



Research Output Journal of Education 5(1):9-13, 2025

ROJE Publications

PRINT ISSN: 1115-6139

<https://rojournals.org/roj-education/>

ONLINE ISSN: 1115-9324

<https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJE/2025/51913>

Page | 9

Building Trust and Transparency in Educational Management

Tarcisius Niwagaba

Faculty of Education Kampala International University Uganda

Email: tarcisius.niwagaba@kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Trust and transparency are foundational to the effective management of educational institutions, fostering collaboration, accountability, and innovation. This paper examines the role of trust in enhancing communication, morale, and efficacy among educational stakeholders while emphasizing the multidimensional nature of trust, encompassing interpersonal, institutional, and systemic levels. Transparency is equally critical, promoting openness in decision-making, information accessibility, and ethical governance. Challenges and strategies for cultivating these values in diverse educational contexts are discussed, supported by case studies and best practices. The analysis highlights how a culture of trust and transparency drives sustainable educational reforms and strengthens community engagement.

Keywords: Educational management, trust, transparency, stakeholder collaboration, ethical governance.

INTRODUCTION

Imagine for a moment the absence of trust in educational settings. What would happen if accountability structures were reactive in exposing instances of fraud and deception in children's education? In such a climate, could we expect teachers to be motivated to go the extra mile in establishing a creative, supportive learning environment? And what of students and parents? What levels of frustration or apathy might develop if principals were uninterested in hearing their complaints about inappropriate parent-teacher communication or how school funds are being allocated? What would the cumulative effects of these actions be on the continuance of desirable school reform goals like building professional learning communities or cultivating deep reflection among students? Would the likely rhetorical questions lie hidden in organizational and academic goals attached to learning and schools as families rush through their educational lives, afraid of being victimized by a system in which cheaters flourish? [1, 2]. The establishment of trust and an accompanying culture of transparency is essential to society's expectation of quality and equity as learning communities seek to create the capacity to manage rising pedagogical complexity. Trust is a prerequisite of the learning community because it enables and guarantees the establishment of relationships among stakeholders, without which cooperation is impossible. It allows administrative entities in education to lower transaction costs [3, 4].

The Importance of Trust in Educational Management

Trust is fundamental to educational management. A school community that is motivated by trust will be driven by the desire to work together to achieve quality teaching and higher student learning outcomes. A high-trust learning community facilitates communication between and among principals, staff members, students, and parents. Decisions about policy, teaching, and learning are transparent, innovative practices are valued, and leadership roles are distributed collaboratively and democratically. Teacher trust has been shown to have a distinctive and powerful influence on collaboration and teacher efficacy in many schools. Furthermore, in many sectors, trust has been described as being fundamental for

the establishment and maintenance of relationships that yield cooperation, satisfaction, and commitment to work within and across organizations. Trust is important in the establishment of a safe, supportive, and morally coherent learning environment where children are valued, listened to, and respected [5, 6]. What is trust? There has been much deliberation surrounding this question, and it has been suggested that any understanding of trust be multi-dimensional, recognizing at least three main dimensions. These can be described as interpersonal trust, institutional trust, and systemic trust. The ability to trust also varies and is conditional on numerous factors. Clear differences have been noted between people who are more trusting and people who are more distrustful or skeptical. Low levels of trust typically lead to low morale, fear, disengagement of employees, and increased levels of social conflict. This context of low trust can be characterized by secrecy and low morale, in which peers do not support or assist one another beyond basic contractual requirements. Some teachers in low-trust environments have perceived initiatives to promote trust-relation thinking, such as practices of emotional intelligence, reflective practice, and the culture of care, as "hyped" and "pretentious PR" designed to "paper over the cracks" and "paper over the power of reflective practice." In contrast, teachers in high-trust environments, where trust has been built up over time, have reported the benefits of increased communication networks and stronger collaborative relationships. Such relationships are valuable not just because they encourage more democratic decision-making practices, but they also promote knowledge sharing, enhanced student learning, and more effective teaching [7, 8].

The Role of Transparency in Educational Institutions

The South African Department of Education White Paper 1 on education and training highlights the importance of transparency in creating a positive school and departmental climate. Transparency is described as involving people in decision-making processes to promote openness, clarity, and accessibility to the information, along with the policies and practices of a school or department, to develop trust between governors, managers, teachers, students, and parents. Transparency in decision-making can help to reduce the confusion and misunderstandings that can result from different points of view. Transparency also leads to a climate of intellectual openness, trust, a feeling of fairness in the decision-making processes, and a sense of being valued [9, 10]. Internal stakeholders should always have access to relevant, timely, and reliable information about the academic, financial, operational, and management performance and health of the respective institutions, to communicate the information in user-friendly ways, and to generate feedback from stakeholders early and often at all educational systems, university communities, and regulatory forums. Transparency is required by both good governance and the need to promote accountability. This follows the ethical responsibility institutions have to act morally and transparently. Examples of transparency measures include publishing annual financial statements, fee structures, staff salaries and staffing formulas, physical resources at the institution, academic records, bylaws, policies, performance indicators, research and academic outputs, and stakeholder information, including relationships with donors, community outreach activities, and quality outputs [11, 12]. Transparency may take various forms in educational institutions, including financial and operational, academic, governance, legal, and policy transparency. While there is value in transparency, there are also challenges. Providing information to stakeholders may be problematic. Information may be taken out of context and used by individuals for pressure group purposes. Privacy laws could be contravened, leading to legal liabilities. However, transparency remains an essential feature of all well-performing schools and departments. The provision of financial, academic, and operational reports to various interest groups has also been shown to be successful in dealing with commercial and corporate reporting as a means of enhancing trust in the financial markets [13, 14].

Strategies For Building Trust and Transparency

In practice, while the following strategies for building trust and transparency and promoting organizational practices that make school-community trust likely are looked at under separate headings, these strategies accordingly reflect a multifaceted approach. Some of these strategies might build trust at a relatively basic level, while others might establish conditions for higher levels of trust. These organizational strategies also allow for adaptation or contingency building to help manage breaches of good news and incidents that might damage an individual's or group's reputation. Organizational practices to operationalize these strategies include: [15, 16]. Communication strategies to ensure that all relevant stakeholders in education can secure relevant information and data in forms and through media well-suited to individual and group needs and to iron out the effects of gab and noise in the information environment promptly; the feedback mechanism is likely to be only weakly institutionalized and

diversified. Engagement strategies that ensure that stakeholders feel that they have had some sort of say in the actions that impact their interests. Multi-channel communication and engagement show up in some schools but will be largely ad hoc, focusing on particular issues at particular times to meet school and stakeholder needs in particular institutional contexts. All of these strategies may be augmented through various types of staff training and professional development that might contribute to staff trustworthiness. Technology is also being adopted in a range of international educational contexts to help present data in a fashion that might help laypeople interpret it and use it as part of a broadening of communication strategies [17, 18]. One way of assessing the scope of current school organizational structures is to carry out an audit—a process based on a diagnostic that will alert schools of all levels to the many ways the hands-off aspects of their decision-making and governing of the school contribute to its creation of an open climate and reputation for trust and transparency that, in turn, underwrites a sustainable educational environment [19, 20].

Case Studies and Best Practices

Case Studies / Best Practices Here we present real cases and best practices in educational management that exemplify the building of trust among actors. While, at first, some of them might not be entirely related to the concept of trust, they are good examples of what can be done to build trust. The following best practices in educational management – local, institutional, and district level – allow us to understand the practical dimension of the issues involved. • Case Study 1: City of Durango, Mexico • Case Study 2: Universidad Autónoma Juan Misael Saracho, Tarija, Bolivia • Case Study 3: Niños de la Calle, Ciudad de El Alto, Bolivia • Case Study 4: Batuta Foundation, Colombia • Case Study 5: Schools of the Most Vulnerable Zones in Chile • Case Study 6: Case of the Brooklyn Primary School, Wellington, New Zealand • Case Study 7: Building Trust and Transparency by Using Data in English Schools • Case Study 8: Building Trust: The New Zealand Experience. Data Use by Principals. Although the variety of social, cultural, and educational contexts provokes different reactions to the culture of transparency, the examples provided in our analysis demonstrate that mechanisms promoting transparency are crucial in complex educational institutions and also that their usefulness far exceeds the narrower managerial purposes. One of the most remarkable results refers to the beneficial effects of self-appraisal in an organizational culture of trust. “The self-evaluation of policies and practices is transformational as it changes school culture and results in policy agendas – previously hidden in the hearts and minds of school staff – becoming explicit.” A culture of transparency supported by an effective policy framework encourages responsible school practice. This capability to adapt and change sustains successful educational organizations, and developing a culture of trust in them by sharing data in context helps to develop this trust. Recent policy has attempted to harness the relationship between openness and trust, predominantly through measures designed to make schools more transparent. Yet, recent initiatives have often overlooked the relationship between transparency, openness, and trust. Although the number of initiatives has reduced in recent years, these call for school-level reform and “emphasize developing a sense of shared endeavor, building trust, and fostering leadership at all levels of the system” [21, 22].

CONCLUSION

The establishment of trust and transparency in educational management is paramount for fostering an equitable, innovative, and supportive learning environment. Trust enables meaningful relationships, collaboration, and commitment among stakeholders, while transparency ensures accountability, fairness, and openness in institutional practices. Successful implementation requires a multifaceted approach, including robust communication, stakeholder engagement, and continuous evaluation. Case studies demonstrate the transformative impact of trust and transparency on school culture and educational outcomes. By embedding these principles into policy and practice, educational institutions can build resilient systems that respond effectively to evolving challenges and uphold the principles of quality and equity in education.

REFERENCES

1. Niedlich S, Kallfaß A, Pohle S, Bormann I. A comprehensive view of trust in education: Conclusions from a systematic literature review. *Review of Education*. 2021 Feb;9(1):124-58. wiley.com
2. Alshurafat H, Al Shbail MO, Masadeh WM, Dahmash F, Al-Msiedeem JM. Factors affecting online accounting education during the COVID-19 pandemic: an integrated perspective of social capital theory, the theory of reasoned action and the technology acceptance model. *Education and Information Technologies*. 2021 Nov;26(6):6995-7013. springer.com

3. Alsaleh A. Professional learning communities for educators' capacity building during COVID-19: Kuwait educators' successes and challenges. *International journal of leadership in education*. 2024 Sep 2;27(5):1172-91.
4. Antinluoma M, Ilomäki L, Toom A. Practices of professional learning communities. In *Frontiers in education* 2021 Apr 27 (Vol. 6, p. 617613). Frontiers Media SA.
5. Berardi M, Antonucci G, Fontana F, Ziruolo A. Trust and governance in a rethinking of classical knowledge management paradigms: toolkits for public sector during the COVID-19 emergency. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*. 2022;20(3):167-78. unich.it
6. Simon CA, James C, Simon A. The growth of multi-academy trusts in England: Emergent structures and the sponsorship of underperforming schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. 2021 Jan;49(1):112-27. sagepub.com
7. Pomirleanu N, Gustafson BM, Townsend J. Organizational climate in B2B: A systematic literature review and future research directions. *Industrial Marketing Management*. 2022 Aug 1;105:147-58. [\[HTML\]](#)
8. Essex R, Kalocsányiová E, Rumyantseva N, Jameson J. Trust amongst refugees in resettlement settings: A systematic scoping review and thematic analysis of the literature. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*. 2022 Jun;23(2):543-68. springer.com
9. Jooste N, Hagenmeier C. Policy framework for the internationalisation of higher education in South Africa: A compass for comprehensive internationalisation?. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 2022 Sep;26(4):415-35. [\[HTML\]](#)
10. Kruger P, Goldstein S, Hofman K. The passage and implementation of a Health Promotion Levy in South Africa as a case study of fair financing procedures. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2023 Nov 1;38(Supplement_1):i49-58.
11. Tetteh LA, Kwarteng A, Aveh FK, Dadzie SA, Asante-Darko D. The impact of internal control systems on corporate performance among listed firms in Ghana: The moderating role of information technology. *Journal of African Business*. 2022 Jan 2;23(1):104-25. academia.edu
12. Aksoy M, Yilmaz MK, Topcu N, Uysal Ö. The impact of ownership structure, board attributes and XBRL mandate on timeliness of financial reporting: evidence from Turkey. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*. 2021 Jun 23;22(4):706-31. researchgate.net
13. Gierlich-Joas M, Baiyere A, Hess T. Inverse transparency and the quest for empowerment through the design of digital workplace technologies. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*. 2024 Feb 10.
14. Kfukfu FM, Kitur J, Nyagah E. Relationship between Leadership Transparency Behaviors and Effective Communication: A Case of the Presbyterian University of East Africa. *ShahidiHub International Journal of Education, Humanities & Social Science*. 2024 Aug 12;2(1):83-98.
15. Qiu T, Akinoglu EM, Luo B, Konarova M, Yun JH, Gentle IR, Wang L. Nanosphere lithography: A versatile approach to develop transparent conductive films for optoelectronic applications. *Advanced Materials*. 2022 May;34(19):2103842. wiley.com
16. Mishra S. The Age of Explainable AI: Improving trust and transparency in AI models. *Journal of AI-Assisted Scientific Discovery*. 2021 Oct 1;1(2):212-35.
17. Fischer-Hübner S, Alcaraz C, Ferreira A, Fernandez-Gago C, Lopez J, Markatos E, Islami L, Akil M. Stakeholder perspectives and requirements on cybersecurity in Europe. *Journal of information security and applications*. 2021 Sep 1;61:102916. sciencedirect.com
18. Ekpobimi HO, Kandekere RC, Fasanmade AA. Front-end development and cybersecurity: A conceptual approach to building secure web applications. *Computer Science & IT Research Journal*. 2024;5(9):2154-68.
19. Laksanadjaja F, Oviedo-Trespalacios O. Uncovering the Web of Secrets Surrounding Employee Monitoring Software: A Content Analysis of Information Provided by Vendors. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*. 2024;2024(1):7951911.
20. George AS. Robo-Revolution: Exploring the Rise of Automated Financial Advising Systems and Their Impacts on Management Practices. *Partners Universal Multidisciplinary Research Journal*. 2024 Nov 25;1(4):1-6.
21. Sofyani H, Pratolo S, Saleh Z. Do accountability and transparency promote community trust? Evidence from village government in Indonesia. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*. 2022 May 13;18(3):397-418. [\[HTML\]](#)

22. Al-kfairy M, Mustafa D, Kshetri N, Insiew M, Alfandi O. Ethical challenges and solutions of generative AI: An interdisciplinary perspective. In *Informatics 2024* Aug 9 (Vol. 11, No. 3, p. 58). MDPI.

CITE AS: Tarcisius Niwagaba. (2025). Building Trust and Transparency in Educational Management. Research Output Journal of Education, 5(1):9-13. <https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJE/2025/51913>.