



Developing Trust in Principal: Its Relationship with Attachment Styles

Okul Yöneticisine Güven: Bağlanma Stilleri ile İlişkisi

Pınar BAYHAN KARAPINAR*

ABSTRACT: Trust is recognized as an essential component of efficient operation and well-functioning of school organizations. Studies of interpersonal trust related to schools suggest that the nature and quality of teachers' trust in principals contributes to important outcomes. In this sense, prior research has heavily focused on the attributes of the trustee and contextual factors, while neglecting the characteristics of the trustor. Thus, this study proposes an adult attachment style as personal characteristics of teachers developing trust in principals. The sample consists of 317 full-time primary and secondary teachers teaching in four private schools. Hierarchical regression analyses revealed that secure and preoccupied attachment styles were positively related to affective trust in principal, whereas none of the attachment styles were significantly related to cognitive trust in principal. The results of the study contribute to our understanding of the role of attachment styles in how teachers perceive and enact trust relationships at school.

Keywords: Trust in principal, attachment style, cognitive trust, affective trust

ÖZ: Güven eğitim kurumlarının etkili ve verimli şekilde çalışabilmesinde en önemli unsurlardan biri olarak görülmektedir. Eğitim alanında bireylerarası güveni içeren çalışmalar, öğretmenleri okul yöneticilerine duydukları güvenin niteliğinin önemli örgütsel çıktılara katkıda bulunduğunu göstermektedir. Bu anlamda, güvenle ilgili yapılan önceki çalışmalarda güvenilen bireye ait özellikler ile durumun özelliklerine ağırlık verilmiş, buna karşın güvenen kişiye ait özellikler ihmal edilmiştir. Bu sebeple bu çalışmada bağlanma stilleri, öğretmenlerin yöneticilerine duydukları güveni etkileyebilecek bir bireysel özellik olarak ele alınmıştır. Çalışmaya konu olan veriler, dört özel ilk ve ortaokul kademesinde tam zamanlı görev yapmakta olan 317 öğretmenden elde edilmiştir. Yapılan hiyerarşik regresyon analizi sonucunda güvenli bağlanma ve saplantılı bağlanma stiline sahip öğretmenlerin yöneticilerine duygusal olarak güven duydukları tespit edilmiştir. Diğer taraftan dört bağlanma stiline öğretmenlerin yöneticilerine duydukları bilişsel güven üzerinde etkisine rastlanmamıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçları öğretmenlerin bağlanma stillerinin okul yöneticilerine duydukları güven üzerindeki etkilerini anlamamıza katkıda bulunmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Okul yöneticisine güven, bağlanma stilleri, bilişsel güven, duygusal güven

1. INTRODUCTION

The educational institutions are considered as healthy and efficient when they have trust among teachers, students, parents and the principals (Hoy & Miskel, 2005). Studies of interpersonal trust related to schools also support the quality teachers' trust in principals as a valuable predictor of an important outcomes including increased productivity, student achievement, increased collaboration and participative decision making (Beeson & Matthews, 1993; Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Goddard Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001; Henkin & Dee, 2001; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000, Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Thus, developing and maintaining interpersonal trust is considered an important issue for the principals of contemporary educational institutions. It contributes to a positive working environment characterized by honest, supportive relationships by enabling the exchange of ideas and affecting the quality and quantity of information exchanged (Diffie-Couch, 1984). In organizational settings, Safran and Muran (2000, p. 213) stated that when employees perceive supervision as beneficial, they see the supervisory relationship as "reciprocal, mutual, and trusting." Similarly, Dirks and Skarlicki (2004) stated that when teachers feel that they can rely

* Assoc. Prof., Hacettepe University, Department of Business Administration, Ankara- Turkey, pbayhan@hacettepe.edu.tr

on the principal to fulfil his or her leadership role with regards to these aspects of the job, they are likely to give up their personal interests and devote all their energy and effort towards accomplishing the performance-related objectives and strategies set by the principal. In this sense, when teachers trust their principals they are more likely to carry out activities which play a pivotal role in enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of their schools (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997).

The literature on trust in principal or supervisor has concentrated on three components (Kramer, 1999): attributes of the trustor (the one who is trusting), attributes of the trustee (the trustworthiness-benevolence, integrity and competency of the principal), and contextual factors (i.e., the duration of the relationship) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy 2000). Of those components educational scholars have heavily focused on the principals' attributes as well as the contextual factors in school settings; while relatively neglecting the characteristics of the teacher as a trustor (Dirk & Ferrin, 2002; Simmons, Gooty, & Little, 2009) Following trustor perspective, Van Meele, Forsyth, and Van Houtte (2014) suggest that teacher characteristic should be explored as antecedents of teacher trust. In this regard, Duffy, Lafferty, and Lafferty (2001), Harms (2011) proposed that the propensity to trust could be explained to some extent by developing an understanding of adult attachment patterns. Mikulincer and Shaver (2007) defined attachment style as the complex pattern of relating based on one's history of interpersonal experiences throughout life. Thus, this study proposes attachment style as a predispositional factor affecting the trust development of teachers in turn contributing to the quality of the trust relationship with their principals.

1.1. The Aim of the Study

Although some part of the attachment literature views the concept of trust as a component of attachment (Harms, 2011), only a few empirical studies have associated attachment styles with trust specifically in partner preferences (Collins & Read, 1990), close partnerships (Mikulincer, 1998), and romantic relationships (Simpson, 1990). In this sense this research argues that attachment styles contribute both positively and negatively to trust in principals, playing a pivotal role in enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the schools. Therefore, this study considers attachment theory as a relatively new paradigm for studying interpersonal relationships in educational and organizational settings and it aims to explore the relationship between the attachment styles of teachers and their level of affective and cognitive trust in their principles. More specifically, I addresses the following question:

How is the association between teachers attachment styles (secure, preoccupied, fearful and dismissive) and their trust toward their principles?

The contribution of this paper is twofold. First, to author's knowledge, this is the first study which contributes to empirical studies by paying attention to teachers' adult attachment styles with offering a significant opportunity to predict trust mechanism on trust in principal. Second, it acknowledges different forms of trust, categorized as affective and cognitive, and investigates the potential effects of attachment styles on two different forms. The multidimensional view of international trust is merit because it can contribute a better understanding of working relationships. Hence, a better understanding of the relation between attachment styles and different forms of trust in principal could lead to increases in successful functioning and school improvement efforts.

1.2. Attachment Theory

Attachment theory is the collaborative work of Bowlby (1969, 1973) and Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978). Bowlby (1973) proposed that the caregiver's availability and responsiveness during the early stages of life lead to a secure relationship between the infant and the caregiver and a positive internal working model of the world, while the caregiver's unavailability and unresponsiveness most likely leads to an insecure attachment relationship as well as negative internal working models of the world. These early relational experiences are especially important in the construction of internal working models of the self and others, which shape individuals' interpersonal interactions throughout life (Bowlby, 1969, 1973).

Based on Bowlby's theory, Ainsworth et al. (1978) proposed individual differences in the quality of early attachment relationships. In particular, they identified three attachment styles: One is the secure attachment style and the other two are insecure attachment styles, anxious-ambivalent and avoidant. Later, Hazan and Shaver (1987) carried out attachment research on adults and confirmed three categories of attachment style by adopting the early attachment patterns (secure, avoidant, and anxious-ambivalent) of Ainsworth et al. (1978).

Building upon this model, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) proposed a four-category (secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful) model depending on the intersection of the two dimensions of Bowlby's (1973) internal working models of self and others. Individuals who have positive models of self (low in the anxiety dimension) and others (low in the avoidance dimension) are identified as *securely attached*. These individuals tend to consider themselves as worthy of love and perceive others as accepting and responsive. Individuals who have a positive model of others (low avoidance) but negative models of self (high anxiety) are identified as *preoccupied*. They see themselves as unworthy of love but perceive others as accepting and responsive. On the other hand, *dismissing* avoidants are identified as having a positive model of self but a negative model of others, viewing themselves as worthy of love but others as untrustworthy and rejecting. Finally, *fearful* avoidants are identified as having negative models of both themselves and others, viewing themselves as unworthy of love and other people as untrustworthy, rejecting, and unresponsive.

1.3. Attachment Styles and Trust

Trust has been conceptualized in many different ways by many scholars. In a classic definition, Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) emphasized trust as the willingness of an individual to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action. Rotter (1980), one of the most prominent trust theorists, defined interpersonal trust as the expectancy held by an individual or group of people that they can rely on the word or promise of another party. According to McAllister (1995), interpersonal trust is an individual's belief in and willingness to act on the basis of the words, actions, and decisions of another. In this regard, McAllister (1995) proposed that trust has two components: affective and cognitive. The affective component reflects the emotional bond between the parties that may cause the referent to demonstrate concern about the other party's welfare one's welfare and a feeling of benevolence. More emotional than rational, it can grow over time into a meaningful workplace relationship between an employee and supervisor (McAllister, 1995). The cognitive component, on the other hand, reflects issues such as the integrity, ability, and capability of another party (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; McAllister, 1995).

Among the attachment styles, securely attached individuals are more willing to open up and disclose information to others (Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991). Since *securely attached*

individuals have a positive image of self and positive expectations of others, they approach social interactions with confidence (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Collins, 1996). Supporting this definition, Riley (2011) indicates that secure teachers are happy to depend on others and have the others to depend on them. In a prominent study relating attachment to trust, Hazan and Shaver (1987) report that individuals with secure attachments have more interpersonal trust and less fear of closeness. Adams (2004) also reports a positive association between secure attachments and the trust of employees in their supervisors, peers, and upper management. Similarly Simmons et al. (2009) indicate that secure attachment is related to trust in one's supervisors, which in turn increases one's work performance. In a recent study by Frazier et al. (2014), secure attachment style is found to be related to trust in supervisors. Particularly, they suggest that securely attached individuals will routinely expect their supervisor to deliver on task deadlines, demonstrate competence at work and high levels of work ability with consistency and integrity which leads them to have higher levels of trust in their supervisor. In educational settings, Kennedy and Kennedy (2004) report that secure teachers may profit from an awareness and deeper understanding of their own mental representations in trusting their colleagues and principals.

On the other hand, preoccupied individuals similar to secure individuals (corresponding to Ainsworth's anxious-ambivalent style) have a positive image of others but feel themselves less worthy than secure individuals. Since they worry about being disliked by others, they need to depend on others to sustain their positive self-regard. Thus, they become preoccupied with gaining the acceptance of others to feel good about themselves. In this sense the preoccupied teacher cannot afford in attachment terms, to lose favor with principals. This may lead them to over involvement with the school management (Riley, 2011). Thus, due to their positive image of others, these individuals may affectively and cognitively trust in interpersonal relationships by both feeling a sense of security and benevolence and believing in the ability and accuracy of their supervisors (Dirks, 2000).

Relying upon aforementioned research, the current study bases its arguments on the notion that if teachers' internal working models consist of positive expectations about other people, then these teachers (secure and preoccupied) will have high dispositional tendencies to trust in their principals both affectively and cognitively. Thus, the following hypotheses were developed.

H1: A secure attachment style is positively related to affective trust in principal.

H2: A secure attachment style is positively related to cognitive trust in principal.

H3: A preoccupied attachment style is positively related to affective trust in principal.

H4: A preoccupied attachment style is positively related to cognitive trust in principal.

Unlike secure and preoccupied individuals, *dismissing* and *fearfully* attached individuals (corresponding to Ainsworth's avoidant style) have negative attitudes toward others. They prefer to structure social activities in a way that minimizes interpersonal closeness and injury. Since they are less satisfied with the interpersonal aspects of their work and colleagues (Hazan & Shaver, 1990), they have difficulties establishing positive interpersonal relationships at work (Hardy & Barkham, 1994). Dismissing and fearful individuals focus on their own tasks by prioritizing work over personal relations (Richards & Schat, 2011). With this logic, Riley (2011) indicates that teachers, who score high on anxiety, would be vulnerable emotionally, when confronted with the stressful moments in school settings. This has been empirically tested in situations other than schools by a number of researchers who have noted, avoidant and anxious attachment styles have been linked to lower levels of trust (Feeney & Collins, 2001; Simpson, 1990). Likewise, Cranshaw and Game (2010) reports that an avoidant attachment relationship with one's supervisor has been found to be related to lower levels of trust. Since dismissing individuals have a positive view of self and a negative view of others, this conveys an impression of arrogance that

may result in lower levels of cognitive trust in reciprocal relationships (Adams, 2004) due to the individuals' underestimation of the targets' competence and reliability.

The fearfully attached teacher experiences an increased sense of unworthiness when compared to the other attachment styles. S/he might feel less able than her peers in her professional capability and is also likely to fear that significant others, such as colleagues and principals will find this out and become negatively disposed toward him/her as a result (Riley, 2011). This makes the fearful teacher more vulnerable to the expectations of others and greater difficulty in managing the competing demands of the other people that she deals with daily, including his/her principal. In turn, such underestimations can also diminish the likelihood of teachers developing affective and cognitive trust relationships with their principals.

In line with the previous reasoning, if teachers' internal working models consist of negative expectations about others, then these (dismissing and fearful) individuals will have low dispositional tendencies to trust in principals either affectively or cognitively. Thus, the following hypotheses were developed:

H5: A dismissive attachment style is negatively related to affective trust in principal.

H6: A dismissive attachment style is negatively related to cognitive trust in principal.

H7: A fearful attachment style is negatively related to affective trust in principal.

H8: A fearful attachment style is negatively related to cognitive trust in principal.

2. METHOD

2.1. Participants and Procedure

This study drew its data from a larger ongoing study focusing on various organizational and individual attitudes. A self-report survey was administered to a sample of full-time private primary and secondary school teachers located in the Golbasi district of the province of Ankara/Turkey. A total of 400 survey packages were distributed to the teachers of four private schools on convenience method. The final data consisted of 317 teachers, ranging between 25 and 56 years of age. The return rate (79%) is considered as satisfactory for self-report survey research of this type (Babbie, 2001). The majority of the participants were women (55.2%) and the average tenure was 11.2 years.

2.2. Instruments

2.2.1. Relationship style questionnaire (RSQ)

This study evaluated the attachment style of the participants using 17 items of Griffin and Bartholomew's (1994) RSQ, on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from "not at all like me" to "very much like me." The RSQ asked the subjects to evaluate their attachment style in close emotional relationships. I combined the relevant items from each of the attachment questionnaires to create four attachment styles: secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful. One item is used in both the preoccupied and dismissing prototypes by reversing the item score. The Turkish validation of the instrument is conducted by Sümer and Güngör (1999). The cronbach alpha coefficients varied between .54 and .78. In the current study the alpha coefficients are between .65 (secure), .57 (dismissing), .40 (preoccupied) and .67 (fearful). This finding is consistent with previous reports showing relatively low internal consistency scores (0.41–0.71) for the RSQ subscales (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Scharfe & Bartholomew, 1994) due to the fact that two dimensions are being combined in each subscale. For each attachment style the average scores

range between 1 and 7 indicating that higher scores represent higher levels of that attachment style of the respondent.

2.2.2. Interpersonal trust

McAllister's (1995)'s instrument, worded in terms of a principal, was used to assess trust. That is to say, the items were modified in order to draw respondents' focus to their relationship with their principals in the schools. The instrument contains six items that assess cognitive trust (e.g., "My principal approaches his/her job with professionalism and dedication") and five items that assess affective trust (e.g., "We have a sharing relationship. We can both freely share our ideas, feelings, and hopes"). A five-point Likert-type scale evaluates the responses, ranging from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree). The total scores of the respondents are the sums of the scores for each item. Higher scores indicate higher levels of trust in principal. The Turkish adaptation of the instrument was borrowed from Ergeneli, Sağlam Ari and Metin (2007)'s study in which cronbach alpha coefficients were reported as .88 (affective trust) and .87(cognitive trust). The current study reports alpha coefficients for affective and cognitive trust are 0.87 and 0.86, respectively.

To diminish common method variance (CMV), I (a) used different response anchors for the predictor and outcome variables, (b) manipulated the order of the questionnaire items, and (c) used Harman's one factor-test. Within the framework of Harman's test, I entered all items together in an exploratory factor analysis and I examined the results of the unrotated factor solution. The analysis produced six factors, with the first factor explaining 19.1% of the variance. Since no general factor was apparent, this study does not consider CMV a serious issue (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986).

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Preliminary Analyses

3.1.1. Confirmatory factor analyses

Before conducting CFA with the maximum likelihood estimation, the data were screened for assumptions of CFA. The three important assumptions with SEM modelling is the requirement that the data are of a continuous scale, have multivariate normal distribution and adequate sample size ($n > 200$) (Byrne, 1998; Kline, 2005). As the data become increasingly non-normal, chi-square become excessively large which might lead researchers for inappropriate modifications. For normality assumptions, outliers and univariate distributions were scanned for skewness and kurtosis scores and found within reasonable ranges (Skewness < 2 ; kurtosis values < 2). In addition to those, multivariate normality is inspected with Mardia's (1970) coefficient of value of Kurtosis. The critical ratio of Mardia's coefficient was found 1.27 (smaller than 1.96) assuming no violations for multivariate normality.

After examining the assumptions of CFA, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on the RSQ and trust items was conducted. The fit indexes of the four-factor model of the RSQ did not initially suggest a good fit to the data ($\chi^2(df = 129) = 889, p > 0.05$, GFI = 0.76, CFI = 0.78, RMSEA = 0.11). One item (item 15) related to the preoccupied style had insignificant loadings. After removal of that item, I conducted CFA on the remaining items. Inspection of the modification indices suggested the error terms of items 17 and 18 and items 2 and 5 were correlated. So, the correlated errors were added between these items to the model. The final

model yielded an acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2(df = 111) = 429, p < 0.05, cmin/df = 3.86, GFI = 0.87, AGFI = 0.83, CFI = 0.90, TLI = 0.89, SRMR = .032$ and $RMSEA = 0.08$). I created indexes for each dimension of RSQ by averaging the relevant items.

For the trust items, CFA indicated that the measurement model afforded a good fit to the data ($\chi^2(df = 34) = 50.32, p < 0.05, cmin/df = 1.48, GFI = 0.97, AGFI = 0.95, CFI = 0.98, TLI = 0.96, SRMR = .027$ and $RMSEA = 0.04$), providing evidence that items are significantly loaded on their respective latent variables of cognitive and affective trust.

3.1.2. Descriptive statistics

Table 1 presents the reliability scores of the instruments as well as the intercorrelations between the study variables.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations about Study Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Gender	-	-.07	-.13*	.06	-.08	.09	.01	.08
2. Age		-	-.01	-.01	.02	.09	-.08	-.12
3. Secure			(.55)	.06	-.17**	-.43**	.18**	.04
4. Preoccupied				(.40)	-.34**	.08	.12*	.01
5. Dismissing					(.57)	.30**	-.06	-.02
6. Fearful						(.67)	-.08	-.05
7. Affective trust							(.87)	.59**
8. Cognitive trust								(.86)
Mean.	--	--	4.26	3.75	4.51	3.86	3.38	3.45
SD	--	--	.90	.96	.99	1.21	.97	.88

Note: Reliabilities are presented at the diagonal in bold. Sample size = $n = 354$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Gender was coded 0=men 1=women

The correlations between the variables are in the directions hypothesized; that is, affective trust is significantly positively correlated with the secure ($r = 0.18, p < 0.01$) and preoccupied ($r = 0.12, p < 0.05$) attachment styles. On contrary, cognitive trust is not significantly correlated with any attachment style.

I carried out two groups of hierarchical regression analyses to test the hypotheses. The first hierarchical regression analysis regressed affective trust on the four attachment styles of secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful after controlling for gender. Table 2 displays the results. The analysis in the first step showed that gender did not account for significant variability in affective trust. Step 2 reveals a significant increase in R^2 . The attachment styles of the secure ($\beta = 0.166, p < 0.00$) and preoccupied ($\beta = 0.122, p < 0.05$) are found to be positively related to affective trust ($F(5, 317) = 3.15, p < 0.01$). Thus, H1 and H3 are supported.

Table 2: Results of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Predicting Affective Trust

Predictors	R ²	Adj R ²	F	ΔR ²	F Change	B
Step 1	.000	-.003	.135	.000	.135	
Gender						.021
Step 2	.048	.033	3.15**	.048	3.91*	
Gender						.038
Secure						.166**
Preoccupied						.122*
Dismissive						-.006
Fearful						-.017

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

The second hierarchical analysis regressed cognitive trust on the four attachment styles of secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful after controlling for gender. Table 3 displays the results. The analysis in the first step showed that gender did not account for a significant variability in cognitive trust. Step 2 reveals none of the attachment styles to be significantly related to cognitive trust ($F(5, 317) = 0.58, p > 0.05$). Thus, H2, H4, H6, and H8 are not supported.

Table 3: Results of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Predicting Cognitive Trust

Predictors	R ²	Adj R ²	F	ΔR ²	F Change	B
Step 1	.003	.000	1.03	.003	1.03	
Gender						.057
Step 2	.009	-.007	.585	.006	.475	
Gender						.062
Secure						.033
Preoccupied						.047
Dismissive						-.008
Fearful						-.036

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

4. DISCUSSION and RESULTS

This paper examines the extent to which attachment styles facilitate or inhibit the formation of the affective and cognitive trust of teachers toward their principals. The results contribute to our understanding of the role of attachment styles in how teachers perceive and enact trust relationships at schools. Trustworthiness and supportive interactions between teachers and principals enable them to make a common focus on enhancing student learning, the quality of the communication and sharing of practices (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Therefore, this study merits attention given the necessity for positive cooperative relationships and a better understanding of trustworthiness in educational settings. More specifically, as attachment styles reflect generalized working models of relationships, it seems reasonable to conclude that teacher's views of self and others would also guide their trust relationships with their principals. Congruent with the previous literature (Frazier et al., 2014), this study finds significant positive relations between secure and preoccupied attachment styles and affective trust in principal. These findings partially support the study's main argument, which presumes that teachers whose internal working models consist of positive expectations about others are more likely to trust in principals affectively. Consistent with previous studies conducted in different settings (Miller & Noiro, 1999; Simpson, 1990), individuals with more positive expectations about other people are more willing to open themselves up and disclose information to others (Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991). However, contrary to the study's expectations, the effects of secure and preoccupied attachment styles on cognitive trust are not supported, suggesting that a positive view of others has more influence on affective trust than on cognitive trust. This finding can be interpreted as a positive view of others not resulting in trust in terms of others' capabilities, reliability, or abilities, but resulting in trust involving empathic, affiliative ties and a feeling of benevolence.

The presumed relations between dismissive and fearful attachment styles and trust dimensions have not gained support. It seems that dismissively and fearfully attached teachers view their relationships differently and engage in different strategies besides trusting, since they believe that others will not be there in times of need. This result is incongruent with prior research emphasizing that a dismissive style is associated with less intimacy in close friend relationships while a fearful style is associated with negative expectations concerning close friends (You & Malley-Morrison, 2000). However, this finding does not parallel that of Cranshaw and Game (2010), who suggested that an avoidant attachment relationship with one's supervisor is related with lower levels of trust in work settings.

Given this pattern of results, it seems that attachment styles account for significant variance in affective trust compared to cognitive trust. Since responsiveness to the needs of partners provides the appropriate standard for affective trust, it seems more meaningful to discover a strong association between the attachment styles and affective trust. Nevertheless, this finding could be given particular emphasis in collectivist cultures (Hofstede, 1980), where establishing a highly personalized relationship is a necessary precondition for working with others (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1993; Wasti, Tan, & Erdil, 2011). In this respect, the individualism–collectivism dimension may influence how much value a trustor places on the capabilities of the trustee (Doney, Cannon, & Mullen, 1998). For instance, evidence of cognitive trust—the target's task-related competency—may not be as valuable as affective trust in collectivistic cultures, where employees put great emphasis on emotional bonds to establish trustworthiness.

On the other hand, even though cognitive and affective trust are causally connected, one might argue that each form has a distinct pattern of association with its attachment antecedents (Johnson & Grayson, 2005). The insignificant relations between attachment styles and cognitive

trust in principal can be interpreted as cognitive trust operating differently from affective trust, such that it arises from accumulated knowledge that allows one to make predictions with some level of confidence (Morrow, Hansen & Pearson, 2004). Therefore, the field needs more theoretical work to address the plausible factors affecting the development of cognitive trust. Alternatively, future studies could explore cognitive trust relationships within teacher-principal dyads from the standpoint of the principal, since cognitive trust has been proven to be knowledge driven and competency based.

Compared to other study findings identifying the antecedents of interpersonal trust, the R^2 value may not be impressive although attachment style variables are statistically significant. This finding might indicate that some other factors, aside from attachment variables, might have an effect on interpersonal trust variables of affective and cognitive trust. For instance, the meta-analysis of Dirks and Ferrin (2002) exploring the factors of trust in leadership classifies those variables as leaders actions and practices (e.g., transformational leadership, justice perceptions, organizational support and participative decision making), follower attributes (e.g., propensity to trust) and relationship attributes (e.g., length of the relationship). Thus, further studies can examine the effects of other variables together with attachment style as classified by Dirks and Ferrin (2002). Moreover since interpersonal trust is dynamic and reciprocal further studies may include not only the trust of teachers in their principals, but the principals' trust in their teachers as well. Not but least future studies should not only explore the plausible effects of attachment styles on trust in principal as a supervisor but also give emphasis on trust in peers (other teachers) and subordinates as well. In addition to the direct predictors of interpersonal trust one might also focus the moderating and mediating variables on attachment styles and trust relationship. In this sense there is a research to suggest that affective trust may follow upon secure and preoccupied attachment styles, the strengths of such relations may be moderated by other factors. One such potential moderator might be attributes of the trustee. It could be argued that depending on the leaders attributes or leadership style, individual tendency to trust in supervisor, would differ.

4.1. Limitations

This research has several limitations. Since it is a cross-sectional study, it may be prone to concerns such as causality and CMV. Although several techniques were applied to diminish the potential for CMV (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986), the threat of inflating variances may still be a concern. Replications with prospective data could be helpful to assess the causality and generalizability of the findings. In addition, attachment styles explain less than 20% of the variance in trust in principal. Therefore, future research is needed for a deeper understanding of the other variables in terms of the attributes of the principals and contextual factors in educational setting, as well as to test these relations with a close focus on the dual nature of trust.

4.2. Practical Implications and Conclusion

The findings of this study have important practical implications for contemporary principals trying to build strong interpersonal relationships for the long-term stability of their educational institutions (Cook & Wall, 1980). School administrators need to be aware of the fact that the trust perceptions of teachers regarding their principals' emotional and affiliative competencies are mostly grounded in the secure and preoccupied attachment styles of those teachers (Simmons, 2009). In this respect, from a selection point, as suggested by Schusterschitz, Geser, Nöhammer, and Stummer (2011), and Tziner, Ben-David, Oren, and Sharoni, (2014) school administrators could utilize adult attachment styles as selective tools in the recruitment processes as it has been proven to be associated with trust in principal.

Another alternative concentrates on developing interventions to alter the internal working models of current teacher. Although changing attachment styles is not an easy process because of their stable nature, some scholars (Fraley, 2002; Ruvolo, Fabin, & Ruvolo, 2001) have suggested that attachment styles can move from insecure to secure styles. School management staff can lead teachers to revise their internal models of work relationships by demonstrating secure behavior patterns and by being responsive to teachers' needs for security and protection. Hence, interventions or counseling therapies could use change strategies to ensure teachers' attachment security by strengthening their positive expectations about others.

In sum, the results of this study provide evidence that attachment styles affect how teachers perceive and enact trust relationships at schools. Despite its limitations, this study expands the literature on attachment–trust linkage by focusing on teacher–principal relationship. Since research on attachment styles and trust relationships is relatively limited in educational settings, these findings may provide a better understanding of this linkage.

5. REFERENCES

- Adams, S. (2004). *The relationship among adult attachment, general self-disclosure, and perceived organizational trust*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Falls Church, Virginia.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the Strange Situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Babbie, E. (2001). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 226–244.
- Beeson, G., & Matthews, R. (1993) Collaborative decision making between new principals and teachers: Policy and practice. ED 361837
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10, 99-109.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss Vol. 1: Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss Vol. 2: Separation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bryk, A.S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Byrne, B. M. (2013). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Routledge.
- Collins, N. L. (1996). Working models of attachment: Implications for explanation, emotion, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 810-832.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 644-663.
- Cook, J. & Wall, T. (1980). New Work Attitude Measures of Trust, Organizational Commitment and Personal Nonfulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53, 39-52.
- Cranshaw, J., & Game, A. (2010). Organizational career management: the role of the line manager caregiving and employee relational models. Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Montreal, Canada.
- Diffie-Couch, P. (1984). Building a feeling of trust in the company. *Supervisory Management*, 29, 31-36.
- Dirks, K. T. (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 1004–1012.
- Dirks, K. T. & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for organizational research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 611-628.
- Dirks, K. T., & Skarlicki, D. (2004). Trust in leaders: Existing Research and Emerging Issues. In R. Kramer & K. Cook (Eds.) *Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Dilemmas and Approaches* (pp. 21-40) New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Doney, P.M., Cannon, J., & Mullen, M. (1998). Understanding the influence of national culture on the development of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 601-620.
- Duffy, C., Lafferty, C., & Lafferty, B. (2001). Organizational trust and attachment to an immediate leader: A pilot study. *AHRD Conference Proceedings, Symposium*, 6, 18-25.
- Ergeneli, A., Ari, G. S., & Metin, S. (2007). Psychological empowerment and its relationship to trust in immediate managers. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(1), 41-49.
- Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2001) Predictors of caregiving in adult intimate relationships: An attachment theoretical perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 972-994.

- Fraley, R. C. (2002). Attachment stability from infancy to adulthood: meta-analysis and dynamic modeling of developmental mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 123–151.
- Frazier, M.L., Gooty J., Little, L.M and Nelson D.L.(2014). “Employee attachment: Implications for supervisor trustworthiness and trust”. *Journal of Business Psychology*, DO I0.1007/s10869-014-9367-4.
- Goddard, R. D., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2001). A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of teacher trust in urban elementary schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 102(1), 3–17.
- Griffin, D., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Metaphysics of measurement: The case of adult attachment. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships, Vol. 5: Attachment processes in adulthood* (pp.17-52). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Hampden-Turner, C., & Trompenaars, F. (1993). *The seven cultures of capitalism*. New York: Currency/Double Day.
- Hardy, G. E., & Barkham, M. (1994). The relationship between interpersonal attachment styles and work difficulties. *Human Relations*, 47, 263–281.
- Harms, P.D. (2011). Adult attachment styles in the Workplace. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, 285-296.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1990). Love and work: An attachment-theoretical perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59,270-280.
- Henkin, A., & Dee, J. (2001). The power of trust: Teams and collective action in self-managed schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11(1), 48-62.
- Hofstede G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (2005). *Education administration: Theory, research, and practice* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoy, W. K. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The omnibus T-Scale. In W.K. Hoy & C.G. Miskel, *Studies in Leading and Organizing Schools* (pp. 181-208). Information Age Publishing: Greenwich: CT.
- Johnson, D., & Grayson, K. (2005). Cognitive and affective trust in service delivery. *Journal of Business Research*,58, 500-507.
- Kennedy, J. H. & Kennedy, C. E. (2004). Attachment theory: Implications for school psychology. *Psychology in the Schools*, 41(2), 247–259.
- Kline , R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kramer, R.M. (1999). Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Emerging Perspectives, Enduring Questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 569-598.
- Manning, T. T. (2003). Leadership across cultures: Attachment style influences. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(1), 20 – 32.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 709–734.
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 24-59.
- Mikulincer, M. (1998). Attachment working models and the sense of trust: An exploration of interaction goals and affect regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1209-1224.
- Mikulincer, M., & Nachshon, O. (1991). Attachment styles and patterns of self disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 321-332.
- Mikulincer, M. & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics and change*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Miller, J. B. & Noiro, M. (1999). Attachment memories, models and information processing. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 16, 147-173.
- Morrow, J.L., Hansen, M.H., & Pearson, A.W. (2004). The cognitive and affective antecedents of general trust in strategic alliance. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16(1),48-64.
- Podsakoff, P.M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(2), 531-544.
- Richards, D. A., & Schat, A. C. H. (2011). Attachment at (Not to) Work: Applying Attachment Theory to Explain Individual Behavior in Organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 169-182.
- Riley, P. (2011). *Attachment Theory and the Teacher–Student Relationship: A practical guide for teachers, teacher educators and school leaders*. Newyork: Routledge.
- Rotter, J. B. (1980). Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility. *American Psychologist*, 35(1), 1-7.
- Ruvolo, A.P., Fabian, L.A., & Ruvolo, C.M. (2001). Relationship experiences and change in attachment characteristics of young adults: The role of relationship breakups and conflict avoidance. *Personal Relationships*, 8, 265-281.
- Safran, J. D., & Muran, J. C. (2000). *Negotiating the therapeutic alliance: A relational treatment guide*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Scharfe, E., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Reliability and stability of adult attachment patterns. *Personal Relationships*, 1, 23-43.
- Schusterschitz, C., Geser, W., Nöhammer, E., & Stummer, H. (2011). Securely attached, strongly committed? On the influence of attachment orientations on organizational commitment. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung*, 25(4), 335-355.
- Simmons, B. L., Gooty, J., Nelson, D. L. & Little, L. M. (2009). Secure attachment: implications for hope, trust, burnout, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 233–247.

- Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 971-980.
- Sümer, N., & Güngör, D. (1999). Yetişkin bağlanma stilleri ölçeklerinin Türk örnekleminde psikometrik değerlendirmesi ve kültürlerarası bir karşılaştırma. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14(43), 71-106.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39, 308-331.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 71, 547-593.
- Tziner, A., Ben-David, A., Oren, L., & Sharoni, G. (2014). Attachment to work, job satisfaction and work centrality. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 35(6), 555-565.
- Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 458-495.
- Wasti, A. S., Tan, H.H., & Erdil, S. (2011). Antecedents of trust across foci: A comparative study of Turkey and China. *Management and Organization Review*, 7 (2), 279-302.
- Van Maele, D., Forsyth, P.B. & Van Houtte, M. (2014). Introduction: Trust as a Matter of Equity and Excellence in Education, In Van Maele, D., Forsyth, P.B. & Van Houtte, M (Eds) *Trust and School Life: The Role of Trust for Learning, Teaching, Leading, and Bridging* (pp.1-33). New York: Springer.
- You, H. S. & Malley-Morrison, K. (2000). Young adult attachment and intimate relationships with close friends: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31, 528-534.

Uzun Özet

Güven, bireylerarası ilişkilerin ve örgütsel yaşamın en önemli unsurlarından birisi olarak görülmektedir. Eğitim kurumlarının etkili ve verimli olabilmesi, eğitim amaçlarının gerçekleştirilebilmesi, öğrencilerin etkili bir şekilde öğrenim görebilmeleri için, öğretmen ve yöneticilerinin birbirlerine güven duydukları bir ortamda çalışmalarını gerekmektedir. Eğitim kurumlarında gerçekleştirilen ve bireylerarası güven ilişkilerini ele alan çalışmalar, öğretmenlerin yöneticilere duydukları güveninin, katılımcı karar vermede, işbirliğini ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışını artırmada (Tschannen-Moran, 2001), grup bağlılığını teşvik etmede, ve okulun başarısında önemli etkileri olduğunu ortaya koymuştur (Bryk ve Schneider, 2002; Goddard ve diğ., 2001; Henkin ve Dee, 2001; Tschannen-Moran ve Hoy, 2000, Tschannen-Moran 2001). Bu bağlamda, yöneticisine güvenen öğretmenlerin, çalıştıkları eğitim kurumlarının etkili ve verimli olmasında rol oynayan önemli görevleri üstlendikleri ifade edilmiştir. Örneğin Dirks ve Skarlicki (2004), yöneticilerine güven duyan öğretmenlerin bireysel çıkarlarını bir kenara bırakarak tüm enerji ve çabalarını yöneticileri tarafından konulan amaçları başarmak için sarf edebileceklerini belirtmişlerdir.

Alan yazınında bireylerarası güvene ilişkin yapılan araştırmalar güvenilen bireye ait özellikler ile durumun özelliklerine ağırlık vermekte; buna karşın güvenen kişiye ait özellikler ihmal edilmiştir. Bu kapsamda Duffy, Lafferty ve Lafferty (2001) ile Harms (2011) bireylerin güven eğilimlerinin onların bağlanma stilleri ile açıklanabileceğini ifade etmişlerdir. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışmada öğretmenlerin sahip oldukları bağlanma stilleri ile yöneticilerine duydukları güven arasındaki ilişkiyi ele alan model test edilmektedir.

Bağlanma davranışı, başka bir bireye karşı yakınlık arama ve sürdürme olarak tanımlanan ve insanların kendileri için önemli olan diğerleriyle güçlü duygusal bağlar kurma eğiliminin nedenlerini açıklayan bir yaklaşımdır (Bowlby, 1969). Bağlanma kuramına göre bireyler erken gelişim dönemlerinde bakımlarını üstlenen kişiler ile etkileşimlerini özümseyerek, kendileri ve diğer insanlar hakkında “içsel çalışan modeller” geliştirirler. Bu modelin bir boyutu, bireyin kendisini ne kadar değerli gördüğüne ilişkin algılarını; diğer boyutu ise, bireyin ihtiyacı olduğunda yakın çevresindeki insanlardan ne oranda yardım isteyebileceğini ve bu kişilerin güven vericiliğine ilişkin değerlendirmelerini içermektedir. İçsel çalışan modeller ilerleyen yaşlarda kişinin bağlanma stilinde bir süreklilik mekanizması sağlamakta ve onların ilişkileri tanımlamasında önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Bu çalışmada, bağlanma stilleri kapsamında Bartholomew ve Horowitz (1991)’in dört kategorili bağlanma stilleri kullanılmıştır. *Güvenli bağlanma*, bireyin kendisini sevmeye değer olarak algılaması, diğer insanların duyarlı ve güvenilir olduklarına inanması şeklinde tanımlanırken; *saplantılı bağlanma* bireyin kendisini sevmeye değer görmemesi, diğer insanların duyarlı ve güvenilir olacaklarına inanması şeklinde tanımlanmaktadır. Öte yandan, *kayıtsız bağlanma stiline* sahip bireyler kendilerini sevmeye değer olarak algılamakta ve diğer insanların

güvenilmez ve reddedici olduklarına inanmakta, *korkulu bağlanma stiline* sahip bireyler ise kendilerini sevmeye değer görmemekte ve diğer insanların güvenilmez olduklarına inanmaktadırlar.

Çalışmada bağlanma stilleri tarafından etkilendiği öne sürülen güven kavramına ilişkin alan yazınında pek çok tanım bulunmaktadır. Mayer, Davis ve Schoorman'a (1995) göre güven; bir kişinin diğer bir kişinin davranışlarına iyi niyet atfetme ve ona yönelik olumlu bir beklentiye sahip olmasıdır. McAllister (1995) ise güveni, bir kişinin başka bir kişinin sözlerinden, davranışlarından ve kararlarından emin olması ve bunlara göre hareket etme istekliliği olarak tanımlamıştır. McAllister (1995) güveni bilişsel ve duygusal güven olmak üzere iki ayrı boyutta incelemiştir. Bilişsel güven, bir kişinin güvenilirliği, doğruluğu, dürüstlüğü, bağlılığı, teknik yetkinliği ve yükümlülüklerini yerine getirme konusunda diğer kişilerin düşüncelerini ifade etmektedir. Bilişsel güvenin temelinde, rasyonel ve gözlemlenebilir davranışlar yer almaktadır. Duygusal güven ise, kişilere gösterilen özen ve ilgi sonucunda gelişen duygusal bağın yansıttığı güçlü ve özel bir ilişkiyi anlatmaktadır (McAllister, 1995).

Daha önce de ifade edildiği gibi çalışmanın amacı öğretmenlerin sahip oldukları güvenli, saplantılı, kaygısız ve korkulu bağlanma stilleri ile yöneticilerine karşı duydukları bilişsel ve duygusal güven arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Önceki çalışmalar ışığında başkalarına ilişkin olumlu beklentilere sahip olan güvenli ve saplantılı bağlanma stiline sahip olan öğretmenlerin okul yöneticilerine karşı duygusal ve bilişsel güven duyma eğilimlerinin daha fazla olacağı düşünülmektedir. Diğer taraftan başkalarına ilişkin olumsuz beklentilere sahip olan kaygısız ve korkulu bağlanma stiline sahip öğretmenlerin ise okul yöneticilerine karşı duygusal ve bilişsel güven duyma eğilimlerinin daha düşük olacağı varsayılmaktadır.

Çalışmaya konu olan veriler, Ankara'da dört özel ilk ve ortaokul kademesinde tam zamanlı görev yapmakta olan 317 öğretmenden elde edilmiştir. Yapılan hiyerarşik regresyon analizi sonucunda güvenli bağlanma ve saplantılı bağlanma stiline sahip öğretmenlerin yöneticilerine duygusal olarak güven duydukları tespit edilmiştir. Diğer taraftan dört bağlanma stiline de öğretmenlerin yöneticilerine duydukları bilişsel güven üzerinde etkisine rastlanmamıştır.

Çalışmada elde edilen bulgular alan yazınındaki bazı çalışmalarla paralellik göstermekle birlikte (Frazier et. al, 2014; Miller ve Noirot, 1999; Simpson, 1990) bağlanma stillerinin okul yöneticisine duyulan duygusal güven üzerinde daha etkili olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu bulgu bize okul yöneticisine duyulan bilişsel güveni etkileyen bir takım başka değişkenlerin olabileceğini düşündürmektedir. Elde edilen sonuçlar hem teorik hem de pratik açıdan önemli katkılar sağlamaktadır. Alan yazınında daha önce üzerinde çok fazla durulmamış olan bağlanma stilleri ve güven arasındaki ilişkiler öğretmen ve okul yöneticisi kapsamında incelenmiştir. Bu anlamda eğitim kurumlarının uzun dönemli başarısına katkıda bulunmak amacıyla okul yöneticilerinin, öğretmenlerin güven algıları üzerinde bağlanma stillerinin etkili olduğunun farkında olmaları gerekmektedir. Bu kapsamda, mevcut öğretmenlerin bağlanma stillerinin güvenli bağlanmaya yönelik olarak geliştirilmesine ilişkin okul yönetimi tarafından eğitim ve danışmanlık hizmetleri sunulması önerilmektedir. Öte yandan, okul yöneticilerine öğretmenlerin işe alım aşamalarında bağlanma stillerinin de bir işe alım aracı olarak kullanılabilmesi (Schusterschitz, Geser, Nöhammer ve Stummer, 2011; Tziner, Ben-David, Oren ve Sharoni, 2014) tavsiye edilmektedir.

Citation Information

Karapınar, P. B. (2015). Developing trust in principal: Its relationship with attachment styles. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education [Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi]*, 30(3), 73-86.