. We expect teachers to maintain authority and discipline in the classroom. When we see students respond in an orderly fashion to their teacher as we pass in the hallway, we think that that teacher probably is doing a good job.

When performance is separated from assessment of outcomes and instead we look for individuals and organizations to meet our traditional expectations for behavior, organizations are said to be operating under a logic of confidence—that is, people have faith that others are doing what they are supposed to be doing. In an atmosphere where adequate performance is assumed rather than verifiable, degrees of competence are not discernable, and only gross incompetence is detected. Thus, parents assume that teachers are doing what they can to produce learning in their children. Teachers assume that their colleagues are acting appropriately behind classroom doors. Without evidence to the contrary, the school continues to operate with legitimacy.

As one might expect, there are problems with maintaining an organization in this decoupled state where we assume people are doing their jobs and the only evidence we have to support our assumptions is that they are meeting a traditional set of expectations for behavior that go along with their role. First and most obvious, people might not be doing their jobs. A fourth-grade teacher might suspect that her colleague teaching third grade did not adequately prepare her students to advance, but, without evidence of gross incompetence, it is difficult to confirm those suspicions. Second, the institutionalized myths set a minimum level of competence in defining behaviors for a job. There is no focus on how to do the job well. The myths about teachers set minimum standards for orderliness and cleanliness rather than promoting a standard of dedicated teaching. Finally, traditional myths or expectations for behavior are slow to change and stand in the way of adaptations that might make teaching and learning more efficient and effective.

EFFICIENT SCHOOLS AS NETWORK ORGANIZATIONS

The traditional organization of schooling itself is an institutionalized myth that slows innovations that might lead to greater efficiency. Schools are usually structured as bureaucracies, with commonly understood roles for state boards and superintendents, local boards and superintendents, principals, and teachers. In fact, economic theory predicts that schools should operate best as bureaucracies precisely because they operate with competing goals, and it is difficult to evaluate individual performance (Ouchi, 1980).

However, other organizational conditions of schooling indicate that schools might operate more efficiently as networks rather than bureaucracies if members of a school community were able to openly define a set of goals. In organizational theory, networks are defined as loosely grouped entities that are dependent on one another for resources and information to create one final product. Networks are particularly useful when there is a need for reliable information and when outcomes are not easily measured (Powell, 1990).

Networks operate under a set of norms or standards for behavior that support working toward mutual goals and forsaking individual goals that might come in conflict with the mutual goal. Members of a network agree to give to others with an expectation that at some future date they will receive a benefit from a member of the network. While they all work toward a common goal that will benefit each individually, members agree not to pursue their own interests if it will hurt others in the network. Such

norms of behavior in a network increase everyone's sense of security to enhance the spread of information, allow for added risk taking, and bring together new combinations of approaches.

As discussed earlier, the outcomes of schooling are difficult to measure. In addition, dependencies exist across role relationships in all schools. Teachers are dependent on one another as children are passed from one grade to the next and must build on the knowledge learned in past years. Parents are dependent on teachers to educate their children appropriately. Teachers are dependent on principals to create school conditions that are conducive to helping children learn.

In addition to the interdependencies, there is a need for efficient sharing of information in schools across role relationships. Parents and teachers who share information on the children can more easily meet the needs of individual children. With efficient communication, parents can better prepare their children for school and work with their children at home. Teachers who communicate with parents may learn how to better bridge any gap in cultures between home and school.

Effective schools research has described schools that successfully operate as networks (Bryk & Schneider, 1996; Meier, 1995, 2002; Spillane & Thompson, 1997). In these schools, goals are openly discussed and agreed on, and the adults in the school community are willing to subjugate their own personal needs to do what is best for the children. In addition, these schools have incorporated collegial observation and discussions of professional standards into their daily operations to keep performance ambiguity low. These schools are deliberately challenging many of the institutionalized myths of schooling, such as the organization of classrooms, the measurement of student outcomes, and the isolation of teachers.

Of course, the stories of successful network schools emphasize the need to build trusting relationships. Some level of trust is necessary to begin discussions on important and heartfelt issues, such as the goals of the school. Higher levels of trust are needed to begin sharing information and resources with one another without knowing when or if repayment is coming. Teachers who invest significant amounts of their time helping their colleagues learn and master new instructional methods may have to wait years to see that investment pay off in higher achievement levels throughout the school. Finally, collegial observation and peer evaluation require an extremely high level of trust between teachers as they make themselves vulnerable to one another and invite criticism for learning purposes.

Trust is an especially useful tool for schools that are attempting to undertake large reform efforts. Trust can facilitate conversations about instructional reform that give the experts a chance to share their understanding of the reform with the teachers and teachers a chance to share

their feedback on how the reality of the reform's implementation measures up to expectations (Spillane & Thompson, 1997). Teachers who report high levels of trust with their colleagues also express a greater openness to innovations (Bryk & Schneider, 1996). In trusting environments, teachers are able to push one another's thinking about instruction and schooling and the ways in which the reform could affect student learning.

Trust between the principal and faculty is particularly important for school reform. Teacher-principal trust allows the principal to introduce instructional and organizational changes to a more receptive faculty. Teachers who feel valued as professionals are open to input from a principal. Faculty members who report high levels of trust also describe a strong commitment among teachers to the school and a recognition among the faculty that they have a collective responsibility for the welfare of their students (Bryk & Schneider 1996). The latest research on trust in schools has even demonstrated a positive relationship between trust and school effectiveness, making a connection between the growth of trust and organizational changes, which can lead to improved educational outcomes for students (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001; Hoy, Tarter & Witkoskie, 1992).

HOW IS TRUST DEFINED IN SCHOOLS?

As the research continues to point to trust as being an important factor in schools, we should take some time to fully examine the concept to see what exactly trust looks like in the context of schooling. Two sets of researchers have persistently explored the operation of trust in schools as well as its benefits. Hoy and his colleagues (Goddard et al., 2001; Hoy et al., 1992; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998) worked from a school climate perspective to develop a definition of trust in schools. From this perspective, trust exists as a characteristic of the school and is maintained as part of the school culture. Bryk and Schneider (1996, 2002) conceptualized trust in schools as a product of the everyday interactions that affect person-to-person relationships in the school. From their perspective, the trust formed between individuals can build to become part of the school culture as well as affect the structural characteristics of the school. Although these two sources of research developed simultaneously and separately, much of the work is parallel and the results are similar.

The body of work coming out of Ohio State University from Hoy and his colleagues (Tarter et al., 1989, p. 295) defines trust as a group understanding that both the group itself and the individuals within the group

are reliable. Further conceptual study from this group led to a description of the five components of faculty trust: benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). *Benevolence* is defined as confidence in the goodwill of others. *Reliability* is the idea that someone can be counted on to come through, and *competence* is the ability to come through. *Honesty* is a global concept for one's character and includes acting in accordance with what one says, accepting responsibility for one's actions, avoiding manipulative behavior, and behaving consistently. Finally, *openness* is the degree to which information is freely shared across parties.

The Bryk and Schneider (2002) work on trust conceptualizes trust in schools as being formed around the specific roles that people play in this setting. Adults in schools interact as parents, teachers, and principals. Each person has an understanding about their own obligations in playing their role and expectations about the role obligations of the other adults in the school. The growth of trust depends in part on the degree to which people have shared understandings of their role obligations. However, because there is not open discussion about what is expected from each other, people use less direct methods to assess each others' fulfillment of role obligations. Typically, people look for actions that conform to their expectations of the role. We think of a good teacher as being attentive to students' needs, using sound pedagogy, and being dedicated to the students' development. However, we don't often witness enough interactions between teachers and students to assess whether or not a teacher is meeting these expectations. Even if we did have full access to all teacher-student interaction, it would be difficult to assess whether or not a teacher meets our criteria for a good teacher. Because we lack information and experience ambiguity in our expectations, people often use a process of discerning the intentions that motivate others when deciding whether or not an individual conforms to their expectations. For example, parents do not always have direct access to their child's classroom. Therefore, they cannot monitor the daily efforts of the teacher on their child's behalf. However, they can make a judgment that this teacher appears dedicated to doing whatever he or she can to benefit the children in the classroom. As such, parents might feel that the teacher meets their expectations of the role obligations of a teacher.

According to this conceptualization of trust, we typically use four key elements to discern the intentions of others in schools: respect, competence, integrity, and personal regard for others. *Respect* involves a basic regard for the dignity and worth of others. In respect that leads to trust, people listen to what others have to say and respond to it in some fashion. As with the Hoy literature (Goddard et al., 2001; Hoy et al., 1992;

Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998), *competence* is the ability to carry out the formal responsibilities of the role. However, Bryk and Schneider (2002) note that in schools competence is difficult to judge in some role relationships. For example, a teacher's competence cannot be directly assessed. Therefore, one cannot always note the differences between an average teacher and a good teacher. However, teaching incompetence is discernible through student scores and evaluation of practices. The authors also note that principal competence is more directly discernible by assessing outcomes, such as the upkeep of the school building and the orderliness of the school. *Integrity* is demonstrated by espousing beliefs that are based on doing what is in the best interests of the children and carrying through with actions that are consistent with those beliefs. This is similar to the Hoy construct of honesty. Finally, *personal regard* involves the display of intentions and behaviors that go beyond the formal requirements of the role.

Bryk and Schneider (2002) argue that role relationships in schools and the accompanying discernments are colored by the structure of power between the roles. The most obvious authority structure is between the principal and teacher in which the principal has formal power over the teacher in the form of hiring and firing, job evaluation, and resource allocation. The relationship between parents and school professionals also is affected by a power structure, although this structure varies in direction according to school location. Most urban schools display a pattern of the school professional having power over poor, less educated parents.

Despite these power structures, all participants remain dependent on one another to maintain or increase school productivity. Principals depend on teachers to provide high-quality classroom instruction for the students. Teachers depend on parents to support their efforts through homework supervision; supplemental enrichment activities; and the provision of basic needs such as proper nutrition, clothing, and hygiene. Parents depend on school professionals to educate their children and keep them safe. These mutual dependencies create feelings of vulnerability for all participants. Efforts to reduce these feelings of vulnerability can help to build trust.

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT BUILDING TRUST?

While little attention has been given to the process of building trust among adults in a school community, there is research in organizational theory on the foundations of trust. The majority of this research presents factors that

contribute to trust development, such as social similarity, proxies, contracts, and repeated interactions. This research often portrays trust as based on one concept or another, rather than viewing it as a growth process. An examination of the individual factors provides an understanding of possible paths to trust building in schools.

Social Similarity as a Predisposition to Trust

People often decide to place their trust with those who share physical and social similarities with them (Zucker, 1986). Immigrants coming to America in the late 1800s and early 1900s chose to live and work among people from the same country of origin, creating ethnic enclaves in major cities that survive even today. Swedes, for example, interacting mostly with other Swedes, felt reassured that by placing their trust with someone from the same culture they were less likely to be cheated. Their belief was that the shared culture would also mean that they had a shared value system and perhaps even be a little more likely to want to support each other. In general, it was a safer bet.

Even now, we often ascribe similar values and motivations to others who look like us or live in a similar fashion. Physical or social characteristics such as race, religion, or even the type of car a person drives are used to represent characteristics that are more difficult to predict or measure, such as competence, honesty, or kindness. For example, suppose we did indeed find ourselves in need of a car mechanic. Unhappy with the work done previously at another garage, we decide to try the new garage on the corner. The mechanic examines the car and informs us that we need an entirely new brake system. Nervous about spending so much money and about the prospect of continuing to drive with a faulty brake system, we notice a religious poster in the shop window. In asking the mechanic about it, we realize that he is a member of the church we attend. We reason that such a religious man must surely practice honesty and compassion in conducting his daily business, and, therefore, he must be less likely to cheat us. So we agree to have the brake system replaced.

The use of social similarity in placing trust can be seen today in schooling when parents and community members call for more African American teachers to serve in African American communities and Hispanic educators to teach in predominantly Hispanic schools. Although people may be predisposed to trust one another on the basis of social similarity, trust will not grow if it is not validated by subsequent actions. Unless social similarity is accompanied by respect, competence, integrity, and personal regard, the initial bond created by social and physical characteristics will fade away. Indeed, as parents and community members were given control over

hiring the school principals in Chicago in the early 1990s, many White, male principals at minority schools were replaced with African Americans and Hispanics. However, just as Wong (1990) found that minority political representation did not necessarily benefit the minority populace, principals of the same race as the community being served did not guarantee good relationships within the school or increased student achievement. While social similarity may lend a principal an initial grace period of goodwill, alone it will not sustain the growth of trusting relationships.

The Limitations of Contracts in Establishing Trust

Some organizational theorists talk of contracts as a basis for trust to form among people in organizations (Batenburg, Raub, & Snijders, 1997; Gulati, 1995; Okun, 1981). Contracts often help people feel more secure because they spell out each person's obligations and assignments, the expected outcomes, and the compensation or punishment should the outcomes not be reached. Typically, contracts are more specific and narrow when made for one-time or short-term transactions, such as a sale of goods. However, when an exchange requires long-term or repeated interactions, contracts are less specific and more dependent on the relationship and are therefore more subjective (Macneil, 1985). In either case, contracts are believed to help individuals trust one another mainly because they provide a shared understanding of what is expected, and the parties fear the punishment should they not follow through.

While contracts may indeed ease the vulnerabilities people experience when interacting with others, they are limited in their power to build trust. As in the case of parents using punishments and rewards to coerce good behavior from their children, contracts are useful when outcomes are easily measured. When a librarian submits a book order to a publisher, she can recognize when that order has been filled correctly. However, as contracts become more open ended and subjective, they rely more on individual interpretations of the terms, and feedback is required to bring more definition to those terms (Rousseau & Parks, 1992). For example, a local grocer whose son has left town for college suddenly finds himself in need of help at the store. He places an ad for a cashier and soon hires a teenage boy to work after school. The boy believes that his job responsibilities are indicated by the job title. That is, he expects to attend to customers at the counter, ring up their orders, and put their goods in a bag. The grocer also envisions these duties as the main focus of the boy's job. However, he also expects that the boy will take his son's place at the store, lending a hand whenever possible. Initially, as the grocer and the boy are interpreting the job responsibilities differently, the

grocer will have to ask the boy to help stock shelves, keep the windows and display cases clean, and answer the phone just as his son once did. Eventually the boy will catch on and reshape his definition of the job to include helping the grocer in whatever way possible. In this case, the employment contract as represented by the ad for cashier no longer operates in its original form but has become a social construction shared by both the grocer and the boy.

Most public school teachers in America fall under union representation and are therefore governed by contracts. These contracts often specify the number of hours teachers are expected to remain in the school each day, the number of professional development hours they are expected to put in, and any additional duties they are expected to complete outside of the normal working day. While these contracts can protect teachers from overwhelming demands on their time, they do not serve to ensure good teaching or effective schools.

Good teaching is a demanding task that is not often limited to the number of hours spent in the classroom. Teachers must spend extra time grading papers, preparing activities for the next day's classes, decorating the classroom, and learning new instructional techniques. In addition, the needs of individual children and their families do not always fall within the hours designated by a union contract. Teachers often spend their personal time either in the school or at home making phone calls and meeting with parents to create a better understanding of what an individual child needs to achieve. Beyond time, many dedicated teachers spend their own money on supplies, learning activities, and decorations to enhance their classroom's learning beyond the designated curriculum.

Even if these circumstances and extra efforts could be better specified in a contract, basing trust on contracts does not work well for schooling (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). As discussed earlier, schools typically work toward a wide range of goals, most of which have not been clearly agreed on by school professionals, parents, or community members. Even if the goals were clearly set, the outcomes are not easily measured. We continue to debate today how best to measure academic achievement. The measurement of other goals, such as character development, would prove even more arduous. Good teaching, the role of the school in character development, and the obligations of teachers and principals to their students are determined by individual social understandings of schooling. These individual understandings must be shared and transmitted through group norms and social cues expressed in everyday interactions among individuals. By agreeing on these obligations, participants in a school community can better fulfill one another's expectations and in doing so form trusting relationships.

The Inefficiency of Trust Based on Social Symbols

Trust might also be based on a socially acknowledged symbol or proxy that implies trustworthiness. This symbol might come in the form of an occupational role or certification process. For example, people trust priests to maintain confidentiality and act in a benevolent manner toward them based on their knowledge of the occupation rather than their personal knowledge of the priest himself. Businesses hire accounting firms to audit their financial statements to reassure investors that the current management is indeed trustworthy.

This type of trust, often called institutional-based trust, is the least efficient method of maintaining a society (Zucker, 1986). The symbols used to encourage the growth of trust must remain highly correlated with the desired qualities they represent. Otherwise, they will be discounted. For example, the failure of employees of the auditing firm of Arthur Andersen to either recognize or report suspect activities of a client, Enron, caused the collapse of the entire firm as its accreditation was no longer credible. Transactions based on this type of trust are generally dependent on the accepted organizational structure, whether or not it remains the most efficient. Therefore, in this system, the production of trust has extra costs associated with it.

Typically, schools receive a certain amount of trust by proxy from parents and community members. Parents entrust their children to school professionals for about six hours per day and, barring any displays of incompetence, accept that their children are well cared for and learning appropriately. However, the amount of trust given by proxy varies with the culture of the parent group (Lareau, 1989; Valdes, 1996). Research has noted that working-class parents are more likely to trust school professionals based on their credentials and assume that they are doing the job of educating the children. In addition, Hispanic cultures have been noted to defer to teachers and principals in matters of education more often than other ethnic groups in America. In both cases where trust relationships between parents and school professionals are based on the proxy of the occupational title, the parents were found to take a smaller or less active role in their child's education. This lack of parental involvement was noted as a factor in inferior educational outcomes, thereby demonstrating the inefficiency of trust by proxy.

Repeated Social Exchanges Support the Growth of Trust

Social similarity, contracts, and proxies may all be usurped by repeated interactions when examining trust relations. As noted previously, the initial bond created by social similarity must be supported once interaction has begun for trust to grow. Long-term contracts are influenced by the

social relationships that develop around them in repeated interactions. Although a social symbol may be useful when outcomes are immediate and tangible, such as an exchange of money or goods, trust by proxy is not an effective means of achieving better educational outcomes. Rather, the teaming that is necessary between parent and school professional to produce higher learning outcomes is better sustained by trust developed through repeated social exchanges.

In a discussion of trust formation among mushroom collectors, Fine and Holyfield (1996) note that while novice collectors initially demonstrate trust based on the proxy of organizational position, they later trust individuals in the group based on their experience with them. When novices enter the organization, they participate in group activities that include cooking and eating the yield of a day's collecting. Here, they are willingly putting their lives in the hands of the group's expert, who must identify and remove any poisonous species. However, as members acquire experience with a group of collectors, they place trust in their colleagues based on displayed competence. Thus, the trust base moves from a proxy form to a base of repeated interaction.

Participants in a school community may experience a similar transition. Many parents entrust their children to school professionals due to their general trust of the organization. However, as they have more interactions with the principal or their child's teacher, they may move their trust to one based on the respect or personal regard they are shown or their perceptions of the competence and integrity of the school professionals.

When we enter into repeated exchanges with someone, we typically conduct a give-and-take with them that may be unequal or difficult to measure (Blau, 1986). When we do a favor for someone, we generally expect that it will be returned in the future. When someone does a favor for us, we feel obligated to do something in return in the future. Because we cannot be certain that the future return of favor will occur—or if it does that it will be equally valuable—social exchange involves trust. Once the initial obligation is paid back, further exchanges may happen with more confidence that the person is trustworthy. Therefore, as the number of successful interactions grows, so does the trust.

When a new principal arrives in a school, teachers may be unwilling to immediately begin an instructional reform effort under the new leadership. However, as their social interactions progress and teachers gain some knowledge of the principal, teachers' values, the consistency of their actions, and their sense of responsibility, they may be more willing to enter into more risky interactions. Although their past exchanges have been on smaller projects, their successful completion has allowed trust between the principal and teachers to grow.

SUMMARY

In much of our everyday interactions, we must decide whether or not to place trust in others. When we successfully complete interactions by trusting that others will not cheat us rather than building up complicated monitoring systems, we realize extra benefits from an efficient transaction. Trust becomes even more valuable in places such as schools, where monitoring is not only inefficient but also impossible. Research on trust in schools conceptualized trust as a product of individual perceptions of other people's respect, personal regard, competence, and integrity. But how do we build it? Organizational literature often talks about trust as rooted in single concepts, such as social similarity, contractual obligations, social symbols, or past and future exchanges. This view of trust is static and suggests that trust either exists or does not. It fails to allow for different levels of trust or the growth of trust over time. We need a more complete model of trust building that might make use of these concepts while bringing more depth to the story of how we come to trust one another.