

SECTION 1 — GENERAL INFORMATION

OVERVIEW AND INSTRUCTIONS

The goal of this tool, *Cross-Jurisdictional Sharing (CJS) Agreements Collaboration Trust Scale*, is to help evaluate levels of trust between collaboration partner organizations. This tool is designed to capture the following five dimensions of trust:

- 1. Trust in Partner Knowledge and Skills** — the extent to which the collaborating group members and organizations exhibit skills, competencies and characteristics that allow them to have influence in some domain.
- 2. Trust in Partner Integrity** — the extent to which the people and organizations involved are seen as honorable and their words match their actions.
- 3. Trust in Partner Investment in Community Well-Being** — the extent to which the people and organizations involved not only care about their own organizations, communities and target populations, but are also seen to be genuinely caring and concerned about partnering organizations, collaborative team members, governments and community well-being.
- 4. Trust in Partner Behavior (Predictability)** — the extent to which the partner organizations' (or organizational representatives') behaviors are consistent.
- 5. Trust in Communication** — the extent to which the people and organizations involved can communicate and coordinate about difficult issues productively.

WHAT IS TRUST AND WHY SHOULD YOU ASSESS IT?

Trust is typically characterized as “the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the outcomes of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party.”¹ In simpler terms, trust is the belief that someone is reliable, good, honest and effective. Developing trust can be thought of as “the work before the work,” meaning the mutual effort needed to build effective communications and relationships. Without it, other tasks get done less efficiently and effectively. Such trust is critical in situations where programs or organizations are dependent on the behavior and reliability of others for their own outcomes. Trust helps to reduce perceived risk, vulnerability and uncertainty.² Trust can also be a sensitive and emotional topic. It is often built slowly and can be eroded rapidly.

Using a tool, such as the one provided by this survey, can help make discussions about trust safer and more productive. The survey is a useful tool to help people explore together their differing expectations and experiences of one another.

MEASURING TRUST

Most instruments used to measure organizational trust have been developed to measure trust within individual organizations. The CJS Collaboration Trust Scale is aimed at measuring trust among partners from different organizations who come together with a common goal. Measuring inter-organizational trust helps quantify the interpersonal needs to predict and understand other people and organizations behavior.³

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Surveys should be collected anonymously so that respondents feel more comfortable providing honest answers. If the number of participants from each partner organization is sufficiently larger to ensure anonymity then it may be useful to collect organizational identifiable information to assess trust from each partner organization’s perspective. Each respondent should rate their level of agreement with each question on the survey using the Likert scale below.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

SCORING

Subsection scores and total overall scores are determined by adding together the scores for items that make up each sub-scale and for the survey overall. Because of the extensive modification to the original trust instrument, this tool should not be considered validated and normative scores are not yet available. However the consistency of the questions construction from the original instrument should provide reasonable reliability. This tool should be used to look at areas of relative strength and weakness in CJS interagency trust and provide a measurement for detecting change over time with repeated measurement. Scores for each subsection can range from 5–25 for each respondent.

Once data has been collected, ratings can be summed and averaged into a single index of trust. Means can be calculated based on all items in the scale, as well as separately for each dimension. This allows researchers to not only determine the participants’ overall trust in their team and/or leader, but also specify which areas of trust are contributing most to the overall trust perceptions.

Items that make up each subsection are listed below.

1. Trust in Partner Knowledge and Skills — 2, 6, 12, 19, 24
2. Trust in Partner Integrity — 4, 9, 14, 18, 22
3. Trust in Partner Investment in Community Well-Being — 5, 7, 11, 16, 21
4. Trust in Partner Behavior (Predictability) — 3, 8, 15, 20, 23
5. Trust in Communication — 1, 10, 13, 17, 25

A scoring sheet is provided at the end of this document.

REFERENCES

1. Mayer, R., Davis, J., & Schoorman, F. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20 (3), 709–734.
2. Costa, A. C., Roe, R. A., & Taillieu, T. (2001). Trust Within Teams: The Relation With Performance Effectiveness. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 10 (3): 225–244.
3. Adams, B. D., Bryant, D. J., & Webb, R. D. G. (2001). *Trust in Teams: Literature Review*. DRDC Toronto Report CR-2001-042. Guelph, Ontario: Humansystems Incorporated.

Portions of this document were adapted from *Trust in Teams and Trust in Leaders Scales* (Adams & Sartori, 2005 & 2008).

SECTION 2 — SURVEY

Date of Survey:

Thank you for your cooperation in assessing the current status of the inter-organizational level of trust among the CJS collaborative. The following statements will assess several different dimensions of trust, reliability and communication among CJS partners. This tool can offer a framework to help people think about the kind of partnership they want and what they need to do together to create it. Please take your time and respond to each sentence by circling the answer or number associated with the statement that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the statements.

1.) The collaborative partners share a common vision of the end goal of what working together should accomplish.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q1:

2.) I have faith in the abilities of my teammates.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q2:

3.) I know what to expect from my collaborative partners.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q3:

4.) I can depend on the collaborative partners to be fair.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q4:

5.) I believe that our collaborative partners have the best interests of our communities and shared issues or concerns in mind.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q5:

6.) I have confidence in the abilities of the collaboration leaders.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q6:

7.) I have confidence in the motivations of the collaborative partners.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q7:

8.) In times of uncertainty, the collaborative partners stick to the plan.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q8:

9.) The collaborative partners honor their word.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q9:

10.) The collaborative partners are reliable in terms of following through on commitments.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q10:

11.) The collaborative partners are motivated to protect our common interests.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score 11:

12.) The collaboration members are qualified to do their job.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q12:

13.) The collaborative partners are willing to engage in frank, open and civil discussion (especially when disagreement exists).

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q13:

14.) The collaborative partners keep their promises.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q14:

15.) I usually know how members of the collaboration are going to react.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q15:

16.) The leaders in this collaborative are genuinely concerned about CJS team members well-being.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q16:

17.) The collaborative partners are willing to consider a variety of viewpoints and talk together (rather than at each other).

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q17:

18.) The collaborative partners are honest people.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q18:

19.) The collaboration members and partners communicate well.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q19:

20.) The collaboration leaders behave in a consistent manner.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q20:

21.) The collaborative partners are motivated to protect me as an individual.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q21:

22.) The collaboration leaders put their words into action.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q22:

23.) The collaborative partners are reliable.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q23:

24.) The collaboration members are capable at their jobs.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q24:

25.) I can communicate with other collaboration members in an open, trusting manner.

Completely Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Completely Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Score Q25:

SECTION 3 — SCORING SHEET

Subsections scores and total overall scores are determined by adding together the scores for items that make up each sub-scale and for the survey overall. Scores for each subsection can range from 5– 25 for each respondent. Once data has been collected, ratings can be summed and averaged into a single index of trust. Means can be calculated based on all items in the scale, as well as separately for each dimension.

Trust in Partner Knowledge and Skills					
#2	#6	#12	#19	#24	Subsection Score

Trust in Partner Integrity					
#4	#9	#14	#18	#22	Subsection Score

Trust in Partner Investment in Community Well-Being					
#5	#7	#11	#16	#21	Subsection Score

Trust in Partner Behavior (Predictability)					
#3	#8	#15	#20	#23	Subsection Score

Trust in Communication					
#1	#10	#13	#17	#25	Subsection Score

Total Trust Instrument Score (add all subsection scores)