University of Alberta

Musings from a Principal's Office:

What Principals Need to Know About Fostering Effective Relationships in Schools

by

Sherri MacDowall

A capping exercise submitted to the Faculty of Education

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Education

In

Educational Administration and Leadership

Faculty of Education

Edmonton, Alberta

August 12, 2022

Abstract

Fostering effective relationships in school can support the development of staff and students. The purpose of this literature review is to share with principals the necessity of fostering effective relationships in their schools, what role trust plays in the construction and maintenance of relationships and what can be done when a relationship suffers in some way. The literature indicates the character traits of benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness (Tschannen-Moran, 1998, p. 9) are all beneficial to leaders whose desire it is to build trusting relationships in their organizations. Principals are human and therefore will make mistakes. The literature suggests the existence of stronger relationships between leaders and followers will more likely result in mistakes being forgiven. In the event there is a breach in trust, the literature also reviews steps to be taken in making amends; these are (a) admit to the mistake and (b) apologize.

Keywords: relationships, trust, human capital, social capital, decisional capital, principal, leader

Contents

Musings From a Principal's Office: What Principals Need to Know About Fostering Effective Relationships in Schools……………………………………………………………………….. 4

Author Background……………………………………………………………………………5

The Importance of Fostering Effective Relationships……………………………………... 8

Human and Social Capital……………………………………………………………………………. 9

Decisional Capital……………………………………………………………………………14

What Does it Take to Foster Effective Relationships?... 15

Changing Beliefs: Teaching is More Than Delivering Curriculum…………………..… 16

Professional Development Could Support Fostering Effective Relationships………….. 21

Effects on an Organization When Trust is Broken and the Relationship is Damaged……… 23

Can Trust be Repaired?..24

Intentionality……………………………………………………………………………..26

Severity………………………………………………………………………………….. 27

Synthesis…………………………………………………………………………………….. 28

References………………………………………………………………………………………..32

Musings From a Principal's Office:

What Principals Need to Know About Fostering Effective Relationships in Schools

In Alberta, each of the quality standards set out by the province: the Teaching Quality Standard (TQS), the Leadership Quality Standard (LQS), and the Superintendent Leadership Quality Standard (SLQS), includes "Fostering effective relationships" (FER) as the first competency for educators and leaders. Many in the field of education have agreed relationships are the bedrock to success in schools (Berkovich, 2018; Bukko et al., 2018; Hollingworth et al., 2018; Leithwood et al., 2020; Tschannen-Moran, in-press; Wieczorek & Manard, 2018). Without the relationship in place, the ability to be an effective principal is greatly diminished. Berscheid (1999) indicated "a relationship…does not reside in the individual" (p. 261) meaning, relationships are never one sided and therefore we must understand how relationships are developed and nurtured to grow them. She goes on to say

> . . . relationships with other humans are both the foundation and the theme of the human condition: We are born into relationships, we live our lives in relationships with others, and when we die, the effects of our relationships survive in the lives of the living, reverberating throughout the tissue of their relationships. (p. 261)

New principals may feel a need to lead in isolation in order to prove themselves to their followers. What these principals leave in their wake is a sense of isolation, and often resentment.

In my career, I witnessed what happened to a principal who tried to lead alone. They isolated themselves from their stakeholders and struggled to gain any traction in their school community. What followed was resentment from staff, parents and students and the eventual departure of the principal. Based on this I believe principals must rely on others to support themselves and those they serve to make improvements and achieve success. LQS competency

one, FER, states "A leader builds positive working relationships with members of the school community and local community" (Alberta Government, 2020, p. 3). A list of indicators of what it might look like to achieve this competency follows the descriptor. However, lacking are the character traits and *how tos* understandings a leader should possess and be able to do in order to foster the relationships expected. The purpose of this literature review is to explore the importance of building effective relationships within a school setting. Attention is also paid to how leaders can build effective relationships. Finally, the question of what happens if effective relationships are absent or become damaged is explored.

Author Background

When I entered the teaching profession over 20 years ago, I never aspired to become a principal. I did not come from a long line of teachers, but it was clear from an early age I would likely end up in this profession. I coerced my brother and our neighbourhood friends to sit in rows as though they were in school while I conducted class from the front of the room. When we tired of playing school, I would organize other games to entertain us. Thus, my love of leadership developed at an early age. I did not recognize at the time I gravitated to leadership. I enjoyed having people follow me. Fast forward many years where I did find myself, officially, in a leadership role in a small, rural K-12 school in Northern Alberta. My exploration of fostering effective relationships has helped me better understand how to lead, especially in a time of uncertainty which the COVID 19 pandemic created.

I have always been comfortable developing relationships in my personal life, but I had not put a lot of thought into how fostering effective relationships beyond the personal into a professional setting would be different, why this action would be important, or what would happen to an organization if relationships were absent or damaged. As I was a newly appointed

principal in the same school where I had been teaching, I felt I would be able to maintain similar relationships with staff members and parents despite my new status as principal. I got along with the staff and could collaborate with others well. I did not see any reason this would change. I was naive to think a change in role would not change the way others perceived me, or accepted my credibility. I simply did not understand “positive relationships between principals and teachers do not happen naturally. . . Open communication is a key factor in any relationship; thus, teachers and principals must stay in constant communication with each other and the families and communities whom they serve” (Rieg, 2008, p. 204). Nor did I truly anticipate the need to view my colleagues' daily actions and their needs through a different lens. I was entirely unaware I would need to reconsider my approach to relationships and how I built them. Developing an understanding of how different personality types require different approaches was one of the biggest learning curves for me. I also realized people relied on me to know my job, anticipate the needs of stakeholders and to be able to follow through with any promises I made. I had little preparation to become a principal and therefore my learning was on the job through trial and error based on my reaction to situations! This approach, reacting to a situation without planning for the outcome first, has taught me this is how mistakes can be made and trust can be broken. This literature review will enlighten new principals about the necessity of fostering effective relationships in their schools, and what role trust plays in the construction and maintenance of relationships and what can be done when a relationship suffers in some way.

As a new principal I made mistakes in the relationship department. I have hurt people’s feelings by being too blunt, I have missed opportunities to lift up people who needed it with recognition and praise for a job well done, I have ignored poor behavior believing it would correct itself, and I have failed to communicate important information in a timely manner. Each

of these failures resulted in a tear in the fabric of our school culture of trust and togetherness. Small cuts can lead to a festering wound if not addressed and healed. In any organization this can lead to distrust, low morale, lack of motivation, sabotage, and self-preservation (Kutsyuruba et al., 2016; Walker & Kutsyuruba, 2016, 2017; Walker et al., 2010). Tschannen-Moran and Gareis (2015) said "[there] is powerful evidence that trust is an essential element of productive schools" (p. 258). Had I been more aware of the constructs surrounding trust I may have avoided some of my missteps and accelerated the growth and progress I wanted to experience. Understanding the role principals play in the day-to-day functioning of a school and developing its many relationships is key to the success of all and building trust is an essential place to start.

This paper does not contain a formula or recipe for building relationships in schools. While schools generally have overarching similarities in their assembly including principal, staff, students, parents and extended community involvement, this is where the generic makeup ends and the complexity of each site, and the relationships within, begins. Humans rely on relationships to not only reach goals, but to also enrich their personal lives. Understanding what makes the humans in your organization tick is a key part to fostering effective relationships. Berscheid (1999) said, ". . . virtually every study of human happiness reveals that satisfying close relationships constitutes the very best thing in life; there is nothing people consider more meaningful and essential to their mental and physical well-being than their close relationships" (p. 260). Keeping Berscheid's comment in mind, principals should learn to foster effective relationships not only to improve their work environments, but also their own personal lives and the lives of those with whom they engage.

The Importance of Fostering Effective Relationships

Rarely do people become teachers if they do not enjoy helping and interacting with others. Kaçaniku et al. (2022) suggested "it can generally be assumed that the motives for choosing a [teaching] career are primarily intrinsically motivated; that is, the interest or joy in having children and young people wanting to work is the dominant factor" (p. 3). For many teachers the motivation to teach is built on fostering positive relationships with their students to enable success (Anderson et al., 2020; Claessens et al., 2017; Ibrahim & Zaatari, 2020; Martin & Collie, 2019; Phillippo et al., 2018; Pianta, 2016; Spilt et al., 2011; Uslu & Gizir, 2017; Wang et al., 2020). However there are teachers who also believe they can be effective in the classroom without focusing on relationships (Garcia-Moya et al., 2019). The latter group mostly consisted of secondary teachers who felt a focus on subject matter was more important. Despite their convictions, Klassen et al. (2012) pointed out "for teachers, the day-to-day effects of coping with poor quality teacher–student relationships may lead to lower levels of engagement and enjoyment and higher levels of anxiety, anger, and emotional exhaustion" (p. 152). Principals who desire relationships to be a focus in their schools need to model what this looks like for all stakeholders in an effort to shift from teaching content only to teaching the whole student. Wieczorek and Manard (2018) said "the school principal is a critical, visible presence who is tasked with responding to the school's and community's needs" (p. 3). Anticipating the needs of all stakeholders is an impossible expectation for one person.

Hyland and Yost (1994), as referenced by Rieg and Marcoline (2008) said, "no one person possesses all of the skills and knowledge necessary to operate the organization effectively, and therefore the challenge is to blend the various strengths" (p. 5). To effectively meet the needs of stakeholders, principals must foster relationships with those stakeholders, and to do this,

principals must establish trust, an essential component of relationships (Tschannen-Moran, in-press). Trust has been defined in a number of ways in the research. Tschannen-Moran's definition seems to be favored among many scholars (Bukko et al., 2021; Hollingworth et.al, 2018; Kutsyuruba et al., 2016; Seijts et al., 2015). She defines trust as "one party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is (a) benevolent, (b) reliable, (c) competent, (d) honest, and (e) open" (Tschannen-Moran, 1998, p. 9). These five facets, as Tschannen-Moran calls them, are the key characteristics principals need to possess to build trust. Seitjts et al. (2015) cite Barton (n.d.) saying, "when we think about leadership we focus too much on what leaders do . . . and we don't spend enough time on who leaders are - the character of leaders" (p. 65). While it may be far easier to assess the progress of a principal, and therefore a school, through what they *do* and the tangible data collected, behind their actions is *who they are*, as "character is foundational to effective decision making and functioning" (Seitjts et al., 2015, p. 66). Effective principals do not just focus on results, but spend time focusing on the development of people and their relationships to achieve those results (Rieg & Marcoline, 2008).

Human and Social Capital

Fostering effective relationships between the principal and stakeholders, especially teachers, ensures not only superior achievement results, but also individual satisfaction with the work they do (Bukko et al., 2021; Hollingsworth et al., 2018; Tschannen-Moran [in-press]). The more satisfaction individuals experience, the happier they are at work and in their personal lives (Alrup et al., 2018; De Corodova et al., 2019; Dreer, 2021; Frenzel et al., 2018). The positive outcomes stemming from happiness include better life achievements, financial success, stronger relationships, better mental health, effective coping abilities and even overall better physical

health (Cohn et al., 2022). Cohn et al. go on to posit positive emotions predict growth better than life satisfaction (such as wealth and living circumstance) and “attentional effects of positive emotions are what lead to gradual, long-term growth” (p. 366). All of these outcomes improve organizations as a whole and the overall effect of positive relationships in school is students experience more academic success (Martin & Collie, 2019). Slater (2008) revealed

> [t]hrough open and honest communication individuals come to know and value each others’ strengths. When a principal is able to figure out what will interest, motivate, captivate and renew a teacher, there is the opportunity to maximize the human capacity within the organization. (p. 66)

Harnessing the strengths of each individual within an organization and bringing these strengths together in a collective unit is the best way a principal can move their school forward (Hitt & Ireland, 2002). Human capital is the individual knowledge, skills and capabilities people bring to the organization (Hitt & Ireland). Principals should encourage and support the development of human capital as this knowledge can be unique and difficult to imitate. Unique knowledge adds dimension to problem solving and planning, something a principal may not be able to achieve on their own. Enhancing human capital by fostering relationships between individuals in a collaborative effort to support and improve an organization is what Hitt and Ireland call social capital. Principal support and development of both human and social capital in their schools encourages a team, or collaborative atmosphere and sets the stage for culture of collaboration. Understanding trust is the heartbeat of a high functioning collaborative team (Lencioni, 2002, p. 195) supports principals in developing human and social capital in their buildings.

Duignan (2020) says, "[w]hen teachers, principals and systems engage together in collective improvement projects, they can create learning cultures that engage, inspire and

nurture deep, rich student learning" (p. 63). The end goal is always to improve the learning of students; however, the path to obtaining this type of engagement and learning is for leaders to invest in both the human and social capital of their teachers and foster deep learning for all. To develop human capital Kim, Raza and Seidman (2019) say we need to "*learn to regard teachers as learners* and to ensure that the learning we want to see in our children is taking place with our teachers" (p. 100). One talented teacher may serve his or her classroom of students well, but their talent remains isolated and serves only a few. Investing in social capital, the development of the team, is perhaps the most effective way to nurture your school climate of trust and collegiality and achieve the academic result we all desire.

Social capital goes beyond investing in the talent of one person (human capital). It "gives you access to the other people's *human capital*. It expands your networks of influence and opportunity, and it develops resilience when you know there are people to go to who can give you advice and be your advocates" (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012, p. 90). Social capital could be considered an enhancement of human capital. The power of a team ensures “diverse and rich talent that can be called on to help solve problems in a complex and dynamic competitive environment . . . help[ing] [to] develop a vision for the future” (Hitt & Ireland, 2002, p. 5). Social capital relies on everyone coming together to share their talents and grow the capacity of the team.

Coming together does not happen organically. Relationship building is critical to fostering trust, and trust is imperative in building social capital. True collaboration requires people to be vulnerable. Often it means admitting mistakes or ignorance. We have to be vulnerable in order to make and accept change. Educators are less likely to share their talents

with people they do not trust and are not invested in. However, with the establishment of trust comes the willingness to take risks and foster a collegial environment among staff.

> To enact change faster and more effectively, to reduce variation in effective teaching in a school or between and among schools in terms of networks, our advice is to use social capital. Use the group to change the group. This means developing how teachers as a team or group can best identify and respond to the needs of individual students. Back this up with the human capital that comes with being able to attract the best people in the profession, develop them as they come in, and build on that to be effective. (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2013, p. 37)

Using the group to change the group can influence extraordinary progress. The power of a network within the school and beyond will support student learning for the future. Transforming a staff into a collaborative unit is the linchpin for meeting a disruption such as COVID 19 at the onset and navigating through the unknown with a collective effort. Principals who can build trusting relationships with and amongst staff are well situated to continue to foster effective relationships across the organization.

Campbell, Lieberman and Yashkina (2016) said, "[social capital] is not simply developing and sharing knowledge and practices, it is establishing, cultivating and valuing opportunities for informed professional judgment, decisions and actions" (p. 221). In order to generate a culture of collaboration, principals must "create and nurture professional and collective processes when leading change for learning improvement and they achieve this by generating and facilitating school cultures energised by collective action and an ethic of collective responsibility" (Duignan, 2020, p. 63). A culture of collaboration is necessary to improve teaching and learning throughout our schools and deeply develop collective

responsibility for our students. In a time of change and disruption, educators must turn inwards and draw from the collective support of the team to not just talk about change but enact it.

Drawing from the collective capacity of the group reinforces a collaborative spirit and supports the improvements necessary to meet the challenges of disruption. This is easier said than done. As Harris (2011) points out, "[s]ecuring lasting educational improvement . . . is primarily, but not exclusively, a case of improving teaching and learning. While this is easy to say, it is notoriously hard to achieve" (p. 626). She goes on to say, "the literature on educational change shows time and again the stubborn resistance that any reform process automatically encounters along with an overwhelming desire to return to normative practices" (p. 626). Improvements take time and commitment before they become common practice. Expecting teachers to change their normative practices for something different likely will not be immediately accepted or effective. Teachers need to be involved in the change. They need to know why the change is being implemented, how it will affect them personally, and how it will affect student success. Being told what to do is not as effective as being directly involved in the process of change (Harris, 2011). When staff trust their leader to have their back, they are far more likely to stay the course no matter how difficult the changes are.

Education is a team effort, meaning it takes the investment of all stakeholders to provide for the needs of students, therefore social capital is about the investment in the collective team (Edinger & Edinger, 2018). An effective leader will recognize the individual skills employees possess and find ways to bring these skills and people together to complement one another to form a collective team (Hitt & Ireland, 2002). Effective leaders will understand there is power in the collective, and in cultivating the group's talents to benefit the whole. Different perspectives should be welcomed to ensure a balanced approach to problems. If appropriately implemented,

building a sense of collective responsibility ". . . benefits everyone, allows for more innovation, allows organizations to adapt to change quickly, and delivers outstanding performance and results" (Salicru, 2017, p. 201). It is the proper implementation of human capital leaders must focus on to build a team. Salicru (2017) reinforces "a collective focus . . . puts group goals and combined action before self-interest, reinforcing the desire to help the team. It also provides satisfaction and feelings of achievement from team successes" (p. 196). Principals would do well to recognize the necessity of a team approach where all develop the sense of ownership to build a thriving organization (Edinger & Edinger, 2018). Leaders who invest in relationship building and the social capital of their organizations will recognize it is time-consuming; however, the rewards are worth it. If we want teachers to truly invest, we must allow them autonomy in their classrooms, and the ability to participate in making collective decisions. The ability to use their professional judgements, be heard in the larger group and have this translated into action by the principal is called decisional capital.

Decisional Capital

Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) point out human and social capital are not enough alone. "The essence of professionalism is the ability to make discretionary judgements. … The capacity to judge and judge well depends on the ability to make decisions in situations of unavoidable uncertainty when the evidence or the rules aren't categorically clear" (p. 93). They suggest judgements made by teachers are based on experience, practice and reflection as well as drawing on the experiences of their colleagues (pp. 93-94). Hargreaves and Fullan said “high-yield strategies become more precise and more embedded when they are developed and deployed in teams that are constantly refining and interpreting them” (p. 96). Duignan (2020) said ". . . it is wise to engage those affected by a decision or a change in its formulation, because those engaged

in making key decisions about a change or development are more likely to be committed to its implementation" (p. 65). The challenge is to align the vision and focus of improvement and meeting challenges together for the collective benefit while still respecting each other's individual autonomy.

A leader may have a particular idea of how the collective will view a topic and what they will decide to do about a situation; however, one should never presume to know the result. A responsible leader will have the ability to see a problem from several perspectives and work with the team to find the best solution. This is not to say principals should relinquish their decision-making ability to the group, but rather open the door for multiple perspectives to be heard to make informed decisions which benefit students. The process of coming to a solution together is decisional capital at work. Fullan (2010, as cited in Duignan, 2020, p.65) shared this idea: "'collective capacity generates the emotional commitment and the technical expertise that no amount of individual capacity working alone can come close to matching'" (p. xiii). Tapping into a collective capacity allows all team players to make sound decisions to benefit the whole group. The reward is the best teachers in front of our students, and this is exactly what principals desire.

Fostering Effective Relationships

Fostering effective relationships begins with an ethos of shared responsibility. While principals play a key role in modeling the desired relationships and cultivating trust in the building, it is the teachers who we must count on to motivate and engage the students to achieve success (Leithwood et al., 2020; Wahlstrom & Seashore Louis, 2008). Felton and Lambert (2020) said “at some institutions, a culture of relationship building seems to be baked into the ethos; a majority of faculty and staff live out a shared mission each day, and the commitment to

student success is palpable" (p. 59). While they are referring to post-secondary institutions in their book, the same tenet is true in schools. The shared responsibility for building a culture of trust and commitment to student success is a necessary component for successful schools. This brief quote from Felton and Lambert sounds idyllic, but it also tells a story, a bit of a cautionary tale for principals. The words "some" and "majority" should signal to the reader relationship building is not always replete with 100% buy-in from everyone. The small percentage of staff who do not buy into the need for relationships to be effective at their job are the ones principals should work with in an effort to change their perspective. Principals should be aware, changing beliefs, like building relationships, does not happen overnight.

When stakeholders recognize the connection between effective relationships and success in school, the results are transformational (Leithwood et al., 2020). Knowing support is ingrained within the culture of the school makes taking calculated risks and making mistakes easier for both teachers and students (Hollingworth et al., 2018). Teachers are able to experiment with pedagogy and find ways to differentiate for students to engage everyone. Students are more comfortable stepping out of their comfort zones and exploring different ways to express their knowledge without fear of ridicule. When a principal has built a trusting relationship with staff and students and encourages both parties to step out of their comfort zones to explore possibilities and capabilities, all will be more engaged in learning (Hollingworth et al., 2018).

Changing Beliefs: Teaching is More Than Delivering Curriculum

Principals should attempt to convince the teacher, who believes their sole job is to deliver curriculum content, to see a bigger picture. The TQS includes the following competencies which go beyond curriculum delivery: "Fostering Effective Relationships, and Establishing Inclusive Learning Environments" (Alberta Government, 2020, pp. 3, 5). Approaching teachers with the

goal of changing what they believe in is not an easy task. Bandura (1997), as cited in Haney et al. (2002) explained, “changing or deepening our belief system takes place in one of four ways: experiencing success, observing success, emotional arousal, or through verbal persuasion” (p. 182). Telling a teacher, they must change their beliefs will not work based on Bandura’s explanation. However, showing them through modeling, observation and encouragement may.

Convincing a teacher *they* matter for student motivation, engagement, learning, behavior, and psychological support (Pianta, 2016) can help the naysayers turn the corner from believing their job is to deliver the curriculum to believing their job is to teach students. Principals can help support this shift by working with staff to cultivate a culture of educating the whole student. Supporting staff to develop a culture which values students as a whole, beyond the transaction of just delivering to them subject content, is the essence of a culture that values students (Felton & Lambert, 2020, p. 63) and relationships. What, then, must teachers do to shift from delivering the subject matter to teaching the whole student and building positive relationships?

First of all, teachers must want to build relationships with students beyond instruction if they want to shift from delivering curriculum to teaching the whole student. To support this desire principals will need to convince them relationships are an important element to teaching (Anderson et al., 2020; Claessens et al., 2017; Ibrahim & Zaatari, 2020; Martin & Collie, 2019; Phillippo et al., 2018; Pianta, 2016; Spilt et al., 2011; Uslu & Gizir, 2017; Wang et al., 2020). To do this teachers will need to set aside time to get to know their students (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007; Claessens et al., 2017). When teachers feel a strong connection to their students, they experience greater job satisfaction (Aldrup et al., 2018). Students smiling at the teacher, greeting them in the hallways and joking around with them during "downtime" all provide teachers with a sense of what Claessens et al. call "communion," which describes the levels at which teachers

feel connected to their students (p. 479) and students feel connected to their teachers. Abele and Wojciszke (2007) proclaim, "communion is the most important dimension because close and secure relationships that include friendliness, trust, empathy, and helpfulness are indispensable for survival" (p. 753). Since these outside of the instructional experiences support relationship building between students and teachers, teachers should carve out time in their day to engage with students on a personal level (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007; Schiewer, 2013; Claessens et al., 2017). Principals can encourage this by supporting opportunities for teachers and students to interact on a more personal level through activities such as clubs and sports, as well as attending events outside of school (Wang & Hofkens, 2020).

Both Pope (2005) and Schapiro (2009), as cited by Schiewer (2013), suggest another way teachers can connect with students is by creating additional space in their classrooms to become hosts to their students. Schiewer (2013) goes on to develop

> this simple idea [as] the key to a model of hospitality that can be quite effective in the classroom. Even though the “third space” in the classroom requires both students and teachers working together, this effort needs to be led by the teachers. After all, we are the hosts—the ones that set the ground rules and the overall tenor of the classroom. (p. 545)

Building positive relationships between teacher and student(s) allows teachers to get to know them beyond academics. As a host may invite guests to their home, teachers may host students in their classroom by making the space comfortable, engaging in conversation to get to know one another’s interests, and generally establish an atmosphere of trust and development of community. In an effort to encourage teachers to invest in teacher-student relationships, Schiewer stresses

> curriculum alone cannot teach students. As teachers, we need to be just as concerned with *how* we teach as we are about *what* we are teaching. Effective teaching (and learning) requires a teaching presence and ethos that bring the curriculum to life. (p. 547)

For those not comfortable in setting up a "third space" in their classroom, Schiewer also suggests "carrying the host metaphor forward, . . . [by] provid[ing] simple instruction, [and] build[ing] community while maintaining authority" (p. 545) as a way to welcome students into the classroom community. Feelings of belonging and community are not only important for student success, but also for overall well-being.

Spilt et al. (2011) acknowledges this notion of well-being directly influencing one's ability to build relationships with others. The relationship between teachers and their students provides opportunities to make lessons relevant and applicable to the students' lives. When teachers can focus on the students' interests and incorporate these interests into their lessons and conversations students feel like their teachers care about *them* and not just their grades (Anderson et al., 2019; Ibrahim & Zaatari, 2019; Miller et al., 2019; Uslu & Gizir, 2017). Educator Rita Pierson (2013), said ". . . kids don't learn from people they don't like" (1:39). In her TED Talk, Pierson claims every student needs a champion, someone who knows them, and wants to be a part of their success. Show students you care about *them* and you have already started to foster the relationship.

The majority of the time teachers spend with students at school is in the classroom instructing. While teachers are getting to know their students in this academic setting and forming a relationship, to build beyond the expectation of teaching curriculum Claessens et al. (2017) say building relationships happens in those "moment-to-moment interactions between

teacher and student" (p. 478) outside of instructing. The potential for fostering positive relationships between teachers and students can happen, as Claessens et al. suggested,

> outside the class context . . . Although mainly situated before or after the lesson in the classroom or in the hallway, teachers also recognized field trips as important opportunities to build and maintain relationships and some even mentioned contact with students outside school life. (p. 483)

This time spent outside of instructional time is not only good for students but also teachers. Fostering relationships between teachers and parents is yet another way to get to know students on a personal level.

Developing relationships with students can be enhanced through connections with home. Connecting with home, and developing a relationship with parents [in this context parents are any adult who is the primary caregiver for a child] adds another dimension to the personal relationship. Goodall (2018), as cited by Soule and Curtis (2021) said “while teachers and parents generally agree that having a strong relationship is important, school leaders are in the best position to support sustainable systems and beliefs designed to build partnerships with parents” (p. 132). Principals can help foster relationships between teachers and parents by encouraging contact on a regular basis. While Soule’s and Curtis’ article focuses on home visits, the premise of fostering relationships is at the forefront of their work. They assert the goal is to build trust between parents, teachers and students by focusing on the relationships. A face-to-face visit can be a very powerful strategy for fostering a relationship, however phone calls, email, and text messages can also garner the desired effect (Anyon et al., 2018). Regardless of the method, making contact home can help to talk about student progress and may help to address any concerns or bias a teacher has about a student; the results often are an improved

educational experience for students (Soule & Curtis, 2020). Principals can also support these relationships by providing professional development (PD) for teachers to broaden worldviews, cultures and language barriers (Nievar et al., 2018) helping to prepare teachers to build relationships with home.

Professional Development Could Support Fostering Effective Relationships

Principals should never assume relationship building comes easily or naturally for teachers. If fostering effective relationships is truly the goal principals wish to establish in their schools, it is imperative they ensure novice teachers, as well as those already in the profession, are exposed to PD and collaboration in building relationships (Spilt et al., 2011; Phillippo et al., 2018; Martin & Collie, 2019; Sprott, 2019). Drawing on LQS (2020) competency 1(h) "engaging in collegial relationships while modeling and promoting open, collaborative dialogue" (p. 3) principals can incorporate strategies for relationship building into conversations naturally as a way to build capacity with their staff. Beyond a school team collaborating Spilt et al. (2011) advocate for PD in relationship building by saying, "[t]eacher educators and school administrators need to understand the critical role of beliefs and feelings about classroom relationships in general and relationships with specific students in teachers' professional development" (p. 470). Martin and Collie (2019) recommend consideration for PD promoting teacher-student relationships be implemented at the school level. Phillippo et al. (2018) contend development of relational practices could be incorporated into teacher education programs. Sprott (2019) makes a strong claim; PD for teachers should be job embedded and collaborative in order to be effective. PD in relationship building should be an essential component of teacher education as well as the principal's PD plan for their staff.

There is need for caution, however, when planning for PD. While academic literature regarding this topic suggests the improvement of student success depends on PD which includes: stamina, collaboration, teacher buy-in, is subject specific, draws on external expertise and includes practice (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Desimone, 2009), Sims and Fletcher-Wood found "...several recent evaluations of PD interventions which include all of the consensus view characteristics have not found a positive impact" (p. 50). What Sims and Fletcher-Wood discovered is a lack of evidence demonstrating the six dependents were effective in making any significant changes.

Research by Osman and Warner (2020) also supports deficiencies of mandated PD. They reveal the influence PD has on teacher improvement relies heavily on teacher motivation and buy-in (the belief they can do and the belief it's important to do). "Teacher motivation plays a crucial role in determining what happens after a teacher participates in professional development" (p. 2). They suggested because each individual is unique, the implementation of PD is also unique. This uniqueness has a lot to do with what Guskey (2009) refers to as "school context" (p. 229). He said, "school contexts differ drastically, and what works well in one setting may not work equally well in another. Improvement efforts at all levels of education need adaptation to a wide variety of contexts." (p. 229). Most of the rich learning happens beyond the PD session when teachers find their way to implement what was acquired. Principals must be aware of this as they consider and prepare for PD in their schools. A strong school culture built on the premise relationships are an essential component of success is perhaps the best way to ensure teacher buy-in (Osman & Warner, 2020).

While Sims' and Fletcher-Wood's (2021) review cautioned leaders about the ineffectiveness of PD, they did also suggest "PD interventions based on instructional

coaching–an observation, feedback, practice cycle in which individual teachers receive guidance from an expert mentor–show consistently positive correlations with pupil achievement" (p. 55). In addition, principals should consider using instructional coaching as a positive method for building relationships in their buildings. Along with coaching, principals should also note PD will be more effective if participants are encouraged to become critically reflective of beliefs, both their own and those of others, as well as becoming

> more discriminating, open, and disposed to transformative learning. This skeptical stance may involve challenging one's own strongly held views. A discriminating skeptic may have strong values, but his or her understandings are always open to reassessment as new perspectives and assessments are encountered. (Mezirow, 2003, p. 62)

As stated, PD is only effective if teachers are motivated to engage because they buy-in to the concept being developed. Principals can encourage buy-in by creating a strong school culture built on trusting relationships. Setting the stage for PD by giving the overarching expectation of relationship building as a focus, however allowing teachers the autonomy to decide what area of relationship building they need to focus on, is perhaps the best way to ensure buy-in (Svendsen, 2020).

Effects on an Organization When Trust is Broken and the Relationship is Damaged

Investing in relationships is time well spent for all stakeholders in education. While the construction phase can be time consuming, positive, trusting relationships pave the way for greater success for all involved. However, it would be naive to think once a relationship is established it will never falter, be tested, or even damaged. Sometimes "trusting environments may slowly dissipate with incremental erosive events and behaviors" (Kutsyuruba & Walker, 2017, p. 134) and sometimes a trusting relationship can be destroyed with an unsuspecting

comment. Principals are tasked with fostering effective relationships in their schools and communities and thus should be "brokers in trust" (Kutsyuruba & Walker, 2017). It is therefore an enormous responsibility to handle these relationships with care. Understanding the fragility of trust is key in nurturing and maintaining trust (Grover et al., 2019; Kutsyuruba & Walker, 2017; Kutsyuruba et al., 2016; Walker et al., 2011). As much as trust can help a school flourish, the damaging of this trust can lead to its failure. A lack of trust between stakeholders and the principal creates feelings of insecurity, the need for self-protection, resentment, alienation, lack of motivation and creativity and stimulates lack of communication, ineffective problem-solving, and finally low morale (Kutsyuruba et al., 2016; Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Walker et al., 2011). Tyler and Kramer (1996) as cited by Kutsyuruba et al. (2016) said,

> When there is distrust in a school, it diverts energy from the school's purpose. When teachers or students feel unsafe, energy that could be devoted to teaching and learning is diverted to self-protection. In the absence of trust, people are increasingly unwilling to take risks and demand greater protection to defend their interests. (p. 478)

Sadly "distrust feeds on itself and begets more distrust" (p. 478) and therefore should be avoided. If the situation is already present, principals should find ways to seek reparation.

Can Trust be Repaired?

"Distrust not only creates a condition for an unpleasant and uncomfortable working environment, it also undermines overall effectiveness and efficiency of the organization" (Kutsyuruba et al., 2016, p. 478). While this statement may be true, the good news is most well-established trusting relationships are "reasonably robust, and despite being fragile and prone to breaking, may be enduring in nature and subject to restoration and renewal" (p. 490). Let's face it, principals are human and therefore will make mistakes. Principals should recognize the

fragility of relationships and take care to act with integrity when handling them. When a mistake which compromises a relationship has been made principals should act quickly to repair the damages incurred. Grover et al. (2019) suggested apologies can repair and renew trust.

The first step in repairing trust is admitting a mistake has been made. Admission of mistakes can be the hardest part of the repair, but without revealing your own role in creating the problem, one cannot truly move forward in renewing trust (Hammet, 2018). The quality and genuineness of the apology is paramount. Showing empathy and true remorse, taking substantive action in compensation for the violation by openly recognizing and admitting the wrong, ensuring willingness and desire to improve, and the tone of the apology are all ways a trust violator can ensure the apology is sincere (Grover et al., 2019; Kahkonen et al., 2021). Tschannen-Moran's (2014) take on trust repair is similar, "damaged trust can be repaired. . . . trust repair is an arduous process that requires humility and effort and may extend over a long period of time" (p. 221). Since trust is fragile, once a principal has established trust they should cherish it, coddle it, and treat it with respect. While broken trust can be salvaged, the relationship may never truly get back to the state it was in before and the rebuild can be an exhaustive process (Walker et al., 2011, Kim et al., 2006).

There are times when principals must make decisions others may not like. Sometimes these decisions must be made on the spot and without the ability to collaborate because quick action is needed. Grover et al. (2019) explain when leaders must take quick action human error and trust violations are more common. Often "apologies engender a tendency to forgive the offense" (Grover et al., 2019, p. 854), however, they also assert apologies do not necessarily recover trust in all situations. Two factors are weighed for every transgression; intentionality and severity (Grover et al., 2019). Intentional action, according to Grover et al. is something an

offender does on purpose with an objective in mind. Severity is perceived by the aggrieved party and is based on the magnitude of the transgression.

Intentionality

According to Grover et al. (2019) intentional acts are planned, violational and fall under the responsibility of the actor. Followers of the actor then make judgements based on the moral character of the actor. For example, is this the first offense or does the offense show a pattern of breaking trust amongst the team (Elangovan et al., 2007)? Followers also consider why a break in trust has occurred. The why influences reconciliation because "motivation or intention behind the act provides information regarding the leader's character" (p. 856) Considering whether the violation was external or internal to the actor, controllable by the actor and stable across time influences the propensity to repair trust (Grover et al.). Kim et al. (2006), suggest further consideration is given to the type of violation, integrity or competence, and the likelihood of repair.

More simply put, violations fall under "the prominent role played by the "didn't want to" attribution over the "couldn't" attribution indirectly suggest[ing] that benevolence may be relatively more important than ability in fostering perceptions of trustworthiness" (Elangovan et al., 2007, p. 18). Acts which break trust because of lack of competence are more likely to be forgiven, especially if the actor admits their mistake, signaling the desire to prevent future violations (Kim et al., 2006). Often trust breaking acts based on competence are considered anomalies and avoidable in the future, therefore easier to forgive. However,

> when the violation concerns matters of integrity, confirming one's guilt with an apology should offer a reliable signal that one lacks integrity that would outweigh any positive effects on trust from the apology's signals of redemption, because people tend to believe

> that a lack of integrity would only be exhibited by those who do not possess it and this belief, once established, would be difficult to disconfirm. (Kim et al., 2006, p. 52)

Based on this, followers are more likely to accept an apology from leaders for trust violations due to competency as there seems to be less intentionality involved and are less likely to accept an apology based on lack of integrity as these violations are more intentional.

Severity

Severity of the transgression is directly related to recovery; the more severe the less likely recovery will transpire (Grover et al., 2019). Grover et al. said "violations of very low severity are barely noticeable; those of minor nature are absorbed in a resilient relationship as inconsequential. … Severe violations strike hard on the attractiveness of being vulnerable" (p. 857) and therefore trust is less likely to be restored. Elangovan et al. (2007) suggest prior frequency of trust violations make a difference to the severity of erosion of trust. A first-time offense is more tolerable, but trustees tend to draw the line at the second offense. They also said

> the erosion of trust after the second violation is so severe that a third violation makes no significant impact on lowering the trust level further. In other words, the "last straw" number for incidents of violations is as low as two – trustors are not willing to "forgive and forget" a second-time violation. (p. 19)

These reasons make a clear case for protecting trusting relationships. While trust can be restored in many situations, especially if the relationship is built on a solid foundation of trust and the actor apologizes, there are times when the severity of the violation deems restoration impossible. Once caught in the turmoil of distrust many feel powerless to break the cycle, and benign actions can seem suspicious (Kutsyuruba & Walker, 2017). Kutsyuruba and Walker, as well as Tschannen-Moran (2014) posit once trust is broken restoration of trust is not an easy

undertaking. They also stipulate a key factor in reparation of trust is the desire of both parties to believe there are benefits to repairing the trust, otherwise the arduous undertaking of repair isn't worth the effort.

When distrust takes hold in an organization the results can be destructive. Distrust prevents people from being their best selves as the focus shifts from one of trusting collegiality and performance which supports others to self-preservation, anxiety and resentment (Kutsyuruba & Walker, 2017; Tschannen-Moran, 2014; Walker et al., 2011). Time and energy are taken away from the school's purpose and goals and are rather spent on sabotaging initiatives to be spiteful or in an effort to seek revenge (Walker et al.). Principals would be wise to recognize trust is fragile and can more easily be broken than built. Kahkonen et al. (2021) suggest there is a need for "research to investigate strategies for dealing with more mundane and smaller trust violations before they escalate to become major trust transgressions; acting early to redress transgressions also requires less costly and extensive measures" (p. 106). Dealing with issues early may help avoid situations where trust cannot be repaired.

Synthesis

This literature review has allowed me to reflect upon my journey as a principal. As I reviewed the numerous articles associated with the topic of relationships and trust, I was reminded of different scenarios in my career where problems could have been avoided had I, or others in a similar position to me, known more about fostering effective relationships and the role trust plays in both the development and maintenance.

Relationships are an essential component of the education world (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007; Aldrup et al., 2018; Berkovich, 2018; Bukko et al., 2018; Hollingworth et al., 2018; Ibrahim et al., 2020; Leithwood et al., 2020; Tschannen-Moran, in-press; Wieczorek & Manard,

2018. When staff sees a principal is interested in their perspectives, considers them and works with the team to develop the next steps, trust begins to form. Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) show the potential of human and social capital coming together. Duignan (2020) and Harris (2011) both profess to change or to move an idea forward; principals need commitment from their staff. When staff trust their leader to have their back, they are far more likely to buy into the change and stay the course. This notion can also be true when trying to change a belief, such as the critical role relationships play in students' success.

Numerous authors feel strongly to be effective in the classroom; teachers must show they care about the whole student, not just their grades (Anderson et al., 2019; Ibrahim & Zaatari, 2019; Miller et al., 2019; Spilt et al., 2011; Uslu & Gizir, 2017). I am curious why students behave one way for one teacher and in an entirely different way for another? I believe sometimes it relates to subject content students have less interest in or struggle with; however, often, it comes down to the relationship they have with individual teachers. When Pierson (2013) told a story about a colleague, she once had who said, "they don't pay me to like the kids. They pay me to teach a lesson. The kids should learn it. I should teach it . . . case closed" (1:22) I remember thinking how awful those students must have it! I have personally witnessed what happens when a teacher does not invest in the whole student. Students need to feel liked, wanted, and respected (the same as teachers). My own children have expressed this sentiment on more than one occasion and have gone so far as to sabotage themselves by not applying effort in classrooms where they do not believe the teacher cares about them as a person. Show them you care about *them* and have already started fostering the relationship. As a principal, I have had to come to an understanding sometimes developing relationships is a struggle. We do not always agree with everyone we work with, staff, students and parents included. However, Hitt and Ireland (2002)

and Edinger and Edinger (2018) made a resounding point when they discussed the need to cultivate the group's strengths to round out the team. Collaboration brings forth the strengths of individuals. Even though there may be teachers on your staff who do not believe positive relationships are necessary to do their job, through collaboration, modeling and what Sims and Fletcher-Wood (2021) called "instructional coaching," I believe all staff will come to see the value in the relationship.

The hardest lesson I learned as a principal is how difficult broken trust can be to repair. Trust is fragile. It can take years to build and only a moment to destroy. Principals must conduct their interactions with integrity and an understanding of the fragility of trust (Grover et al., 2019; Kutsyuruba & Walker, 2017; Kutsyuruba et al., 2016; Walker et al., 2011). Keeping the well-being of students, staff, parents, and the community in mind will help to ensure the maintenance of trust stays strong in the face of challenges. Should there be an occasion when trust is broken, relationships built on a foundation of trust are most often resilient and subject to restoration (Kim et al., 2006; Kutsyuruba et al., 2019; Tschannen-Moran, 2014; Walker et al., 2011). It is essential to understand, not all violations of trust can be repaired. Violations involving integrity are less likely to be forgiven than those based on competence (Grover et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2006). However, reparation should begin with admitting a mistake made and then apologizing for it to make amends (Elangovan et al., 2007; Grover et al., 2019; Kahkonen et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2006).

The most important lessons I have learned in my career are; first, principals are human and will make mistakes, and second, relationships built on a foundation of trust can withstand these mistakes. The proverb "it takes a village to raise a child" rings true in education too. There

is enormous power in the collective, and principals would be wise to tap into social capital to move their schools forward by fostering effective relationships.

References

Abele, A. E., & Wojciszke, B. (2007). Agency and communion from the perspective of self versus others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(5), 751–763. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.751

Alberta Education. (2020). *Leadership quality standard*. Alberta Queen's Printer. https://www.alberta.ca/assets/documents/ed-leadership-quality-standard-english.pdf

Alberta Education. (2020). *Teacher quality standard.* Alberta Queen's Printer. https://open.alberta.ca/publications/teaching-quality-standard-2020

Aldrup, K., Klusmann, U., Lüdtke, O., Göllner, R., & Trautwein, U. (2018). Student misbehavior and teacher well-being: Testing the mediating role of the teacher-student relationship. *Learning and Instruction*, *58*, 126–136. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.05.006

Anderson, V., Rabello, R., Wass, R., Golding, C., Rangi, A., Eteuati, E., Bristowe, Z., & Waller, A. (2020). Good teaching as care in higher education. *High Education 79*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00392-6

Anyon, Y., Atteberry-Ash, B., Yang, J., Pauline, M., Wiley, K., Cash, D., Downing, B., Greer, E., & Pisciotta, L. (2018). It's all about the relationships: Educators' rationales and strategies for building connections with students to prevent exclusionary school discipline outcomes. *Children & Schools*, *40*(4), 221–230. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1093/cs/cdy017

Berkovich, I. (2018). Typology of trust relationships: Profiles of teachers' trust in principal and their implications. *Teachers and Teaching, 24*(7), 749-767. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1483914

Berscheid, E. (1999). The greening of relationship science. *American Psychologist, 54*(4), 260-266. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.4.260

Bukko, D., Liu, K., & Johnson, A. H. (2021). Principal practices that build and sustain trust: Recommendations from teachers in a high-trust school. *Planning and Changing, 50*(1–2), 58–74.

Campbell, C., Lieberman, A., & Yashkina, A. (2016). Developing professional capital in policy and practice. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community, 1*(3), 219-236. http://dx.doi.org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1108/JPCC-03-2016-0004

Claessens, L. C. A., van Tartwijk, J., Pennings, H. J. M., Wubbels, T., van der Want, A. C., Verloop, N., & den Brok, P. J. (2017.). Positive teacher–student relationships go beyond the classroom, problematic ones stay inside. *Journal of Educational Research*, *110*(5), 478–493. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1080/00220671.2015.1129595

Cohn, M. A., Fredrickson, B. L., Brown, S.L., Mikels, J. A., & Conway, A. M. (2009). Happiness unpacked: Positive emotions increase life satisfaction by building resilience. *Emotion*, *9*(3), p. 361–368. https://search-ebscohost-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edselc&AN=edselc.2-52.0-66949113297&site=eds-live&scope=site

Darling-Hammon, L., Chung Wei, R., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad. *National Staff Development Council.* https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/professional-learning-learning-profession-status-report-teacher-development-us-and-abroad_0.pdf

De Cordova, F., Berlanda, S., Pedrazza, M. & Fraizzoli, M. (2019). Violence at school and the well-being of Teachers. The importance of positive relationships. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, Article 1807. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01807

Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, *38*(3), 181–199. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.3102/0013189X08331140

Dreer, B. (2021). Teachers' well-being and job satisfaction: The important role of positive emotions in the workplace. *Educational Studies, 47,* 1-17. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1080/03055698.2021.1940872

Duignan, P. (2020). *Leading educational systems and schools in times of disruption and exponential change: A call for courage, commitment and collaboration*. Emerald Group Publishing.

Edinger, S. K. & Edinger, M. J. (2018) Improving teacher job satisfaction: The roles of social capital, teacher efficacy, and support. *The Journal of Psychology, 152*(8), 573-593.

Elangovan, A. R., Auer-Rizzi, W., & Szabo, E. (2007). Why don't I trust you now? An attributional approach to erosion of trust. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*(1), 4–24. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1108/02683940710721910

Felten, P., & Lambert, L. M. (2020). *Relationship-rich education: How human connections drive success in college*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fournier, R., Cervera, M. S., Buckley, K., Gutierrez, A. (2019). Stories from the field: Cultivating relationships through administrator actions. *In Transforming Education*. Transforming Education. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED601210.pdf

Frenzel, A. C., Becker-Kurz, B., Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., & Lüdtke, O. (2018). Emotion transmission in the classroom revisited: A reciprocal effects model of teacher and student enjoyment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *110*(5), 628–639.

Grover, S. L., Abid-Dupont, M.-A., Manville, C., & Hasel, M. C. (2019). Repairing broken trust between leaders and followers: How violation characteristics temper apologies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *155*(3), 853–870. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1007/s10551-017-3509-3

Guskey, T. R. (2009). Closing the knowledge gap on effective professional development. *Educational Horizons*, *87*(4), 224–233.

Hammet, G. (Host). (2018, July, 29). How to regain trust with Stephen MR Covey (No. 341). [Audio Podcast]. In *Growth Think Tank, Leadership*. https://www.genehammett.com/341-how-to-regain-trust-with-stephen-mr-covey/

Haney, J. J., Lumpe, A. T., Czerniak, C. M., & Egan, V. (2002). From beliefs to actions: The beliefs and actions of teachers implementing change. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, *13*(3), 171–187.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. G. (2012). *Professional capital : Transforming teaching in every school*. ProQuest Ebook Central https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. G. (2013). The power of professional capital: With an investment in collaboration, teachers become nation builders. *Journal of Staff Development*, *34*(3), 36–39.

Harris, A. (2011). System improvement through collective capacity building. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*(6), 624-636. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111174785

Hitt, M. A., & Ireland, R. D. (2002). The essence of strategic leadership: Managing human and social capital. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *9*(1), 3-14.

Hollingworth, L., Olsen, D., Asikin-Garmager, A., & Winn, K. M. (2018). Initiating conversations and opening doors: How principals establish a positive building culture to sustain school improvement efforts. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46*(6), 1014–1034.

Ibrahim, A. & Zaatari, W. E. (2020) The teacher–student relationship and adolescents' sense of school belonging. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 25*(1), 382-395. doi: 10.1080/02673843.2019.1660998

Kaçaniku, F., Maderbacher, I., Erhard,F., & Saqipi, B., (2022). I want to become a teacher because…? Student-teachers change in attitudes of becoming teachers in Austria and Kosovo. *Education Research International*, *2022*, Article 9355679, 1-11. https://downloads.hindawi.com/journals/edri/2022/9355679.pdf

Kahkonen, T., Blomqvist, K., Gillespie, N., & Vanhala, M. (2021). Employee trust repair: A systematic review of 20 years of empirical research and future research directions. *Journal of Business Research*, *130*, 98–109. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.03.019

Kim, P. H., Dirks, K. T., Cooper, C. D., & Ferrin, D. L. (2006). When more blame is better than less: The implications of internal vs. external attributions for the repair of trust after a competence- vs. integrity-based trust violation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *99*(1), 49–65. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.07.002

Kim, S., Raza, M., & Seidman, E. (2019). Improving 21st-century teaching skills: The key to effective 21st-century learners. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, *14*(1), 99-117. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499919829214

Klassen, R. M., Perry, N. E., & Frenzel, A. C. (2012) Teachers' relatedness with students: An underemphasized component of teachers' basic psychological needs. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *104*(1), 150–165. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1037/a0026253

Kutsyuruba, B., Walker, K., & Noonan, B. (2016). The trust imperative in the school principalship: The Canadian perspective. *Leadership & Policy in Schools, 15*(3), 343–372. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1080/15700763.2016.1164866

Kutsyuruba, B., & Walker, K. D. (2017). The destructive effects of distrust: Leaders as brokers of trust in organizations. *Advances in Educational Administration*, *26*, 133–154. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1108/S1479-366020160000026008

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management, 40*(1), 5-22.

Lencioni, P. (2002) The five dysfunctions of a team: A leadership fable. Jossey-Bass. https://d-pdf.com/book/1026/read

Martin, A. J., & Collie, R. J. (2019). Teacher-student relationships and students' engagement in high school: Does the number of negative and positive relationships with teachers matter? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *111*(5), 861–876.

Mezirow, J. (n.d.). Transformative Learning as Discourse. *Journal of Transformative Education*, *1*(1), 58–63. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1177/1541344603252172

Miller, A. C., & Mills, B. (2019). 'If they don't care, I don't care': Millennial and generation z students and the impact of faculty caring. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 19*(4), 78-89. https://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login

Nievar, A., Brown, A. L., Nathans, L., Chen, Q., & Martinez-Cantu, V. (2018). Home visiting among inner-city families: Links to early academic achievement. *Early Education and Development*, *29*(8), 1115–1128.

Osman, D. J., & Warner, J. R. (2020.). Measuring teacher motivation: The missing link between professional development and practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *92*, 1-12. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103064

Phillippo, K., Brown, E. L., & Blosser, A. (2018). Making sense of student-teacher relationships: Teacher educator and candidate engagement with the relational practices of teaching. *Action in Teacher Education*, *40*(2), 169–185.

Pianta, R. C. (2016). Classroom processes and teacher-student interaction: Integrations with a developmental psychopathology perspective. In D. Cicchetti (Ed.), *Developmental psychopathology: Risk, resilience, and intervention* (pp. 770–814). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119125556.devpsy415

Pierson, R. (2013). Every kid needs a champion [Video]. TED Conferences. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/rita_pierson_every_kid_needs_a_champion

Rieg, S.A. (2008). Young children's perceptions of school administrators: Fostering positive relationships. In M. R. Jalongo (Ed.), *Enduring bonds: The significance of interpersonal relationships in young children's lives* (pp. 193-209). Springer Science & Business Media. https://link-springer-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/content/pdf/10.1007/978-0-387-74525-1.pdf

Rieg, S. A., & Marcoline, J. F. (2008, February 20-23). Relationship building: The first "r" for principals [Paper Presentation]. Eastern Educational Research Association Conference, Hilton Head, SC. https://eric-ed-gov.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/?id=ED501101

Salicru, S. (2017). *Leadership results: How to create adaptive leaders and high-performing organisations for an uncertain world*. John Wiley & Sons.

Schiewer, T. (2013) Teacher-student relationships: A model of hospitality. *Pedagogy 13*(3), 544–548. doi:https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1215/15314200-2266450

Seijts, G., Gandz, J., Crossan, M., & Reno, M. (2015.). Character matters: Character dimensions' impact on leader performance and outcomes. *Organizational Dynamics, 44*(1), 65–74. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2014.11.008

Sims, S., & Fletcher-Wood, H. (2021). Identifying the characteristics of effective teacher professional development: A critical review. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *32*(1), 47–63. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1080/09243453.2020.1772841

Slater, L. (2008). Pathways to building leadership capacity. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *36*(1), 55–69.

Soule, N. E., & Curtis, H. L. (2021). High school home visits: Parent-teacher relationships and student success. *School Community Journal*, *31*(2), 131–153.

Spilt, J. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Thijs, J. T. (2011). Teacher wellbeing: The importance of teacher—student relationships. *Educational Psychology Review*, *23*(4), 457–477.

Sprott, R. A. (2019). Factors that foster and deter advanced teachers' professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *77*, 321–331. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1016/j.tate.2018.11.001

Svendsen, B. (2020). Inquiries into teacher professional development--What matters? *Education*, *140*(3), 111–130.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). *Trust and collaboration in urban elementary schools* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Ohio State University.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. (2015). Principals, trust, and cultivating vibrant schools. *Societies, 5*(2), 256-276. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc5020256

Tschannen-Moran, M. (in-press). Leadership practices and why they matter: Trust in leaders. In R. Tierney, F. Rizvi, K. Ercikan and G. Smith (Eds), *Elsevier International Encyclopedia of Education (4th Ed.)*.

Uslu, F., & Gizir, S. (2017). School belonging of adolescents: The role of teacher-student relationships, peer relationships and family involvement. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *17*(1), 63–82.

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.

Walker, K., Kutsyuruba, B., & Noonan, B. (2011). The fragility of trust in the world of school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*(5), 471–494.

Walker, K. D., & Kutsyuruba, B. (2017). The seven deadly narratives of leadership. *Advances in Educational Administration, 26*, 207–233. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1108/S1479-366020160000026012

Walter, C., & Briggs, J. (2012). What professional development makes the most difference to teachers? Oxford University Press. https://www.oupjapan.co.jp/sites/default/files/contents/events/od2018/media/od18_Walter_reference.pdf

Wang, M.T., Hofkens, T.L. (2020). Beyond classroom academics: A school-wide and multi-contextual perspective on student engagement in school. *Adolescent Research Review 5*(4), 419–433. https://doi-org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/10.1007/s40894-019-00115-z

Wieczorek, D., & Manard, C. (2018). Instructional leadership challenges and practices of novice principals in rural schools. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 34*(2), 1-21.