

Evaluation Method

Trust and Empathy

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union



Grant agreement no.: 2014-1-DE01-KA203-000706

Project Consortium: University of Applied Sciences Magdeburg-Stendal (Germany); Aalborg University (Denmark); Lapland University of Applied Sciences (Finland); University of Lincoln (United Kingdom); University of Ljubljana (Slovenia); Potsdam University of Applied Sciences (Germany); Tampere University of Applied Sciences (Finland); University of Tampere (Finland); YMCA University of Applied Sciences (Germany)

Evaluating Trust and Empathy

Martyn Thayne, University of Lincoln, UK

Description of factor

For online teams to perform effectively, all members must feel comfortable with sharing their thoughts, ideas and opinions, whilst also relying on others to behave in accordance with the commitments and stated aims of the group. It is therefore important that teams behave cooperatively and all members can be trusted to work with integrity throughout all phases of a collaborative project. Research shows that teams with high degrees of trust are more proactive, more focused on task output, more optimistic, more frequently initiate interactions, and provide more substantive, productive feedback (Jarvenpaa, Knoll & Leidner, 1998; Clark, et al., 2010; Feng et. al. 2004; Paul & McDaniel, 2004). As such, it is vital that the learning environment can support and cultivate interpersonal trust between team members, especially when working collaboratively on creative design projects. It must also be noted that the level of trust in online teams is influenced by ways in which empathy is supported, both in terms of empathic accuracy (which refers to the ability to accurately infer the specific content of other people's thoughts and feelings), as well as the facilitation of supportive responses (which involves building a rapport, responding compassionately and thoughtfully to others, particularly useful when delivering peer-feedback and developing social bonds). It is therefore important to evaluate how trust and empathy may be facilitated and cultivated in online learning environments, especially in those instances where teams do not have access to additional face-to-face interaction to supplement their relationships.

Description of method

The trust and empathy survey employs both quantitative and qualitative questioning through a mix of of psychometric testing and open-ended questions.

A 7-point Likert scale will be used for the self-assessment of respondents' subjective experiences of trust and empathy in the online learning environment (1 = Very strongly disagree, 7 = Very strongly agree).

The open-ended questions provide an opportunity for respondents to qualify their answers and provide more detailed information about their experiences.

The following trust factors — *Trustworthiness, Integrity, Ability, Benevo*lence — have been adapted from 'Trust in Global Virtual Teams' measurement scale by Jarvenpaa, Knoll & Leidner (1998). Two additional trust factors have also been adapted: Empathy/Relational Trust (see Paul & McDaniel; Feng & Preece, 2003) and Cooperative Behaviours (see Costa & Anderson, 2011).

Why to use (especially in context of creative online collaboration)

This survey can be run during or after the course cycle. Running at the mid-point of course can help to identify and correct any issues that could potentially affect team performance for the remaining phases of a collaborative project. Running the survey after the course has completed can help to identify any critical issues that need to be addressed for the next run of the course/future collaborative projects. This would enable course instructors to make iterative adjustments and improvements to the course, whilst it also provides students an opportunity to reflect on collaborative team performance.

How to analyse

Statistical analysis can be applied to questions 1-24 (see Jarvenpaa, Knoll & Leidner, 1998). Questions 4, 8, 12, 20, 24 are reversed scored.

Qualitative analysis can be applied to the two open-ended questions (25) & 26). It is recommended that the following coding scheme, adapted from Curtis & Lawson (2001) and Bulu & Yildirim (2008), be used to analyse factors that positively or negatively affected online collaboration:

Behavior Categories		Codes	Description
Leadership		GS	Group skills: A generic code applied to expression that encourages group activity and cohesiveness.
	*	OW	Organizing work: Planning group work; setting shared tasks and deadlines.
	*	IA	Initiating activities: Setting up activities such as chat sessions to discuss the progress and organizing group work.
	*	Ef	Advocating effort: Urging others to contribute to the group effort.
	*	ME	Monitoring group effort: Comments about the group's process and achievements.
Feedback	*	FBS	Feedback seeking: Seeking feedback to a position advanced.
	*	FBG	Feedback giving: Providing feedback on proposals from others.
Task oriented interaction	*	RI	Exchanging resources and information to assist other group members.
	*	SK	Sharing knowledge: Sharing existing knowledge and information with others.
	*	Ch	Challenging others: Challenging the contributions of other members and seeking to engage in debate.
	*	Ex	Explaining or elaborating: Supporting one's own position (possibly following a challenge).
		FBS	Feedback seeking: Seeking feedback to a position advanced.
		FBG	Feedback giving: Providing feedback on proposals from others.
Social interaction	*	SI	Social interaction: Conversation about social matters that is unrelated to the group task. This activity6 helps to 'break the ice'.
Enthusiasm	*	EG	Eagerness: Expressions that contain excitement and enthusiasm about group project.
	*	GS	Group skills: A generic code applied to expressions that encourage group activity and cohesiveness.
Technical/Task uncertainties	*	FT	Facing/having technical problems.
	*	HeS	Help seeking: Seeking assistance from others about task, confusing about task.

How to interpret and use for improving online collaboration

The results of the survey can identify specific trust factors that may affect online collaborative performance. Low scores (1-3) can identify specific aspects of the learning environment or team composition that need addressing, whilst low scores across the range of questions would indicate significant issues that course instructors need to address.



The survey is divided into 6 groups of questions relating to a separate trust factor (trust factors are interrelated so there could be some overlap between these categories)

Trustworthiness

- These questions are designed to evaluate levels of ,trustworthiness' within collaborative teams. These are general feelings of trust within the group and can indicate issues of team composition and bonding
- Improvements may include developing closer, more empathic team relations (especially if there are also significant issues with relational trust)

Integrity

These questions are designed to evaluate levels of trust within collaborative teams that all members will act with ,integrity'. This can indicate levels of engagement, consistency and predictability within a team.

Ability (Competence Trust)

- These questions are designed to evaluate levels of competency trust within collaborative teams (that other members of the group are trusted to have the necessary abilities to do perform collaborative tasks). Working collaboratively means trusting the ability of your team members.
- Instructors/teams might develop ways to better exploit and promote the skills of each team member.

Benevolence (Calculative Trust)

- These questions are designed to evaluate levels of calculative trust within collaborative teams (that the team will work in consideration and good faith to deliver according to agreed objectives). 'Calculative trust' is a form of contractual agreement where parties can be relied on to deliver according to the details of the contract.
- This is a 'results' driven criteria that relates to a desire to strive for a goal or accomplish a task, and could be further supported by incenti



vising collaborative tasks and facilitating social interaction between team members.

Empathy (Relational Trust)

- These questions are designed to evaluate levels of relational trust and empathy within collaborative teams. 'Relational trust' is the extent to which a person may feel a personal attachment with their team members and is therefore motivated to do good by the other party.
- This can be used to identify the informal, social factors that can either support or hinder successful team relations.

Cooperative Behaviours

- These questions are designed to evaluate levels of trust related to working cooperatively within a team.
- Can identify issues relating to the collaboration and communication methods a group might adopt, highlighting potential problematic positive aspects of team composition and dedication of group members.

Material

Addendum: Trust & Empathy Evaluation Questionnaire

Literature

Bulu, S. T., & Yildirim, Z. (2008): Communication Behaviors and Trust in Collaborative Online Teams. Educational Technology & Society, 11 (1), 132-147.

Clark, W., Clark, L., Crossley, K. (2010): Developing Multidimensional Trust Without Touch In Virtual Teams, Marketing Management Journal, Spring 2010

Crisp, C. B., & Jarvenpaa, S. L. (2000): Trust over time in global virtual teams. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meeting, Toranto.

Costa A.C., Anderson, N. (2011): Measuring trust in teams: Development and validation of a multifaceted measure of formative and reflective



indicators of team trust, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20:1, 119-154,

Curtis, D. D., & Lawson, M. J. (2001): Exploring collaborative online learning, Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 5 (1), 21-34.

Feng, J., Lazar, J., Preece, J. (2004): Interpersonal Trust and Empathy Online: A Fragile Relationship, Behaviour & Information Technology Volume 23, 2004 - Issue 2

Ford, R., Piccolo, R. & Ford, L. (2017): 'Strategies for building effective virtual teams: Trust is key' Business Horizons, 2017, vol. 60, issue 1, pages 25-34

Jarvenpaa, S. L., Knoll, K., Leidner, D. E. (1998): Is Anybody out There? Antecedents of Trust in Global Virtual Teams, Journal of Management Information Systems Volume 14, 1998 - Issue 4

Jarvenpaa, S. L., Leidner, D. E. (1998): Communication and Trust in Global Virtual Teams, Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication Volume 3, Issue 4 June

Jarvenpaa, S. L., Shaw, T., Staples, D. S. (2004): Toward Contextualized Theories of Trust: The Role of Trust in Global Virtual Teams, *Information* Systems Research Vol. 15, No. 3, September 2004, pp. 250–267

Kanawattanachai, P., Yoo, Y. (2002): "Dynamic Nature of Trust in Virtual Teams," Case Western Reserve University, USA. Sprouts: Working Papers on Information Systems, 2(10)

Paul, D.L., McDaniel, Jr, R. R. (2004): A Field Study of the Effect of Interpersonal Trust on Virtual Collaborative Relationship Performance. MIS Quarterly Vol. 28, No. 2 (Jun., 2004), pp. 183-227

Pauleen, D. (2014): Virtual Teams: Projects, Protocols and Processes, London: Idea Publishing

Trust and Empathy in Online Collaboration

This questionnaire has been developed by the OnCreate project in order to provide a diagnostic tool for evaluating trust and empathy in online collaboration and virtual teamwork.

Methodology

The following survey employs both quantitative and qualitative questioning through a mix of of psychometric testing and open-ended questions.

A 7-point Likert scale will be used for the self-assessment of respondents' subjective experiences of trust and empathy in the online learning environment (1 = Very strongly disagree, 7 = Very strongly agree).

The open-ended questions provide an opportunity for respondents to qualify their answers and provide more detailed information about their experiences.

Trustworthiness

Overall, the other men Mark only one oval.	nbers of	f my tea	ım were	very tr	ustwort	thy		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strongly Agree
. I could rely on my tear Mark only one oval.	m memk	ers thr	oughou	t the pr	oject			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strongl Agree
. Most people in my tea Mark only one oval.	m do no	ot hesita	ate to he	elp and	suppor	t others	3	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly								Very Strongl Agree

Very Strongly

Disagree

2

3

7

Very Strongly

Agree

1

Integrity

These questions are designed to evaluate levels of trust within collaborative teams that all members will act with 'integrity'

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strong
Disagree								Agree
You could trust other fashion	team me	embers	to cont	ribute to	o the pr	oject in	a fair a	nd honest
Mark only one oval.								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strong Agree
The other team memb Mark only one oval.	ers were	e stronç	gly com	mitted t	o the p	roject		
wark only one oval.								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strong Agree
am never sure if other	er memb	ers of t	he tean	ı will de	liver or	n what t	hey pro	mised or not
Mark only one oval.								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly								Very Strong Agree
Disagree								
Disagree	nce Tr	ust)						
Disagree	nce Tr	rust)						
ility (Competer	ed to eva	aluate le						
ility (Competer	ed to eva	aluate le						
ility (Competer e questions are design members can be truste	ed to eva	aluate le	ecessary	/ abilitie	s for effe	ective co	ollaborati	on)
	ed to eva	aluate le	ecessary	/ abilitie	s for effe	ective co	ollaborati	on)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strongly Agree
	Within my team we ha Mark only one oval.	ve com _l	plete co	onfidenc	ce in ea	ch othe	r's abili	ty to pe	rform tasks.
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strongly Agree
	I am often uncomforta are critical to the proje Mark only one oval.		ng othe	r team	membe	rs take	respons	sibility f	or tasks which
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strongly Agree
	se questions are designo	ed to eva	aluate le	evels of					
	nevolence (Cal	ed to eva	aluate le	evels of o	deliver	accordir	ng to ag	reed obj	
	se questions are designoream will work in consident. The outcomes of the page 2.5.	ed to eva	aluate le	evels of o	deliver	accordir	ng to ag	reed obj	
	se questions are designoream will work in consident. The outcomes of the page 2.5.	ed to eva eration a	aluate le nd good vere im	evels of o	deliver	accordir	ng to ag	reed obj	ectives)
t	se questions are designered will work in consider The outcomes of the park only one oval. Very Strongly	ed to eva eration a project v	aluate le nd good vere im	evels of or a faith to portant	to the r	est of n	ng to ag	7	Very Strongly Agree
	se questions are designate am will work in consider. The outcomes of the part	ed to eva eration a project v	aluate le nd good vere im	evels of or a faith to portant 3	to the r	est of n	ng to ag	7	Very Strongly Agree
t	se questions are designate am will work in consider. The outcomes of the part	ed to eva eration a project v	aluate le nd good vere im 2	evels of or a faith to portant 3	to the r	est of n 5 nything	ng to aginy team 6 to disr	7 upt the	Very Strongly Agree project
ŧ	se questions are designered will work in consider the putcomes of the putcomes	ed to evaluation a project v	aluate le nd good vere imp	evels of of a faith to portant 3 cnowing 3	deliver to the r 4 gly do a	sest of n 5 nything	ng to aginy team 6 to disr	7 upt the	Very Strongly Agree Project Very Strongly Agree
t	se questions are designate am will work in consider the putcomes of the putcom	ed to evaluation a project v	aluate le nd good vere imp	evels of of a faith to portant 3 cnowing 3	deliver to the r 4 gly do a	sest of n 5 nything	ny team 6 to disr	7 upt the	Very Strongly Agree Project Very Strongly Agree

16. I can rely on others to behave in accordance with the commitments and stated goals of the

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strongl Agree
pathy (Relatio	nal Tr	ust)						
		•	vole of	ama athu	, and rai	otional t	ruot with	in callaborativ
se questions are designoss	eu io eva	aluate le	veis oi e	empatny	and rei	alionai l	rust with	iii collaborativ
The people in my tean Mark only one oval.	n are frie	endly ar	nd usua	illy cons	siderate	of eac	h other'	s feelings
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strong
					-			ers
Mark only one oval. Very Strongly	onal and	2			-		7	Very Strongl
Very Strongly Disagree We take each other's i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very Strong Agree
Very Strongly Disagree We take each other's i	1	2	3	4	5 deration	6 on when	7	Very Strong Agree
Very Strongly Disagree We take each other's i	1	2 ad opini	3 Ons into	4 O consid	5 deration	6 on when	7	Very Strong Agree a decision
Disagree We take each other's i Mark only one oval. Very Strongly	1 deas and	2 dd opinid	3 ons into	4 consider	5 deration 5	6 when 6	7 making	Very Strong Agree a decision Very Strong Agree
Very Strongly Disagree We take each other's i Mark only one oval. Very Strongly Disagree	1 deas and	2 dd opinid	3 ons into	4 consider	5 deration 5 r respec	6 when 6 ct withir	7 making	Very Strong Agree a decision Very Strong Agree

Cooperative Behaviours

These questions are designed to evaluate levels of trust related to working cooperatively within a team

21. You feel comfortable with the shared ownership of ideas within the team?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strongly Agree
In this team we addres Mark only one oval.	ss issue	s or pro	oblems	openly				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strongly Agree
Most people in my tea Mark only one oval.	m are o	pen to a	advice a	and help	from o	others		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Very Strongly Disagree								Very Strongly Agree
There is no 'team spiri Mark only one oval.	it' in my	group						
	1	group 2	3	4	5	6	7	Very Strongly Agree
Very Strongly	1 in which	2	eel trust	and en	npathy	is supp	orted by	Agree
Very Strongly Disagree Please state the ways	1 in which	2	eel trust	and en	npathy	is supp	orted by	Agree
Very Strongly Disagree Please state the ways	1 in which	2	eel trust	and en	npathy	is supp	orted by	Agree
Very Strongly Disagree Please state the ways	in which	2 h you fesitively	eel trust	and encollabor	npathy ative pe	is supperforma	orted by	Agree y the learning
Very Strongly Disagree Please state the ways environment (how did	in which	2 h you fesitively	eel trust	and encollabor	npathy ative pe	is supperforma	orted by	Agree y the learning

Powered by

