

University of New England

**The Role of Trust in
Secondary School Music Teaching Faculties**

A thesis submitted by

Andrew Close,

MMus(perf), BMus(cond), GradDipEd, PCertPluralingualEd, GradCertOrff

for the award of Doctor of Education

November 2016

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my supervisors, Dr. Myung Sook-Auh and Associate Professor David Paterson, for their support, encouragement, and kind reminders. Thank you also to Dr. Terrance Hays and Professor Robert Walker (both staff of the University of New England) for their wisdom and enthusiasm.

A number of experts in the field of education/trust research have been generous with their time and advice: Megan Tschannen-Moran (University of William and Mary, Virginia) for her early encouragement; Mieke Van Houtte (University of Ghent) and Dimitri Van Maele (formerly of the University of Ghent) for meeting me in Ghent, their words of advice, and their challenging questions.

To all those teachers who gave their time and experience in responding either to the online questionnaire, but particularly those teachers who also agreed to be interviewed, I owe a special debt of gratitude. Trust amongst peers is not an easy topic to discuss. Your honesty and passion for our music teaching colleagues are commendable.

Todd Rosenkranz and Susan E. Sporte (Associate Director for Evaluation and Data Resources), from the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research, helped with gaining access to their data, without which sections of this thesis would not have been possible.

I have been fortunate to present talks at a number of conferences - these have all been invaluable in forming and fine tuning my ideas: International Society for Music Education world conference in Thessalonica, Greece (2012), Australian Society for Music Education National Conference (2011), a University of New England Postgraduate research Conference (2010) and a workshop at my own school, the International School of Geneva (2009), the latter being a great help early on in forming my ideas and approach.

Thank you to my dear friends Holly Smith-Dinbergs and Richard Cole for their editorial insights.

Finally, an immense thank you to my partner Shauna, whose encouragement and patience have been unwavering.

I certify that the ideas, experimental work, results, analyses, software and conclusions reported in this thesis are entirely my own effort, except where otherwise acknowledged.

I also certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted for any other award, except where otherwise acknowledged.



Andrew John Close

14 Dec 2016
Date

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	1
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 A personal statement.....	3
1.2 The aims and design of this research	6
1.2.1 Aims.....	6
1.2.2 Design	7
1.3 Definition of terms.....	9
1.3.1 Trust.....	9
1.3.2 Music teaching teams	10
1.3.3 Peripatetic/instrumental teacher.....	11
1.3.4 Director/head/coordinator of music	11
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
2.1 Trust.....	12
2.1.1 The three-tiered nature of trust in sociology.....	13
2.2 An overview of trust in sociology.....	13
2.2.1 ...and distrust.....	18
2.2.2 Why the prisoner's dilemma game is not included in this research	19
2.3 Trust within the workplace – interpersonal relationships	20
2.3.1 Control, supervision, and subversion.....	21
2.3.2 Gender in the workplace	22
2.3.3 Age and experience.....	23
2.3.4 Role of humour	24
2.3.5 Macro versus micro influence of trust	24
2.4 Trust in education	25
2.4.1 Research groups.....	25

2.4.2 The various actors in education	29
2.4.3 The role of the principal in varied school structures	30
2.4.4 Factors contributing to trust in schools.....	32
2.4.5 Positive outcomes of trust in schools.....	32
2.4.6 Obstacles to trust in schools	34
2.4.7 Consequences of low-trust environments in schools.....	35
2.4.8 Gender and the ‘other’	37
2.5 Trust in education – other international research.....	38
2.6 Trust and teamwork in education.....	41
2.7 Repairing trust.....	43
2.8 Issues affecting trust specific to music teachers	43
2.8.1 Music teachers as an independent group	43
2.8.2 Musical identity	45
2.8.3 Musical genre.....	47
2.8.4 Theoretical system and musical literacy.....	49
2.8.5 Role stress.....	50
2.8.6 Isolation	52
2.8.7 Burnout	53
2.8.8 Peripatetic teachers	54
2.9 An Australian perspective.....	55
2.9.1 Australian research on trust in education.....	55
2.9.2 Australian research on issues affecting music teachers	56
2.10 Existing frameworks for trust in education.....	57
2.11 Justification for this Research.....	59
CHAPTER 3: DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	60
3.1 Research Questions.....	60

3.2 The participants.....	60
3.2 Research design	63
3.2.1 The questionnaire (TMTTQ)	65
3.2.2 The semi-structured interview script	72
3.3 Data collection – the online questionnaire.....	73
3.4 Data collection – the interviews.....	75
3.5 Procedure	77
3.6 Cautions	78
3.6.1 Caution in interpreting data	78
3.6.2 The use of Likert items, scales, <i>Means</i> and non-parametric tests	78
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	80
4.1 Order of results	80
4.2 Analysis of closed-ended questions	80
4.2.1 Correlations.....	82
4.2.2 Role of the principal – statistical analysis	86
4.2.3 Five facets of trust – statistical analysis	86
4.3 Analysis of open-ended questions	87
4.3.1 Methodology.....	87
4.3.2 Q.6 How would you describe the relationships within your music teaching team?.....	87
4.3.3 Q.7 Do you feel that the relationships within your music teaching team help or hinder the process of curriculum creation and design? Why?.....	90
4.4 Comparisons with Chicago CCSR material.....	95
4.4.1 Arts teachers / non-Arts teachers	95
4.4.2 Chicago Arts teachers and TMTTQ music teachers	97
4.5 Summary of interviews.....	113
4.5.1 ‘Edgar’	113

4.5.2 ‘Cecilia’	115
4.5.3 ‘Jill’	116
4.5.4 ‘Francis’	118
4.5.5 ‘Kate’	119
4.5.6 ‘Brenda’	120
4.5.7 ‘Helen’	121
4.5.8 ‘Danielle’	122
4.5.9 ‘John’	124
4.6 Analysis of interviews in reference to six facets of trust	125
4.6.1 Vulnerability	125
4.6.2 Benevolence.....	127
4.6.3 Honesty	128
4.6.4 Openness.....	129
4.6.5 Reliability	132
4.6.6 Competence	133
4.7 Analysis of interviews in reference to issues specific to music teachers.....	134
4.7.1 Musical identity	134
4.7.2 Musical genre.....	135
4.7.3 Theoretical system and musical literacy	136
4.7.4 Role stress.....	137
4.7.5 Isolation	138
4.7.6 Burnout	139
4.7.7 Peripatetic teachers	140
4.7.8 The role of the principal in the lives of music teachers	141
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	144
5.1 Summary of results	144

5.1.1 What factors develop/hinder trust/distrust in secondary school music teaching faculties?	144
5.1.2 Are those factors different from those affecting other secondary school teaching faculties?	146
5.1.3 Can a model of how trust operates in secondary school music teaching faculties be developed on the basis of the findings of this study?	147
5.2 New Emerging Themes	147
5.2.1 Ego and Expertise	148
5.2.2 Respect and acknowledgement.....	150
5.2.3 Strength in diversity.....	153
5.2.4 Acting in the best interests of the students	155
5.2.5 Holding conversations about teaching.....	156
5.3 Determining the relative importance of these themes resonates with the respondents	158
5.4 Development of possible model of how trust operates.....	163
5.4.1 An initial framework for trust in music education.....	163
5.4.2 Developing a new conceptual framework for trust in music education	164
5.5 Comparison with extant literature.....	167
5.6 Implications	168
5.7 Future research.....	170
5.7.1 Comparative studies by subject disciplines	170
5.7.2 Trust in tertiary music environments	170
5.7.3 Humour	171
REFERENCES	172
APPENDIX A - Authorisation from the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC), and email invitation	187
APPENDIX B – “Trust in Music Teaching Teams” online questoinnaire (TMTTQ)	191
APPENDIX C - Interview Procedure	199

APPENDIX D – TMTTQ open-ended responses	203
Q6. How would you describe the relationships within your music teaching team?	203
Q7. Do you feel that the relationships within your music teaching team help or hinder the process of curriculum creation and design? Why?	206
APPENDIX E – Interview transcripts.....	210
‘Edgar’ - Interview Monday, 5 August 2013.....	211
‘Cecilia’ - Interview Monday, 14 May 2012	220
‘Jill’ - Interview Thursday, May 10, 2012.....	226
‘Francis’ - Interview Thursday, August 26, 2013.....	232
‘Kate’ - Interview Thursday, April 26, 2012	240
‘Brenda’ - Interview Tuesday, 20 March 2012.....	247
‘Helen’ - Interview Wednesday, September 19, 2013.....	256
‘Danielle’ - Interview Tuesday, March 5, 2013.....	262
‘John’ - Interview Friday, 15 April 2013.....	267

List of Tables

Table 3.1	Participants as a table	61
Table 3.2	Semi-structured interviews respondent details	62
Table 3.3	Source of questions for online questionnaire	67
Table 3.4	CCSR questions cross-referenced	69
Table 3.5	Demographic and Genre/background questions	71
Table 4.1	Summary of closed-ended questions	81
Table 4.2	Strong correlations between closed-answered items	83
Table 4.3	Strongest correlations between closed-answered items	84
Table 4.4	Mann-Whitney U Test for Arts and non-Arts teachers, CCSR data	96
Table 4.5	...Music teachers in this school are cordial with each other	98
Table 4.6	...Music teachers in this school trust their principal	100
Table 4.7	...Music teachers in this school trust each other	102
Table 4.8	...How many times this school year have you had conversations with fellow music teachers about the goals of the department?	104
Table 4.9	...How many times this school year have you had conversations with fellow music teachers about developing new curriculum?	106
Table 4.10	...How many times this school year have you had conversations with fellow music teachers about managing classroom behaviour?	108
Table 4.11	...How many times this school year have you had conversations with fellow music teachers about what helps the students learn best?	110
Table 4.12	...Music teachers in this school regularly discuss assumptions about music teaching and learning	112
Table 5.1	Responses to follow-up survey	160
Table 5.2	Responses to follow-up survey indicating respondents' answers	162

List of Figures

Figure 2.1	How this research is related to the existing literature	12
Figure 2.2	Trust-Distrust categories	19
Figure 2.3	Research by groups	26
Figure 2.4	Consequences of individual and collective teacher trust	28
Figure 2.5a	Model for systems for trust in elementary schools	30
Figure 2.5b	Model for systems for trust in middle and secondary schools	30
Figure 3.1	Research design imagined as a graphic	65
Figure 5.1	An initial model for how trust develops in Music Teaching Teams	163
Figure 5.2	A new conceptual model for effective trust relationships in Secondary School Music Teaching faculties	165

ABSTRACT

The study of trust in schools has often been neglected as an area of research, especially in examining teacher-to-teacher relationships. Secondary School Music teaching faculties appear to have received very little attention. Gaining insight into (1) what factors develop or hinder trust – or, indeed, create distrust – and (2) whether these factors are different from those affecting other subject faculties will contribute to an increase in the effectiveness of these music teacher-professionals.

This thesis addresses three questions. What factors develop/hinder trust/distrust in secondary school music teaching faculties? Are those factors different from those affecting other secondary school teaching faculties? Implicit in this second question is whether such faculties describe themselves as having different trust levels to other faculties. Thirdly, can a model of how trust operates in secondary school music teaching faculties be developed on the basis of the findings of this study?

To address these questions, a widely distributed questionnaire was developed by the author using Consortium of Chicago Schools Research (2001-7), Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003), and Kochanek (2005) instruments as models. This questionnaire (TMTTQ) was used to gather information and delivered using online survey software ($N=35$). Quantitative data was then compared with existing data from four iterations of the Consortium of Chicago Schools Research's teachers' survey. Following this, semi-structured in-depth interviews with a self-selected focus group ($N=9$) sought to elaborate, clarify and contextualize the data. Grounded theory analysis techniques were utilized, involving inductive and deductive coding to develop themes and sub-themes. This new data, used in triangulation with the trust questionnaire results and Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's definition of trust (developed specifically within an education framework), informed the development of a conceptual model of how trust operates in music teaching faculties.

Comparisons between Arts and non-Arts teachers within the Consortium of Chicago Schools Research's data revealed no substantial differences in levels of trust. However, comparisons between CCSR Arts teachers and the TMTTQ respondents demonstrated that the latter group felt both a greater predisposition to trust each other but were less likely to communicate regularly about educational methodology and student management. Although

some generic factors leading to trust were identified by the participants (vulnerability, benevolence, and competence) others appeared to be less important to music teaching faculties (honesty, reliability). Demands and stresses identified in the literature as being specific to music teachers were often echoed by interviewed respondents, the most commonly mentioned being musical identity and role stress.

Several new themes emerged from this research: the contradiction between Ego and Expertise; the importance of respect and acknowledgement; the strength of diversity in faculties; holding conversations about teaching; and the centrality of “acting with the best interests of the students”. The interviewed participants were then asked to rank and comment on these themes as a method of feedback, before a new conceptual model for effective trust relationships in Secondary School Music Teaching faculties was formulated.

This thesis concludes that the factors which develop/hinder trust/distrust in secondary school music teaching faculties are sufficiently different from those affecting other subject faculties as to warrant the examination of such an individual subject group as valid and a rich source of research.

The implications from this study could increase our understanding of the interpersonal relationships in music teaching faculties and an explanation of the factors that may contribute to the development of distrust within such faculties. Although every music faculty will exhibit different patterns of behaviour, an acknowledgement of the patterns identified in this thesis can assist leaders and teachers as they seek to develop trust within music teaching faculties.