Building trust in elementary schools:
the impact of home school community collaboration

Esther Ho Sui Chu
Chinese University of Hong Kong,
Hong Kong

There is a general consensus among contemporary social scientists that social trust is important(Alexander, 2003; Coleman, 1990; Delhey & Newton, 2003; Huang, 2003; Putnam, 1993). In thecontext of education, trust was seen as a goal and a tool for school improvement (Meier, 2002; Brown, 1998; Schneider & Bryk, 2002). This paper examines teachers' trust in schools and the factors related to their level of trust. Results of factor analysis show that 19 items measuring teachers' trust can be categorized into four factors of relational trust: "teachers trust on students"; "parents trust on teachers"; "teachers trust on parent" and "teachers trust on parental involvement". Results from descriptive analysis indicated that teachers in general hold a positive attitude toward the students and their parents, and majority of teachers are also quite positive towards parents' support and the mutual respect between teacher and parents in Hong Kong. Results from the hierarchical regression analysis suggested that parent social background factors (SES), but not teachers' background factors, has the strongest association with teachers' level of trust. The results suggested that upper-class students are more likely to have higher level of trust on student, trust on parent and trust on parental involvement. However, teachers are more likely work harder to establish trust relationship with parents from working class students. Moreover, the seven types of home-school-community collaboration appears to have different contribution to the dimensions of relational trust in Hong Kong elementary schools even after background factors have taken into account.

Literature Review

The interest in trust covers sociology, political science, economics, psychology, and anthropology (Alexander, 2003; Coleman, 1988, 1990, 1994; Delhey & Newton, 2003; Huang, 2003; Putnam, 1993). In the context of education, trust was seen as a goal and a tool for school improvement (Meier, 2002; Brown, 1998; Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Under the current reform of decentralization, privatization, voucher, and accountability, researchers and educator are interested to study how to make schools "trustworthy" for students, parents and teachers to remain in a school, to enhance school climate, and to improve students' learning and school effectiveness.

Correspondence concerning this article should be adressed to Esther Ho Sui Chu, e-mail: estherho@cuhk.edu.hk

If trust is indeed as important as this, then the following three questions will be worthy to explore: First, what is the nature of trust in schooling? Second, where does it come from? Third, what does trust do for schooling?

What is the Nature of Trust?

Trust was seen as part of a broader syndrome of personality characteristics that include optimism, a belief in cooperation, and confidence that individuals can resolve their differences and live a satisfactory social life together (Newton, 2004). Distrusters are pessimistic and cynical about the possibilities for social and political cooperation and change (Uslaner, 1999). So, trust appears to be a complex quality of social capital manifest at individual and institutional level (Alexander, 2003; Huang, 2003; Meier, 2002, Moye, Henkin.& Egley2005).

At the individual level, trust is defined as "one's willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that this other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable and competent (Tschannen-Morgan, 2004). At the institutional level, trust is associated with organizations characteristics such as quality of communication and cooperation. Trust between individuals or between groups within organization is significant for the long-term stability of the organization and the well being of its members (Moye, Henkin & Egley, 2005; Uslaner, 1999).

Where does Trust come from?

From a social-psychological perspective, social trust is a core "personality trait of individuals". It is learned in early childhood, and tends to persist in later life, changing only slowly as a result of experience (e.g. Erikson 1950). An alternative perspective suggested that social trust is the product of adult experiences. Those who have been treated kindly and generously by life are more likely to trust than those who suffer from poverty, unemployment, and discrimination.

The second major theory towards trust is to see it as a property of society rather than individuals. Trust is not so much a core personality trait of individuals, but individuals participate in, contribute to, or benefit from a trusting practices or cultures, or from social and political institutions that encourage the development of trusting attitudes and behavior. Putnam (2000) argued that a society that is well founded upon a large and varied range of voluntary activities in associations and organizations is likely to generate high levels of social trust. In sum, two dimensions of factors are related to the extent of trust.

One dimension is related to the individual or institutional factors. Another dimension is related to the childhood or adult experience.

Relationship between home school community collaboration and relational trust in schools

Trust between parent and teacher is a vital element in successful home school community collaboration. In fact, the relationship between trust and home school community collaboration could be reciprocal. Adam and Christenson (2000) examined the relationship of family school relationship and trust in elementary and secondary grades in a large Midwestern metropolitan area in the United States with a sample of 1234 parents and 209 teachers. They found that home school communication was identified to be the primary contributor to enhance trust in schools. And trust also positively related to three school performance – students' attendance, their GPA and their credits earned per year.

Bryk & Schneider (2002) conducted another research on the Chicago school reform. The study used a mixed method to collect qualitative and quantitative data. The field information from case studies in 12 different elementary school communities since 1990 for three years was triangulated with quantitative data of 1991-1994-1997 longitudinal survey. Results from the in-depth interviews with principals, teachers, parents, and community leaders suggested that relationship trust among different stakeholders was the basic element for determining whether a school community made good use of their newfound authority and resources. The insight of the importance of "relational trust" was tested by a series of longitudinal survey. Results from the multilevel analysis indicated that there is significant variation of the extent of "trust" between teachers-parents, teachers-teachers and teachers-principals among Chicago elementary schools. More important is that relational trust is significantly related to school improvement. The study demonstrated that the greater the trust in students and parents, the higher the level of school achievement in reading and mathematics, even when the impact of socioeconomic status was held constant. In sum, elementary school communities characterized by high relational trust were much more likely to demonstrate marked improvements in academic productivity across the early to mid 1990s' in Chicago (Bryk & Schneider, 2002: pp123)

Research Problems

In this study, teachers' trust was conceptualized as a multifaceted constructs manifest in four aspects: trust on students, trust on parental support, trust on mutual respect with parents, and trust on parents. Two major questions will be addressed:

1. What is the nature of trust perceived by teachers? To what extent different dimensions of trust varied among schools?
2. Where do different dimensions of trust come from? To what extent teacher background, parent social background, and home school community collaboration practices related to different dimensions of trust?

Method

The data is from a large study of parental involvement in children's learning. Teacher questionnaires were administered to 94 schools in February 2004. A total of 2879 teachers from 94 schools returned the teacher questionnaires. On average, there were about 35 teachers returned questionnaires per school (see Table 1, Appendix).

Operationalization of Home school community collaboration

Home school collaboration is a multidimensional construct. The present study employs a new conceptual framework that is synthesized from the conceptual work of the past theoretical and empirical work (Epstein, 1990; Ho, 1998; Ho & Willms, 1996; Shen *et. al.*, 1994) for classifying different forms of parent involvement. In this new framework, there are seven types of parent involvement (See Figure 1). Teachers were asked how often parents in their school participate in the seven types of parent activities. A four-point Likert response set from often (coded as 3) to never (coded as 0) was used.

Seven Types of Parental Involvement

Operationalization of Trust

Nineteen items were designed to measure the extent of relational trust between teacher-parent and teacher-student. The trust instrument used in the present study is developed based on the items constructed by Bryk and Schneider (2002) and their findings of case studies in three US primary schools. Teachers were asked to what extent they agree with 20 items related to trust on students, parents and home school relationship. A four-point Likert response set from strongly agree (coded as 4) to strongly disagreed (coded as 1) was used. The items are localized according to Hong Kong context and modified according to the results of a trial study of about 100 teachers. One item was deleted in the final instrument for is low reliability. Therefore, the following 19 items were kept in the final instrument for measuring teachers trust:

Dimensionality and Reliability of the measures of Trust in the survey instrument

A principal component analysis with Varimax rotation was conducted to examine the factor loadings of 19 relational trust items. The results of factor analysis show that these items

can be categorized into four factors of relational trust. Factor loadings and reliability coefficients are summarized in Table 2 (Appendix).

Factor 1 is composed of 6 items to measure the extent to which: students can be counted on to do their work in school, students are caring toward one another, the learning environment here is orderly and serious, students respect others who get good grades, parents encourage good habits of students, and teachers trust their students. This factor is labelled as "teachers trust students". Factor 2 consists of 6 items: parents respect teachers, teachers feel good about parents' support for their work, parents in this school have confidence in the expertise of the teachers, teachers and parents think of each others as partners in educating children, parents do their best to help their children learn, and parents are reliable in their commitments. This factor is labelled as "parents trust teachers". Factor 3 is labelled as "teachers trust parents", including: teachers respect parents, talking with parents helps teachers understand their students better, staff work hard to build trusting relationships with parents, and teachers have frequent contact with parents. Factor 4 is composed of 3 items: parental involvement supports learning, community involvement facilitates learning, and teachers trust the parents. It is labeled as "teachers trust on parental involvement". Four factors accounted for 65.87% of variance.

These four constructs were standardized at the teacher level; therefore, they had a mean of zero and a standard deviation of 1. The Cronbach's alphas of the four types of relational trust are between .742 and .879, indicating a satisfactory internal consistency of these constructs (see Table 2, Appendix).

Figure 1 Seven Types of Parental Involvement

Types of Involvement	Forms of Involvement
Parenting	-assisting families with parenting skills and understanding child and adolescent development.
Learning at home	-helping and monitoring students' learning activities at home.
Connecting	-social activities for initiating connections between the school and parents, and among parents themselves.
Communicating	-mutual contact between teachers and parents.
Volunteering	-parents helping out in school activities as volunteers.
Decision making	parental participation in decision-making at different levels of the school governance hierarchy.
Community collaboration	-matching community resources for children's learning and matching business and community programs with school goals and parental interest.

1. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work
2. Students are caring toward one another
3. Students here are orderly and serious
4. Students respect others who get good grades
5. Students are encouraged to have good habits here
6. Teachers in this school trust their students
7. Parents in this school respect teachers
8. Teachers in this school feel good about parents' support for their work
9. Parents in this school have confidence in the expertise of the teachers
10. Teachers and parents in this school think of each others as partners in educating children
11. Parents in this school do their best to help their children learn
12. Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments
13. Teachers in this school respect parents
14. Talking with parents in this school helps teachers understand their students better
15. Staff in this school work hard to build trusting relationships with parents
16. Teachers in this school have frequent contact with parents
17. Parental involvement supports learning here
18. Community involvement facilitates learning here
19. Teachers in this school trust the parents

Results and Discussion

Relational Trust within School

Trust is an important factor in maintaining a harmonious relationship between students, parents, and teachers. Teachers' perception of relational trust within school was assessed and the results are shown in Table 3. Overall, the relational trust between parent and teachers is pretty high. The trust between teachers and student are relatively lower (see Table 3, Appendix).

More than 90% of teachers agreed that talking with parents helps teachers increase understanding with students, respecting parents, having frequent contact with parents, and trusting students were common in their schools and staff in their school work hard to build trusting relationship with parents. The majority also showed agreement towards the notions of students respect others who get good grades (87.1%), parents in this school respect teachers (83.8%), teachers and parents in this school think of each others as partners in educating children (82.5%), parents in this school have confidence in the expertise of the teachers (82.6%), community involvement facilitates learning here (81.7%), teachers in this school feel good about parents' support for their work (80.8%), and teachers in this school trust the parents (81.7%). The trust between teachers and student are relatively lower. Fewer teachers agreed on the notions that students can be counted on to do their work (60.3%) and parents do their best to help their children to learn (70.6%).

Relational Trust among Schools

The variation between and within schools for the four types of relational trust within school is shown in Table 4. 'Teachers trust students' varies substantially among schools (25.2%). The between-school variations in the two types of relational trust between teachers and parents are relatively small (12.4% for parents trust teachers and 3.3% for teachers trust in parents). Small variation was also found in 'teacher trust on parental involvement.(8.9%).

These findings suggest that we can identify schools with particularly high or low level of teachers' trust in students. However, we cannot distinguish schools with particular high level of mutual trust between teachers and parents. There is also small variation in schools' trust on parental involvement (see Table 4, Appendix).

Factors related to Teachers' Perception of Relational Trust in School
Correlation background factors and trust

Results in Table 5 (Appendix) indicated that teacher background and parent background have stronger relationship with teachers' trust in student than with the three dimensions of trust on parents.

Female teachers tend to have less trust on student but they are more likely to try to build trust relationship with parents than the male teaches. Teachers teaching in upper grade levels tend to have stronger trust on students but they are less likely to trust on parental support on their children's learning. Teachers with longer teaching experience have weaker trust on students but they tend to pay more effort in building trust with parents. Teachers with higher educational level tend to be more trust on students.

Teachers who are responsible for the home school collaboration activities are more likely to have stronger trust on students. Teachers who are parents by themselves are more likely to work hard to build trust with parents in their school.

Of the three parent's social background factors, socio-economic status appears to have the strongest relationship with teachers' level of trust. Teachers who are serving more immigrant students or students from single parent families are more likely to have less trust on the students and they also perceived that parents are less likely to provide support to their children's learning. Teachers serving students from higher social economic status are more likely to have stronger trust on the students and parents, and they also tend to have stronger belief on the contribution of parental involvement in children's education (see Table 5, Appendix).

<u>Correlation of home school community collaboration on relational trust</u>

Of the four dimensions of trust, the practices of the seven types of home school community collaboration have the strongest relationship with teachers' trust on parents.

Teachers' trust on students is positively related to parenting, learning at home, decision making and community collaboration. Parents support to teachers is positively related to volunteering and decision making. Teachers' effort to build trust with parents is positively related to communicating, parenting, and volunteering (see Table 6, Appendix).

The Relative Contribution of Background Factors and Home School Community Collaboration Practices on Building of Relational Trust in School

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to test the effect of teachers' background, parent background, and the various practices of home school community collaboration practices on relational trust in school. The teacher background factors included gender, grade level, teaching experience, educational levels of teacher respondents, teachers' role in organizing home-school collaboration activities, and whether they are parents. Parent social background of the class in which teacher mainly teaching included: the percentage of immigrant students and single-parent family in the class, and SES of students. All the six teacher background and three parent background were first controlled in Block 1 of the model, followed by seven types of home school community collaboration reported by teachers were entered in Block 2. Two sets regression analysis were conducted for each type of relational trust and the results are summarized in Table 7, Appendix.

The extent of 'teachers' trust in students' is more related to background factors of teachers and the classroom, followed by seven types of parental involvement on trust on parents' support and trust on students (ΔR^2 = 8.6% and ΔR^2 = 10.6% respectively, $p > .05$). Teachers with more teaching experience tends to have less trust on students, but when they are teaching in class with less immigrant students and more from higher SES, teachers tend to have higher level of trust on their students.. Of the seven forms of home school collaboration, parental involvement in 'learning at home' and 'community collaboration' enhance significantly teachers' level of trust on students.

The extent of teacher's perception of 'parental trust on teachers' is related to the gender of teacher, socio-economic status of the parents and parental involvement in 'communicating' and 'volunteering'. (ΔR^2 = 6.3% for background factors and ΔR^2 = 9.3% for home school collaboration factors, $p > .05$).Female teachers tend to have lower level of trust on parental support and trust on teachers' and it is more likely for teachers to trust on parental support when the parents are from higher SES. It is interesting to find the negative association of communicating with parents trust in teachers. One possible reason is that, in the Asian culture of Hong Kong, the nature of home-school contact is still problem oriented. Teachers might believe that when parent trust teachers, they are less likely to be contacted by parents. Higher levels of volunteering enhance teachers' trust on parental support on schools.

The level of teachers' trust on parents and teachers effort on building trust are more influenced by the types of parental involvement than the background factors. Results show that each block of variables imposes a significant effect on the level of teachers respect on parents and teachers' belief on the 'effort to build trust with parents' and 'teachers' trust on parents' when two blocks of variables were entered into the model separately (ΔR^2 = .2.6%, $p < .05$ for background factors; ΔR^2 = 12.4%, $p < .001$ for teachers' respect on parents; ΔR^2 =2.3%, $p < .01$ and ΔR^2 = 15.0%, $p < .001$ on trust of parental involvement).

To conclude, various types of home school collaboration are influential on relational trust between teachers and parents, especially on teachers' trust on parents and teachers effort on building trust with parents (see Table 7, Appendix).

Conclusions

This paper examines teachers' trust in schools and the factors related to the level of trust. First, I clarify the concept of trust and examine the multidimensionality of teachers' trust in the Hong Kong primary schools. Results of factor analysis show that 19 items measuring teachers' trust level can be categorized into four factors of relational trust: "trust on students"; "parent trust teacher"; "teacher trust parent" and "teacher trust on parental involvement". Four factors accounted for 65.87% of variance. The Cronbach's alphas of the five types of relational trust are between .742 and .879, indicating a satisfactory internal consistency of these constructs.

In examining the factors related to the level of trust, factors including teacher background and classroom social background, teachers' view on parents, their acceptance of parental empowerment school management, and the actual practice of various forms of parental involvement were included in the analysis for predicting relational trust perceived by teachers. Result findings indicate that teachers in general hold a positive attitude toward the students and their parents, and majority of teachers are also quite positive towards parents' support and the mutual respect between teacher and parents.

Factors including teacher background and classroom social background, and the actual practice of various forms of home school community collaboration were included in the analysis for predicting relational trust perceived by teachers. Results of descriptive analysis indicate that teachers in general hold a positive attitude toward the students and their parents. Over 90% of teacher attempt to work hard on building trust with parents and majority of teachers are also quite positive towards parents' support.

Results from the final model for the hierarchical regression analysis suggested that the six teachers' background factors do not have strong relationship with teachers' level of trust. Of the three parent social background factors, social-economic status (SES) of parents appears to have the strongest association with teachers' level of trust. The results suggested that upper-class students are more likely to have higher level of trust in student, trust in parent support and trust in parents and community. However, teachers are more likely work harder to establish trust relationship with parents from working class students.

The seven types of home school community collaboration have the stronger relationship with teachers' trust in parents and community. Teachers reporting more parental involvement in parenting, learning at home, connecting, communicating, and community collaboration tend to have higher level of trust on parents and community.

Teachers reporting higher level of parental involvement in learning at home and community collaboration are more likely to have higher level of trust in students. Teachers' level of trust in parent support appears to be enhanced by higher level of parental volunteering but lower level of communicating. Teachers reporting higher level of parental involvement in parenting and decision making also have significant association with their effort in building trust with parents. Overall, the seven types of home-school-community collaboration appears to have significant contribution to the level of relational trust between students, teachers and parents in Hong Kong elementary schools.

Several limitations are noteworthy. First, the explaining power of the final model is not very strong. Many other factors such as teachers' pervious experience with parents and schools' climate of openness towards parents and community should be included in further studies. This study focus on the perception of teachers as measure of trust, perception of other stakeholders including principals, parents and students are also important in further studies.

References

Adam, K.S. and Christenson, S.L. (2000) Trust and the Family–School Relationship Examination of Parent–Teacher Differences in Elementary and Secondary Grades. *Journal of School Psychology.* 38(5): 477-497

Alexander, M (2003) *Social capital and trust:* An application to analyzing networks of cooperation.

Brown, D. J. (1998) *Schools with heart: Voluntarism and public education.* USA: Westview Press

Bryk, A..S. & Schneider, B (2002) *Trust in Schools: A Core Resource fro Improvement.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation

Coleman, J. S. (1988) "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology 94 (supplement):* 95-120.

Coleman, J. S. (1990) *Foundations of Social Theory.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Coleman, J.S. (1994) Family, school, and social capital. In T. Husen & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education* (2nd ed., pp.2272-2274). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Delhey, J. & Newton, K (2003) Who trusts? The origins of social trust in seven nations., *European Societies* 5(2): 93-137.

Epstein, J. L. (1990) School and family connections: Theory, research and implications for integrating sociologies of education and family. In D. G. Unger, & M. B. Sussman (Eds.), *Family in community settings: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 99-126). New York: Haworth Press.

Erikson, E.H. (1950) *Childhood and Society,* New York: Norton.

Ho, S.C. (1998). *Parental involvement and parental investment in children's education: The contribution of cultural and social capital.* A paper presented at the International Conference on Restructuring the Knowledge Base of Education in Asia, Hong Kong.

Ho, S. C., & Willms, J. D. (1996) The effect of parental involvement on the achievement of eighth grade students. *Sociology of Education, 69*(2), 126-141.

Huang, F (2003) Social Trust, Cooperation and Human capital. Retrieved from the website: http://www.ssc.upenn.edu/~fali/hcsc815.pdf on April 16 2007

Meier, D (2002) *In Schools We Trust.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Moye, M.J., Henkin, A.B.& Egley, R. J. (2005) Teacher-principal relationships" Exploring linkages between empowerment and interpersonal trust. *Journal of Educational Administration.* 43(3):260

Newton, K (2004) Social trust: Individual and cross-national approaches *Portuguese Journal of Social Science* 3(10): 15-35.

Putman, R. D. (1993) (with R. Leonardi and R. Y. Naetti). *Making Democracy Work,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press,

Putnam, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American Community,* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Shen, S. M., Pang, I. W., Tsoi, S. Y. S., Yip, P. S. F., & Yung, K. K. (1994) *Home school co-operation research report.* Hong Kong: The Government Printer.

Tschannen-Moran, M (2004) Trust Matters: Leadership for Successful Schools. Jossey_Bass : A Wiley Imprint.

Uslaner, E.M. (1999) Democracy and social capital, in Warren, M. (ed.) *Democracy and Trust.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 121-150

Appendix

Table 1. Characteristics of teacher respondents

	Percentage of Teachers	Average	
		Mean	(S.D.)
Teacher Background			
Gender			
Male	21.3%		
Female	78.7%		
Grade Level of homeroom teachers			
Grade 1	8.3%		
Grade 2	8.2%		
Grade 3	8.5%		
Grade 4	9.9%		
Grade 5	10.8%		
Grade 6	10.4%		
Non homeroom teachers	43.9%		
Teaching Experience		14.61	(0.21)
Education Levels			
Ph D	10.7%		
Master	2.7%		
Bachelor	18.3%		
Associate Degree	61.7%		
High Diploma/Certificate	6.5%		
Teacher has Responsible for HSC	24.2%		
Teacher is parent	35.4%		
Parent Background			
Percentage of immigrant students in class		2.70	(5.01)
Percentage of single parents in class		2.39	(3.18)
Socio-economic status (SES) of class			
Upper class	0.6%		
Upper-middle class	14.1%		
Middle class	36.2%		
Lower-middle class	43.2%		
Lower class	5.9%		

Table 2. Dimensionality of relational trust

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Factor 1: Teachers trust students				
1. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work	**.800**	.243	.037	.210
2. Students are caring toward one another	**.759**	.161	.231	.179
3. Students here are orderly and serious	**.678**	.335	.165	.029
4. Students respect others who get good grades	**.646**	.150	.312	.101
5. Students are encouraged to have good habits here	**.613**	.417	.126	.276
6. Teachers in this school trust their students	**.536**	.217	.402	.273
Factor 2: Parents trust teachers				
7. Parents in this school respect teachers	.203	**.725**	.317	.072
8. Teachers in this school feel good about parents' support for their work	.347	**.718**	.213	.222
9. Parents in this school have confidence in the expertise of the teachers	.185	**.678**	.358	.072
10. Teachers and parents in this school think of each others as partners in educating children	.370	**.617**	.252	.216
11. Parents in this school do their best to help their children learn	.551	**.595**	.001	.200
12. Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments	.250	**.595**	.056	.502
Factor 3: Teachers trust parents				
13. Teachers in this school respect parents	.185	.254	**.792**	.085
14. Talking with parents in this school helps teachers understand their students better	.140	.264	**.776**	.071
15. Staff in this school work hard to build trusting relationships with parents	.239	.282	**.719**	.208
16. Teachers in this school have frequent contact with parents	.145	-.042	**.560**	.481
Factor 4: Teachers trust on parental involvement				
17. Parental involvement supports learning here	.226	.180	.100	**.799**
18. Community involvement facilitates learning here	.104	.152	.166	**.759**
19. Teachers in this school trust the parents	.337	.451	.242	**.506**
Eigen value	3.762	3.504	2.853	2.394
Total Variance Explained (%)	19.802	38.246	53.262	65.865
Reliability (Alpha)	.867	.879	.813	.742

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of relational trust

	Mean	S.D.	% Agree
Teachers trust students			
1. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work	3.64	0.95	60.3
2. Students are caring toward one another	4.05	0.87	77.6
3. The learning environment here is orderly and serious	4.11	0.96	78.4
4. Students respect others who get good grades	4.38	0.87	87.1
5. Parents in this school encourage good habits of students	4.11	0.92	77.7
6. Teachers in this school trust their students	4.14	0.82	81.7
Parents trust teachers			
7. Parents in this school respect teachers	4.27	0.9	83.8
8. Teachers in this school feel good about parents' support for their work	4.15	0.87	80.8
9. Parents in this school have confidence in the expertise of the teachers	4.17	0.82	82.6
10. Teachers and parents in this school think of each others as partners in educating children	4.21	0.9	82.5
11. Parents in this school do their best to help their children learn	3.92	0.96	70.6
12. Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments	4.09	0.88	78.7
Teachers trust parents			
13. Teachers in this school respect parents	4.76	0.75	**96.1**
14. Talking with parents in this school helps teachers understand their students better	4.84	0.8	**95.9**
15. Staff in this school work hard to build trusting relationships with parents	4.51	0.78	**92.1**
16. Teachers in this school trust the parents	4.38	0.77	**90.3**
Teachers trust on parental involvement			
17. Parental involvement supports learning here	4.07	0.94	75.7
18. Community involvement facilitates learning here	4.16	0.86	81.7
19. Teachers in this school have frequent contact with parents	4.64	0.78	93.9

Table 4. Percentage variation of relational trust of teachers between and within schools

	Percentage of Variance between school	Percentage of Variance within school
Teachers trust students	25.2	74.8
Parents trust teachers	12.4	87.6
Teachers trust on parents	3.3	96.7
Teachers trust on parental involvement	8.9	91.1

Table 5. Correlation between background factors and relational trust

Background factors	Teacher trust student		Parent trust teacher		Teacher trust parent		Trust in parental involvement	
Teacher background								
female teacher	-0.064	*	-0.050		0.093	**	-0.016	
grade	0.063	*	-0.078	**	0.013		-0.008	
teaching experience	-0.057	*	0.024		0.082	**	0.002	
education level	0.061	*	-0.020		-0.044		0.031	
responsible to organize HSC	0.082	**	0.046		-0.006		0.045	
As parent	0.003		0.024		0.065	*	0.008	
Student Background								
immigrant student in class	-0.158	***	-0.078	*	-0.034		-0.066	
single parent family in class	-0.104	**	-0.034		0.017		0.036	
SES	0.207	***	0.206	***	-0.046		0.081	*

Table 6. Correlation between home school collaboration and relational trust

Seven types of parental involvement	Teacher trust student		Parent trust teacher		Teacher trust parent		Trust in parental involvement	
Parenting	0.082	**	0.043		0.186	***	0.114	***
learning at home	0.125	***	-0.008		0.020		0.110	***
connecting	-0.007		0.032		0.022		0.123	***
communicating	0.053		-0.039		0.277	***	0.108	***
volunteering	0.042		0.158	***	0.058	*	0.088	**
decision making	0.142	***	0.128	***	0.020		0.097	**
community collaboration	0.109	***	0.047		-0.018		0.243	***

Table 7 Hierarchical Regression Analyses on four types of relational trust within school

	Trust in student		Parent trust teacher		Teacher trust parent		Trust in parental involvement	
	Std. Coef (Beta)		*Std. Coef (Beta)*		*Std. Coef (Beta)*		*Std. Coef (Beta)*	
Final Model								
Teacher Background								
female teacher	-0.073		-0.081		0.038		-0.049	
grade of homeroom	-0.012		-0.048		0.000		-0.026	
teaching experience	-0.099	*	0.069		0.078		0.012	
education level	0.043		0.045		-0.005		-0.006	
responsible to organize HSC	0.064		-0.038		-0.043		0.012	
as parent	0.059		-0.073		-0.006		-0.025	
Parent Background								
immigrant student in class	-0.093	*	-0.015		-0.008		0.007	
single parent family in class	-0.042		0.003		0.041		0.050	
SES	0.157	***	0.204		-0.110	*	0.083	*
Home school collaboration								
parenting	0.047		-0.020		0.150	***	0.111	**
learning at home	0.110	**	0.017		0.024		0.098	*
connecting	-0.013		0.061		0.033		0.112	**
communicating	0.008		-0.110	**	0.275		0.116	**
volunteering	0.016		0.111	**	0.056		0.067	
decision making	0.048		0.051		0.086	*	0.072	
community collaboration	0.079	*	0.008		-0.003		0.299	***
Block 1: Background Factors								
R^2 change	8.6%***		6.3%***		2.6%		2.3%	
Block 2: Teachers' Practice of PI								
R^2 change	10.6%***		9.3%***		12.4%***		15.0%***	