AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

Joshua D. Baker for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education presented on November 5, 2014.

Title: Faculty Perceptions of Actions of Community College Presidents that Increased Organizational Trust

Abstract approved: _____

Sam Stern

Organizational trust refers to the tendency of individuals or groups within an organization to trust each other. Tschannen-Moran (2004) describes trust as one's "willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent" (p. 17). The purpose of this study was to research the faculty perceptions of actions of community college presidents that increase organizational trust. A single college case study was used for this study. To participate, community colleges had to be in the state of Washington, not be in a district, be at least 20 years old, and be of average size in the state, defined as having between 3,000 and 12,000 full-time enrollments. Also, the president and faculty union representative expressed willingness to support the research and indicated that the institution was

an appropriate place to study organizational trust. Informants were required to be tenured faculty members with at least ten years at the college. Informants were recommended by the president, vice-president of academic affairs, and the faculty union representative. Thirteen faculty members were interviewed. Responses were analyzed and seven themes were created. Those themes were autonomy, communication, shared governance, interaction, commitment to excellence, putting people first, and shared vision. Autonomy, communication, commitment to excellence, and putting people first are very similar to those found in the Tschannen-Moran Model. However, shared governance, interaction, and shared vision all had a less direct connection to the model. Each theme consisted of many examples of actions of the president that increased organizational trust.

Keywords: organizational trust, collective trust, shared trust, community college, leadership, leadership strategies

Faculty Perceptions of Actions of Community College Presidents that Increased Organizational
Trust

by
Joshua D. Baker

A DISSERTATION

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Presented November 5, 2014
Commencement June 2015

<u>Doctor of Philosophy</u> dissertation of <u>Joshua D. Baker</u> presented on <u>November 5, 2014</u>

APPROVED:

_____

Major Professor, representing Education

_____

Dean of the College of Education

_____

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my dissertation will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my dissertation to any reader upon request.

_____

Joshua D. Baker, Author

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I was choosing a dissertation topic I was advised to choose a subject I was passionate about and that would hold my interest through the entire process. I have been extremely pleased to find that this topic was a perfect fit for me. I developed greater insight into effective leadership with every step of the research process. Of special value was hearing the opinions of community college faculty members. Having been a former teacher I felt like I understood the faculty experience. The interviews I conducted helped me more fully appreciate the diversity of experiences and opinions of faculty. The findings and application of this study are of great personal value, and I am currently applying them to my practice as an administrator and expect to continue to do so.

I have enjoyed tremendous support in the PhD process. My major, Sam Stern, has been wonderfully helpful and patient in guiding me through the process. I am grateful to my committee, the program faculty, colleagues, and my cohort for the cheering, assistance, and support. They have all been a great strength and helped keep me on the path to completion.

I am also grateful to my family, especially my wife. My wife has born an exceptionally heavy burden these four years. In addition to the raising of our three wonderful children, she has led our family through two job changes, four moves, two of which were across the country, and the purchase of two homes. Without her unwavering support the completion of this degree would not be possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF APPENDICES

Faculty Perceptions of Actions of Community College Presidents that Increased Organizational Trust

Chapter I: Focus and Significance

Students at community colleges have a variety of goals, including continuing education, transferring to a four year institution, or enhancing employability (Boggs, 2004). Community colleges in America form a vital link between people and better jobs (US Department of Education, 2009). Their open door policies provide an avenue for untold numbers to access pathways new careers (Boggs, 2004). To maximize access and success, community colleges offer a variety of programs at different times with a mix of support services. They try to create a culture of success and inclusion that will move people toward their goals for the future.

Community college presidents have an especially important role in influencing the campus. For better or worse, the climate of the campus affects students, faculty, staff, and other stakeholders. Community college presidents have the opportunity and responsibility to create an optimal climate for organizational performance. Organizational trust, or the lack thereof, is an important characteristic of a campus.

Understanding a broader definition of trust will help create a more focused definition of organizational trust. Cummings and Bromily (1996) defined interpersonal trust as:

An individual's belief or a common belief among a group of individuals that another individual or group (a) makes good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit and implicit, (b) is honest and (c) does not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available. (p. 4)

In other words, organizational, or collective, trust refers to the tendency of individuals, workgroups, administrators, and employees to trust other groups and individuals within the organization. In Kramer's words (2010), "collective trust is conceptualized as a kind of

generalized trust conferred on other organizational members" (p. 82). Individual trust and organizational trust are certainly related, but the value of organizational trust merits focused attention. Tschannen-Moran (2004) defines trust as following: "Trust is the one's willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent honest, open, reliable, and competent" (p. 17). This definition served as the guiding model for this research.

Research has demonstrated several benefits of organizational trust. Roueche (1989) cited trust as a critical part of creating a shared vision at community colleges. Hernandez (2000) found that trust is also helpful in working with unions. Employees tend to work to help each other and work collaboratively when trust is present (Barnett, Anderson, Houle, Higginbotham, & Gatling, 2010; Henkin & Dee, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Dervitsiotis (2006) added that trust is the foundation for flexibility and collaboration. Furthermore, employees are generally happier, more satisfied, and less stressed in a high trust organization (Costa, Roe, & Tailleiu, 2001). Organizational trust has been demonstrated to have many benefits to employees and to the organization as a whole.

Low trust organizations usually create significant barriers to effective performance. In the absence of trust, people frequently create rules and restrictions to mandate how people should act (Henkin & Dee, 2001). Significant time can be spent studying, enforcing, discussing, and rewriting these rules. Low flexibility results, and employees are left to simply follow and enforce policies. One possible result of low trust is high transaction costs and less efficient work (Henkin & Dee, 2001), meaning that every process becomes slower and more restricted by policies and paper work. Low trust is also a barrier to change (Kesler, Perry, & Shay, 1996). The case for promoting organizational trust is strong, since the benefits of high trust and the costs of low trust have been researched and documented.

The value of organizational trust has been observed in several different types of organizations. The business sector has received the most attention (Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Lee, Gillespie, Mann, & Wearing, 2010; Lines, Selart, Espedal, & Johansen, 2005; Staples & Webster, 2008; Werbel & Henriques, 2009). Athletic teams have conducted limited research (Dirks, 2000). K-12 education has received significant consideration, with the greatest focus on the elementary schools (Cosner, 2009; Hallam & Mathews, 2008; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000; Van Maele & Van Houtte, 2009). Higher education institutions, especially community colleges, have been studied to a lesser extent than the other organizations in terms of building trust (Baird, 2010; Caldwell, 1992; Moye, Henkin, & Floyd, 2006). The previous research indicates that organizational trust is beneficial to organizations from various sectors.

Solomen and Flores (2001) wrote, "Asked to define what trust is, we find ourselves puzzled…But more important, we don't know how to create trust or how to build trust in circumstances of distrust, on the ruins of a trust already betrayed" (p. 3). Most administrators recognize that organizational trust is an essential component of effective leadership, yet it remains an issue in many community colleges throughout the country. As demonstrated, the benefits of high organizational trust are desirable, and low trust is costly. With distinct benefit to administrators, and to the organization as a whole, it is a wonder that more institutions do not invest more effort into growing organizational trust. It is proposed that with additional direction on how to build organizational trust, practitioners will be more interested in and capable of building organizational trust.

Understanding the role of faculty at community colleges will be helpful as the creation of organizational trust is explored. In *Field Guide to Academic Leadership* (2002), Diamond

explored the relationship between faculty and administrators. He explained that many colleges

practice shared governance. Shared governance is the sharing of powers and administrative

decisions with faculty. Diamond explained that shared governance serves as a significant factor

in determining culture. The degree to which decision making is shared differs greatly from

college to college. The relationship between faculty and administrators is also of interest,

because college faculty members traditionally have strong unions and academic freedom, with

the result that faculty members usually have a powerful voice on campus. Understanding the

role of faculty at community colleges will be helpful, as it is the perspective that will frame this

study on organizational trust.

Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study was to research the faculty perceptions of actions of community

college presidents that increase organizational trust. This purpose was developed as the

researcher conducted a literature review, noting the diverse cultural norms that existed at various

community colleges. Organizational trust varied greatly between colleges and commonly

identified as a sign of a healthy and high performing organization. Increasing organizational

trust is one way to improve the climate of an organization. A wealth of previous research

concentrates on organizational trust, but very little of it relates to colleges, especially community

colleges. It is hoped that this research will suggest useful considerations for other college

presidents who are attempting to increase organizational trust.

Research Questions

1. According to faculty, what actions of community college presidents have
   increased organizational trust?

Faculty members' opinions are critical to understanding how presidents have increased organizational trust. Because teaching is the core function of a college, faculty, as the provider of the most critical product of the institution, are an ideal source for information about organizational trust.

Traditionally, faculty members maintain a much stronger union than other groups at the college and are frequently a challenge for administrators. Thompson (1994) reported that failure to involve faculty in a shared governance model was one of the top reasons that presidents were fired. He continued, "On most campuses the faculty are inclined to question the efforts of administration, and often there is a low level of trust" (p. 64). Additionally, faculty members have long held a role of shared governance with administration. Faculty members hold a powerful position on campus because of tenure and academic freedom. Also, at many campuses faculty have responsibilities outside of the classroom that bring them to interact with administration in governance capacities and provide them with knowledge of the actions of administrators and a sense for how those actions affect organizational trust.

Faculty are also a good source of information because of their tendency to stay at a college for a long time, perhaps even an entire career. On the other hand, deans, student services employees, and other administrative staff are prone to have shorter stays at the college and may have proved to be challenging in identifying informants. Also, the tenured faculty role at community colleges is relatively consistent and made for a better research design as the other roles can vary from college to college. Although faculty members were selected for this research and have been identified as a valuable source of information it is not the intention of the researcher to indicate that other organizational members do not have valuable and relevant information. Non-faculty members of the college, including but not limited to administrators,

student services, staff, and the board have important roles in the college and their perceptions of

the actions of the college president that increase organizational trust are also important.

Practical and Scholarly Significance of this Study

An enhanced understanding of how organizational trust at community colleges is

increased will be beneficial for both scholarly and practical reasons. The following sections

provide a more detailed explanation of how increasing organizational trust at community

colleges is beneficial, as well as an explanation of the gap in the literature that this study will fill.

Negotiations. Contract negotiations and labor relations are some of the most challenging

parts of administrators' responsibilities. High organizational trust is a noteworthy asset in

promoting productive work with unions (Hernandez, 2000). In the presence of trust,

administrators and union leaders will work collaboratively to reach mutually beneficial

arrangements. The results of this research could provide useful information to help presidents

grow organizational trust and thereby improve contract negotiations.

Collaboration. Collaboration is critical for departments and individuals at community

colleges. Very few activities occur that do not require the support of multiple departments.

Collaboration is frequently needed for creation of new degree programs, student activities,

service learning opportunities, and budgeting. Also, many grants require departments on a

campus to collaborate. The relationships behind collaboration are complicated, and trust can

help forge a bond between these groups (Barnett, Anderson, Houle, Higginbotham, & Gatling,

2010; Henkin & Dee, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Improved collaboration may contribute

to more grant success and bring new revenue streams to campus. Trust should be considered an

asset as administrators look at new initiatives. This research will help community college

presidents build organizational trust and thereby increase collaboration on community college campuses.

Leadership effectiveness and longevity. Organizational politics complicate the work of community college presidents. Strong faculty unions and shared governance add to the political complication of community colleges. Administrators should be conscious of their image and how they are perceived by faculty. Gillespie and Mann (2004) have reported that trust of leaders is strongly correlated with leadership effectiveness. From this study it cannot be determined if the trust preceded the effectiveness, or vice versa. It should be noted that trust of leaders is not the same as organizational trust. The difference, and interaction, will be explained in the literature review. Dirks (2000) found that success builds trust, and having trust leads to success. It seems that one leads to the other in a circular process. These studies suggest that leaders will be more effective, and thus increase their likelihood for longer employment if they build trust. Building organizational trust enables administrators to have a more effective administration and perhaps greater longevity in their position.

Worker retention. Employees are more likely to find satisfaction in their job and experience less stress if they work in an organization with high organizational trust (Costa, Roe, & Tailleiu, 2001). Increased job satisfaction could lead to increased performance and higher worker retention. This is beneficial for employees but also saves the school untold dollars in recruiting, hiring, and training new faculty and staff. By helping administrators learn how to build organizational trust, this research will help colleges create an environment that is better for employee satisfaction, thereby increasing worker retention and reducing costs of hiring and training.

Scholarly significance. While a great deal of research exists on the topic of trust and organizational trust in k-12 schools, extensive searching found little research about trust at community colleges or at universities. Only one research article was identified that specifically addressed organizational trust (as opposed to general or interpersonal trust) at community colleges, and it does not focus on increasing organizational trust (Wihbey, 2002). This research will fill a gap in the literature and help create a more complete picture of organizational trust at community colleges.

Personal interest. Leadership has been an interest of mine throughout my life. I recall that even as a third grader I took note of the leadership style of a new principal. Since that time I have enjoyed a variety of lectures, observations, and books about leadership. However, it was not until I was starting my doctoral program that I realized that leadership has been a consistent theme throughout my life. As a history major I felt a constant attraction to study figures like Hitler, Ghandi, and other political and military leaders. One of my minors was management, where I connected with Stephen Covey's *7 Habits for Highly Effective People*, and I also thoroughly enjoyed studying organizational behavior. With my coaching minor I immersed myself in books written by John Wooden, Phil Jackson, and other coaches. This led to my master's in physical education where I focused a good part of my studies on coaching. I can look back now and clearly identify my consistent and strong interest in leadership strategies and the ways in which they affect human motivation. This interest has been manifest in how I have coached athletes, taught students, worked with colleagues, and raised my children.

During my first year of doctoral classes I was given a book that helped me narrow my focus from leadership and high performing organizations to building organizational trust; that book was *The Speed of Trust*, by Covey and Merrill (2006). I had never considered trust

previously, but I quickly identified that trust was a key ingredient for any meaningful relationship, personal and professional. Continuing to consider trust led me down this path of study to where I am now, investigating what increases organizational trust. It is my hope that this research will help me build organizational trust as I lead organizations. It will also help me as I speak on leadership and consult with others about their own leadership skills.

Definitions

      Organizational trust. Cummings and Bromiley (1996) wrote that "Organizational trust refers to the degree of trust between units of an organization or between organizations" (p. 302). An organization that has high trust is characterized by members who are willing to take risks, in other words, to take actions that may improve the organization but may make the individual vulnerable. Although trust itself is not easily measured, researchers typically look at qualities like perceptions of fairness, fulfillment of obligations, belief that management is not trying to gain an advantage, open communication, and administrative consistency (Childers, 2009; Turner, 2010).Organizational trust is synonymous with shared, collective, group, or team trust.

      Tschannen-Moran (2004) defines trust as "one's willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent" (p. 19). This definition will serve as the guiding model for this research.

      Low organizational trust. Low organizational trust is a lack of organizational trust. It does not indicate distrust, but simply that people are not inclined to easily extend trust. These organizations are likely to be identified as transactional in nature.

      Distrust and mistrust. Some researchers have differentiated between low trust and distrust. Saunders and Thornhill (2004) claim that distrust is more than a lack of trust; it is purposeful not trusting resulting from a past negative experience or even a reputation.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to research faculty perceptions of the actions of community college presidents that increased organizational trust. Understanding the answer to this question could help administrators act in ways that build organizational trust. Organizational trust is valuable for many reasons, including improved contract negotiations, increased collaboration, improved effectiveness and longevity of leaders, and increased employee retention. Increased organizational trust can help the president and other administrators achieve a variety of important goals, including initiatives that support student success and obtaining grants, both of which advance the college and increase financial sustainability. Practically speaking, it could help an administrator have a more effective tenure in the leadership position as judged by achievement of organizational goals. It should be noted that although organizational trust has many researched benefits it is a means to an end and not the ultimate goal. There are times that organizational trust may be compromised because difficult decisions are needed to advance the college. From a research perspective, organizational trust at community colleges has been largely left untouched. This research will provide valuable and practical guidance for community college administrators and fill a gap in the existing literature.

Chapter II: Review of Literature

The purpose of this review of literature was to synthesize the research related to the community college president's role in increasing organizational trust. A thorough review created a foundation whereon the research will build. To add depth to the conversation, many other elements of organizational trust have been explored in this section.

Approach to Literature Review

Oregon State's online library was the primary source for the organizational trust literature. EBSCO Host was the main search tool. Many different categories within EBSCO were searched, including: Education, Business, General, and Psychology and Sociology. PsycInfo also proved a valuable resource for this topic. Finally, Google Scholar was also used. Search terms included, but were not limited to, various combinations of the following phrases: community college trust, college trust, college organizational trust, building organizational trust, restoring trust, and finally, group and collective trust. These search terms provided a large number of quality articles that were used in extensive citation searching and in thorough scanning of reference lists.

Inclusion and Exclusion

This review focused on the research that will lay the groundwork for exploring the president's role in building organizational trust at a community college. It included the effects of having and not having organizational trust, and factors and strategies that build organizational trust. It included studies that have taken place in all types of organizations, not just community colleges.

The review excluded related topics that do not contribute to purposes of this study. Specifically, general leadership research not directly linked to organizational trust was excluded.

Interpersonal trust was only discussed as it directly relates to organizational trust. Measuring organizational trust was only included when it helped explain other inclusion categories, because the intention of this research was to explore perceptions of how trust was built, and the study did not actually measure trust. This literature review also excluded organizational trust between organizations that are not governed by a higher organization, meaning that trust between organizations in a similar field was not discussed. Also excluded was trust of organizations, which is a popular research topic building on the public's distrust of various organizations.

Review of Literature

The thematic literature review was organized into seven sections based on the nature of the findings of the study. Creswell (2012) explained that thematic literature reviews are organized around topics and focus on synthesizing the main findings of the study. The seven sections are: organizational trust defined, benefits of organizational trust, cost of low trust, negatives of organizational trust, descriptors of leaders that influence trust, actions that decrease organizational trust, and strategies to build organizational trust. Some of these sections were organized into subsections for ease of reading.

Organizational Trust Defined

Traditionally, trust is considered in the context of interpersonal relationships. Mishra (1992) defined trust as a combination of competence, openness, concern and care for others, and reliability. Covey and Merrill (2006) offered a condensed version of categories: character and competence. Individuals cannot be trusted unless they can be trusted to do the job up to a certain acceptable standard and in faith that that they will seek the benefit of others and not just themselves.

Cook and Wall (1980) observed that peoples' actions can demonstrate their trust in others. This could be described as willingness to take risks. When someone is trusted, people take certain risks based on their belief that the person will not violate that trust. Understanding interpersonal trust will help bring clarity to organizational trust.

Organizational trust refers to the trust that exists among members of an organization. It includes the trust that tends to exist amongst employees or between employees and administrators as a result of culture of the organization (Jessup, 1997).

A number of writers have proposed different identifiers of organizational trust. These characteristics have been used to identify and measure organizational trust. It has been suggested that integrity, commitment, and dependability are the three dimensions of organizational trust (Chathoth, Mak, Sim, Jauhari, & Manaktola, 2010). Kramer and Tyler proposed an instrument to measure organizational trust called the Organizational Trust Inventory (Cummings & Bromily, 1996). The Organizational Trust Inventory considers three qualifications as it assesses trust: whether the subjects keep commitments, negotiate honestly, and do not take excessive advantage of others.

Tschannen-Moran (2004) defined trust as the "willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent." Tschannen-Moran developed this definition as a result of a comprehensive literature review of trust research. This review considered trust research from various types of industries, including education. This robust, research-based definition will serve as the model for this inquiry. In the Tschannen-Moran model, vulnerability serves as the indicator of risk, with benevolence, honesty, openness, reliability, and competence as the facets of trust. Tschannen-Moran

recognized benevolence as "perhaps the most essential ingredient" of trust and is defined as caring (pp. 19).

Some researchers have proposed that low trust is the lack of trust and that distrust or mistrust is purposefully not trusting (Saunders & Thornhill, 2004). Low trust may result from not having sufficient opportunity or skills to build trust. Distrust may be a result of negative consequences associated with trust in previous experiences, or it may arise from another's reputation for untrustworthiness.

Benefits of Organizational Trust

The benefits of organizational trust are diverse and well researched. As will be demonstrated, benefits range from increased production to improved negotiations. The research presents compelling evidence to motivate leaders to pursue organizational trust.

Increased production. Research has concluded that organizational trust increases team production (Lee, Gillespie, Man, & Wearing, 2010; Staples & Webster, 2008). This may be partly related to the finding that organizational trust correlates with commitment to work (Kling, 2004: Mino, 2002; Paine, 2007), and higher commitment leads to higher production. If teams are more effective, or doing more with less, or doing more in less time, those teams will naturally produce more, as was demonstrated by Palanski, Kahai, and Yammarino (2011). In researching college basketball teams, Dirks (2000) found a strong correlation between team success, as measured in victories, and trust. Dirks suggested that, in a cyclical fashion, trust brings success, and success builds trust. Salamon and Robinson (2008) noted increased sales with organizational trust. Many of the following benefits help explain the increase in team productiveness resulting from strong organizational trust.

Increased flexibility and innovation. Researchers have found that organizational trust makes change and adaptation much easier to create and manage (Dervisiotis, 2006; Henkin & Dee, 2001; Kling, 2004; Rudolf, 2009). Sloyan (2009) conducted a study of how people responded to change and found that organizational trust, trust in the leadership, trust in the process, and trust in the outcomes were all vital to responding appropriately. These findings suggest that organizations that need to be flexible to adapt to demands or opportunities would benefit from high levels of organizational trust.

Some community colleges seek to move from a hierarchical governance structure to shared governance. Harris (1996) noted that building organizational trust is part of the process to make this possible. This conclusion was similar to Dirks (2000) findings with basketball teams, that is, building trust creates benefits (winning) which leads to more trust. Trust has to be built in order to move to shared governance, and one of the biggest benefits of shared governance is increased organizational trust.

Transformational leadership is linked to organizational change. In a study of community college leaders, Roueche (1989) found that trust is a major factor in creating and sharing vision, a critical part of transformational leadership and driving organizational change. Therefore, a leader seeking change would be wise to establish a strong foundation of organizational trust so as to facilitate a shared vision. This is in agreement with Vineburgh's (2010) findings that faculty members at historically black colleges and university are more innovative in the presence of organizational trust.

Along this same lines, Brien, Ratna, and Boddington (2012) found that trust is one of the five variables of social capital in organizations. In other words, if an individual has the trust of other members of the organization, he or she is more likely to be able to create change in the

organization. This leads to an organization that is quick to adapt to changing environmental demands and opportunities.

More effective collaboration. Multiple studies confirm that organizational trust increases collaboration. Barnett, Anderson, Houle, Higginbotham, and Gatling (2010) found that urban science teachers that partnered with researchers did not invest into the project until trust was established. Once a trusting relationship was fostered each partner invested in the others needs; teachers participated in research, and researchers participated in teaching. Dervitsiotis (2006) observed that high trust and great relationships yield high performance and adaptability to change. Fang, Palmatier, Scheer, and Li (2008) studied an organization at three levels of collaboration. They studied the levels of trust of marketing firms that collaborated together, trust between an organization and an individual who was assigned to represent them to a collaborative unit, and the trust among representatives at a collaborative unit. They found that increased trust led to partners committing more resources to the collaboration. Additionally, the researchers observed that building trust at multiple levels was critical to building effective collaborations.

Henkin and Dee (2001) added that trust was required for effective team work. They came to this conclusion after looking at a school that greatly outperformed similar schools following the hiring of an administrator that focused on building trust. According to Maurer (2010), one of the reasons that trust is required for effective collaboration is that trusting relationships leads to increased gathering and sharing of knowledge from outside sources. Collaborating efforts could contribute to dynamic organizational change, create new solutions, and decrease duplication of efforts.

Information sharing is one of the most notable elements of collaboration that increased in the presence of trust. Lee, Gillespie, Mann, & Wearing (2010) surveyed engineering teams and

members of automotive teams and reported that team effectiveness increases as trust builds and

knowledge is shared freely. Maurer (2010) reported that trust increased the gathering of

information which in turn led to increased innovation. Staples and Webster (2008) also found a

strong correlation between trust and knowledge sharing. They also found that trust is more

critical for knowledge sharing when there are communication challenges, such as distance.

Improved contract negotiations. Hernandez (2000) studied contract negotiation

strategies for community college administrators. Trust was described as an essential element to

create the collaborative environment that would aide in the negotiation of mutually beneficial

contracts. Considering the strength of faculty unions and the effect they can have on

administrators' effectiveness and career, it seems prudent to build organizational trust. Although

the number of research articles on this benefit is limited, it seems consistent with other benefits

of organizational trust.

Work behaviors. Researchers have found evidence that employees in high trust

organizations enjoy their work more. Costa, Roe, and Tailleiu (2001) found that those

employees experienced higher satisfaction in their employment and also enjoyed the teams with

which they work. Driscoll (1978) found that faculty at a small liberal arts college were more

satisfied with increased organizational trust. And according to Yoon Jik and Hanjun (2011), in

addition to increased employee satisfaction, there was also an increased commitment to the

organization. Additionally, employees report lower levels of stress (Costa, Roe, & Tailleiu,

2001) and cynicism (Kling, 2004) accompanying high organizational trust. Lower levels of

stress help explain why these employees are more satisfied with their job and thus more likely to

remain with that organization (Pomraning, 2010). Some of the causes of these benefits will be

explained in a subsequent discussion of strategies for building organizational, including

autonomy of work.

Research suggests a positive relationship between trust and professionalism at work.

Trust is correlated with team integrity (Palanski, Kahai, &Yammarino, 2011). Altuntas and

Baykal (2010) found that nurses who trusted their colleagues and administrators were more

conscientiousness, had more civic virtue, were more courteous, and were more altruistic. This

study was based on a correlational design and therefore cannot prove causality, but it did suggest

a strong benefit of organizational trust.

Kath, Magley, and Marmet (2010) found that organizational trust is strongly related to

good safety practices. Their findings suggest that employers and employees will be safer and

more productive in the presence of organizational trust.

The benefits of organizational trust appear to be meaningful. Production, adaptation,

collaboration, and contract negotiations are areas in which administrators are usually evaluated.

Happy, satisfied, and less stressed employees are more likely to see their administrator as a

leader instead of a task-focused manager. The literature makes a very compelling case for

increasing organizational trust.

Costs of Low Trust

People tend to act out of self-protection when there is low trust. Most researchers choose

to research the value of high trust, not the cost of low trust. However, in that process, some have

uncovered how harmful low trust can be to organizations.

Henkin and Dee (2001) found that lack of trust at public schools led to adversarial

relationships between teachers and administrators, underperformance, and formal processes that

result in high transaction costs. Covey and Merrill (2006) described high transaction costs as

slow and confining process that result from increased regulations and policies—additional steps to accomplishing tasks, resulting in the proverbial bureaucratic red tape. In this scenario, everything must be in writing, approved, and double checked. A lack of trust results in an inefficient workplace.

Kesler (1996) studied strategies for creating change. While doing so, he identified low trust as one of the reasons that people resist change. Those resisting change may use strategies including sabotage, absenteeism, transfer, and underperforming (Kesler, 1996). Low organizational trust increases the likelihood that employees will engage in undesirable activities, especially in response to change initiatives.

Miner-Rubino and Reed (2010) discovered another cost of low trust. While researching the relationship of trust with production at a property management group they also found that lower trust was associated with lower job satisfaction. While studying productivity, Musacco (2000) found, as a byproduct of the research, anecdotal evidence that low trust resulted in unhappy employees. Unhappy employees pose a threat to companies and are a serious consequence of low organizational trust.

Negatives of Organizational Trust

The literature does make brief note of possible negative consequences of organizational trust. Langfred (2004) found that high trust with low autonomy is good, but high trust with high autonomy is dangerous. If people are trusted to do a good job but no one checks to see that they have done a good job, it creates a situation that is vulnerable for someone to act unethically and underperform.

Covey and Merrill (2006) are notable proponents of trust, but they warned that trust should not be given blindly. They wrote that high trust should be accompanied with judgment.

Trust without judgment, also known as blind trust, goes too far in trusting and creates a dangerous environment. If trust is not carefully balanced with accountability and judgment, it will create negative consequences. Although Langfred's (2004) research was the only evidence supporting Covey and Merrill, it is of value to include the expert opinion because it creates a more complete understanding of organizational trust.

Descriptors of Leaders that Influence Trust

Researchers have reported interesting findings about the qualities and characteristics of leaders that influence organizational trust. Perry and Mankin (2007) reported that trust in the Chief Executive Officer of an organization was not correlated with organizational trust. However, three other studies seemed to contradict these findings. Quinlan (2008) found that leadership characteristics did affect the culture, which in turned affected organizational trust. Joseph and Winston (2004) had similar findings, reporting that servant leadership was strongly correlated with trust of leader and organizational trust. Erturk (2007) found that faculty in Turkey at a college with higher organizational trust were more likely to trust their supervisor. The majority of research indicates that the actions of leaders affect organizational trust. However, Perry and Mankin's (2007) findings suggest that there may be situations where leadership styles and actions do not correlate with organizational trust.

Some demographic descriptors appear to correlate with higher organizational trust. Gilbert and Tang (1998) found that older and married individuals were more likely to lead organizations that had higher trust. They found no correlation with race or gender.

Actions that Decrease Organizational Trust

It is important to identify actions that decrease organizational trust in order to more fully understand how to build organizational trust. Some actions that destroy trust are quite

predictable. For example, massive layoffs destroy trust (Pomraning, 2010): in the face of losing

employment it is possible that some individuals would act in untrustworthy ways to make a

coworker look bad and save their own job.

Adams (2004) found that the use of fear also decreases organizational trust. Fear is a

common characteristic in what Jessup (1997) has termed "power cultures," which are also

negatively correlated with organizational trust. These findings suggest that use of fear and the

creation of power cultures are normally unhealthy for the organization. However, power cultures

are also defined by Jessup as being cohesive and having shared values. It should be noted that

power cultures do have some benefits, even though they seem to decrease organizational trust.

Henkin and Dee (2001) found that mechanistic organizations deter the growth of

organizational trust. A mechanistic organization, or one that relies on strict policies and

procedures to govern the majority of actions, communicates that the employees cannot be

trusted.

Other interactions between management and workers play a role in levels of trust. Abell

(2004) found that poor communication and missed deadlines contributed to lower organizational

trust. There are two valuable lessons to learn from Abell's research. First, communication is

critical. This includes communication about details and about expectations. Second, leaders

need to meet expectations, like deadlines. Consistently meeting deadlines allows colleagues to

trust each other to get the job done.

Pomraning (2010) found that limiting autonomy decreased trust. It is natural for people

to trust less when they feel they are not trusted, or if they feel their work needs to be scrutinized.

This brings to mind a critical balance that needs to be maintained: trust versus accountability. If

decreasing autonomy decreases trust, one might wonder if supervision and evaluations should be

eliminated. This would be an example of blind trust, and almost always results in negative

consequences (Covey & Merrill, 2006). It is important to include Sanders' (1993) findings that

performance appraisals decreased organizational trust, but they did result in higher motivation

for learning. Performance appraisals do have value, but administrators should take note that they

may decrease organizational trust.

Reviewing the literature on actions that damage organizational trust helps create a larger

perspective on trust. Earlier in the review of literature many benefits of organizational trust were

cited. This section also demonstrates that there are some actions that damage organizational

trust. It should not be assumed that all actions that decrease organizational trust are necessarily

bad, but leaders should recognize the side effects of these actions.

Strategies to Increase Organizational Trust

As has been demonstrated, organizational trust is a valuable quality for a college. In a

study of college trustees, Plinske and Packard (2010) found that the ability to build trust was the

most desirable quality during presidential searches. Myran, Baker, Simone, and Zeiss (2003)

suggested that building trust should be the number one priority for a president's first year at the

college. Gillespie and Mann (2004) reinforced that is it the responsibility of the leader to set the

tone and establish a culture of organizational trust. It is recognized and strongly recommended

that leaders shoulder the responsibility to build organizational trust.

The following subsections will discuss some of the various methods for building

organizational trust. The research evidence comes from a variety of different organizations.

Increasing autonomy. Moye, Henkin and Floyd (2006) found that allowing employees

to have more autonomy increases organizational trust. This seems to be an example of

Pielstick's (1998) observation that when administrators trust employees it increases the

employee's trust of administration. Increased autonomy shows employees administrators trust them to produce high quality work, to work ethically, and make sound judgments. Increasing autonomy could also include having influence over the work environment (Moye, Henkin, & Floyd, 2006). Having an influence on the way work is done, the culture, or even the physical surroundings will help employees feel more ownership and belonging to the organization and will increase organizational trust.

Lau (2010) found the value of autonomy also evident at institutions of higher education. Lau's study uncovered the notion that empowering non-academic personnel increased organizational trust. Vineburgh (2010) reported that faculty also had higher organizational trust when they felt empowered.

Shared governance. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) found that sharing power increased organizational trust. Other researchers (Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Lines, Selart, Espedal, & Johansen, 2005) confirmed that democratic styles of leadership build trust. By allowing employees a voice in the decision making process, administrators help employees feel like a more important part of the organization. Once again, it also communicates trust from administration in employees, which leads to reciprocal trust. Sharing power and seeking for input from employees may seem a waste time or inefficient, but the practice is valuable, as it leads to greater trust, more consistent buy-in, the previously mentioned benefits that accompany organizational trust.

Driscoll (1978) discovered that this same principle applies at colleges. At a small liberal arts college he found that faculty who were involved in the decision making process had increased organizational trust. Increasing organizational trust by increasing shared governance seems to be a theme for a variety of organizations.

Communication. Communication of intentions is critical to building trust. Researchers have found that communication should be accurate, transparent, and timely (Kennet, 1999; Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010; Palanski, Kahai, & Yammarino, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). By being accurate with information and transparent with intentions it limits intentional and unintentional misunderstandings that could potentially damage trust. Effective communication also prevents employees from guessing what leaders are pursuing or what is sometimes negatively referred to as a leader's "hidden agenda" or "end game".

Listening is a critical element of communication. Wiser (2009) reported that new presidents should listen first to help build trust. Listening is part of the previously mentioned process of practicing shared governance. When a leader listens, he or she communicates interest in the opinions and experiences of others and will likely practice shared governance.

Other communication strategies can be used to build trust. Gillespie and Mann (2004) found that communicating shared vision and values was helpful. Identifying and focusing on these common cares is a way to connect and build relationships. Identifying core values and vision communicates the intentions of the organization, which helps build organizational trust.

Interpersonal actions. There are many things leaders can do in their everyday interactions that influence organizational trust. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) found that leaders who were compassionate and demonstrated sensitivity increased trust. Positivity was also positively correlated with trust (Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010), as was being perceived as having integrity and exhibiting fairness (Clark & Payne, 2006). Butler (1991) reached similar conclusions, adding loyalty. This research supports the previously reported findings by Erturk (2007) that employees trust organizations when they trust the intentions of the leader. The intentions of the organization are partly expressed in written and verbal communication, but it is

also communicated by how the administrators treat employees. This is a possible explanation of

why Cosner (2009) reported that increased interaction time increased trust. When administrators

build relationships with employees and let them see their good nature, employees are more

trusting and feel safer to take risks. Building relationships is clearly advantageous for building

both personal and organizational trust (Maurer, 2010).

Predictability has been shown to increase trust (Butler, 1991; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy,

2000). According to these findings, inconsistent actions put employees on their guard and

discourage trust in the administration. Wiser (2009) added that leaders should not only be

consistent with their own actions, but they should be consistent with the culture of the college.

Leaders should go to all reasonable measures to be consistent in their actions, especially in their

treatment of employees.

Much of the research supports the theory that the first step to build organizational trust is

to trust others. Jessup (1997) noted that organizational trust is fairly consistent across an

organization. Pielstick (1998) found that modeling trust was the first step. Leaders play a

powerful role in creating the culture of an institution. By initiating trust it sets a norm for the rest

of the organization. Lau and Liden (2008) found that employees who were trusted by their

supervisor were also more trusted by their coworkers. The research indicates that leaders who

want to build organizational trust should start by setting an example and trusting their

employees.

Competence is crucial in building organizational trust (Butler, 1991; Clark & Payne,

2006). Thus far we have focused mostly on character and communication of intentions, but that

is only half the picture (Covey & Merrill, 2006). Even if an individual is the epitome of

character, good intentions, and caring he or she will never promote organizational trust if their

work is marred by incompetent actions. Gillespie and Mann (2004) added that trust of the leader

was closely connected with the effectiveness of the leader. Basham (2010) recommended that

the leader establish a culture of excellence to increase the organizational trust.

      Organizational actions. Administrators influence many actions and policies that can

increase organizational trust. Transparency has more application than just communication of

intentions; policies should also be transparent (Cosner, 2009). Kennett (1999) reported that

systems can also help create equity and trust. If intention and application of policies are

transparent and consistent there is less opportunity for questioning or doubting. Maurer (2010)

cited objective and measurable rewards as one way to practice consistent policies. This is in

agreement with other findings that organizational justice promotes trust (Erturk, 2007;

Kaneshiro, 2008; Van Hala & Ahteela, 2011).

      Organizational responsiveness also increases organizational trust (Pomraning, 2010).

Organizational responsiveness means that the organization acts when they receive feedback that

there is some sort of problem. One example of responsiveness is punishing unethical behaviors

(DeConinck, 2010). Kacmar, Bachrach, Harris, and Noble (2012) went further and noted that

trust is protected when conflict and stress are proactively managed by administration.

Organizations with high trust tend to have less internal conflict (Vineburgh, 2010). These

findings suggest that administrators who are responsive in managing employee actions and

conflicts will help build organizational trust, but they must be cautious not to micromanage their

employees.

      Success is another cultural descriptor that may increase organizational trust. In a study of

college basketball teams Dirks (2000) found that trust seemed to increase success and success

increased trust. Success appears to increase the unity that promotes organizational trust. Some

will question the transferability of findings from athletics, and doubters will be quick to point out examples of successful organizations that have low trust. However, it does make sense that a given organization will have more trust when business is good versus when business is bad.

Administrators in an organization should help employees unite their thoughts, actions, and mindset to build trust. In a study of public school teachers Van Maele and Van Houtte (2011) found that teachers who had a common belief in their student's abilities had higher organizational trust. Gaur, Mukerjee, Gaur, and Schmid (2011) found that when people understood the obstacles and goals of other groups within the organization they were more likely to trust each other. This suggests that people will trust others once they understand the background of the culture and other factors that influence their decisions. With an increased understanding of each other and a shared vision, units will increase shared vision.

Inclusiveness is an underlying suggestion with many of these findings. Making people feel like an essential part of an organization builds organizational trust. When they feel excluded they start to lose trust. DeConinc's (2010) found that perceived support, relationship-based cultures, and frequent informal conversations and meetings increase organizational trust (Six & Sorge, 2008). Leaders would be wise to create inclusivity by recognizing the efforts of all and create opportunities for employees to interact.

In his study of faculty and organizational trust at historically black colleges and universities, Vineburgh (2010) revealed a few interesting details specific to colleges. Older faculty members appeared to be more likely to trust the organization. This would seem to recommend policies that helped retain quality faculty. In addition, faculty members who have previously served in administrative capacities at their current institution have higher organizational trust. These results were in agreement with previously mentioned research

supporting shared governance models that maximize the number of faculty allowed to gain

administrative experience while remaining a member of the faculty.

 Summary of strategies to build organizational trust. The research is rich with

findings on how to increase organizational trust but lacks findings specific to community

colleges. Understanding findings about organizational trust creation in other types of

organizations will be helpful in identifying organizational trust creation at community colleges.

 Employees who feel autonomy in their work report increased trust in the organization

(Lau, 2006; Moye, Henkin, & Floyd, 2006; Pielstick, 1998; Vineburgh, 2010). What's more, if

employees actually felt part of the decision making process, or shared governance, they also

reported more organizational trust (Driscoll, 1978; Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Lines, Selart,

Espedal, & Johansen, 2005; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Communication, including

listening, was also found to be critical (Kennet, 1999; Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010;

Palanski, Kahai, & Yammarino, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000; Wiser, 2009). Gillespie

and Mann (2004) added specifically that communication of a shared vision was important.

 The day-to-day actions of administrators are reflected in the trust of the entire

organization. Honesty, compassion, fairness, integrity, and positivity were all found to be

important to creating organizational trust (Clark & Payne, 2006; Butler, 1991; Erturk, 2007;

Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). The good qualities of

administrators can be observed by employees when administrators take the time to be around

their people and build relationships, thus building organizational trust (Cosner, 2009; Maurer,

2010). While interacting with employees it is important that leaders be consistent in their own

actions and consistent with the culture of the college (Butler, 1991, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy,

2000; Wiser, 2009). Competency of the leader is also important (Basham, 2010; Butler, 1991;

Clark & Payne, 2006; Covey & Merrill, 2006; Gillespie & Mann, 2004). Many researchers have found that employees trust leaders when they are first trusted by the employer (Lau & Liden, 2008; Pielstick, 1998).

Organizational policies can increase organizational trust. The research especially emphasizes consistency and fairness (Cosner, 2009; Erturk, 2007; Kaneshiro, 2008; Kennett, 1999; Van Hala & Ahteela, 2011). Should there be an organizational misstep in one of these areas, the organization should be proactive in seeking an appropriate response (DeConinck, 2009; Pomraning, 2010). Appropriately managing trust violations has led to decreased stress and conflict (Kacmar, Bachrach, Harris, & Noble, 2012; Vineburgh, 2010). Six and Sorge (2008) added perceived support and belonging to the group built collective trust.

Strong group identification helps build trust. For example, a successful organization is correlated with organizational trust (Dirks, 2000). Also, similar philosophies or mission (Van Maele & Van Houtte, 2011) or even an understanding of other members of the group (Gaur, Mukerjee, Gaur, & Schmid, 2011) increases organizational trust. Vineburgh (2010) suggested that retention of employees is valuable because people become more trusting as they get older.

Summary

Organizational trust, also known as collective, group, or team trust, is a cultural characteristic that represents how likely a member of an organization is to trust colleagues and administrators within that organization. Integrity, commitment, and dependability have been suggested as the three dimensions of organizational trust (Chathoth, Mak, Sim, Jauhari, & Manaktola, 2010). The collective integrity, commitment, and dependability of the group are characteristics that help determine the levels of trust that the group shares. The Organizational Trust Inventory, which is a common way to measure group trust, identifies keeping

commitments, negotiating honestly, and avoiding taking excessive advantage of others as the

assessable areas to determine the level of organizational trust. Tschannen-Moran (2004) defines

"trust as one's willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is

benevolent hones, open, reliable, and competent." This definition will serve as the model for this

research.

Organizations that have trust as a mainstay of their culture benefit from several

researched effects. High trust groups are more successful, productive, efficient, and in the case

of sports, likely to win (Dirks, 2000; Lee, Gillespie, Mann, & Wearing, 2010; Palanski, Kahai, &

Yammarino, 2011; Salamon & Robinson, 2008; Staples & Webster, 2008). They are also more

able to adapt to changing needs and demands, partially due to the positive relationship between

trust, transformational leadership, vision building, and communication (Dervisiotis, 2006; Harris,

1996; Henkin & Dee, 2001; Roueche, 1989; Rudolf, 2009; Sloyan, 2009). Collaboration of

efforts and information sharing is another benefit (Barnett, Anderson, Houle, Higginbotham, &

Gatling, 2010; Dervisiotis, 2006; Fang, Palmatier, Scheer, & Li, 2008; Henkin & Dee, 2001;

Lee, Gillespie, Mann, & Wearing, 2010; Staples & Webster, 2008; Tschannen-Moran, 2000).

Contract negotiations with faculty unions improved due to shared trust (Hernandez, 2000).

Employees were more satisfied with their jobs, enjoyed their assigned teams, were less stressed,

had better interaction with their coworkers, and engaged in safer work behaviors (Altuntas &

Baykal, 2010; Costa, Roe, & Tailleiu, 2001; Kath, Magley, & Marmet, 2009; Palanski, Kahai, &

Yammarino, 2011, Pomraning, 2010). The research makes a very compelling argument for

promoting organizational trust.

The literature is nearly void of research on the negatives of organizational trust.

Langfred (2004) found that high trust combined with low autonomy was beneficial, but if high

trust was combined with high autonomy it created a situation that might encourage lower production or lower quality. Covey and Merrill (2006) wrote that blind trust, or high trust without judgment, was dangerous. Trust must be balanced with accountability and judgment.

Researchers have identified minimal negatives of high trust organizations. Henkin and Dee (2001) found that low trust organizations had high transaction costs, meaning that they were burdened by excessive rules, regulations, paper work, and reporting structures. Other negatives were essentially the opposite of previously reported benefits, including underperformance (Henkin & Dee, 2001), resistance to change (Kesler, 1996), and low job satisfaction (Miner-Rubino & Reed, 2010; Musacco, 2000). Low trust organizations have been found to be generally unpleasant and less productive places to work, thus creating an unpleasant situation for employees and administrators.

Very little research has been conducted to determine if the leadership style and demographic descriptors of leaders influence organizational trust. This present research is focused on what leaders did, not who they were; but such information on leadership style and demographic descriptors is still pertinent. Most research on building organizational trust seems to assume that leadership styles do affect organizational trust. Perry and Mankin (2007) actually found that this was not the case. However, other researchers found that leadership styles did in fact affect organizational trust (Joseph & Winston, 2004; Quinlan, 2008). Gilbert and Tang (1998) found that being older and married were positively correlated with organizational trust, but race and gender had no correlation. Little research has been done in the area of the descriptors of leaders, but it does appear that some characteristics of the leader do influence organizational trust.

Leaders should be aware of the actions that damage organizational trust. Abell (2004) found that poor communication and missed deadlines damage trust. Pomraning (2010) added that massive layoffs hurt trust as well. The challenge is that some of actions do have notable benefits, so leaders must work to find a balance. Organizations that have strong and dominant cultures actually have low organizational trust (Jessup, 1997). The military is one example of this, where working conditions make dominant culture important. Pomraning (2010) found that lowering autonomy reduces trust, though increasing autonomy to the point of blind trust would be harmful (Covey & Merrill, 2006). Evaluating employees lowers organizational trust, but it also increases motivation for learning (Sanders, 1993). As demonstrated earlier, organizational trust has significant value for an organization. However, it should not be sought at all costs, because there are some situations and actions that indicate it is important to have a balance.

The ability to build trust is a characteristic that trustees most seek in potential college presidents (Plinske & Packard, 2010). In fact, presidents should consider making building trust their top priority for the first year (Myran, Baker, Simone, & Zeiss, 2003). Not only is it the administrator's opportunity to build organizational trust (Gillespie & Mann, 2004); the members of the organization expect it of them.

Leaders can build organizational trust in a variety of ways. Increasing autonomy and allowing employees additional control over the work environment improves organizational trust (Moye, Henkin, & Floyd, 2006). Also beneficial is allowing employees a voice in the governance of the organization (Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Lines, Selart, Espedal, & Johansen, 2005; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Shared governance and other democratic forms of governance do a great deal in extending trust to employees, which, in return, helps them trust administration (Pielstick, 1998).

Excellent communication is another way to increase organizational trust. Transparency of intentions is a critical action for building trust (Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010; Palanski, Kahai, & Yammarino, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). If intentions are not clear employees are sometimes left wondering what the "hidden agenda" is. Even good and true intentions not communicated effectively can lead to questioning of intentions. Leaders should also communicate accurate information (Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010; Palanski, Kahai, & Yammarino, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Communicating inaccurate information will lead to a loss of trust in abilities. Communicating shared visions and values also helps build trust (Gillespie & Mann, 2004). Effective communication is one of the most vital skills for administrators who are looking to build organizational trust.

Interpersonal interactions go a long way in helping employees to trust the character of a leader and thereby increasing organizational trust (Butler, 1991; Clark & Payne, 2006; Covey & Merrill, 2006). Research recommends that leaders communicate their character by being compassionate (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000) and positive (Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010); and demonstrating loyalty, integrity, and receptivity (Butler, 1991). Part of communicating character is increasing interaction with employees, essentially being available to them and investing time in building relationships (Cosner, 2009). Building employees' confidence in the character of administrators is vital to establishing organizational trust and creating a work place where employees feel comfortable and encouraged to take appropriate risks.

Research indicates that leaders who want employees to trust them and each other should start by extending trust (Pielstick, 1998). Lau and Liden (2008) found that when employees were trusted by their managers, they were more likely to be trusted by their coworkers. Leaders

can grow trust by first trusting their employees, perhaps revealing a safe level of vulnerability and teaching that some risk is acceptable.

Competence of the organization and of leaders is essential for building trust (Butler, 1991; Clark & Payne, 2006). Impeccable character and clear communication of intent cannot save organizational trust if competence is lacking. A culture of excellence should improve organizational trust and make the leader much more effective (Basham, 2010; Gillespie & Mann, 2004). Dirks (2000) studied college basketball teams and found that success and organizational trust were cyclical in nature: they grew together, and it was not possible to determine if success preceded trust or vice-versa.

People have more organizational trust when they feel a part of the organization. Transparent policies, including clear language and consistent applications, build trust because they decrease preferential treatment (Cosner, 2009). Organizational members also experience increased trust when they feel supported by the organization (DeConinck, 2010) and feel that the organization is responsive to the needs of its individuals (Pomraning, 2010), especially in situations of justice or correcting injustices (Kaneshiro, 2008). Six and Sorge (2008) found that promoting a culture of relationship building and having information conversations were also critical. Unity is a catalyst to organizational trust and leaders would be wise to seek opportunities to grow trust by increasing inclusive policies and behaviors.

Chapter III: Methods and Procedures

In this section the research methods and procedures used to explore faculty perceptions of actions of community college presidents that increase organizational trust will be explained. This will include a discussion about the author's philosophical approach to research and how it specifically relates to the design of this study of organizational trust. This chapter will also explain why a single-case case study was an appropriate method to examine faculty perceptions of community college administrators that build organizational trust. The specific procedures for the research will be outlined, followed by methods of analysis and steps taken to establish the credibility of the findings. Finally, a brief discussion of the protection of human subjects will precede a summary.

Philosophy and Personal Disclosure

I generally consider myself a post-positivist. I believe there are eternal truths and principles that are unchanging. However, those truths may look very different as they are applied in vastly different contexts. A researcher's philosophical approach is important because it can help determine and explain the researcher's methods, procedures, and analysis; and it may even reveal potential bias (Merriam, 2009).

From the post-positivist perspective, I helped informants identify and reveal how they construct their views of organizational trust. Post-positivists believe individuals define their own social realities (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). As a researcher I sought specific examples that reveal principles that can be evaluated for application in other situations. Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) explained that post-positivists do mostly qualitative work. Gall, Borg, and Gall continued that qualitative research is usually used to identify themes, whereas quantitative is used to test themes. They explained that in conducting research, post-positivists want to be where the

phenomenon has occurred. They prefer to talk to individual teachers instead of teachers

collectively. I strongly identify with Gall, Borg, and Gall's description of post-positive

researchers.

Merriam (1998) asserted that qualitative research is best suited to understanding complex

interactions and increasing understanding of how people make sense of their interactions.

Qualitative research was an excellent way to understand perceptions concerning the increase of

organizational trust. Although these perceptions are not necessarily the absolute truths that I

believe exist, identifying perceptions can still help point us in the right direction and provide

very useful indicators of how to increase organizational trust in the future.

Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) argue that results of qualitative research do have some

generalizability, but only as determined by those who read and interpret the study. Although the

participants create social contexts, post-positivists believe that there is some consistency in

different social settings. This allows qualitative research to have at least some generalizability.

There is no intention that qualitative results will have wide generalizability, but it is believed that

the research will identify themes that may be connected with similar situations and potentially be

verified through quantitative work. The applicability of qualitative research as it relates to their

specific situation is largely determined by the reader.

Methods

In this case study, faculty members were interviewed about the actions of presidents that

were perceived as building organizational trust at their community college. Faculty were

encouraged to talk about any president that they had familiarity with. The majority of the

respondents talked about the current president because they were most familiar with his actions

for a variety of reasons, including the current president's length of time at the college, and many

faculty members were not aware of administrator actions early in their career when other presidents were employed. Faculty informants were the primary source of information. Interviewees have been referred to as informants because they are sharing information and observations about their culture (Bernard, 2000).

A case study was used to determine how actions of administrators influenced faculty perceptions of increased organizational trust. Generally speaking, case study is an excellent method for gaining insight into phenomena in social contexts (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993; Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Yin, 2003). A case study was a good fit for this research because it allowed the researcher to go very deeply into one organization's experiences and examine how the actions of administrators increased organizational trust. Merriam (1988) clarified that case studies are not for retelling events, but rather an opportunity to identify principles from events that have transpired, which was consistent with the intent of this research.

Case studies do not isolate variables, but instead attempt to account for as many variables as possible (Merriam, 1988). Case studies make the researcher aware of a large number of interacting influences. This allowed the researcher to sort through the complex relationships involved with trust and leadership at this community college and identify principles and themes. Merriam (1988) asserted that case study findings can suggest what should or should not be done in similar situations. It leaves responsibility on the reader to identify when the situation is similar, and thus the findings can be applied.

Yin (2003) cautioned that a researcher exploring a case study should possess certain skills that will help them be successful. Those skills include the ability to ask good questions, listening well, being adaptive, having a firm grasp on the topic, and responsiveness to

contradictory evidence. Merriam (1988) agreed, noting that the success of the case study is

limited by the abilities of the investigator.

      Site selection. A single-case case study was used for this study of organizational trust.

A typical college in the state of Washington was used for this research. Yin (2003) identified the

"typical scenario" as one of several situations where a single case study could be used instead of

a multi-case study. A typical scenario in Washington includes schools with full-time enrollments

(FTE's) between 3,000 and 12,000, thus eliminating the notably small and large colleges.

Community colleges that were in college districts were also eliminated. This excluded the

schools in the Pierce, Seattle, and Spokane districts from the study.

      The researcher's familiarity with community colleges in Washington was helpful in

making interpretations of informant responses (Creswell, 1994). The researcher attended a

community college in Washington, worked at a community college in Washington for seven

years, and was involved in many state level community college events including participating in

Leadership Training for Workforce Deans and serving as a committee member on the state Prior

Learning Assessment Committee.

      Other criteria limited the selection of a school. It was required that the college be at least

20 years old. This eliminated any colleges that may not have had sufficient time to create a

history of interactions from which to study increases in trust. Technical colleges were also

eliminated for consideration. Although technical and community colleges are extremely similar,

the researcher is most familiar with the community college system and was best equipped to

interpret data from those institutions. Fifteen of the 36 community and technical colleges in the

state of Washington remained candidates for this case study.

The presidents of each of the 15 community colleges were invited to participate in this study. Four of the 15 presidents expressed an interest in participating, with two of them offering the contact of a faculty union representative, which was the second step in the process. The faculty union representative from the two schools both expressed willingness to participate. After phone conversations and email exchanges it was determined that the selected community college would be more likely to provide quality data based on the hesitancy of the second college's union representative. It is important to note that the selected school had a president, vice-president of academic affairs, and faculty union representative who were all willing to participate. This suggests that they felt safe enough for conversations about presidents and organizational trust to occur. Nine schools did not respond, one responded that it was a bad time for this study, one initially said yes but became non-responsive when the request went to the internal research approval committee, and the final school expressed initial interest but did not act on the invitation to continue in the approval process.

Informant selection. A total of seventeen faculty members were invited to participate in this study. The president, vice president of academic affairs, and the faculty union representative were all asked to identify three to five tenured faculty members they considered to be good sources of data for this research. Tenure was a requirement because it indicates a commitment to the long-term well being of the college. Additionally, the faculty must have been at the college at least ten years. The longer a faculty member is at a college the more likely he or she is to have interactions outside of their department and be aware of the actions of the president and the larger happenings of the college. The president, vice president of academic affairs, and the faculty union representative each identified six faculty members with one duplicated name between the president and faculty union representative. The seventeen faculty members were

initially contacted by email with follow up phone calls and emails. Thirteen of the faculty

members agreed to be interviewed; two indicated they were unavailable or too busy. The final

two did not respond to email or voicemail.

All thirteen informants were tenured faculty members. They averaged 25.8 years at this

specific community college, with a low of 12 years and a high of 47 years. Eight of the

informants taught primarily in general education courses, while five taught mostly career and

technical classes. Four of them were division chairs at the time of the interviews, and an

additional three had been division chairs previously. All informants have been involved in a

variety of leadership capacities and committee work on campus. Six of the informants were

male, and seven were female.

Merriam (1988) identifies referrals as one way to identify informants for case studies.

Administrators were given criteria to help them identify faculty that should be interviewed, also

known as criterion sampling (Merriam, 1988). The following criteria were selected based on the

likelihood that individuals with these characteristics have been exposed to the actions that create

organizational trust and have been able to monitor how those actions have affected

organizational culture. Informants had to be tenured faculty members. This distinction was

made because tenured faculty members traditionally hold a great deal of power and are a

potential source of conflict for administrators. They also may feel safe to speak openly because

the tenure position tends to make them less vulnerable. Additionally, their tenure status indicates

a commitment to the college. They also had to have been at the college for ten years, increasing

the likelihood that they had a sufficient number of experiences to reflect on for the interview

questions.

Thirteen informants were interviewed for this case study. Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) wrote that selecting the number of informants is a matter of judgment for the researcher. More informants increase perspectives on trust, but the power of the personal story may be lost (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Gall, Borg, and Gall recommended that a lower number of informants be used when deep and rich descriptions are necessary. Merriam (2009) recommended using only enough interviews to answer the research question. Merriam agreed with Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) that when no new categories or other meaningful information emerges then it is time to stop interviewing. This is consistent with Tuckman's (1999) advice to obtain the desired data as efficiently as possible while limiting bias. Thirteen was an appropriate number of interviews for this research, as the last couple of interviews provided support for previous topics but did little to add new knowledge.

Interviewing. Interviews were the sole source of information for this research. Yin (2003) identified interviews as one source of data that may be used in case studies. Archival data and documents were not used. Merriam (2009) asserted that it is not necessary to include documents just for the sake of inclusion. No need arose to verify or clarify information using any sort of documents or other sources.

Face to face interviews were used exclusively because it is the most natural setting in which to have a probing conversation (Bernard, 2000). Additionally, face-to-face interviews tend be longer, which allows for more gathering and exploration of data (Bernard, 2000). Telephone interviews and online face-to-face interviews create challenges to developing a personal relationship conducive to interviewing (Bernard, 2000), so they were only to be used for follow up interviews or when an in person interview could not be arranged, but ended up not being needed at all.

The interviews were semi-structured. Semi-structured interviews provide a general

outline for the conversation but allow freedom to thoroughly investigate the case (Bernard,

2000). This created some consistency but also encouraged a free flow of ideas. Bernard (2000)

identified it as the best style of interview if only one interview can be conducted with an

informant.

Tschannen-Moran's model of trust was used to guide the development of the interview

questions. Tschannen-Moran (2004) defined trust as follows: "Trust is the willingness to be

vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other person is benevolent, honest, open,

reliable, and competent." Each component was used to create one open-ended question. The

following semi-structured interview was based on Tschannen-Moran's model of trust. The

underlined word in each question comes directly from the Tschannen-Moran model.

1.   What has a president done that has increased the comfort level of individuals to being

     <u>vulnerable</u> and taking risks?

2.   What behaviors of presidents increased <u>benevolence</u> in the institution?

3.   What behaviors of presidents increased <u>honesty</u> of institutional members?

4.   What behaviors of presidents encouraged members of the institution to be <u>open</u>?

5.   What behaviors of presidents encouraged members of the institution to be <u>reliable</u>?

6.   What behaviors of the president increased <u>competency</u> of members of the organization?

7.   What else has the president done to increase the organizational trust?

The outline of the interview also included possible prompts to help the informant and can be

found in Appendix E. The interview was piloted with three college faculty, each from different

institutions (Merriam, 2009; Tuckman, 1999). The pilot interviews revealed that some of the

questions were difficult for faculty to conceptualize or think of specific examples. For example,

they sometimes struggled to identify what benevolence meant in terms of faculty behavior. In response, the researcher provided definitions and synonyms. Faculty also tended to answer about how the president had demonstrated their own competency or openness as opposed to how the president increased those actions of faculty. The researcher responded by guiding informants through a series of questions that would help them better understand the question. For example, if an informant was answering the question about being competent and discussed the president's competence, the researcher would first ask the informant if the president's being competent encouraged faculty to be more competent. On some occasions faculty did believe that setting the example was important. Then the researcher would ask what a competent faculty looked like, or behaved like. The faculty members were able to come up with good examples in reply and were then challenged to think of how the president increased those actions, which was the original intent of the question. This proved to be an effective interview strategy. It was also noted during the pilot interviews that faculty usually wanted to share at least a few negative examples. The researcher responded by asking the informant if there was some opposite of this action that increased organizational trust that they had witnessed. This frequently led to useful information and was successful in drawing faculty back to focusing on positives.

The semi-structured interview allowed faculty freedom in their responses. At times, faculty members were unable to respond to a question. However, after a few prompts and an occasional redirect, faculty usually identified something relevant before moving on to the next question. Interviews lasted approximately one hour, with two lasting only about 40 minutes, and two about an hour and a half.

Following are several interview techniques that were utilized. Bernard (2000) identified several different probing techniques that can be used to help informants share useful information.

The silent probe invites the informant to continue by just quietly waiting for them to continue. The echo probe is repeating what they said and then creating space for them to explain. The uh-huh probe is saying small comments like "uh-huh," "I see," and "right" that urge them on. The tell-me-more probe is an invitation to do just that: "Say more about that." In a long question probe lengthy questions are used to ask more specific and direct questions, allowing an opportunity to think. Leading is generally discouraged, but at times a leading probe can help an informant address a particular area of interest. In the final technique, the baiting probe, or phased assertion, the interviewer pretends to already know about a particular event or topic that gives permission for the informant to talk about something they might think is confidential.

Tuckman (1999) shared several different types of questions that interviewers should be able to use. One consideration is direct versus indirect. A direct question will ask specifically about trust, where as an indirect question will ask about more generally about culture and climate. Indirect questions feel safer for respondents and thus they are more likely to give open and honest answers. However, they take longer to gather information, so there is a trade-off. Specific versus non-specific questions are very similar. Specific questions could ask how the informant feels about communication from the president about budget issues, while non-specific questions would ask about communication in general. Specific questions can sometimes make individuals feel guarded, so the non-specific questions can result in better data, though, again, it takes longer to acquire. Another difference of questions is fact versus opinion (Tuckman, 1999). As this research is about the faculty perceptions of administrator's actions, the questions will start by establishing given facts such as main administrative actions and changes, and then work towards expressions of opinion about those facts.

The researcher relied on non-verbal communication during the interview (Creswell, 2007). Non-verbal communication can be an indication of when an informant is uncomfortable or can communicate that there is space to probe further. These cues should signal to the interviewer how to adapt the interview to meet the participants comfort level and willingness to share. More often than not the non-verbal cues communicated a lack of comprehension of the question or that the informant was still processing and needed more time or prompting.

Interviews were recorded so the interviewer could focus on probing the informant (Tuckman, 1999). This facilitated a more successful semi-structured interview. The interviews were transcribed following the interviews.

Great attention was given to preparation for an effective site visit. Prior to the visit, permission from the institution was obtained, as advised by Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996). They recommend getting permission from both administrators and faculty representatives. The researcher worked with the president, vice-president of academic affairs, and a faculty union representative. They received a brief, clear written description about expectations and risks (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). See the Appendix A for the original email to the president and Appendix B for the original email to the faculty union representative. The informants signed a consent and waiver prior to beginning the interview.

Before the interviews the participants were informed about what to expect, why they were selected, what was to be done with findings, and what benefits and risks they faced (Tuckman, 1999). They signed an informed consent prior to the interview that clarifies confidentiality and potential risks. Interviews were conducted in the faculty member's office or an empty classroom.

Data Analysis

This section will explain how the data were analyzed and reported. Narrative analysis was used for this research. Narrative analysis means that meaning and principles were pulled from the observations and opinions of informant (Merriam, 2009). Data preparation, identification of main points, identification of categories, and writing the report will be discussed in this section.

All information, or data, that helped answer the research questions was identified and divided into categories. The researcher attempted to rely on the data from interviews to identify themes but recognized that personal opinions and knowledge gained from studying previous research influenced the interpretation of data (Merriam, 2009). Previous research on creating organizational trust was purposefully consulted when the interviews are analyzed. Miles and Huberman (1994) recommend starting with some themes from literature but to be completely open and prepared to find new themes. In previous work, Merriam (1988) argued that it is appropriate to allow personal opinions or previous findings to influence the categories, but warned that this will limit the identification of new themes. A good test for the categories is to make sure that all data fits into a category (Merriam, 2009).

Strategies to Ensure Soundness

External validity was sought by using theory in approaching the design (Yin, 2003). The Tschannen-Moran definition of trust (2004) will be used as the guiding model for this research. Tschannen-Moran is an established researcher in the area of trust. Her research, including a comprehensive study of the literature, has led Tschannen-Moran (2004) to define trust as the "willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent." In addition, the review of literature was a guide in

determining themes from the informant responses and findings were consistent with the literature.

Internal validity was increased by including a more detailed description of the college in chapter four. In brief, this college has received awards relative to student success, innovative student programs, diversity, and for being a good place to work. There is strong evidence that is a high performing community college.

Protection of Human Subjects

Institutional Review Board permission was obtained before any contact was made with any college presidents. Approval was obtained from the president of the college, vice president of instruction, and the faculty union representative. Informants signed an approved release form. Interview transcripts will be kept secured and then destroyed after three years. The write up will not identify either the institution or any member of that institution, including presidents discussed or informants.

There are ethical concerns in conducting a qualitative case study. As the key research instrument (Merriam, 2009), the researcher was aware of two broad categories of risk: data collection and data dissemination (Merriam, 1988). In the data collection, the interviewer could become an influence on the culture. Caution was used to avoid actually getting involved and influencing the organization. Merriam (1988) recommended considering what the unintended consequences may be. An ethical advantage of this research is that it only considers the positive actions that build organizational trust. Nevertheless, it was unavoidable that informants shared negative opinions and thoughts. The researcher avoided talking about the negatives as much as possible.

Merriam (1988) also noted the ethical concerns in the data dissemination. All responses are confidential. Data will not be shared with other researchers should they request it. Although it is likely that some people will be able to determine which school the dissertation is written about, the researcher will attempt to hide the identification of the school and informants. The final ethical issue is the mixing of data with bias. The researcher acknowledges that the analysis was influenced by personal bias, but it was limited as much as possible to increase the trustworthiness of the research.

Limitations of Study

The natural bias of the researcher is the most noted limitation of qualitative studies. The researcher asked the interview questions allowing him the opportunity to guide the conversation. The researcher also analyzed the results. Even though the researcher attempted to not let personal experience and beliefs influence the interpretation of results, complete objectivity cannot be guaranteed. Reliance on a research-based definition of trust helped manage these natural limitations. Tschannen-Moran (2004) was the source for this definition, which was, "trust is one's willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent." This definition served as the model that was used to create the semi-structured interview questions.

This case study relied only on the interviews of faculty members who were teaching at the college. Informants are prone to bias and may not have a full understanding of the actions of the presidents. To counter this, informants were obtained from references from three different people: the president, the vice president of academic affairs, and the faculty union representative. These different sources provided references of a different nature that helped to provide a more accurate representation of all faculty members and not only those that have worked with the

president in a certain type of capacity. Thirteen informants were used in this case study.

Informants were consistent in their responses and even seemed to build on each other.

Informants were frequently inclined to answer questions in terms of trusting the president instead

of trusting the organization as a whole and the members of it. The researcher tried to redirect the

informant with questions related to the whole organization. Preparatory questions were

frequently used, such as, "What do competent faculty members do?" A follow up was then

asked, "What did the president do that encouraged the faculty to act in that way?" Additionally,

the researcher asked the informants if the president set an example in that area. For example,

"You indicate that the president acted benevolently: did that increase the benevolence of faculty

members"? Informants frequently felt that the president's example in a particular area was

important to promote that action within the organization. It was important to determine that the

informants actually felt there was a connection with the example being set.

Most faculty members do not interact with the president directly on a regular basis.

Informant Eleven commented that he felt he was a "significant step away from the president."

This was potentially problematic for this research. Fortunately, at this college a good number of

the faculty members were confident answering the questions because they had interacted with

the current president in regards to international work, grants and other projects: and he and many

of the previous presidents were vice-presidents prior to being the president. Also, having served

as division chairs or in other leadership roles increased their interaction with the president.

Faculty members were not always able to completely identify what actions were caused by the

president. For example, the president may or may not have been responsible for the policy on

shared leave. This type of information was included in the findings because it is of potential

value to readers who are shaping policy at other colleges. A college president certainly could

influence this type of policy should he or she choose. Additionally, some informants cited the

actions of the president from the time he or she was vice-president. These actions were also

included because the president at the time certainly has oversight in that area, and it is of

potential value to readers of this case study.

Another problem with qualitative research is the inability to prove causation. Informants

believed the president had increased organizational trust by promoting a shared vision, but it is

quite possible that the opposite is true: that the organizational trust facilitated a shared vision.

Even more likely, the two increased in tandem.

Although it is likely that faculty were subject to recall bias, their experiences and

opinions are still of importance. Informants may not have a perfect recollection of their

experiences, but it is their perceptions, accurate or not, that influence their behaviors. Spence

(1982) explained that someone conducting interviews can help a patient, or informant, identify

truth they didn't know they had. Recall bias is a limitation of the study but informant

recollections of events that influenced their action were very valuable.

With the design using faculty only for informants and only seeking information about

actions that increased organizational trust also created limitations. Although this design is

purposeful and does provide benefits as noted in chapter one, it does create only a partial picture

of a larger story. Readers should be aware that this is only a faculty view or organizational trust

and does include any actions that decreased organizational trust.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to research faculty perceptions of the actions of community

college presidents that increased organizational trust. As a post-positivist, I am interested in

answering this question by examining phenomena at the ground level. Instead of a broad look

from a distance, I seek deep descriptions from those who have witnessed the phenomena of

building organizational trust. This research was a single-case case study that examined the

faculty perceptions of organizational trust building at one college. A single-case case study

allowed an in-depth exploration that increased the ability to account for multiple variables.

College selection was limited to community colleges in Washington State because the

researcher is most familiar with that context. A typical community college was sought for this

research. A typical case was defined as an average sized community college that is not in a

community college district. Presidents of 15 community colleges were invited by email to

participate in the study. Permission from the president, vice president of instruction, and the

faculty union representative were obtained. Two colleges were willing to grant access but the

final decision was made based on the hesitancy of the faculty union representative from the

college that was not selected.

Interviews of faculty will be the source of data for this research. References for faculty

to interview were obtained from the president, a faculty union representative, and the chief

academic officer. Each of them provided six referrals, even though only three to five were

requested, with one overlap between the president and faculty union representative. It was

required that faculty members be tenured and employed by the college for at least ten years.

Thirteen of the faculty members were willing to participate and available for an interview.

A semi-structured interview was created based on the Tschannen-Moran model of trust.

Interviews were piloted with three faculty members from different institutions not related to this

study. Feedback was used to adjust the interviews and interviewing technique. Interviews were

conducted face to face. Permission was obtained from the institution and informants prior the

interviews. Interviews were recorded.

The recording was transcribed word for word. Data was coded and sorted into categories. Once final categories, or themes, were established each data point was placed in a particular theme.

Chapter IV: Results

The purpose of this study was to research faculty perceptions of the actions of community college presidents that increased organizational trust. It is intended that the results of this study will add to the body of leadership literature and provide insight that might help community college presidents increase organizational trust. A case study methodology was used to allow the researcher to deeply explore the faculty perceptions of actions of presidents that increased organizational trust at one college.

This chapter will report the results of interviews with faculty. First, the process for creating the interview will be discussed. Second, the research context will be examined. Finally, the results will be shared.

Model and Interview Format

Tschannen-Moran's model of trust was used to guide the development of the interview questions. Tschannen-Moran (2004) defined trust as follows: "Trust is the willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other person is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent." According to this model, increasing these areas should foster the increase of organizational trust. Each component was used to create one open-ended question. The following semi-structured interview was developed based on Tschannen-Moran's model of trust. The underlined word in each question is taken directly from the Tschannen-Moran model.

1. What has a president done that has increased the comfort level of individuals to being and taking <u>risks</u>?

2. What behaviors of presidents increased <u>benevolence</u> in the institution?

3. What behaviors of presidents increased <u>honesty</u> of institutional members?

4. What behaviors of presidents encouraged members of the institution to be <u>open</u>?

5. What behaviors of presidents encouraged members of the institution to be <u>reliable</u>?

6. What behaviors of the president increased <u>competency</u> of members of the organization?

7. What else has the president done to increase the organizational trust?

The outline of the interview also included possible prompts to help the informant and can be found in the Appendix E. The interview was piloted with three college faculty from three different institutions. The pilot interviews revealed that some of the questions were difficult for faculty conceptualize or think of specific examples. For example, they sometimes struggled to identify what benevolence meant in terms of faculty behavior. In response, the researcher provided definitions and synonyms. Faculty also tended to answer about how the president had demonstrated their own competency or openness as opposed to how the president increased those actions of faculty. The researcher responded by guiding informants through a series of questions that would help them better understand the question. For example, if an informant was answering the question about being competent and spoke about the president being competent the researcher would ask the informant if the president's being competent encouraged faculty to be more competent. On some occasions faculty did believe that setting the example was important. Then the researcher would ask what a competent faculty looked like or behaved like. The faculty members were able to come up with good examples in reply and then were challenged to consider how the president increased those actions, which was the original intent of the question. This proved to be an effective interview strategy. It was also noted during the pilot interviews that faculty usually wanted to share at least a few negative examples. The researcher responded by asking the informant if there was some opposite of this action that increased organizational trust that they had witnessed. This frequently led to useful information and was successful in drawing faculty back to focusing on positives.

The semi-structured interview allowed faculty freedom in their responses. At times, faculty members were unable to respond to a question; however, after a few prompts and an occasional redirect, faculty usually identified something significant before moving on to the next question. On occasion the informants were not able to identify any useful observations and they were allowed to move on to the next question. Interviews lasted approximately one hour, with two lasting only about 40 minutes, and two about an hour and a half.

Research Context

A single college was used for this case study to allow the researcher to explore specific actions that took place that increased organizational trust. Only one college was used for this study because organizational trust is so complex and so reliant on context. Each community college in Washington is unique. There is great variation in institutional size, governance model, faculty and administration relations, role of branch campuses, longevity of current and past presidents, and much more. These differences likely influenced how trust was increased at each college. In this section a general description of the college and the informants will help readers determine how this research may be beneficial at other colleges.

Selection and Profile of School

Profiling the community college used in this case study will help readers understand how the results of this research may relate to the way presidential actions impact organizational trust at other community colleges. Some descriptors of the college have been omitted to help maintain the confidentiality of the college and the informants. This community college is located in the state of Washington and is not a member of a community college district. The researcher categorized it as a medium size community college with between 3,000-12,000 students. Fifteen community colleges in Washington fell within this size range. The intention of

these distinctions was to identify a college that might represent more of the average, or typical,

interaction opportunities between faculty members and the president. The college serves

students with a variety of goals, including transfer, preparation for work, and continuing

education.

    This college has been recognized locally and nationally for its student success initiatives

and as a desirable place to work. It is especially noted for their innovation as it comes to serving

underrepresented populations, students that are not ready for college studies, and their

international work and they have received local and national awards that reflect this success.

Additionally, according to data from their website, their graduation rates are consistently above

the state average. This college has been high performing and has been recognized as a great

college to work for.

    The presidents of 15 community colleges were invited to participate in this study. Four

of the 15 presidents expressed an interest in participating, with two of them offering the contact

of a faculty union representative, which was the second step in the process. The faculty

representatives from the two schools both expressed willingness to participate. After phone

conversations and email exchanges it was determined that the selected community college would

be more likely to provide quality data based on the hesitancy of the second college's union

representative. It is important to note that the selected school had a president, vice-president of

academic affairs, and faculty union representative that were willing to participate. This suggests

that they felt safe enough for conversations about presidents and organizational trust to occur.

Nine schools did not respond, one responded that it was a bad time for this study, one initially

said yes but became non-responsive when the request was forwarded to their research approval

committee, and an other expressed initial interest but did not act on the invitation to continue in the approval process.

Selection and Profile of Informants

A total of seventeen faculty members were invited to participate in this study. The president, vice president of academic affairs, and the faculty union representative were all asked to identify three to five tenured faculty members they considered to be good sources of data for this research. Tenure was a requirement because it a commitment to the college. They had to have been employed by the college for at least ten years to increase the likelihood that they had enough experience to reference in answering the interview questions. The president, vice president of academic affairs, and the faculty union representative each identified six faculty members with one duplicated name between the president and faculty union representative. The seventeen faculty members were initially contacted by email with follow up phone calls and emails. Thirteen of the faculty members agreed to be interviewed; two were away from the campus for a period of time and indicated they were unavailable or too busy. The final two did not respond to either the initial or follow up correspondence.

All thirteen informants were tenured faculty members. They averaged 25.8 years at this specific community college, with a low of 12 years and a high of 47 years. Eight of the informants taught primarily in general education courses, while five taught mostly in career and technical classes. Four of them were division chairs at the time of the interviews, and an additional three had been division chairs previously. All informants have been involved in a variety of leadership capacities and committee work on campus. Six of the informants were male, and seven were female.

Interview Results

This section will report the responses to the interview questions. The responses are organized by the question they answered and then clustered into categories. Only responses that were related to the question or to the larger topic of organizational trust have been reported in detail. The semi-structured format allowed for great variation in answers, and many of the answers ended up not being usable data for this research. The unrelated conversations did have value, as they frequently helped the informant identify an experience that they did not originally think of from the prompt. These conversations also brought up many topics that did not answer the specific interview questions but did relate to the larger topic of organizational trust. The questions will be addressed in the order they were asked.

The majority of the responses were about the current president. The following are possible reasons for this. First, people tend to think of what they have recently experienced. Second, this president was a vice-president on campus for many years before he was president, and the faculty had a greater opportunity to interact with him when he was in that position. Third, the majority of faculty indicated their belief that trust was higher with the current president than previous presidents. They all seemed to think that the college had always been a good place to work and organizational trust was always an asset. The researcher attempted to keep informants focused on talking about organizational trust, as they tended to talk about trust of the president. Many of them believed that organizational trust started with trust of the president, using terms such as, "set the tone." In the reporting of the interviews, the researcher will not attempt to identify which of the described actions belonged to which president.

Risk Taking

The first interview question was, "What has a president done that has increased the comfort level of faculty to being vulnerable and taking risks?" This question drew, by far, longer answers than any other question. The much longer responses were due to a variety of factors. First, the question itself was very fitting for the institution. Faculty at this community college communicated comfort in taking risks, and they indicated that they were very aware of why they felt safe. Second, some faculty had read the title of the research and came prepared with a number of thoughts about organizational trust. These answers were frequently shared immediately because informants were speaking to organizational trust even if it did not seem to be a natural connection with risk taking. Third, the researcher asked the most follow up questions during this segment of the interview. As the interviews continued the informants would introduce less new information, thus fewer follow up questions were needed.

In this section responses that align with the interview question will be explored. Responses that relate to organizational trust but do not relate to faculty feeling safe to take risk will also be shared. Some identified risks included: starting a new academic or student-focused program, starting a new class, changing curriculum, or voicing opinions contrary to the president's. The responses to why faculty felt safe to take risks will be reported in the following categories: no punishment for risk taking, history of autonomy with support, resources, motivation, listening, and shared governance.

No punishment for risk taking. Most of the informants commented that they felt safe to take risks because they did not believe there would be negative consequences. Informant Eight said:

There's somewhat of a safety net that if you take that risk and it doesn't work out despite

your best efforts, you won't be retaliated against—there won't be punitive actions. I don't

know exactly how to say it. But you feel like you can go ahead and take that risk. You're

not afraid of what will happen, and we've tried various things over the years and some

have worked better than others, you know. People are still here, and they are still

plugging along. So that ability to try things but not have, not have to worry about if the

outcome is not 100% positive, what's going to happen.

Informant Seven agreed and even added that willingness to fail helped faculty to be more willing

to try and make improvements. He said:

And we knew that (the president) had our back. So, you know, we knew what was going

to happen, we were willing to take the risk, if it flies, great, if it doesn't fly, that's fine.

We're better for it because we attempted to make improvements.

Other informants shared these sentiments. Most had either personally experienced or witnessed

an occasion when a project did not go as successfully as planned, but there were no negative

consequences.

Informant One also provided insight into the lack of negative consequences. She

commented:

(The president) has always made clear that there was an experimental nature to lots of the

things we did. So if a new initiative were introduced and it failed, that was ok. We

learned something from it. Or, if its success was limited we could analyze it to see if it

could be modified to see if could be more successful. So, I don't think that the president

has ever seen success as the only measure by which to judge faculty and staff. But risk

taking itself has been rewarded. And, of course there is always going to be a certain lack

of success, but that's, that's been valued too.

Responses of informants strongly suggested that a lack of negative consequences helped them

feel comfortable making themselves vulnerable by engaging in initiatives that may or may not be

successful.

History of autonomy with support. Faculty informants strongly declared that the president and

other administrators supported autonomy. Informant Two went so far as to say, "I've never

thought, or felt, that I couldn't do something that I really wanted to do. I can pretty much do

what I want as long as it is reasonable." Others echoed that sentiment, with some adding that it

needed to be consistent with the direction the college was headed. Not being micromanaged was

identified as one action that helped faculty feel safe to experiment and take risks. In the words of

Informant Two, "So one of the things that I've really valued about my job is all the freedom that

I have. And I think this comes from not being micro-managed." It is not that the president has

no control of what happens on campus, but responses indicated he was a collaborative leader

instead of a command style leader. Informant Three actually compared him to a shepherd.

How the president introduced faculty to new ideas was consistent with faculty descriptions of

him being a collaborative leader, or shepherd. Informant Seven said that the president liked to

make faculty aware of innovation that is happening at other colleges and open the door for them

to investigate. The informant pointed out that usually it is simply sharing of an opportunity,

instead of forcing someone to pursue a certain path.

   Resources. The question on risk frequently led to a conversation about what encouraged

faculty to engage in innovation. Providing resources was something that faculty identified as

helpful in encouraging them to try something new. Resources included funding to explore

professional interests via conferences, visits to other schools, and even reducing the teaching

load, called release time. The administration frequently permitted release time from the teaching

schedule to allow faculty to devote more time to growing particular projects. The president was

even identified by Informant Four as taking a major risk by budgeting a notable portion of

money to a student-focused project during a budget cut. By providing these resources to projects

that faculty were involved in, the president was able to instill within the culture the perception

that faculty were not only safe, but supported in pursuing new avenues that promote the mission

of the college.

       Motivation. Faculty felt motivated by the president to try new things. Informant Three

recalled being skeptical when the president initially said he wanted to "reward creativity." A few

years later, she thought that the president had in fact rewarded creativity during his time as

president through a variety of different measures. She felt like the president knew the employees'

strengths and passions and encouraged faculty, in word and resources, to develop those areas.

During the tenure process the president communicated to faculty members that they were

expected to do something outside of teaching that would contribute to the larger community.

Informant Four identified column advancement as a particularly effective way to motivate

faculty to do more than simply teach. Faculty could apply for a promotion, or column

advancement, based on being involved in activities away from the classroom. This included

participation in shared governance, campus activities, or community building. Faculty also

noted that the president and other administrators were generous with their praise of faculty

members who were engaging in innovative work. This praise took place both in public and in

private. Faculty at this college felt motivated by the president promoting risk taking, praising of

efforts, and rewarding faculty with promotion.

Listening. Informants also brought up the opinion that the president was a good listener.

Informant Four felt that the president was very willing to listen and could even be challenged.

The president's style was not to solve problems for his employees, which Informant One

speculated might have been a purposeful attempt to help faculty feel more like owners in the

governance and encourage them to act independently and not look to leadership for instruction in

all things.

Shared governance. Informants indicated throughout the interview process that this

college had a strong commitment to shared governance. Informant Eight observed:

> You see faculty in positions of power, and that lets people know that there is a lot there
>
> you can do if you just want to do it, if you want to do something you can do it, you can
>
> try to do it. It's not just lip service. So the structure of it and being able to see people in
>
> those positions is really important.

Informant Eight continued by making the following comment that related shared governance to

autonomy:

> I think it is a good place to work. I've always thought that. But I think that, I think
>
> because of the things we've already talked about. You could be innovative, had a say in
>
> your own destiny, and in your own work and how you did that work, and projects you
>
> took on. For me, personally, that keeps it really fresh. There are also opportunities
>
> because of our structure for faculty to move into leadership roles.

This college had faculty involved in many leadership positions, and faculty reported that they

have fewer administrators than other colleges because faculty members fill those roles.

Informant Eight said that this meant there were "less layers to get ideas through." Faculty taking

more governance roles was a heavy influencer in the culture of the college. Informant Nine said

she took the risk of getting involved in college governance simply because she was asked to

consider it. She did not consider herself ready, but the request encouraged her to step forward.

Informant Eight commented that the leadership opportunities help faculty "stay fresh" because

they are able to switch roles at times. The impact of shared governance was wide spread and a

very notable, distinctive trait of this college.

Other responses to question number one. While answering the question about taking

risks, informants shared a number of items that did not necessarily relate to taking risks but

seemed to have made a valuable contribution to organizational trust. Hiring the right people

came up twice. Almost all faculty members brought up international work. This was frequently

accompanied by discussion about diversity on campus and in the community. Additional

comments arose related to communication, including honesty, not being fake, limited

unprofessional communication, and small group listening meetings. Many faculty members

mentioned that the president was a big picture thinker and effective in sharing that vision. There

was some mention of the president doing things that put faculty interests ahead of the college's

bottom line. And finally, there were many references to interaction, both with the president and

with colleagues. Some of the interaction referred to purposeful meetings, while others

referenced casual conversations. These topics did not seem to relate directly to taking risks, but

all of these topics appeared to be major factors in organizational trust at this college and the

specific comments will be more fully considered in chapter five.

Benevolence

The second question was, "What behaviors of presidents increased benevolence in the

institution?" Many faculty members struggled to conceptualize what benevolence in faculty

looked like and how the president influenced that. They were able to come up with several

examples of institutional benevolence and then thought of how the actions of the president may have increased that benevolence. On many occasions the informants gave examples of benevolence of the president, but many said institutional benevolence started with the president and that his benevolence set a tone that continued with the organization. This section will report the informants' thoughts on which actions of presidents increased the benevolence of the organization. The answers will be reported as following: kindness to employees, diversity and international work, and focus on students. There were far fewer tangential conversations on this question.

Kindness to employees. Approximately half of the answers to benevolence fell into the broad category of kindness to employees. The kindness of the president was specifically noted and informants mentioned that the president being kind set the example for the rest of the organization. Informant Ten summed up simply as, "He cares about me. And, well, he cares about me." Informant Four commented that the president really knew the people in the institution. As an example, Informant Four and others cited the recent retirement party for four faculty members:

> (The president) gave some really concrete example of things, relationships that he had
> with each of those folks, and was clearly moved by that. I think that's something that
> impresse(d) the people that were there, and that, you know, maybe are newer faculty, and
> see that, and makes an impression on them. He clearly cares about his faculty, not just
> what they have done for the campus, but I think on a personal level as well. That's pretty
> powerful. I think people pick up on that.

The apparently authentic emotional connection to these faculty members was an example of benevolence to the faculty. Informant Ten included that the president was always willing to

listen. This president was also recognized by Informant Eight for his early emphasis on comportment, referring to the professional demeanor that faculty should have with each other. These qualities indicated to the faculty that the president cared about them individually, that they were more than just employees.

Appreciating and recognizing people were also mentioned. Informant Eleven was impressed by one president's ability to make employees shine with her praise:

(The president) was so talented in appreciating people, that it didn't matter who she was acknowledging in that moment, she could, with just…15 or 20 sentences would make that person receiving that award, with that acknowledgement, just make them feel like the greatest person. And she never said it the same way twice…What a talent for a president to be able to have that… the audience…would always applaud just a little bit louder.

Other informants also mentioned the value of recognizing employees in increasing benevolence.

Informants Seven and Eight praised another president for his actions during a faculty strike. The president was sympathetic to the cause of the faculty and saw it more as an issue with the state. During the strike he personally took refreshments to faculty on the picket line. After the strike he extended the faculty contract past the normal period to allow the faculty to make up the time they missed on strike: thus they were not financially penalized.

Autonomy resurfaced with this question for multiple informants. Informant Nine stated, "He's allowed people a lot of autonomy…I don't want to see a college president mucking around in instruction, frankly. You know, there are other more important things for them to be doing." Informants agreed that being able to be self-managing was something they appreciated and even saw it as a sign of kindness.

Related to autonomy, Informant Two felt that supporting faculty in pursuit of their interests was benevolent. This support fell into two different categories: first, funding initiatives at the college; and second, allowing leave for professional and personal pursuits. Informants Three and Five felt an increase of kindness because the school paid for them to participate in conferences related to their profession. On the other hand, Informant Seven provided several examples of faculty taking anywhere from a semester to several years away from the school to participate in development. In one example a tenure track faculty was allowed to complete a one-year academic program that was more of a personal interest than a professional interest. Informant Seven shared his thoughts on this action: "That said to me that the president value(d) me as much as, not for what I can do for you, but (the president) valued me for me." Another faculty was given several years away from the college to complete a doctoral degree.

There was also some mention of contractual and union related issues. Informant Six noted that the faculty contract was purposefully vague to allow flexibility and was beneficial for faculty members. Informant Four was pleased with the shared leave policy and was happy to be a part of an organization that allowed faculty members to give away their sick days to others with major health issues. Informant One mentioned that administrators took pride in having faculty salaries amongst the best in the community college system.

Informants also felt that the college was benevolent in how it dealt with struggling faculty members. Informant One emphasized that the president was always supportive and not punitive. She stated:

When faculty are having serious problems in their behavior, in their performance…

seriously not meeting basic goals, faculty who don't show up for a class and don't let

students know, or faculty who don't get their grades in on time chronically, that kind of

thing, the college has always, from my perspective, been extraordinarily generous in its

attempts to reach out to faculty having problems, to help them, often, with having peer,

help them and not being punitive when clearly the contract would certainly allow it. I

think the faculty immediately affected, and the faculty around them, see that the college

sees faculty as an investment that they are willing to support. It makes it easier for

faculty who are having problems to be open about those problems because they know

will be met with an offer of help rather than with punitive measures.

Informant One identified that the president's support of faculty increased benevolence. She

observed increased openness of faculty members, which is another component of organizational

trust.

On occasion, poor performance has necessitated the firing of a faculty member.

Informant Eight had to sit in on several firings and was impressed by the manner in which the

bad news was delivered. She said:

I have sat in on a few firings. (The president) was so kind to the person who was being

let go, and he treated them with such a dignity and respect… he said, "Well, I think when

you've lost everything else, the least you can do is try to help people have their dignity

still intact."

She also liked that the conflict was dealt with directly and calmly when it needed to be handled.

She recalled:

(The president) brought in all the players in to the room and, had them talk about it…And

talked how they had a long term working relationship, and although this ending wasn't

what they had hoped, they shouldn't let this define the relationship they'd had, had over

all those years. Essentially, make up and be friends.

She shared that these meetings were very effective and helped faculty return to interacting in a professional manner.

Diversity and international work. The president's emphasis on diversity was seen as an act of benevolence. This intention was first noticed in how new faculty were recruited, including trips to California in efforts to find diverse faculty members. Later, a new degree requirement for a class with an emphasis in diversity and globalism was adopted. It was also mentioned that the push for diversity included a variety of multi-cultural events.

The emphasis on international work complemented the focus on diversity. Multiple informants commented on the benevolence of the international work, which included hosting teachers and students from other countries, sending faculty to teach in other countries, and supporting developing academic programs in other countries. Faculty thought that international work was an ideal match for the diversity focus and helped them relate more to their local community.

Focus on students. Multiple faculty members felt like the institutions focus on students and the local community was a sign of benevolence, and that focus started with the president's vision. The school had made decisions focused on student success as opposed to what is best for the bottom line of the college. Additionally, there is a focus on helping underprivileged students, and removing barriers to access and success.

Other responses. This question prompted fewer unrelated comments than question number one. Some informants discussed hiring the right people again, with an emphasis on hiring the right vice-presidents and deans. Some informants actually said that having the right people was important, which could be interpreted as both hiring and training. There was also a mention of the importance of the tenure process. Shared governance and faculty in leadership

positions were also mentioned again. As these do not seem to be related to this specific

interview question they will not be discussed here but they will be explored in greater detail in

chapter five.

Honesty

The third question was, "What behaviors of presidents encouraged members of the

institution to be honest?" It was difficult for faculty to identify what a president did that

increased how likely they were to be honest with their colleagues. Most of them addressed the

actions of the president that demonstrated honesty. Some were asked if they thought that the

president being honest increased honesty within the organization and they replied affirmatively.

Informant Six commented, "Because (the president) is that straightforward I feel like I can be

that straightforward." The responses to this interview question will be divided into two major

categories: the president's honesty, and seeking honesty, meaning the president invited them to

be honest.

Honesty of president. Most informants stated that the president sets a tone for the

college and that honesty from the president had increased honesty within the whole organization.

Informant Three said:

> I think that (the president) models honesty. He's transparent, ethical, he speaks from the
>
> heart, he's genuine. I think he has some wisdom in terms of how to release information
>
> in a manner that is both effective and, so I just think from modeling that.

The faculty felt that the president's honesty, as the leader of the college, was critical for

promoting honesty in others.

Many informants stated that a lack of dishonesty was the biggest reason why they believed the president was honest. After more consideration a number of them added that being honest about difficult topics was a vital demonstration of honesty. Informant Seven said:

> I can't think of a situation where our president would not have been honest with us. (Our presidents) have always been straightforward when it comes time to give us information about what we have, about, you know, honest in sharing with the ideas. Even if it's with, in the end, is something we don't want to hear.

Many people pointed to the president's willingness to come forward with difficult topics, like the budget, as something that increased honesty in the institution.

Although a "positive spin" was appreciated, hiding the negatives and overemphasizing the positives was not desired. Faculty felt that the president found a balance of being positive but not taking it too far. Informant Four reflected:

> So that ability to stay positive under what everybody knows are extremely difficult financial conditions is, you know, has got to be a really difficult job. And, I certainly admire (the president) and administrators for doing that. And now I never got that sense that they were sugar-coating things, so, there's your honesty, I think, that's part of it. We don't want it sugar-coated; we want to know the truth.

Informant Eleven added that admitting mistakes was one form of a difficult truth that helped build honesty.

The style of delivery was also important in creating organizational honesty. Faculty appreciated a leader who was authentic in how he or she presented information. They appreciated that the president did not appear to be "selling" something. Informant Twelve observed:

I don't get the sense that in small meetings, focused meetings, that he is that much
different when he is in big meetings. He's just, he doesn't, what's the word I'm looking
for... I didn't get that sense that he, it's kind of what I see politicians do, depending on
the audience they are talking to they change the message a little a bit. I never seem to see
that in him. I have seen him in large groups and small groups. Sometimes we have met
individually and I'd get the sense that what he'd say to me would be the same message
he'd carry through even if he was talking to a different individual about the same thing.

Informant Two added, "It's sometimes seen for presidents to come across as politicians, and he
never seems that way." Faculty valued that they felt like the president was being authentic and
consistent.

Faculty also appreciated that the entire leadership team was consistent in their message.
They speculated that the president did a great deal in communicating with the leadership team to
make sure they were each sharing the same message. This helped faculty have trust in more than
just the president, but in the entire leadership team.

Many faculty already trusted the president because he was formerly a vice-president.
Informant Twelve stated:

When he first became vice-president I was division chair. So the division chairs met with
him once a week, except during summer. So you get a chance to see that individual when
various situations come up they get discussed, talked about. And behind closed doors
you get to hear what he's, you know, what he's thinking. And I just realized over the
time, yeah, I just trust him to do the right thing. And it's not because of any particular
example, it's just over time, the way he problem solved. It's always honest, he was
always direct.

Certainly hiring from within the institution is not required to create organizational trust, and may even have the opposite result, but in this case study, hiring from within was helpful for faculty believing the president was honest.

Seeking honesty. Faculty praised efforts of the president to seek for honest feedback. It was indicated that seeking honesty started with a relationship between faculty and president. Some faculty were involved in the union and also met with him in those capacities at least quarterly. These interactions created a relationship that made it easier for faculty to believe what the president said.

The president had done several things to obtain honest feedback. The president welcomed honest feedback, including feedback that reflected poorly on the president. Informant Thirteen commented that the president received feedback graciously and the faculty giving the feedback was not punished. This was consistent with the overall climate of the college, which stressed support over punishment. Informant One emphasized the supportive climate that encouraged honesty:

> And ultimately if the student's needs aren't being met and basic requirements of the job aren't being met, a faculty member occasionally leaves the college, but it's often by their being brought to realize that they are not doing their work and for whatever reasons they are not able or willing to take the help the college is giving them. So, at some point, you know, there'd be action against that faculty member within the contract. The contract is the last resort, not the first resort.

Although her comment does not directly address being honest, it was in response to the climate that existed that made faculty feel safe to give honest feedback. This climate of support and lack of punishment has made these informants feel safe being honest. To facilitate feedback the

president has hosted small group meetings of approximately 6 faculty members that were encouraged to share their honest feedback on what was happening at the school.

Openness

The fourth question was, "What behaviors of presidents encouraged members of the institution to be open?" Like honesty, this also drew fewer answers than the other questions. The shorter answers were likely due to the fact that much of the material had already been discussed and the fact that actions of presidents that increased openness are not simple elements to evaluate. It does not appear that the shorter answers in any way reflect a lack of honesty or openness within the institution. In fact, quite the opposite: faculty members seemed genuinely pleased with the level of openness and honesty that existed at the college. There were no shortages of examples of open and honest actions, but the faculty were challenged to think of how exactly the president increased openness of faculty members. As with honesty, the faculty felt that openness started with the president. In fact, the answers for honest and open overlapped a great deal. The following section will reveal how the president had increased openness by setting the example of openness, promoting shared governance, and creating space for faculty to share.

President as model for openness. Many faculty members felt that they could be open because the president was open with them first. Informant Twelve said the president "shares, and it encourages, I think, the faculty to be open." Informant Five contributed the following comment: "I felt like I could be very open with them about my thoughts and my desire to never, ever (work in a particular situation) again, because they were very open with me about what they were thinking." Informants were in agreement that when the president was open they were more likely to be open themselves.

Sharing of difficult information seemed to be important to openness. Informant Eleven said he appreciated the president being open about bad news. He said:

Obviously I don't want to know everything about what's going on, but I want to hear the tough issues, that might be something that might be embarrassing or uncomfortable, or distasteful, or you know, if it's going to ultimately affect me and the college, and more importantly my students, then I want to hear about it. And, you know, I feel like I have been getting that especially with the bad news that is coming, you know, out of Olympia, and so on. I want to hear that, that bad news, and what may be happening as a result.

Informant Thirteen added that he also wanted the president to be open about the solutions to problems that arise. One of the important areas for openness was personnel issues. The president had been open about personnel issues when it was appropriate.

Sharing simple items of information was also important to faculty. They were not referring to sensitive information that would make the president vulnerable; they just wanted to know what the president was doing and what major things were happening with the college. Informant Eight pointed out that good administrative assistants were very helpful in keeping faculty informed. Most of the communication of these basic updates came through email, faculty meetings, or making various notes and documents available to the public.

The president's relationship with the union was one of the most important examples of openness. Multiple faculty members stated how important the cooperative relationship was with the union. Informant Seven said:

One of the things they did, and do right now on campus, that is somewhat unique, is the administration and faculty, they get together every two months, the HCEA, the bargaining unit, they get together, and they talk about issues. So when you actually do

get to negotiations, you know over the last two years you've been talking about (faculty

concerns). So that by the time you actually come to, okay, lets negotiate, you're not

getting hit with something that you haven't heard, haven't seen, because for two years

you've been talking about, this is what needs to happen. That was a result of (the

president) listening to the process.

The cooperative relationship with the faculty was clearly an asset in both organizational

openness and organizational trust.

Shared governance. Shared governance and the flat structure were cited as conducive to

openness. Informant eight believed that the flatter structure helped information flow more

easily. Informant Two echoed:

I think there's an openness that comes from our organizational structure, because you

don't have those clear lines, faculty, and then there's (a) straight line, then administrators,

so there's this kind of thing where you have faculty in positions of authority,

responsibility. Well, for them to do their jobs they have to have information, so you do

have to let them know about that.

Multiple informants recognized that faculty serving in leadership positions naturally increased

openness because they were involved in important decisions in regard to personnel and strategic

planning. Informant Two shared that his role on accreditation gave him great liberty to interview

the top administrators on campus. Informants Two and Eight both discussed how important it

was that they could email anyone on campus and not worry about the organizational chart. The

shared governance and flat structure of this college seemed invaluable for creating openness.

Creating space for faculty to share. Faculty felt that the president had been effective in

creating a safe space that invited open conversations. Multiple informants commented on the

"open door policy." They added that they had tested it out, and found it to be true, that the president was in fact inviting of faculty to sit down with him and talk about almost anything. Informant Ten claimed the president was effective in making faculty feel comfortable to take advantage of the open door policy because the president was more aware of the individual faculty members. She also said he was genuine, and every time they met they hugged. Certainly hugging is not a requirement to increase openness, but it does suggest the type of the relationships that exist at this college that have helped increase openness and trust.

Faculty also felt safe being open because of their experience hearing the president communicate. Although they appreciated his openness, they also noted that he did not share what they thought to be inappropriate information about others. Gossip, for example, was limited. The lack of negative conversation made faculty feel that they could be open without being vulnerable.

Inviting faculty to share information was cited as one way the president increased openness. Informants mentioned again the small group meetings the presidents held. Informant Seven said of one of the presidents:

When he became president he knew that he didn't have the trust of the people that were here on campus. Here's how he got trust. His first year here he didn't change a thing. Everything was like it was. He met with every single individual on campus, had an opportunity to sit down and talk with him in groups of six to ten. And he said, "I want to hear what you think we ought to be doing, how we ought to go, and what things need to happen." He says, "I am not going to say anything, I am not commenting, you're telling me what you think needs to happen and I am going to write these things down.

Informant Two noted that meetings where faculty were allowed to ask questions were also

important. Additionally, some individuals were asked for their opinion on specific topics.

Reliability

The fifth question was, "What behaviors of presidents encouraged members of the

institution to be reliable?" Reliability was defined as covering the core responsibilities of the

position, for example, showing up on time, turning in grades by the deadline, etc. Many of the

informants' accounts started by describing what reliable faculty looked like and then tried to

identify how the president helped increase reliable behaviors. Although the interview questions

differentiated between reliability and competence, many of the responses having to do with

reliability overlapped with competence, which was the next question. Responses will be

reported in the following categories: accountability, the tenure process, setting the example,

mission and vision, autonomy and passion, reward, and collaboration. A brief section is

dedicated to reporting responses not directly related to increasing reliability.

Accountability. Faculty stated that there were processes in place that would assist with

reliability, although it was not a major focus on campus. Accountability started with the

department coordinators. It was their responsibility first to address deficiencies in basic

performance. As needed, some issues would progress up the chain of command. Informant Four

explained:

> If you don't show up to class you're going to hear about it from you coordinator initially,
>
> and then it goes up the food chain. Contractually we are obligated as faculty to do some
>
> things, in addition to providing instruction, office hours, advising, you know, shared
>
> governance is big, really pushed heavily on our campus. So things are contractually

obligated to do, your expected to do them, if you're not doing them reliably, your likely

going to hear about it.

Problems were first addressed by a faculty member who had no contractual supervision

responsibilities for other faculty members. It is like a mechanism of self-policing. Two

informants identified that having a good vice president had been an important piece in holding

faculty members accountable.

Informant Thirteen recalled that one president really emphasized the contractual

responsibilities. This emphasis had been replaced with an emphasis of serving students, the

community, and the world as a whole. Informant Thirteen reported that when faculty members

focus on doing their best instead of following rules, they end up working harder. He also noted

the following benefits that have resulted from trying to invoke internal motivation:

> You have programs that are quality because people; the time it took them. Because they
>
> care about it. Again that's the kind of, you know, as another way of rewarding positively
>
> rather than saying, you need to be here. Nobody was here because we were told to be
>
> here.

Certainly this evidence is inconclusive, as far as which approach has worked better, but it is

worthwhile to note that focusing on internal motivation may provide benefits more than

reliability.

Tenure process. Other accountability measures are the tenure and post-tenure processes.

Both of these processes were largely faculty driven. Informants believed that the tenure process

had been effective in eliminating unreliable faculty members. Informant Thirteen was pleased

with the improvement of the tenure process over the years, saying; "The tenure process has not

been a careful process in the past. I think it's become more and more careful."

Setting the example. Evidence was mixed about what role the president's example played in being reliable. Informant Eleven thought that even if the president were unreliable the faculty would not be less reliable in how they behaved because they were professionals. However, Informant Seven argued that the faculty would be more reliable if the president set a standard of reliability with his example.

Mission and vision. Informants Eight and Twelve felt there was a connection between reliability and communicating the mission and vision of the college. To sum up the discussion, a faculty member is more likely to be reliable if the mission and vision of the college are present in their mind and therefore an active motivator. Informant Twelve thought this started with the president creating a vision and consistently communicating that to the faculty members. He said:

> I feel like the current administrative staff are pretty clear about what they focus on. They
>
> seem to stay on message. And if you, as a faculty member, you kind of get a sense for
>
> where they're headed, then you do some initiative that (is) in that area you usually get
>
> resources. I never had (the president or vice-president) say "you need to do this or do
>
> that", they just kind of paint a picture, "this is where we are headed, and if you can figure
>
> out something along these lines that would be great."

Informant Eight echoed the same thoughts about the president communicating the vision and keeping it present in the minds of faculty members. She added that pursuing grants that focused on student success, diversity, and underserved populations was one way to make that mission more tangible to faculty and provide funding to support it. She said:

> I think the kind of grants we go after, so "achieving the dream" is a big one. I think trio, I
>
> think some of the, there was a climate that already sets some of that, it wasn't a drastic

change. I think what presidents actions do, they go and get some resources that help

actualize the ability of faculty to do those things that students need.

Autonomy and passion. Three informants were confident that there was a relationship

between faculty being able to follow their passions and being reliable. Informant Three noted

that the president's passion was contagious and that he helped others find their passion, causing

them be more reliable in their work. Informant Six viewed it from a related perspective of

autonomy. She said:

(Faculty) are reliable because they are happy. There is an atmosphere where you are not

walking on eggshells, you are not afraid that you are going to get let go. If somebody's

miserable and unhappy, they're going to let deadlines slide, they are not going to want to

take part in shared governance, they could care less if they are treating their students

right, if they are delivering the material that is needed. Things like that when people are

unhappy. They are going to more focus on "what can I do" and focused on doing the

bare minimum.

Informant Four added this about how autonomy and following passion was promoted:

I mean there's always encouragement to do those sort of exciting and creative initiatives.

For somebody that's interested in doing more, and getting more involved, there's always

an opportunity. And administration, in my experience, has always been supportive,

including financial support for faculty that want to try new things. Maybe, if you, for

example, want to take a leave, there's, of course there's the professional development

leave, growth and enrichment leave, or even unpaid leave to go out and do whatever.

You come back and know your job is still going to be there. All of those things are

avenues that administrators have always been very supportive of.

Informants' responses suggested that they were more reliable in their work because they had identified with the mission of the college, had been allowed to work autonomously to achieve that mission, and had received support to do their work.

Rewards. Informants identified a number of things that they saw as rewards for being reliable. Several identified some form of acknowledgement. This had been awarded during meetings, emails, and even visits to faculty members' office to offer congratulations. Informant Two said:

> They've always been really consistent in pointing out people who were doing some really good things, and making sure that other people know about it. What they do is that they, they will say, here's, this person who just won this award, and this person who worked so hard to get this program going, or somebody just received a really good accreditation review, and, and other things that we may not know about, that they have been really good at acknowledging that, and this is important because if you think it terms of, our work… You think about being recognized by giving you, giving bonuses, giving pay out, well that doesn't happen, the only kind of pay increase that a faculty could get, would be, well it used to be step increases, which we haven't gotten in six years, or column advancement which you have to apply for, the only kind of merit pay we have. But in terms of getting recognized it's not really going to happen in terms of money, so how else do you do it? Well you do it by acknowledgement.

Recognition and praise was important to faculty and they felt like it encouraged them to fulfill their work responsibilities.

Promotion was brought up by three separate faculty members as an effective way to increase reliability. Promotion, or column advancement, was obtained by submitting a portfolio

of documentation of the faculty member's work. To obtain promotion the faculty member had to

demonstrate that they were more than reliable. They had to show that they went above the

normal responsibilities of teaching and advising. Informant Twelve observed:

> You have to do that little advancement portfolio. And you watch and all of a sudden it
>
> made faculty say to themselves, "you know if I want to get promotion or have column
>
> advancement I do have to be a little more engaged". And it did seem over time it made a
>
> fairly substantial difference in the activity level of faculty, not all faculty but a lot of
>
> them.

Informant Four added these thoughts on promotion:

> Post-tenures evaluations first 3 years, then every 5 years. That's just tick off the boxes,
>
> you're teaching your classes, you're on a couple committees, blah blah blah. Column
>
> advancement is more like a promotion, it's an opportunity to advance along the salary
>
> schedule, so the bar's much higher. So you do have to provide evidence of exceptional
>
> activities, and in your field of study.

The introduction of faculty promotion was reported as have a meaningful influence on the

performance of faculty.

Collaboration. Informant Three proposed that reliability was enhanced because faculty

were able to lean on the strength of other faculty members. She said:

> As you move through time with a group of people, you become aware of their
>
> competencies…. There are opportunities for me to learn what others know. And what
>
> their expertise is, and so we actually when someone new comes in, we'll say, "Ah, you
>
> want to see, you know, some aspect of the classroom go see…" we'll give them a half a
>
> dozen faculty.

Informant Thirteen also mentioned relying on the strengths, knowledge, and skills of other faculty members.

Informant Three felt that collaboration was developed because there were "no silos." A "silo" is a term frequently used to indicate that one department will work without interacting or collaborating with other departments. She cited a diversity and globalism degree requirement that was shared by all divisions, small grants that brought people together from different departments, and other opportunities for faculty to interact. Although only one faculty member brought this up it is an interesting connection that is worth mentioning.

Other responses. By question five of the interview, most of the responses tended to stay in line with the question and few follow-ups uncovered unrelated ideas. However, in a follow up question Informant Nine and the researcher discussed a number of topics that were not necessarily related to reliability but did relate to organizational trust. Her comments emphasized the importance of shared governance, social justice, vision, focusing on students, and international work. Her comments will be discussed in greater detail in chapter five.

Competence

Question six was, "What behaviors of presidents increased competency of members of the organization?" Competent was defined as being good at one's job, as opposed to reliable, which was defined as fulfilling the basic responsibilities of the job. It seemed easy for informants to identify a diverse set of answers to this question. The answers were very similar to the answers related to reliability and thus sometimes lacked the depth that was found in responses to previous questions. This section will report the answers to this question divided into the following categories: hiring, tenure and tenure review, on-campus opportunities, interaction with the president, professional development funds, and promotion. A brief summary

of the informants' answers that relate to organizational trust, not directly relating to competence,

has been included.

Hiring. Hiring was discussed as an important step in having competent faculty.

Informant Two said the following of the importance of good hiring:

> It's hard to have faith in somebody if they're not hiring good people. It's also hard to
>
> have faith in an organization if it is not hiring good people. It was this kind of thing,
>
> where the surprise was not when we hired somebody good. The surprise was when we
>
> hired somebody that didn't work out. And that's what you want, because it means what
>
> you're doing, your expectation is that these people are going to be good, they are going to
>
> do their jobs good, and you can count on them. And I still think that's how it is in terms
>
> of hiring faculty. That…that reliability comes in from having a good selection process,
>
> and this goes back to it as well, who does the hiring for faculty here? Well, faculty! You
>
> know, there is an administrator on the committee, and then they have a separate interview
>
> with (the vice-president). And then the hiring decision is made.

It is noted that the president was not mentioned in this comment. Perhaps there is some value in

identifying that the informant did not say that the president had the final say in all hires and

occasionally, or even frequently went opposite of the recommendation of the faculty. Informant

Two added these comments about the faculty role in hiring:

> I think the committee really works hard to come up with a consensus, and that, I've heard
>
> stories about (other schools) where a committee would turn in a recommend, then the
>
> vice-president or president hired who they wanted, but I don't see that happening here.
>
> Because again… faculty have such high positions, then you have to be careful to not
>
> undercut them, and that just doesn't happen because it's this kind of thing where the

position where division chairs, and all people like that are in, I mean they're working

positions, they're positions of power, they help make policy, and so, the vp's are going to

respect that, the president is going to respect that. So you can't give a division chair

something and have it dismissed out of hand. That's just not going to happen.

Hiring the right people was seen as a major contributor to having competent faculty.

Informant Six related that the faculty members at this college were among the highest

paid in the state at community colleges. She felt that the high pay also came with an expectation

of elevated performance. Informant Six also thought that being among the highest paid was

important but was a less direct contributor to competency.

Tenure and post-tenure. Multiple informants thought that tenure and post-tenure

helped improve competence of the faculty. It was noted that this process was supportive and

focused on helping faculty maximize their teaching ability. Informant Three said the following

of the tenure process:

(Tenure is) from the perspective that the person is going to grow in this position and

given support. So any evaluation, assessment, we try all kinds of strategies to reduce and

kind of tension or concern or worry. So, I guess that does go back, and I have to say that,

those in the tenure process, are acclimated or assimilated in to the culture of

understanding that this is a supporting role that the tenure process plays. And so they

actually learn and go through…going through the process brings them into the culture.

They learn the culture.

Informant Eleven believed that the high number of observations helped faculty. He said:

> I was thinking about this, by the time someone gets tenured, there have been 28 times that
>
> they have been observed in the classroom. And, you know, if things are going to show
>
> up as a, you know, a problem, certainly this would have been detected.

The tenure process was viewed as an important step in building competence.

Post-tenure was recognized as having tremendous value in continuing to improve

performance of faculty. Informant Five said, "Post-tenure is taken seriously. I actually hear, and

I know this to be true, they (some faculty) are so awful, that their post tenure was not

automatically granted. They had to go through some improvement committee." Informant

Eleven also added the following comments about post-tenure:

> I like the post-tenure process. That's a great way to, for us, to, after were tenured, to still,
>
> you know, find ways to improve and sit in on our classes, and to give us feedback in
>
> ways that we wouldn't have gotten otherwise, and to put together this portfolio. For me
>
> it's like, you do all these things and then you realize, once you put it together, wow, I did
>
> a lot of things! And I think that is so good for everybody.

The tenure and post-tenure processes were seen as important in developing the competence of

the faculty. Although the president did not create this model per se, these were certainly

processes the president could influence, should he or she so desire.

On-campus opportunities. Faculty cited numerous opportunities that existed on campus

to develop competence. Faculty members with release time from teaching ran the Learning and

Teaching Center. The Learning and Teaching Center was the host for many conversations and

improvement opportunities. Informant Four said:

> We are constantly getting emails from (the president's) office or other offices on campus
>
> about different training opportunities. And we also, you know, the Learning and

Teaching Center. It used to be FRC. It kind of transitioned into the LTC. It's ongoing

for a number of years that supports mainly faculty training and competency efforts. So

from a faculty perspective, I think the opportunity to be competent and to learn more in

your discipline or outside your discipline, they are everywhere.

Faculty felt that there were many local opportunities for growth that contributed to a culture of

constant self-improvement. Talking with colleagues was a key to that development. Even

though much of this took place through the Learning and Teaching Center, some of it took place

elsewhere, like department meetings.

Faculty also mentioned the opportunities on campus to get involved and do something

outside of their normal teaching role. Informant Twelve noted that faculty would usually receive

funding to do some special seminar, with science and history cited as examples. Informant Eight

discussed the release time that was granted for special projects. By enabling faculty to pursue

their passions and interests the president motivated and enabled them to do more.

Interaction with the president. A number of informants felt like there was an important

relationship between their interaction with the president and their own competence. Informant

Two felt like the president set the standard for competence by being excellent at his job. When

asked if it was important that the president was competent, Informant Two said, "Absolutely,

because how can you expect that way when you are not that way. It goes back to, you set the

tone." Informant One added:

Well, through demonstration, by professional example.   And, you know, (the president)

has attained lots of awards for himself and for the college and his international work is

outstanding. You know the college is recognized as a leader, you know, regionally,

nationally and internationally.

These responses indicate that the president had been excellent in his work and that had influenced faculty members to go above and beyond in the work they do. Informant One noted that not only was competence simply modeled for them, but high expectations were emphasized to faculty during the hiring and tenure processes.

The president was described as someone who led by vision. Informant Four stated "I think from the very onset, the values, the vision and the values get articulated clearly and the expectations are set forth. And we talk about them up front." Informant Ten added that the emphasis was on living your passion. Informant Twelve said the following of how the president worked with faculty:

> There's just a lot of little initiatives over time with a little bit of resources and funding
> and encouragement have blossomed in a lot of professional and technical areas. And a lot
> of them stem back to planting the seeds and watching them grow. Giving some
> recognition, and some kudos to those who do those kinds of things.

Most informants made comments indicating that they felt like their personal interaction with the president helped them to be more competent in their work.

Professional development. Professional development funds were a major emphasis in building faculty's competence. Administration had been supportive when increased professional development funds had been written into the contract. Additionally, they have been protected during budget cuts. Professional development funds have been used for a variety of professional development, including national conferences. Informant Eleven said:

> The money that is set aside to be able to go to the conferences, I think that's just so
> important, you know, such a valuable part of professional development when you sit in
> on a workshop and, presentations by the colleagues in your discipline and your sitting

there going, this is how I can take this back to teaching, this is the most, you know, recent

things, you know.

Faculty clearly felt very strongly about the guaranteed professional development funds they

received. Not only did it demonstrate a commitment to keeping faculty competent; it indicated

that the needs of the faculty were important to the administration.

The college also supported earning additional degrees. Although professional

development money was not allowed to be used on tuition, the school did provide tuition

reimbursement for some faculty. Informant Six also felt like they tried to not overload doctoral

students with additional work while they were working on their degree. Informants clearly felt

there was very strong support when it came to seeking professional development.

Promotion. Noteworthy rewards had been provided to those who excelled in their work.

As mentioned under reliability, promotion was based on contributing above the normal level of

faculty work. Informant Eleven said there seemed to be a notable increase in faculty efforts once

promotion was introduced.

Other responses. Five informants gave valuable responses in providing insight into

organizational trust that did not necessarily relate to competence. The topics of the responses, in

no particular order, are: hiring from within, listening to faculty, structure, communication during

presidential transition, relationships with the union, shared governance, and social interaction.

These responses will be used in chapter five when overarching themes are addressed.

Open Portion of Interview

The seventh, and final, interview question asked the informants if there was anything else related

to organizational trust that they could share. Most informants had a great deal to say at this

point. However, much of it was general advice or reflected on other colleges and did not appear

to relate directly to the question of how the president's actions may have increased organizational trust.

Few new answers were brought forward during this section, but some were developed into more thoughtful ideas. This section will start with a brief summary of the answers that were already very well covered in previous questions, including professional development, shared governance, autonomy, communication, and relationship with the union. Then greater attention will be given to topics that were more fully brought to light during the open portion of the interview, including passion of the president, vision, knowing the institution and its faculty, interaction, and putting people first.

Repeated topics. This section will quickly summarize responses that were already covered sufficiently during other questions. As these topics have been sufficiently developed in the previous sections the responses to this question will only be summarized. The topics for the section are professional development, shared governance, autonomy, communication, and working with the union.

At least seven of the faculty made direct reference to autonomy in this section. Informant Seven went so far as to say that it was like "nobody was anybody's boss." Informant Three added that it was important that the president allowed the vice-presidents to have autonomy. Informant Seven said that allowing and supporting autonomy communicated to faculty that they were respected and trusted.

The emphasis on professional development carried over from the previous questions about increasing reliability and competence. Faculty felt it was clear that administration wanted them to continue to learn, improve, and expand their skills and knowledge. Administrators demonstrated this commitment by providing funds for continuing education and by giving

support in the form of time off for professional development. Informant Six believed that faculty

members were more loyal and less likely to leave because of this commitment from the

institution.

Shared governance was also brought up again. Informant Three commented that one

president seemed absolutely committed to reaching a consensus on issues. Perhaps this process

to reach consensus was difficult, but faculty knew they had a legitimate voice in the college and

took ownership in its direction.

Communication came up throughout the interview questions and was the most frequently

mentioned concept during the final, open question. Communication is a broad topic and

comments varied. Listening was mentioned, with Informant Seven commenting on how

important it was to him when the president visited his office and asked for his opinion. Keeping

people informed about topics was frequently mentioned. Delivering a consistent message was

also important to faculty. Informant Nine noted that it was appreciated when a president came to

division meetings to detail how budget cuts would be handled. The final comment on

communication comes from Informant Two, who appreciated that the president "criticized in

private and praised in public." Informants made it clear that effective communication was a

major contributor to organizational trust.

The previous six questions regularly drew responses that related to the relationship with

the union. There were limited comments in this section about the union. Informant Nine noted

that the contract was not "hyper-specific," which she believed was beneficial to faculty because

it allowed them flexibility. It was unclear whether the less specific contract built organizational

trust, or if the contract was loose in details because organizational trust already existed. Either

way, it was helpful in maintaining trust within the college. The fact that this type of contract

does not cause more issues suggests that there is a healthy relationship between the union and

administrators. Informant Two commented on the interaction between the president and the

union and described it as functioning more like a partnership focused on everyone's well-being,

including the college, faculty, and students.

This section has highlighted a portion of informants' opinions that were shared during the

open segment of the interview.   Autonomy, professional development, shared governance,

communication, and the union were concepts that came out strongly during the previous six

questions. The summary in this section has been kept brief because the points were strongly

emphasized during the previous questions.

Less emphasized topics. This section will report the answers that were shared during

the open portion of the interview that were less obvious in the answers to the first six questions.

They are not necessarily new concepts, but they are worth more attention because they may have

been less emphasized during the previous sections. The topics that will be explored in this

section are passion of the president, vision, understanding of faculty and the institution,

interaction, and a concept referred to here as "people first."

Passion of the president. Many informants commented on the passion of the president.

Informant One said:

> The community connections and the passion that (the president) has brought, serving the
>
> needs of the community. I think it inspires the institution to work hard to meet the needs
>
> of refugee, immigrant, second language, and academically and sophisticated students.

Being passionate may be more natural for some people, but demonstrating passion could

arguably be construed as a choice. The president's passion was mentioned previously with less

emphasis; it is worth pointing out that the president's passion may have been important in increasing organizational trust.

Vision. Vision seemed to be a minor but constant theme throughout the answers to previous questions. The following responses may add to the understanding of the importance of vision. Informant One said that the president was "skilled at bringing people together that shared a vision." Informant Twelve noted the following:

> Just the confidence on this campus, I think there is some real trust. I get the sense, I just feel like we are part, we are not all doing the same thing, but we are all kind of focused on the same direction. There seems to be a good movement of all the individual groups to be successful.

Although the term vision is not expressly used, vision should be understood as what is keeping faculty all "focused on the same direction." Informant Four made the following observation that tied vision to the relationship between faculty and administration:

> There is a sense of collaboration between faculty and administration. I mean, we are here…we are here to do the same thing, right? I mean administration and faculty, we have the same goal in mind. That is to serve our students. That's the central message. Everything else is, you know, all secondary. Whatever we are doing it's all…well you know, the whole student-centered message, we kind of make fun of that sometime. We hear that over and over again. I think it really is true here.

Again, the term vision is not used, but Informant Four talks about the focus on students, which other informants had identified as a central part of the president's vision. These contributions help bolster the evidence pointing to the value of the developing vision.

Understanding of faculty and the institution. Many comments indicated that the president had a strong understanding of the faculty and the institution. Informant Seven said the president had a real appreciation for the role of faculty. Other informants agreed. Informant Four said:

> I think faculty appreciate (the president) because he's former faculty. He was a teacher for many years before he became an administrator. He's kind of been in the trenches. I think people respect that. And you know, he's easy to talk to and approachable. I think that, in itself, I keep going back to this tone…its sets a tone for being comfortable, not intimidated by your president, or feel like he's out to get you in any way. He seems more like a faculty person. He understands what it is to be a faculty member.

Informant One agreed, saying:

> I think the fact that both (the president and vice president of academic affairs) are former faculty members gives them an understanding of what faculty members do, and they're ethos and philosophy that administrators who come out of other areas of experience might not have. Not that there aren't outstanding college presidents who haven't been teachers beforehand.

The faculty members seemed to take comfort in knowing that the president of the college had been a faculty member at one time. They appreciated the fact that he had experienced what they experienced while teaching and that as a result he might have the same perspective on issues.

In addition to citing his history as a faculty member, informants also had more trust because they knew the president when he was in other administrative roles at the college. Not only did this help him because he understood the college and the people, but the faculty had a chance to interact with him before he became president. The established relationship was

important because the president's schedule took him off campus a great deal more.

Understanding the role of faculty and how the college works was important in growing

organizational trust at this college.

    Interaction. The importance of interaction among faculty and between faculty and the

president came up a few times. This was not the first time the idea has been put forth, but it is

worth further attention. It seems always to be mentioned but always in a subtle way. For

example, at the end of each semester a faculty reception was hosted by administration. Pizza is

served and faculty and administrators socialize. Informant Eleven said:

> Well I think, it is very wise to have the faculty administration meeting where people can
>
> just talk and I think that's brilliant, you know. I'm, so, yesterday, you know, I am talking
>
> to (the president), one on one, you know. What a great, opportunity, just to kind of check
>
> things out.

Scheduling events like the faculty reception created a place for the president to interact with

faculty. These types of events were very important, especially considering all of the time the

president spends away from the campus.

    Other social events have been created that facilitate opportunities for relationship

building. At commencement each year the president and faculty spend time together socializing

before the graduation ceremonies begin. Informant Eleven told the following story about another

social event:

> Just before graduation a few years ago. We had the wine and cheese thing… I was
>
> talking to a part-time faculty instructor who was there, or maybe a one year person who
>
> was going to graduation, and was there at the wine and cheese thing, and (she) said, "Is
>
> that the president over there?" And I go, "Yeah." They go, "Really, I have never seen

him before." I go, "Come on." She goes, "No!." I say, "Come on, come over here."

(The President) was talking to 2 or 3 people and I butted in and introduce them, and she

was shaking and so on. That is another example in terms of accessibility. Who knows,

he might have been talking about something really important with 3 or 4 people but he

has someone here who wants to meet the president, and "Of course!"

Informant Seven added that the president made appearances at many other social events on

campus. The informants felt like this unstructured time was critical and fostered the type of

relationships that increased organizational trust.

"People first." During the open portion of the interview, comments about putting people

first rivaled the number of responses about communication. Informant Thirteen commented,

"They generally, if they can, will do what's best for employees. That, their listening, you know,

that they do want honest feedback. They do want to support people to follow their passions."

During this portion of the interview at least seven informants made strong comments about how

the president demonstrated his commitment to the well-being of both campus and community

members. Two informants reported that they were supported and allowed some flexibility with

assignments during personal crisis like health issues or the death of loved ones. Informant Three

said the president was a "shepherd for their growth." Two others pointed to compensation,

identifying the higher pay scale and the receipt of stipends for additional work, instead of being

required to as part of their contract. The idea that the president had the best interest of

employees at heart was subtle, yet recurred through the interviews and was emphasized again

during the open portion of the interviews.

Chapter V: Conclusions, Implications, and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to research the faculty perceptions of actions of community college presidents that increased organizational trust. Thirteen faculty members at one community college were interviewed for this case study. The research focused solely on the positive actions of community college presidents. Although the informants described a high level of organizational trust, it should not be assumed that there were no actions that decreased organizational trust. The exclusively positive reports by informants reflected the focus of the interviews being solely on actions that increased organizational trust.

The Tschannen-Moran model of trust was used to guide this research. Tschannen-Moran (2004) defined trust as follows: "Trust is the willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other person is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent." It is hoped that this research will provide useful examples of how organizational trust was increased at one community college. Although the results of this research are not intended to be generalizable, the research findings may be helpful to community college practitioners interested in improving organizational trust at their institution.

In the first section of this chapter, the process by which the themes were identified will be explained. In the second section, the themes will be presented and will include a description of how the informants described each theme, a discussion of how each theme relates to the Tschannen-Moran model of trust, a comparison to the existing literature on increasing organizational trust, and examples of how the themes manifested themselves at this college. In the third section recommendations for future research will be explored.

Identification of Themes

        This section will explain the process that was followed to identify the themes that emerged from the interviews. The themes represent categories of interview responses that answer the overarching research question: what are faculty perceptions of the actions of presidents that increased organizational trust? The themes were determined to be autonomy, communication, shared governance, interaction, commitment to excellence, putting people first, and shared vision.

        The seven themes were identified based on the evidence revealed during the interviews. The interview responses were listened to and read multiple times by the researcher. Each response that related to the interview questions or larger research question was recorded on a note card. As recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994), literature review categories were used to help formulate the initial themes. Autonomy, communication, shared governance, presidential leadership style, and organizational actions were the original categories from the literature review. Initially, these themes seemed appropriate for the data. Miles and Huberman also warned that using the literature categories as a guide may limit the ability of the researcher to identify all of the themes from the research. With this in mind, all of the data obtained from the interviews were reexamined and it was determined that the themes of autonomy, communication, and shared governance were supported by both the literature and interviews. However, presidential leadership style and organizational actions and policies were too broad of themes and the information within the themes was too diverse to be meaningful. The data within those themes were reexamined and sorted into new categories. After reevaluating the data that was previously assigned to either presidential leadership style or organizational actions it was determined that interaction, putting people first, and shared vision were also accurate themes

because large numbers of responses fit these themes. A final theme was identified as notes within the themes were organized and it became apparent that a commitment to excellence was also vitally important because informants emphasized this point, and it did not appropriately fit within other categories.

The relationship between the Tschannen-Moran model and the themes from this research is not entirely consistent. Every principle from the Tschannen-Moran model was represented by at least one theme that emerged, but not all themes from this research had a direct connection to the model. As an example, the theme of commitment to excellence has clear ties to the Tscannen-Moran principles of reliability and competence. The theme of communication also has connections to the Tschannen-Moran principles of honesty and openness because they are examples of communication. The theme of putting people first seemed connected to the Tschannen-Moran principal of benevolence because making others a priority could be viewed as an act of kindness. The themes of autonomy, shared governance, interaction, and shared vision do not appear to have a distinct connection to any of the principles from the Tschannen-Moran Model. A chart demonstrating these relationships may be found in Appendix F. The discussion in this chapter will explore each of the seven themes and how informant responses contributed to the formation of each theme.

In summary, each theme emerged from comments from the interviewed faculty who were asked to describe presidential actions that increased organizational trust. Every relevant comment was written on a note card and organized into themes. Additional themes were developed for those comments that were not related to categories from the literature review. The literature review was helpful in pointing the researcher in the right direction, but careful

inspection of and reflection on the evidence was necessary to identify all the major themes from the interviews.

Implications and Discussion

The purpose of this section is to explore the implications of this research. Implications are organized into major themes that address the overall research question. The research question was, "What are the faculty perceptions of actions of community college presidents that increase organizational trust?" Data analysis led to seven themes: autonomy, communication, shared governance, interaction, commitment to excellence, putting people first, and shared vision. The remainder of this section will be dedicated to describing the themes, exploring the Tschannen-Moran Model in relation to each theme, connecting the themes to the literature, and a brief discussion about the theme, including examples.

Autonomy

Every informant described an action or event that was closely related to increased autonomy of faculty. Informants' descriptions of autonomy included not being micromanaged and having the freedom to pursue their own interests. As an example, Informant Two summed up the emphasis on autonomy by saying,

So one of the things that I've really valued about my job is all the freedom that I have. And I think this comes from not being micro-managed. I think that if there's … a president who micromanages then you can think that this person just doesn't trust you.

Informant Eight said, "You could be innovative, had a say in your own destiny, and in your own work, and how you did that work, and projects you took on. For me, personally, that keeps it really fresh." And Informant Two said, "I've never thought or felt that I couldn't do something

that I really wanted to do." Informants also agreed that autonomy was purposeful and even promoted by the president.

Autonomy is not specifically mentioned in the Tschannen-Moran Model but it does seem to have some connection to Tschannen-Moran's concept of vulnerability. Autonomy came up most frequently in response to the question about risk taking because acting autonomously is one example of taking a risk. When someone acts on their own accord they become vulnerable. There is limited risk in doing exactly what you are told.

Increasing autonomy was one of the major topics in the literature review on organizational trust. Moye, Henkin, and Floyd (2006) noted that organizational trust increased as autonomy increased. Pielstick (1998) found that when administrators trusted employees, the employees then trusted administrators more. Allowing employees to act autonomously is one way for the president to communicate his trust of employees. Limiting autonomy certainly communicates distrust. In their studies of organizational trust in four-year colleges, Lau (2010) and Vineburgh (2010) also found that faculty and other employees felt more organizational trust when they felt empowered to act autonomously.

It appeared as though informants were supported in doing almost anything as long it fit within the mission or vision of the college. The president was very effective at communicating his vision, so faculty were able to make sure their efforts stayed within the parameters that administrators would support. One president was identified as being a "big picture thinker." Informant Four identified this president as talented at creating and communicating his vision, which helped others direct their efforts to align with the vision. There was no indication that faculty had pursued activities only to find out later that it did not fit within the president's vision for the college. This speaks to the consistency of the vision and how effectively it was

communicated. A strong vision can guide faculty members' autonomous actions. It provides

parameters from which to operate and gives them permission to be creative. Vision was not

specifically mentioned in the Tschannen-Moran model, but it is one of the seven themes of this

research and will be discussed in greater detail later.

Other researchers have noted the relationship between vision and risk taking. Robinson

and Stern (1997) explained this principal in different terms. They used the term "alignment"

between the organization and the individuals, one example of which could be the president

communicating the mission and vision. They also use the term "creativity." Increased autonomy

would likely lead to increased creativity, as individuals feel free to use their own unique style in

their own work. Creativity is one of many benefits of providing autonomy. Robinson and Stern

(1997) explained that alignment is necessary for creativity. Concerning growing alignment they

wrote, "For creativity to come from any employee, a company has to ensure that those who come

into contact with a potentially useful idea will respond positively to it. An organization can

make clear what it stands for in many ways" (p. 123). Alignment, which mission and shared

vision is likely to increase, improves autonomy and creativity.

Presidential support for faculty was demonstrated in a variety of ways. Informants said

that the president praised faculty members, and it made them feel like their contributions

mattered and encouraged them to continue to engage. The recognition took place in a variety of

ways, including large group meetings, email, and personal conversations. Informant Twelve

observed:

There's just a lot of initiatives over time, with a little bit of resources and funding and

encouragement, have blossomed in a lot of professional and technical areas. And a lot of

them stem back to planting seeds and watching them grow. Giving some recognition, and some kudos to those who do those things.

Two concerns deserve attention when considering the value of praise. First, how does this impact those who have made contributions but may have been overlooked in receiving praise? Second, could excessive attention to praise lead to inauthentic or insincere praise? Informants recognized that the president was authentic, and that positively affected organizational trust.

Promotion was another way that faculty felt supported with their autonomous efforts. Column advancement is a pay increase, or promotion, for faculty members who are engaged in work that is outside of their primary responsibility for instruction and was cited as a contributor in creating a culture of autonomy. Faculty believed development funds were considered an investment, not only in the quality of instruction, but in future innovation. If faculty felt any hesitation from administrators in providing resources they may have begun to hesitate to request funding. The president at this college showed a clear commitment to faculty being supported in professional development by supporting a contract with guaranteed professional development funds. Providing financial support reinforced the president's commitment to supporting faculty autonomy.

Faculty felt it was safe to take risks in acting autonomously because there was little punishment. Informant Eight said,

> (The president) always made clear that there was an experimental nature to lots of the things we did. So if a new initiative were introduced and it failed, that was okay. We learned something from it. Or, its success was limited, we could analyze it to see if it could be modified to see if it could be more successful. So I don't think that the president has ever seen success as the measure by which to judge faculty and staff. But

risk taking itself has been rewarded. And, of course there is always going to be a certain

lack of success, but that's been valued too.

As noted in chapter four of this dissertation, faculty cited many examples of either

themselves or others taking a variety of risks with initiatives that had not succeeded and they

never felt there was a negative consequence. They felt safe to continue to act on their own

because they did not fear that their efforts would be punished if the endeavor did not turn out the

way they expected.

Although every informant mentioned autonomy, there were also warnings that some sort

of accountability had to be maintained. Many faculty, especially Informants One and Four,

indicated that increased autonomy can sometimes cause a faculty member to feel that they have

no one to report to, which could lead to unprofessional or unreliable behavior. No specific

examples were given, and since increasing trust was the focus of the interviews, no examples

were asked for, but other informants obliquely mentioned this challenge as well. Some

accountability must be maintained but not so much that it makes faculty members feel

micromanaged, thus decreasing autonomy. For members of an organization to trust each other

they must believe others will fulfill responsibilities and that sometimes necessitates

accountability.

Communication

Every informant described at least one way that communication increased organizational

trust. They reported that the president set a tone for the rest of the college with his effective

communication. Informants frequently described the president as open, honest, authentic,

consistent, positive, and a good listener. This led to an organization that practiced honest and

open communication while maintaining a positive tone to effectively transmit information.

Informant Three spoke about honesty and openness and said that the president definitely wanted her to be very honest with him, adding, "Because (the president) is that straightforward I feel like I can be that straightforward." Informant Two referred to administration keeping the faculty informed when he said, "They told us what they were doing. There were never any surprises, no one could ever say, I didn't know this was going on." Informant Twelve said, "There's a good…attention to information flow and keeping us informed about issues." Informant eight added insight as to how open the communication was around the college: "In some organizations it would be considered not appropriate for a faculty member to email directly to the president. But here, I see that communication going both ways. It's fine, I can email anybody on campus." Informants valued being included in important and relevant communication and appreciated the manner in which that communication took place.

Communication was an expected theme from this research because it connected directly to the Tschannen-Moran model. Openness and honesty were principles from Tschannen-Moran's model. Openness and honesty are closely related but not exactly the same. Both honesty and openness require truthfulness, but openness adds the notion of being forthcoming with information. The answers to the research questions about open and honest communication certainly contributed to the content of this theme, but communication did come up in most other questions, including the open portion of the interviews.

Previous evidence strongly supports the important role of communication in building organizational trust. Researchers have found that communication should be accurate, transparent, and timely in order to increase organizational trust (Kennet, 1999; Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010; Palanski, Kahai, & Yammarino, 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

Wiser (2009) recommended that listening is the first step for college presidents to build organizational trust.

Informants indicated that they felt organizational honesty started at the top, with the president. They cited the president as the one that "set the tone" for others. The most frequent initial response for demonstrating honesty was simply a lack of dishonesty. Honest feedback and delivering difficult messages also demonstrated honesty. Informant Five shared, "Making honest statements about the negative will increase my trust." She then shared an example of how the president had done just that with the budget. Although it can be difficult to have really honest conversations, it helped increase the confidence of the faculty in their president.

Extensive and effective communication leads to greater transparency. Informants greatly appreciated the efforts to be open about the budget challenges in particular. They also valued the sentiment that they could contact anyone on campus, regardless of position, and have a conversation with that person. Faculty recognized the ability of the president to effectively determine which information needed to be shared and which needed to be withheld. This was even more important when it came to personnel decisions. There were appropriate times to share details, and that encouraged the recipient to be more open in return. However, keeping conversations positive and not associating with gossip or other negative talk is also very valued. These elements increased the openness of the organization, which was an important factor in increasing organizational trust.

By being open, administrators put themselves at risk to the faculty. Previous research suggests that the first step to increasing organizational trust is to first trust others. Pielstick (1998) found that modeling trust was the first step. Leaders can play a powerful role in creating the culture of an institution. Initiating trust sets a norm for the rest of the organization. Lau and

Liden (2008) found that employees who were trusted by their supervisor were also more trusted by their coworkers. The research indicates that leaders who want to build organizational trust should start by setting an example and trusting their employees. The Tschannen-Moran model supports these findings in that the model emphasized openness and honesty.

Informants credited the president for being approachable and a good listener. This agrees with Wiser's (2009) recommendation that college presidents use listening as a first step to building organizational trust. Informant Four stated, "I think the biggest thing about (the president) is he's pretty approachable. I would feel quite comfortable just calling (the president) up, getting an appointment and going and talking to (the president)." Other faculty shared this sentiment.

Not only was the president approachable, but he actually sought for the input of faculty. Informant Three said, "I've personally been asked just for my view point on different initiatives or different individuals here." Presidents also used special small group conversations to establish a climate of listening. Informant Seven recalled, "His first year here he didn't change a thing…He met with every single individual on campus, had an opportunity to sit down and talk with them in groups of six to ten." These small group conversations were an opportunity for faculty to tell the president what they were thinking and what they thought should happen. Informant Eight commented on the small group listening meetings:

> I think that it jump-started relationships right away and really sort of eased any concerns
> of someone new coming into the organization. It created a climate where people felt
> valued and that they could share and they would be heard.

She also added that the meetings were valuable because not only did they initiate communication

with the president, it encouraged faculty to consider the perspective of diverse members of the

campus community.

The style of communication and tone of delivery also appeared to be important to faculty.

Faculty observed that one of the presidents was very authentic in his delivery. They described an

unpolished delivery that actually made most of the informants trust the president more.

Informant Twelve said, "I didn't get the sense that the president, it's kind of what I see (what)

politicians do, depending on the audience they are talking to they change the message a little bit.

I never seem to see that in (the president)." Informants struggled to put this concept into

consistent terms, but several made comments that the president didn't feel like a politician or

salesman. There even seemed to be an appreciation and endearment to that fact that the

president did not seem like a professional speaker. They liked that they could trust the president

and did not have to try and measure what was substance and what was showmanship.

The informants appreciated the president's approach to communicating honestly on hard

topics. A positive spin on hard truths was a major emphasis for faculty informants. Informant

Four made the following observation:

> The last eight years have been tough times for the college and the state financially. So,
>
> it's hard to paint a rosy picture, and that's the presidents, I talked about tone earlier, it
>
> sets a tone for the college…I have to admit, it must have been hugely challenging to do
>
> this, but, looking for the silver lining.

This positive approach seems important to organizational trust, but it could be thought of as

contradictory to the previous emphasis on honesty. According to the informants, faculty want

honesty, but they also want to believe that they belong to successful organization. Putting the

positive emphasis on the bad news allowed the faculty to feel good about their approach to the

challenge.

Praise is one form of communication and appeared to be a contributor to increasing

organizational trust. Praising to increase organizational trust was not identified in the literature.

Practitioners would be wise to also remember the previous comments about authentic

communication when they consider praising faculty members and to avoid insincere praise.

More will be written about authentic leadership later.

Shared Governance

Every informant frequently and emphatically identified shared governance as a

contributor to organizational trust. Shared governance was described both in the leadership style

and in the structure. Faculty felt empowered by the leadership style of the president to

participate in governance and also to pursue their own passions. The structure was unlike the

traditional top-down organizational flow chart. Informant Thirteen said, "We were always flat."

The most widely identified characteristic of a flat organizational chart was faculty in leadership

positions, especially as division chairs. However, the commitment to shared governance was

more than figures on an organizational chart; faculty genuinely felt that they had power and that

the president wanted them to exercise that power.

Shared governance is not mentioned specifically in the model of trust proposed by

Tschannen-Moran. This is not surprising, as the Tschannen-Moran model is a model of trust,

and shared governance is a result of trust or increases trust. Informants most frequently talked

about shared governance in response to interview questions about feeling safe taking risks and

increasing openness, and during the portion of the interview when faculty were allowed to

discuss any actions that increased organizational trust. Informant Eight went so far as to describe shared governance as a form of benevolence.

The importance of shared governance in increasing organizational trust is consistent with findings from the literature. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) found that sharing power increases organizational trust. Other researchers (Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Lines, Selart, Espedal, & Johansen, 2005) confirmed that democratic styles of leadership build trust. By allowing employees a voice in the decision making process it makes the employee feel like a more important part of the organization. Once again, it also communicates a trust from administration, which leads to reciprocal trust. Sharing power and seeking for input from employees may seem inefficient, but it does have value because it leads to greater buy-in and the previously mentioned benefits that accompany organizational trust. Driscoll (1978) discovered that this same principle applies at colleges. At a small liberal arts college, faculty who were involved in the decision making process had increased organizational trust. Increasing organizational trust by increasing shared governance seems to be a theme for a variety of organizations.

Informants felt like the president had listened to them. First, he sought their input; and second, he trusted and used their recommendations. Informants Thirteen and Seven identified two presidents that hosted small group input meetings. These meetings were used at the beginning of the president's tenure in office. In the meetings, the president invited faculty members to openly share their thoughts about the college. Informants Seven, Eight, and Thirteen felt strongly about the benefits of these meetings, with Informant Seven claiming that the president hosting these sessions and following the input changed the opinion of teachers from

that of a "doomed" situation to recognizing the president as a "godsend." The informants felt strongly about these and other efforts of the president to listen to the faculty.

The president trusted the faculty with decision-making power. Informant Three identified one president who "led by consensus." The decision-making process was more drawn out, but the faculty were very involved in the process. Informant One observed, "The group decision-making process, which can be a detriment because it can take so long and it can be so messy, but I think a commitment to that pays off."

Listening to faculty was one critical element of shared governance at this college. The president created opportunities to obtain the input of faculty. The president demonstrated his willingness to follow the voice of the faculty by utilizing committees and following their recommendations. According to Informant Two, when committees made their recommendations they were usually followed. Faculty felt more trust in the organization because they had a strong voice in how it operated.

The organizational structure of this college was referenced directly or indirectly on a regular basis. Informant Eight noted that the college was different from many others because they had division chairs instead of division deans. Division chairs at this school are full-time faculty members that had been elected by faculty to serve in these positions whereas division deans are professional administrators. Division chairs remain faculty members but have release from teaching so they can perform administrative responsibilities. In addition to the obvious benefit of giving faculty members a strong voice, Informant Seven pointed out that one benefit of this model is the division chair knows they will return to normal faculty ranks and will be cautious to not do anything that hurts faculty in the long run. This organizational model

increased organizational trust because it relies on the knowledge and judgment of faculty. There

were more decisions made by those working where the action took place.

Having many faculty members who are currently serving, or have previously served, as

division chairs was reported to be very beneficial in creating trust. This is consistent with

Vineburgh's (2010) study of faculty and organizational trust at Historically Black Colleges and

Universities. Faculty members who have previously served in administrative capacities at their

current institution have higher organizational trust. Faculty at the college researched for this

case study serve in additional leadership roles other than division chairs. Department

coordinators, tenure review committee, accreditation teams, faculty senate, and other working

committees have real power and influence on campus.

A flatter structure with fewer administrators seemed to be quite favorable, but some

challenges may accompany such a model. With less college administrators faculty members

wishing to move fully into administration may have a more difficult time finding a suitable

opening at this college and must either wait for their opportunity or go elsewhere.

Administration included the union in shared governance. Informant One said that

grievances simply were not filed because administration kept the union so informed of any

problems they were having with faculty. Other informants shared similar thoughts about the

attention the president gave to working collaboratively with the faculty and the union.

Hernandez (2000) found that trust was an essential element when presidents and faculty sought a

mutually beneficial agreement. The vice-president of academic affairs is vitally important in

shared governance, especially in communicating with the union. Informant Seven also

emphasized the commitment of a previous president to listening to the faculty and accepting their

input. He said this made negotiating easier because all the issues were known in advance of the

meetings.

Many faculty members noted that the contract was unspecific. Informant Five said this

vagueness was purposeful. She said it contributed to a "hands off climate. Informant Nine

supported this by saying, "Because we don't have a hyper-structured contract we have the ability

to work out these problems in ways that are suitable to the individual department or division, and

maybe the faculty who are involved." At this particular college the vagueness of the structure

allowed them the opportunity to communicate and share governance, which are both critical to

increasing organizational trust. This college's work with the union is an example of

Pomraning's (2010) findings that organizational trust increases when an organization is

responsive to the needs of the employees. There is some inherent risk in a more vague contract.

It places a great deal of pressure on the trust between the union and administrators. Should trust

be compromised or a major disagreement develop, it would create a situation where vague

language could not provide a resolution. It is perhaps surprising that this vague language has

been effective for so long and breakdowns have not mandated a more descriptive contract. This

fact suggests an environment where there is a strong level of organizational trust.

Interaction

Throughout the interviews there was a subtle but underlying theme of interaction.

Interaction is very similar to communication, and some might even consider it a subset of

communication, but it was emphasized frequently enough to merit its own theme. The value of

interaction lies with its ability to foster relationships. Interaction is how communication takes

place. Essentially, a space needs to be created for communication among colleagues and for

relationships to be established. Although informants rarely pointed out the concept of interaction

specifically, it was underlying theme to most of what they discussed. Informants described

interacting with colleagues and the president as essential to build relationships that would foster

trust. The interactions ranged from formal and purposeful meetings, to conversations around

campus, to work-related travel. Informant Ten reflected, "You start getting to know people.

There are ways we are brought together. And that has, I think, helped increase the level of trust."

Informant Eight added, "When you have a history with people over time and people tend to stay

here a long time, that helps to engender trust." Interacting with the president and colleagues

creates the opportunity to build history and increase trust.

The need for interaction may be better understood by analyzing the president's schedule

and demands. Informants reported that the president's job was mostly off-campus working with

the community, politicians, and potential donors. As a result, presidents were on campus very

rarely and therefore had less opportunity to spend time with faculty. Informant Eleven was one

of a few faculty that emphasized that they felt like they were a "significant step away" from the

president. For this reason the president's attention to interaction was helpful in building

relationships with faculty. Despite these faculty members focusing on their lack of interaction

with the president, they all still went on to share many meaningful examples of the presidential

actions that increased organizational trust.

Interaction was not a part of Tschannen-Moran's model, but it was, perhaps, how some

qualities, such as benevolence and openness, were established and communicated. It was never a

primary theme for any answer in particular, but faculty regularly cited their interaction with the

president, other administrators, and other faculty members as being important contributors to

organizational trust.

Existing literature supports the idea that interaction is important in building organizational trust. For example, Cosner (2009) reported that increased interaction time increased trust. When administrators build relationships with employees and let them see their good nature, employees are more trusting and feel safer taking risks. Maurer (2010) found that building relationships is advantageous for building both personal and organizational trust. DeConinc (2010) found that perceived support, relationship-based cultures, and frequent informal conversations and meetings increased organizational trust (Six & Sorge, 2008).

Several events existed that allowed the faculty to interact with each other, administrators, and the president. Every semester there was a faculty/administrator reception that involved food, comments from the president, and casual conversation. Another purposeful interaction was a wine and cheese event that was held at the graduation ceremony. Events also included retirement parties, multi-cultural nights, and new tenure recognition. Informant Ten made an important observation about the president's actions at the events. "When he comes to the meetings, when he comes to the retirements, (he's) very much aware of the individual." The president was successful in making the most of these opportunities to build relationships. The interaction was both an opportunity to communicate with faculty members and simply to be present. With so many off-campus events it could be easy for the president to disappear from the sight of faculty.

Interaction also took place in meetings. The previously discussed small group listening meetings fall into this category. The president invited small groups of faculty members to share their opinions about the college. These listening activities and other meetings with the president were valuable in providing an opportunity to interact and build relationships.

Less formal interactions were also important. At least two presidents were credited with creating opportunities for interaction by going to talk with faculty members in their office. These visits were sometimes congratulatory, seeking feedback, or just social chats. Informant Seven felt honored by the president coming and asking for his opinion, and that helped him trust the president more. Walking around campus and having impromptu conversations was also reported and appreciated. Informant Eight identified having a "connection" with a president based on the casual conversations around campus. Informant Eleven also felt appreciated because a president was very personable in conversations they had when they crossed paths on campus. Informant responses support the philosophy that presidents should incorporate walking the campus and having impromptu conversations in their schedule. These efforts are challenging to implement because the president has such a busy schedule, a schedule that frequently involves off-campus activities.

Peters and Austin (1985) were pioneers in the leadership style of "management by wandering around." They identified this successful practice as key to understanding the truly critical issues of the organization and helping administrators make more informed decisions. They wrote:

> It turns out that neither superior customer service nor constant innovation—the two sustaining edges of excellence—is built upon genius in the executive suite, sleight-of-hand techniques or mystical strategic moves on a game board that allow one to gain a five- or ten-year advantage over one's competitors. Both are built, instead, on a bedrock of listening, trust and respect for the dignity *and* the creative potential of each person in the organization…Simple wandering—listening, empathizing, staying in touch—is an ideal starting point. (p.579)

Peters and Austin even described how this looks at a college compared to a business, noting that

the client was the student and their overall experience was critical. The president becomes more

familiar with the reality of the day-to-day operations and builds essential relationships as he or

she manages by wandering. Managing by walking around can help combat the concern that the

president makes decisions that affect day-to-day operations without having a real understanding

of basic operating practices.

According to informants, the president played a role in increasing organizational trust.

The findings of this research and previous research suggest that it would be worthwhile for a

president to act in ways that would increase organizational trust. However, a forced effort to

increase trust could be seen as forcing inauthentic relationships and micromanaging, both of

which threaten values previously touted by informants. In a review of literature, Gardner,

Cogliser, Davis, and Dickens (2011) look at the definitions and explore the history of the

research on authentic leadership. Researchers have taken an interest in authentic leadership since

the early 2000's. Their review indicates there is a public interest in fostering leaders who are

honest, transparent, genuine, and self-aware. Informants described the president as having

qualities of an authentic leader, and those traits were communicated during some of the

described interactions.

Commitment to Excellence

The informants agreed that the college had a commitment to excellence. There was a sentiment

that all faculty members should be the best professionals they could be, and faculty felt like there

was support to make this happen. Informants described excellent faculty as not only being great

teachers but also providing leadership or service of note for the college or community. The

commitment to this excellence could be seen in the rigorous hiring process, the communication

of expectations during tenure and post-tenure, strong support for continuing education, and

faculty promotion that incentivized going above contractual responsibilities of teaching.

Informant Twelve said, "There's clearly emphasis on continuing education, you know,

continually upgrading your skills and knowledge base." Informant Three commented that during

the tenure process it was communicated to faculty "that there was some expectation that each

person would somehow contribute to the larger community of (the college), something they were

passionate about."

The theme of commitment to excellence is directly related to the Tschannen-Moran

principles of competence and reliability. The commitment to excellence includes efforts to be

both reliable and competent. The responses that led to the development of this theme mostly

came about as a result of the questions about taking risk, competence, and reliability.

Previous research has identified the role of high performing employees for increasing

organizational trust. Researchers claim competence is crucial in building organizational trust

(Butler, 1991; Clark & Payne, 2006). It is also consistent with Covey and Merrill's definition of

trust (2006). Covey and Merrill wrote that trust requires confidence in both character and

competence. People can have the highest morals of character, but if they do not have the skills to

complete the task they will not be trusted. In an article about leadership styles, Basham (2010)

recommended that the leader establish a culture of excellence to increase the organizational trust.

The president was recognized for setting the example for excellence. Informant One

mentioned that the president had received recognition and multiple awards for his work and the

work of the college. Informant Twelve was so pleased with the handling of the budget cuts it

actually increased his confidence the president's leadership. Informants felt strongly that the

competence of the president contributed to the culture that promoted the excellence of faculty.

This is related to the findings of Gillespie and Mann (2004) that that trust of the leader was closely connected with the effectiveness of the leader.

The commitment to excellence started with how people were brought into the organization. Informant One said that the college had to be very careful about the faculty to whom they awarded tenure because "once you get them you are stuck with them." Informant One said that the hiring process was rigorous. She also added that faculty were frequently adjunct instructors or on one-year contracts at the college before they interviewed for a tenure position.

The tenure process was described as being both a supportive process and a screening mechanism. Informant Eleven reported that a tenure track faculty member would be observed 28 times prior to being granted tenure. Informant Eleven said that tenure was not a guarantee and some people were denied tenure. Faculty felt strongly that the support and the screening that took place during the tenure process was helpful for increasing excellence amongst faculty.

Promotion was identified as an important incentive for faculty to perform at a high level. Promotion was an increase in pay and not an increase in title. Informant Twelve observed the following about the effect of the introduction of promotion.

If I want to get promotion or have column advancement I do have to be a little more engaged and it did seem over time it made a fairly substantial difference in the activity level of faculty, not all faculty, but a lot of them.

The introduction of promotion seems to have made a significant impact on the level of competence and contributed to a culture where excellence was rewarded.

Informants felt that the president had made a serious commitment to their professional development. Informant Eight said that professional development funds were written into the

contract and had thus survived the budget cuts. Faculty were encouraged to use these funds to

attend national conferences in their area of expertise or to receive training related to their work.

Faculty have also been supported at times by receiving additional funds for tuition

reimbursement. Professional development opportunities were also abundant on campus.

Informant Four said that many on campus opportunities came from the faculty driven Learning

and Teaching Center.

Professional leave was utilized to develop faculty member's abilities. Informant Four

reported that many faculty have taken sabbatical to explore and develop their expertise.

Informant Six also cited a faculty member who took several years away from the college to

complete a doctorate degree. Informants reported that the president and vice president of

academic affairs were generally supportive of these leaves from the college.

Putting People First

Informants regularly made comments that suggested that organizational trust was

increased because the president put people first, including faculty, staff, and students. Putting

people first could also be described as putting the needs of individuals above the needs of the

college. This included not only the need of the students but also of the faculty. This was another

area where informants thought the president set an example that set the tone for the rest of the

college. The president demonstrated this in a variety of ways, including focusing on the

struggles that students and the community faced and using punishment as a last resort for

employees.

Putting people first fits nicely into Tschannen-Moran's model of trust. Tschannen-Moran

identifies benevolence as one of the principles of trust. Responses focused on putting people

first came most frequently in response to questions about risk taking, benevolence, honesty, and openness, as well as during the open comment session at the end of the structured questions.

Existing research provides a variety of examples that fall under this larger umbrella of putting people first. Covey and Merrill (2006) said that trust consisted of character and competence; the character component would be addressed by putting people first. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) found that leaders who were compassionate and demonstrated sensitivity increased trust. Clark and Payne (2006) found that being perceived as having integrity and being fair increased trust. Butler (1991) reached similar conclusions, claiming that integrity and loyalty increased organizational trust. Additionally, Erturk (2007) found that employees trusted organizations when they trusted the intentions of the leader.

Informants felt that the president made faculty a priority of the college. Faculty felt appreciated by celebrations that the president held in their honor. Celebrations included retirement parties and recognition of faculty being granted tenure. It was not simply the event that was important; it was the communication that took place at the events. Informant Four praised the president's speeches at a recent retirement party. The president made very emotional and personal comments about each of the faculty that were retiring. Informant Four said that this made quite an impression on the faculty, and perhaps especially the newer faculty who are still learning the culture of the institution. Perhaps Informant Four's most important remark about the experience was that the president "clearly cares about his faculty." Other informants, especially Informant Ten, echoed the sentiment that the president knew the faculty and cared about them. Informants felt that the president was authentic in his concern for faculty welfare, and it created a meaningful relationship. This is an example of the finding of Tschannen-Moran

and Hoy (2000) that leaders increased trust when they were compassionate and demonstrated sensitivity.

Informant Seven cited one interesting example of a president demonstrating his care for the faculty members. The faculty were on strike because of an issue with the state. The president actually went out and took the faculty coffee. And then, after the strike was over, the president decided to extend the contracted work days of the faculty, allowing them to make up their strike days so they were not financially punished for striking.

Faculty also felt supported when it came to personal and family health issues. The campus practiced a shared leave policy where employees could donate their sick days to other employees who were experiencing a health emergency. Informant Four reported that employees were very interested in helping each other with these types of things. Informant Six added that the college allowed the faculty to cover for each other in cases of family emergencies as well.

Informants also shared examples of how the administration had supported practices and policies that benefitted faculty. As another example, Informant Five was offered a small stipend for a project that some institutions might consider part of the contracted workload. Informant Thirteen cited an example of the president coming to the union and recommending a pay increase for faculty. Informants were impressed that the college would bring forth ideas that were good for students and the faculty but threatened to hurt the bottom line of the college. These actions communicated that the faculty were valued and that the administration wanted them to be proud of their work.

The president had been supportive of faculty taking leave from the college for reasons of personal enrichment. Informant Seven cited two examples of faculty who were allowed to step away from the college for a period of time to continue their education. These types of

allowances communicated to the faculty that they were important. The informants felt strongly that the president had their best interest at heart, which is example of the president putting the needs of the faculty above the needs of the college.

Informant One said that administrators treated faculty with support instead of punishment. She added that the contract was always the last resort because helping the faculty improve was preferred over punishment. She later repeated this emphasis:

> The college has always, from my perspective, been extraordinarily generous in its attempts to reach out to faculty having problems…Not being punitive when clearly the contract would certainly allow it. I think the faculty immediately affected, and the faculty around them, see that the college sees the faculty as an investment that they are willing to support. It makes it easier for faculty who are having problems to be open about those problems because they know (they) will be met with an offer of help rather than with punitive measures.

Informant Eight noted that in the rare case that an instructor would need to be terminated they were always given the opportunity to resign first.

Social justice was brought up as a sign of benevolence. Informant Twelve cited the college's attention to serving populations that previously had been underserved. Adult Basic Education and English as a Second Language were both mentioned specifically. The president emphasized that the local population had changed and the college needed to adapt to meet the needs of the community. Informant Two said that efforts had been made to teach the faculty about the concept of privilege and also cross-cultural communications in order to help them serve more diverse populations. One president focused on international initiatives, recruiting diverse faculty and staff and adding a diversity and globalism degree requirement. Putting an

emphasis on the people in the community and addressing the needs of non-students demonstrates that the college was committed to serving others.

Shared Vision

Informants frequently talked about the president's vision. The faculty seemed to connect with the president's vision so much that it seemed that it was their own vision. Informant Four described the president as a "big picture kind of thinker, really good about painting the broad strokes." It started with building a shared vision and then communicating that vision. It created a common purpose focused on the needs of students and the community that united the actions of faculty. The faculty echoed the president's vision of international work and focusing on the needs of the community. This mission was frequent and consistent communicated .

Shared vision did not appear to have a direct connection to any principle from the Tschannen-Moran model. Vision was a major category only for the question about reliability and during the end of the interview when the informants were free to talk about anything they thought increased organizational trust. However, all the informants brought up vision at various times during the interview, frequently in conversation not directly related to the original question.

Creating a shared vision is a common leadership principal that research suggests is connected to increasing organizational trust. Gillespie and Mann (2004) found that communicating shared vision and values was helpful. Identifying and focusing on these common cares is a way to connect and build relationships. Roueche (1989) reported that organizational trust may enable college presidents to create a shared vision. It is likely that a shared vision and organizational trust increase in tandem.

One of the presidents in particular was cited for his expertise in building vision and generating buy-in. He would create the vision for the faculty to pursue, then allow them freedom to determine the most effective way to achieve that vision. Informant One also noted his expertise in bringing the right people together to grow the vision. Perhaps this is the purpose behind the president visiting faculty in their office to ask for their opinions, as mentioned by Informant Seven. Informant Three added greater detail:

> Rather than sell his vision he would start with a small core of faculty or staff, and so rather than selling his idea from the top down, and implementing things and then trying to get everybody on board, he would actually get us all on board so that there was some sort of energy that sparked all of us. He knew how to tap into all of us. So he basically sort of just shepherded, he was the shepherd of us.

This president has exercised great wisdom in how he developed and promoted a vision on campus. Faculty described the vision as having a galvanizing effect.

Part of the president's success in growing his vision is choosing the right ideas to champion. Informant two said the president really pushed for diversity. Informant Four also cited a focus on the changing demographics of the local population. This frequently involved diversity as well because the changing demographics involved immigrant families. This common purpose led to teachers having an increased focused on student success and created a major emphasis on international work.

Faculty seemed to feel united by the shared vision. When they had differences they could return to the common ground. They tended to trust the intentions of their colleagues more because they believed they all had the needs of students as their guiding priority. Research supported the idea that having a common belief increased organizational trust. In a study of

public school teachers, Van Maele and Van Houtte (2011) found that teachers who had a common belief in their students' abilities had higher organizational trust. Although the context is different, this finding appears to hold true at this college.

The president utilized his resources to grow the vision. Informant Four said that the president had done an excellent job of communicating with the administrators, so they all knew which direction they were headed. The consistent messaging has given faculty more trust in what the institution was doing. Informant Twelve took confidence in the consistency of the message, and it gave him courage to act on the vision that the president had laid out.

Recommendations for Future Research

During the design and implementation of this study, the researcher was intrigued by several other research possibilities that could shed additional light on the topic of increasing organizational trust at a community college. Following are some examples of directions that future research could pursue.

This research purposefully selected a school that was considered to be of moderate size in comparison to other community colleges in the state of Washington, thus neglecting the idiosyncrasies of a very small or very large campus. Informant comments actually indicated that the size of the college was important. They believed themselves to be part of a smaller campus, which, for them, explains their increased interaction with the president. If this college was much larger—say 30,000 students—and perhaps included multiple campuses, how would this influence the findings? The themes may be the same, or similar, but the application of the themes would likely be different. Perhaps such a study could even more fully develop the themes from this research.

Another option worthy of consideration is who was interviewed. This research was specifically focused on the perceptions of faculty members. They are many other constituencies that could be considered, including student services, vice-presidents and deans, the community, and the board. Each of these would provide a fascinating perspective and vary greatly. For example, shared governance was a major emphasis for the faculty but may not show up at all for the other groups. Perhaps there are themes that faculty did not mention that other groups may feel very strongly about.

Future research could also derive from the themes of this study. Communication, putting people first, autonomy, commitment to excellence, and having a common purpose were not unanticipated themes when the existing literature was considered. Although a concept may be found under a synonym, these could be found in many leadership books. Shared governance and interaction could be considered unique, however, and should be researched further.

References

Abell, F. (2004). Baltimore city community college: A long way to go. Two years yield few meaningful reforms, underscore deep-seated challenges facing Baltimore city residents' largest provider of post-secondary education. *The Abell Report, Volume 17 No.2*. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Adams, S. H. (2004). *The relationship among adult attachment, general self-disclosure, and perceived organizational trust* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-03252004-150617/

Altuntas, S., & Baykal, U. (2010). Relationship between nurses' organizational trust levels and their organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, *42*(2), 186-194. doi:10.1111/j.1547-5069.2010.01347.x

Baird, C. A. (2010). *Leadership behaviors that build or destroy trust: A narrative case study.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of North Carolina, Greensboro, NC.

Barnett, M., Anderson, J., Houle, M., Higginbotham, T., & Gatling, A. (2010). The process of trust building between university researchers and urban school personnel. *Urban Education*, *45*(5), 630-660. Retrieved from EBSCO*host.*

Basham, L. M. (2010). Presidents as transformational or transactional leaders in higher education. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 6 (6), 141-152.

Bernard, H. R. (2000). *Social research methods, Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Boggs, G. R. (2004, Nov/Dec). Community colleges in a perfect storm. *Change*, *36*(6), 6-11.

Brien, A., Ratna, N., &Boddington, L. (2012). Is organizational social capital crucial for productivity growth? An exploration of "trust" within luxury hotels in New Zealand. *Journal Of Human Resources In Hospitality & Tourism*, *11*(2), 123-145. doi:10.1080/15332845.2011.648840

Butler Jr., J. K. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a conditions of trust inventory. *Journal of Management*, *17*(3), 643. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Caldwell, P. F. (1992). *Communication/culture study for Victor Valley College, Victorville, CA, November 1991-April 1992*. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*. (RIEAUG1993)

Chathoth, P. K., Mak, B., Sim, J., Vinnie, J., & Manaktola, K. (2010). Assessing dimensions of organizational trust across cultures: A comparative analysis of U.S. and Indian full service hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *30*, 233-242. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.09.004

Childers, W. H. (2009). *Transformational leadership and its relationship to trust and behavioral integrity* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Clark, M., & Payne, R. (2006). Character-based determinants of trust in leaders. *Risk Analysis: An Official Publication of The Society For Risk Analysis*, *26*(5), 1161-1173. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *53*(1), 39-52. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Cosner, S. (2009). Building organizational capacity through trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *45*(2), 248-291. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Costa, A., Roe, R. A., & Taillieu, T. (2001). Trust within teams: The relation with performance effectiveness. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, *10*(3), 225. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Covey, S. M. R., & Merrill, R. R. (2006). *The speed of trust: The one thing that changes everything*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Cummings, L.L., & Bromiley, P. (1996). The organizational trust inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In R. Kramer, & E. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 302-330 & 429). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DeConinck, J. B. (2010). The effect of organizational justice, perceived organizational support, and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees' level of trust. *Journal of Business Research*, *63*(12), 1349-1355. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.01.003

Dervitsiotis, K. N. (2006). Building trust for excellence in performance and adaptation to change. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, *17*(7), 795-810. doi:10.1080/14783360600595153

Diamond, R. M. (Ed.). (2002). *Field guide to academic leadership: A publication of the national academy for academic leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dirks, K. (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(6), 1004-1012. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Driscoll, J. W. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. *Academy Of Management Journal*, *21*(1), 44-56. doi:10.2307/255661

Erlandson, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., & Allen, S. D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ertürk, A. (2007). Increasing organizational citizenship behaviors of Turkish academicians: Mediating role of trust in supervisor on the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*(3), 257-270. doi:10.1108/02683940710733089

Fang, E., Palmatier, R. W., Scheer, L. K., & Li, N. (2008). Trust at different organizational levels. *Journal of Marketing*, *72*, 80-98.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction*. White Plains, New York, NY: Longman.

Gardner, W. L., Cogliser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. P. (2011). *Leadership Quarterly* 22, no. 6: 1120-1145. *Business Source Premier,* EBSCO*host*.

Gaur, A. S., Mukherjee, D., Gaur, S. S., & Schmid, F. (2011). Environmental and firm level influences on inter-organizational trust and SME performance. *Journal Of Management Studies*, *48*(8), 1752-1781. doi:10.1111/j.-6486.2011.01011.x

Gilbert, J. A., & Tang, T. L. (1998). An examination of organizational trust antecedents. *Public Personal Management*, *27*(3), 321-338.

Gillespie, N. A., & Mann, L. (2004). Transformational leadership and shared values: The building blocks of trust. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *19*(6), 588-607. doi:10.1108/02683940410551507

Hallam, P., & Mathews, J. L. (2008). Principal leadership: Building trust to support school improvement. *Journal of School Public Relations*, *29*(2), 210-236. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Harris, Z. M., & Parkland Coll., C. L. (1996, March). *Institutional transformation*. Paper presented at the 101st annual meeting of the North Central Association, Chicago, IL.

Henkin, A. B., & Dee, J. R. (2001). The power of trust: Teams and collective action in self-managed schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, *11*(1), 48-62. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Hernandez, J. (2000, May). *Collaborative strategies for working with faculty unions*. Paper presented at the meeting of National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development, Austin, TX.

Hoy, W. K., &Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: an empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, *9*(3), 184-208. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Jessup, C. M. (1997). *An investigation of the empirical relationships of organizational culture and trust* (Doctoral dissertation). Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO.

Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2004). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *26*(1), 6-22. doi:10.1108/01437730510575552

Kacmar, K., Bachrach, D. G., Harris, K. J., & Noble, D. (2012). Exploring the role of supervisor trust in the associations between multiple sources of relationship conflict and organizational citizenship behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, *23*(1), 43-54. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.11.004

Kaneshiro, P. (2008). *Analyzing the organizational justice, trust, and commitment relationship in a public organization* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://access.library.oregonstate.edu/pdf/534909.pdf

Kath, L. M., Magley, V. J., & Marmet, M. (2010). The role of organizational trust in safety climate's influence on organizational outcomes. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 42(5), 1488-1497. doi:10.1016/j.aap.2009.11.010

Kennett, C. L. (1999). Trust at the threshold: Negotiating new pathways for methods instruction. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Quebec, Canada.

Kesler, R., Perry, C., & Shay, G. (1996). *So they are resistant to change? Strategies for moving an immovable object*. Proceedings from the annual international conference of the National Community College Chair Academy, Phoenix, AZ. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Kling, A. S. (2004) *Commitment to organizational change: Assessing the effects of identifying benefits to change and its relationship with organizational trust* (Doctoral dissertation). Alliant International University, Los Angeles, CA.

Kramer, R. (2010). Collective trust within organizations: Conceptual foundations and empirical insights. *Corporate Reputation Review*, *13*(2), 82-97. doi:10.1057/crr.2010.9

Langfred, C. W. (2004). Too much of a good thing? Negative effects of high trust and individual autonomy in self-managing teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, *47*(3), 385-399.

Lau, D. C., & Liden, R. C. (2008). Antecedents of coworker trust: Leaders' blessings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(5), 1130-1138. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Lau, W. (2010). Empowerment of non-academic personnel in higher education: Exploring associations with perceived organizational support for innovation and organizational trust (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved fromProQuest LLC. (ED524917)

Lee, P., Gillespie, N., Mann, L., & Wearing, A. (2010). Leadership and trust: Their effect on knowledge sharing and team performance. *Management Learning*, *41*(4), 473-491. doi:10.1177/1350507610362036

Lines, R., Selart, M., Espedal, B., & Johansen, S. (2005). The production of trust during organizational change. *Journal of Change Management*, *5*(2), 221-245. doi:10.1080/14697010500143555

Maurer, I. (2010). How to build trust in inter-organizational projects: The impact of project staffing and project rewards on the formation of trust, knowledge acquisition and product innovation. *International Journal Of Project Management*, *28*(7), 629-637. doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2009.11.006

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., &Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miner-Rubino, K., & Reed, W. D. (2010). Testing a moderated meditational model of workgroup incivility: The roles of organizational trust and group regard. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *40*(12), 3148-3168. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00695.x

Mino, C. E. (2002). *Organizational trust, organizational cynicism and organizational commitment during a change initiative* (Doctoral dissertation). Alliant International University, Los Angeles, CA.

Mishra, A. K. (1992). *Organizational responses to crisis: The role of mutual trust and top management teams* (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Moye, M. J., Henkin, A. B., & Floyd, D. J. (2006). Faculty-department chair relationships: Examining the nexus of empowerment and interpersonal trust in community colleges in the context of change. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, *15*(2), 266-288. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Musacco, S. D. (2000). *The relationship between organizational trust and organizational productivity: Understanding the centrality of trust in the organizational setting* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://access.library.oregonstate.edu/pdf/534923.pdf

Myran, G., Baker, G., Simone, B., Zeiss, T., & American Association of Community Colleges, W. C. (2003). Leadership strategies for community college executives. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. (2010).The impact of positivity and transparency on trust in leaders and their perceived effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(3), 350-364. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.002

Paine, S. C. (2007). *The relationship among interpersonal and organizational trust and organizational commitment* (Doctoral dissertation). Alliant International University, San Diego, CA.

Palanski, M. E., Kahai, S. S., & Yammarino, F. J. (2011). Team virtues and performance: An examination of transparency, behavioral integrity, and trust. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *99*(2), 201-216. doi: 10.1007/s10551-010-0650-7

Perry, R. W., & Mankin, L. D. (2007). Organizational trust in the chief executive and work satisfaction. *Public Personal Management*, *36*(2), 165-179.

Peters, T., & Austin, N. (1985). MBWA (Managing by Walking Around). *California Management Review*, *28*(1), 579.

Pielstick, C. (1998). The transforming leader: A meta-ethnographic analysis. *Community College Review*, *26*(3), 15. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Plinske, K., & Packard, W. J. (2010). Trustees' perceptions of the desired qualifications for the next generation of community college presidents. *Community College Review*, *37*(4), 291-312. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Pomraning, D. C. (2010). Overall organizational emotional intelligence and organizational emotional intelligence factors as antecedents of organizational trust. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 3919. Abstract received from PsycINFO database.

Quinlan, L. M. (2008*). Leader personality characteristics and their effects on trust in the organizational setting* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://access.library.oregonstate.edu/pdf/534905.pdf

Robinson, A. G., & Stern, S. (1997). *Corporate creativity: How innovation and improvement actually happen*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Roueche, J. E., American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, W. C., & And, O. (1989). Shared vision: Transformational leadership in American community colleges. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Rudolf, M. M. (2009). *Trust and the capacity for change in an organizational context: An empirical study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://access.library.oregonstate.edu/pdf/534906.pdf

Salamon, S. D., & Robinson, S. L. (2008). Trust that binds: The impact of collective felt trust on organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(3), 593-601. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.593

Sanders, L. W. (1993). *The impact of performance appraisal interviews on organizational trust and motivation for learning* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Texas, Austin, TX.

Saunders, M. N. K., & Thornhill, A. (2004) Trust and mistrust in organizations: An exploration using an organizational justice framework. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *13*(4), 493-515. doi: 10.1080/13594320444000182

Six, F., & Sorge, A. (2008).Creating a high-trust organization: An exploration into organizational policies that stimulate interpersonal trust building. *Journal of Management Studies*, *45*(5), 857-884. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00763.x

Sloyan, R. M. (2009). *Trust, sensemaking, and individual responses to organizational change* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://gradworks.umi.com/3354372.pdf

Solomon, R. C. & Flores, F. (2001). *Building trust in business, politics, relationships, and life*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Spence, D.P. (1982). *Narrative truth and historical truth: Meaning and interpretation psychoanalysis.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Staples, D., & Webster, J. (2008). Exploring the effects of trust, task interdependence and virtualness on knowledge sharing in teams. *Information Systems Journal*, *18*(6), 617-640. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2575.2007.00244.x

Thompson, P. H. (1994). Shared leadership. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum, 5*(3), 61-70.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004). *Trust Matters: Leadership for Successful Schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001).Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *39*(4), 308-331. doi: 10.1108/EUM0000000005493

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, *70*(4), 547. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Tuckman, B. W. (1999). *Conducting educational research*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace.

Turner III, E. S. (2010). A correlational study of trust in an organization undergoing change (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from EBSCO*host.*

U.S Department of Education. (2009, March). *Community colleges*. ED Review. Retrieved from: http://go.galegroup.com.proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA19780980 5&v=2.1&u=s8405248&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w

Vanhala, M., &Ahteela, R. (2011). The effect of HRM practices on impersonal organizational trust. *Management Research Review*, *34*(8), 869-888. doi: 10.1108/01409171111152493

Van Maele, D., & Van Houtte, M. (2009). Faculty trust and organizational school characteristics: An exploration across secondary schools in Flanders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *45*(4), 556-589. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Van Maele, D., & Van Houtte, M. (2011). Collegial trust and the organizational context of the teacher workplace: The role of a homogeneous teachability culture. *American Journal of Education*, *117*(4), 437-464.

Vineburgh, J. H. (2010). *A study of organizational trust and related variables among faculty members at HBCUs* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/614

Werbel J. D., & Henriques, P. L. (2009). Different views of trust and relational leadership: Supervisor and subordinate perspectives. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *24*(8), 780-796. doi: 10.1108/02683940910996798

Wihbey, J. A. (2002). *Employee attitudes on organizational trust in a Connecticut community college* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.

Wiser, E. A. (2009). *The new university president: Communicating a vision, cultural competency, and symbolic cultural forms* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (ED515990)

Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yoon Jik, C., & Hanjun, P. (2011). Exploring the relationships among trust, employee satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Public Management Review*, *13*(4), 551-573. doi: 10.1080/14719037.2010.525033

Appendix A

Request to President

Dear President (insert name),

I am a PhD student at Oregon State University studying Community College Leadership. The title of my dissertation is, Faculty Member's Perspectives of the Behaviors of Community College Presidents that Increase Organizational Trust. I am seeking one community college that would allow me to interview faculty members about actions of the colleges current and past presidents that have increased organizational trust.

With your approval, and the blessing of a faculty union representative, I will conduct interviews with no more than 20 faculty members. The interviews will focus on actions of presidents that build organizational trust. It is anticipated that interviews should last approximately an hour but should not exceed an hour and a half. I am seeking tenured or tenure track faculty members with at least 10 years at the institution. I will ask you, the faculty union representative, and the chief academic officer to identify 3-5 faculty each.

I am conducting this research under the supervision of Sam Stern, my major professor at Oregon State University. Both the risk and benefit of this research is the potential for increased discussion about the actions of the presidents and how it impacts the climate of the campus. It should be noted that the interview will focus entirely on actions that build organizational trust. The researcher is not pursuing any information about actions that decrease organizational trust. The college and participants will remain confidential.

Please call or email me if you are willing to participate in this study. I will contact your office within a week to determine your schools willingness to participate in this study.

Regards,

Josh Baker
joshuadbaker@hotmail.com
206-354-0930

Appendix B

Request to Union Representative

Dear (faculty union rep),

I am a PhD student at Oregon State University studying Community College Leadership. The title of my dissertation is, Faculty Member's Perspectives of the Behaviors of Community College Presidents that Increase Organizational Trust. I am seeking one community college that would allow me to interview faculty members about actions of the college's current and past presidents that have increased organizational trust. President (insert name) has given me an initial approval and I now seek your support as a faculty union representative.

With your support, I will conduct interviews with no more than 20 faculty members. The interviews will focus on actions of presidents that build organizational trust. It is anticipated that interviews should last approximately an hour but should not exceed an hour and a half. I am seeking tenured or tenure track faculty members with at least 10 years at the institution. I will ask you, the president, and the chief academic officer to identify 3-5 faculty each.

I am conducting this research under the supervision of Sam Stern, my major professor at Oregon State University. Both the risk and benefit of this research is the potential for increased discussion about the actions of the presidents and how it impacts the climate of the campus. It should be noted that the interview will focus entirely on actions that build organizational trust. The researcher is not pursuing any information about actions that decrease organizational trust. The college and participants will remain confidential .

Please call or email me if you are willing to support this study.

Regards,

Josh Baker
joshuadbaker@hotmail.com
206-354-0930

Appendix C

Initial Email to Faculty

I am a PhD student at Oregon State University studying Community College Leadership. The title of my dissertation is, Faculty Member's Perspective of the Actions of Community College Presidents that Increase Organizational Trust. (Your president, vice president of academic affairs, and your faculty union representative) have granted me permission to seek faculty participants at (your college). I am seeking to conduct confidential interviews with faculty members about actions of presidents that have increased organizational trust. You have been identified as a good source of information for this research and I hope you will agree to participate.

To participate in this research, faculty should be tenured and have spent at least 10 years at this college. Interviews will be face-to-face and last about an hour. Interviews may go longer based on length of answers. The interviews will focus on actions of presidents that build organizational trust. It should be noted that this includes previous presidents and not just the current president. No questions will be asked about negative actions of a college president.

I am conducting this research under the supervision of Sam Stern, my major professor at Oregon State University. The college and participants will remain confidential . It is not anticipated that discussing actions that increased organizational trust will pose any significant risk to you, but the affects of discussions about leadership and organizational climate cannot be entirely predicted.

I will be in Seattle to conduct these interviews between Tuesday June 4th and Monday June 10th. I look forward to your response and will be following up over the next few days to determine your willingness to participate and availability.

Regards,

Josh Baker

joshuadbaker@hotmail.com

206-354-0930

Appendix D

Interview Consent Form

This consent form outlines my rights as a participant in the research study of Faculty Member's Perspectives of the Behaviors of Community College Presidents that Increase Organizational Trust, conducted by Josh Baker, a doctoral student at Oregon State University. The purpose of this research is to explore the thoughts and observations of faculty about actions of presidents that increase organizational trust. It is expected that the interview will last approximately an hour, based largely on the length of the responses. Although no immediate risks are apparent, the impact of discussing organizational dynamics is unpredictable.   No direct benefits have been identified, but this research may help informants or others identify effective leadership practices to increase organizational trust.

I understand that:

- Participation is voluntary.

- I can refuse to answer any question.

- I can stop the interview at any time.

- My name will remain confidential in any publications or discussions.

- All interviews will be audio recorded. If I do not wish to be recorded I should opt out.

I have read this consent form. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and I am satisfied with the answers. I agree to participate in this study. I understand that refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled.

_____

Signature of interviewee   Date

Printed name of interviewee

Signature of researcher   Date

If you have questions about your rights or welfare as a participant, please contact the Oregon State

University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Office, at (541) 737-8008 or by email at

IRB@oregonstate.edu.

Contact info:

Student Investigator

Josh Baker

206-354-0930

joshuadbaker@hotmail.com

Primary Investigator

Sam Stern, Ph.D

541-737-6392

Sam.stern@oregonstate.edu

Appendix E

Interview

My research is focused on the actions of community college presidents that increase organizational trust. Organizational trust refers to the tendency of members of an organization to trust other individuals and groups within the organization. Organizational trust is often recognized by the willingness of members of an organization being willing to collaborate and taking risks such as innovation. When organizational trust is present groups within an organization will make themselves vulnerable to each other. They are more likely to share thoughts, data, and opportunities. It is believed that a community college president can increase the climate of trust within the college. The purpose of this interview is to identify actions of presidents that have increased the climate of trust.

To start, I'd like to get a little basic background about you and your experience.
- What is your professional background in higher education? How many years have you been at this college and which presidents have you worked with?

As I ask you about trust I will refer to a definition of trust as provided by trust researcher Tschannen-Moran. "Trust is the willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other person is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent." This model, or definition, of trust, will serve as the guide for the questions about organizational trust.

1. What has a president done that has increased the comfort level of individuals to being vulnerable and taking risks?
- Did you feel safe to be innovative and try new things? Why?
- What risks have you taken? What enabled you to do that?

2. What behaviors of presidents increased benevolence in the institution?
- Consider charity or kindness as synonyms, others before self.
- What do you identify as benevolent actions of community college staff and faculty? How increased?
- When have you been benevolent? Has this been promoted or facilitated by actions of the president?

3. What behaviors of presidents increased honesty of institutional members?
- What do you identify as examples of honesty within the college? How increased?

4. What behaviors of presidents encouraged members of the institution to be open?
- What does it mean to be open?
- When have you been open? What encouraged this?

5. What behaviors of presidents encouraged members of the institution to be reliable?
- What do reliable faculty do?
- How have you been reliable? How increased?

6. What behaviors of the president increased <u>competency</u> of members of the organization?
- What do "competent" faculty do? How do they become more competent?
- How has the actions of a president increased this?

7. What else has the president done to increase the organizational trust?
- Any purposeful action to shift this climate?

Appendix F

Themes Table

Tschannen-Moran Model	Corresponding Theme from Research
Being vulnerable	Autonomy
Benevolent	Putting people first
1)Honest and 2) Open	Communication
1)Reliable and 2) Competent	Commitment to Excellence
No Category	Shared Vision, Shared Governance, Interaction