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ABSTRACT

Organizational development (OD) is a branch of organizational behavior and industrial sociology that is a "system-wide process of data collection, diagnosis, action planning, intervention, and evaluation aimed at increasing congruence between organization and structure, process, strategy, people, and culture" (Beer, 1980). Typically, OD practitioners or consultants are hired to work with a group or team in an organization in order to help the team reach its goals despite the strains of organizational change. This model is frequently used in corporate settings, but little research has been conducted on the application of the model to a non-profit or non-corporate atmosphere. This study's aim is to assess the possible benefits of the organizational development model with a non-profit that primarily operates with teams of volunteers, specifically Blount County Habitat for Humanity.
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CHAPTER I

AN INTRODUCTION TO ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

This chapter will outline the history of organizational development (OD) as it pertains to industrial/organizational sociology and psychology, and how it has been developed into a field of research and practice since the early 1900s. It will provide a brief summary of a broad understanding of organizational sociology and a chronological outline of the development of organizational development primarily from an industrial/organizational psychological viewpoint (as organizational development itself is derived from this branch of study).

Though this particular study applies organizational development from a sociological perspective, organizational development was first conceived by psychologists, who later became known as industrial/organizational psychologists. However, whereas psychologists emphasize the individual in their field of study, sociologists are primarily concerned with society at large, and the various social institutions that shape and are shaped by the lives of individuals. Therefore, it is simple to apply many sociological theories to organizations themselves. Of course, the rise of industry led German philosopher Karl Marx (who is widely claimed by sociologists as a founding theorist) to conceive of the notion of class conflict as the separation between those with access to resources and those without access to resources grew more divided (Kivisto 12-25). Karl Marx, however, was not the only early “sociologist” who began to examine the industrial world as a primary economic and social force. Probably most pertinent to the understanding of organizational structure during the Industrial Revolution was Max Weber’s
“Bureaucracy,” which outlined the increasing rationalization of the organizational structure of public and private enterprises. With the bureaucratic structure, organizations became rigidly-managed and patternized; elements like “regular activities…distributed in a fixed way as official duties,” “the authority to give the commands for…these duties…distributed in a stable way and…strictly limited by rules,” and “methodological provision…made for the regular and continuous fulfillment of these duties” became the norm for most organizations (Kivisto 89).

Organizational sociologist Dean J. Champion clarifies Weber’s characteristics of a bureaucratic organization as being: “impersonal social relations, appointment and promotion on the basis of merit, previously specified authority obligations which inhere in the position…a hierarchy of authority, abstract rules or laws covering task assignments and decisions, and specialization of position” (34). As organizations became more rationalized, they also became more predictable so that sociologists were able to study trends in the organizations themselves.

Some early organizational sociological studies were concerned with the limitations of the bureaucratic model. Whereas Weber concluded that the most efficient organizations were ones that operated with the utmost rational protocol, organizational sociologists were determining that rationalization was not always the most practical way to do business. Elton Mayo of the “human-relations school” argued in the 1920s that humans invest emotions into their work (Champion 45). The “human-relations” model began to examine the psychological and social satisfactions of people in the workplace, perhaps becoming one of the earliest forms of organizational development (46). From 1927 to 1932, Mayo conducted the famous “Hawthorne Studies” at the Hawthorne plant, a branch of the Western Electric Company. These studies investigated physical environment influences (such as lighting, temperature, and humidity), as well as the plant’s work-structural elements (such as number of hours per work day, incentive systems, and pay),
and even the plant’s social situation (46). The studies found that social needs and satisfactions were closely correlated to employee productivity because “increased productivity appeared to be [a] result of increased group cohesiveness among workers” (47). Though these studies are criticized by many modern industrial/organizational sociologists and psychologists, they were very useful for determining the many issues that influence employees and their behaviors in organizations. Dean Champion also discusses a study in 1954 that analyzed the behavior of people in organizations depending on various kinds of managerial presences (36). Under one manager, who was understood to be “more friendly,” the employees deviated from the strict rules of the organization from time to time. When a new manager, who was a “strictly business type of person” came on board with the organization, however, employees were more likely to follow strict orders with much less deviation (36-37). Studies like this indicated that men were not machines in organizations; they found that there is a great deal of agency within organizations on behalf of both managers and employees. Understanding that employees operate in certain ways within the “social worlds” of organizations was the first step in recognizing how social science could positively impact the corporate sphere.

The history of organizational development is most commonly discussed as being a branch of industrial/organizational psychology, and so to fully understand organizational development, it is important to first understand not only how sociologists but also how psychologists became involved in the organizational setting. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, American society was changing rapidly with the rise of industry. Industrialization, in many ways, caused immigration, a rise in the birth rate, and urbanization, among other things (Koppes and Pickren 10). Production began to change from small, familial and apprentice-based businesses to large factories that were able to hire hundreds of employees. Meanwhile, psychology as a field of
study was seeking to become legitimated through the applications of empiricism and the scientific method rather than its previous concern of merely “studying humans from a philosophical view” (Koppes and Pickren 11). Psychology was thus becoming defined as “the science of human behavior, cognition, emotion, and motivation,” abandoning much of its questionable or dubious roots such as phrenology (Spector 4). Applied psychology, like Applied sociology, is a branch of study that involves using psychology to solve a practical problem in a pragmatic way through the usage of the scientific method. Because problems or issues of concern (typically those that had to do with the adjustment from small to large companies) were rising within the rapidly changing industrial world, psychologists began to seek to approach these problems from a psychological viewpoint.

Credited as the one of fathers of what became industrial/organizational psychology, Hugo Munsterberg came to America from Germany and conducted research in the selection and hiring processes in organizations (Spector 9, Koppes and Pickren 13). Walter Dill Scott was also an early industrial/organizational psychologist who was concerned with using psychology in marketing to better appeal a product to the customer (Spector 9). In its earlier days, industrial/organizational psychology was not institutionalized, but after Munsterberg’s book in 1913, *Psychology and Industrial Efficiency*, the industrial world became quite interested in what psychologists had to offer them, thus building the credibility of the study. Still, Applied psychology itself was a very small branch, and Applied industrial/organizational psychology was even smaller; in 1917, only “16 of the 300 members of APA [American Psychological Association] were working primarily in the various applications of Psychology” (Koppes and Pickren 15). In the mid 1920s, however, psychologists began to work in the industry or as consultants for the industry (Koppes and Pickren 15). This was a time of great industrial reform;
people were beginning to form labor unions in order to reduce the number of work hours per week, establish a fair wage system, and also eliminate child labor (Zickar and Gibby 62). The industry had to, in many ways, compromise with labor unions’ demands in order to maintain operations. Industrial/organizational psychology was able to help these sorts of compromises take place because consultants wanted to optimize both the needs of the organization as a whole and the employees themselves.

Eventually, industrial/organizational psychology (I/O Psychology) was known for being concerned with the macro-organizational issues of “job design, employee selection, employee training, and performance appraisal,” as well as the micro-organizational issues of “the well-being of employees… employee attitudes, employee behavior, job stress, and supervisory practices” (Spector 5). This shift of concern about employee welfare came about after the Great Depression, and job satisfaction became a subject of interest for I/O psychologists. Finally, in 1937, the American Association of Applied Psychologists founded Section D, Industrial and Business Psychology, which eventually melded into Division 14 of the APA (Koppes and Pickren 26). I/O psychologists were hired as consultants by organizations to help them more completely understand their problems and provide solutions from a psychological standpoint. Even as early as the 1930s, independent consulting firms began to employ I/O psychologists to organizations struggling with “turnover, soldiering, strikes, ineffective supervision, and motivating employees to increase efficiency” (Zickar and Gibby 64).

After WWII, prosperity led to an even greater concern for job satisfaction. Very unlike the earlier days of industrialization, work was viewed as something that was meant to be pleasurable and fulfilling, not a miserable twelve or fourteen-hour time of toiling to provide just enough on which the family could survive. The military itself became quite interested in what
I/O psychology could offer. In 1951, The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) was established specifically for the US Army to focus on research dealing with “motivation, morale, and leadership” as well as the behaviors of soldiers in battle and the effects of stress (Meyer 147). HumRRO proved to be a beneficial investment because, soon, other similar research organizations were established for several branches of the government. The Advanced Research Resources Organization (ARRO) is one example. Developed in the late 1970s to work with federal agencies such as the Departments of Labor, Justice, and Transportation, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as “many state and local governments…ARRO staff opened up the area of physical performance as an important aptitude of domain for evaluation in the employment situation, especially in response to social changes affecting the employment of women and minorities in physically demanding jobs” (Meyer 149). To do this, ARRO developed new job analysis methodology, and even began to look at team performance.

Walter Dill Scott, who began to analyze psychology in advertising back in the 1920s, started his own I/O psychology consulting firm before I/O psychology was even recognized by the APA. The Scott Company began consulting some thirty or forty years before HumRRO, and at least fifty years before the ARRO. The success of the Scott Company led to the development of several other independent consulting firms, such as the Center for Creative Leadership. The CCL is an “international, nonprofit, educational institution devoted to leadership research and training” founded in 1970 (Meyer 150). The Center publishes a variety of educational programs each year in which “some 20,000 managers and executives, educators, government leaders, and community service administrators and volunteers” are in attendance (150). The Industrial Revolution of the early twentieth century brought about significant changes in service and
manufacturing companies. These changes, in addition to the rapid increase of war technology, coupled with a growing humanistic concern for the well-being of both employees and soldiers led to the creation and growth of I/O psychology as a legitimate field of research, study, and practice. However, just as I/O psychology is one branch of applied psychology, organizational change management and organizational development are merely branches of I/O psychology or sociology.

Companies and organizations are in many ways “living” things. They employ people to do a specific job in a specific market at a specific time. Just as any other living organism affects and is affected by its environment, so are companies. Organizations do not exist in vacuums; but, rather, they change and adapt depending on how their environment changes and adapts. Understanding organizations in this way, almost from a biological perspective, allowed I/O psychologists to begin to formulate how psychology could help organizations cope with change. This specific branch of I/O psychology, organizational change management, involves making “organizations more responsive to environmental shifts [and] should be guided by generally accepted and unified theories of organizations and organizational change” (Porras and Silvers 51). In their article “Explaining Development and Change in Organizations,” Andrew Van de Ven and Marshall Poole discuss four models of change in organizations: life-cycle theory, teleological theory, dialectic theory, and evolution theory. Life-cycle theory follows a biological-developmentalism model; it explains the organization as an organism undergoing growth with each developmental stage coded within it, much like DNA. There is a growth-like progression “to the final end state” and “each stage of development is seen as a necessary precursor of succeeding change” (515). Teleological change theory is similar to life-cycle theory in that there is an end state the organization is trying to reach. Unlike life-cycle theory, however, the
organization decides what goals it wants to pursue and has the freedom to choose how it will pursue these goals. Teleological theory also allows room for the re-formulation of goals once certain goals have been reached (Van de Ven and Poole 516). Dialectical theory, rooted in Hegelian philosophy, understands change as the synthesis of compromises to conflicts. In this model, organizations are met with challenges to their specific current operations and must re-formulate their management styles in light of the challenge, allowing room for compromise. Evolutionary theory follows a Darwinian model of constant adaptation and a corporate idea of “survival of the fittest” (Van de Ven and Poole 517-18). Most organizations will follow at least one of these four change processes, if not a combination of two or more, when they adapt to their environment. Understanding which change model works best for an organization and how to give the organization the tools it needs to make the change take place is a crucial aspect of organizational change management.

As globalization creates larger markets, even international markets in many cases, businesses have realized the value of being able to adapt to an ever-changing world of competition. In 2000, “research and development spending in the top 300 companies world-wide increased 12.8%, with the largest increases in some 100 American companies;” R & D spending had previously observed a steady annual increase of 4 or 5% each year since 1975 (Hage 599). Companies are able to make significant changes by adjusting their product, service, technology, or administrative practices (599). In order to do this, however, organizations must be able to learn at a rapid rate, so that they create “a facility for discontinuous information processing on the part of both firms and individuals, [as well as] the capability to deploy knowledge and demonstrable skills in novel ways and flexible communications” (Rousseau 530). This is where organizational development comes in.
Organizational development is concerned with helping organizations cope with change so that the outcome of organizational change will be for the better. Michael Beer states it best:

Organizational Development is a system-wide process of data collection, diagnosis, action planning, intervention, and evaluation aimed at increasing congruence between organization structure, process, strategy, people, and culture; developing new and creative solutions; and developing the organization’s self-renewing capacity. It occurs through a collaboration of organization members working with a change agent using behavioral science theory, research, and technology (Jamieson and Worley 102).

Organizational development became defined by practitioners and interventionists in the 1950s and grew rapidly in the 60s and 70s as a branch of study and practice that helps organizations through Kurt Lewin’s three-step organizational change process: unfreezing, changing, and refreezing (Burke 14, 16). For the OD practitioner or interventionist, this process is actually a feedback cycle in which the practitioner diagnoses the organization, often by using one of the four change theories, creates an intervention plan, implements the plan through a series of “action cycles” during the “changing” phase, evaluates the outcomes of the plan as remedial to the original goals of the intervention, and then re-diagnoses and designs the intervention again to optimize the organization’s results over time.

Diagnosing the change process involves meeting the organization where it is in its development. Some OD practitioners will help organizations through rigidly-Lewinian periods of episodic change (usually life-cycle or teleological change theories), or they will help organizations become continuously-changing (typically Dialectic or Evolutionary change theories) (Weick and Quinn 366). In episodic change environments, interventionists are agents of
change, primarily concerned with “cognitive restructuring in which words are redefined… concepts are interpreted more broadly, or new standards of judgment and evaluation are learned (372). In continuously-changing organizations, “change is an ongoing mixture of reactive and proactive modifications, guided by purposes at hand, rather than an intermittent interruption of periods of convergence,” and so practitioners modify interventions to equip organizations with tools required for balance amidst an ever-changing environment, instead of guiding through a step-by-step sequence of change (379). Interventionists can lead this process in one of four different ways: by the participating strategy (creating a relationship and open dialogue), the transcending strategy (developing a new, forward-seeking, internal mindset), the forcing strategy (using authority and leverage), or the telling strategy (appealing to the logic of new change) (Quinn and Sonenshein 77). Culture also plays a key role in the diagnostic aspect of interventions. Faucheux, Amado, and Laurent point out in their article “Organizational Development and Change” that “American managers predominantly hold an ‘instrumental’ view of the organization as a set of tasks to be achieved, [while] French managers favor a ‘social’ view of the organization as a collectivity of people” (353). One can assume that Asian cultures would also place a high value on teams and collective success.

No matter which method a practitioner uses for a particular organization, though, the practitioner will always value “choice, participation, human dignity, and learning” while “disrupting the status quo (unfreezing), producing valid data, providing free choice, developing individual or organizational capacity and helping the client learn, engaging people in developing their desired future, and identifying, surfacing, or working with support, inertia, or resistance” (Jamieson and Worley 110). Interventionists typically will spend time in the organization conducting interviews with management and employees, giving out questionnaires, or making
general observations of the organization’s target issues (Lundberg 144). This time spent in the organization helps the interventionist begin to fully make sense of the organization’s core values and current problems. Diagnostic planning helps the interventionist understand the major questions and concerns of the organization before determining the best route to organizational success.

Action cycles are the most important aspect of the OD intervention process because it is during the action cycles that the practitioner is actively guiding and engaging the employees within the organization. The actual “action” in the action cycles depends, again, on the diagnosis of the organizational change. Organizations that follow a teleological episodic change sequence, for example, may utilize the participative strategy, so that the action cycles involve open, shared dialogue of goal-seeking direction between the employees and the interventionist. In the participative strategy, relationships, dialogue, and the common good are emphasized, and employees perceive the interventionist as having a lower degree of control, making their own inputs seem more powerful (Quinn and Sonenshein 74). This model does not necessarily work for all organizations, though. Some organizations, especially dialectical, continuously-changing organizations, will benefit more from the telling strategy, in which the intervention emphasizes the organization’s self-interest from a very logical standpoint, and the interventionist has a high perceived level of control so that the logic the interventionist presents seems more credible (74). Most action cycles, however, do understand employees in organizations as self-interested, yet they are still “inherently social, guided by a normative culture that influences [their] behavior” (70). In summary, action cycles seek various ways of convincing people that the organizational change is best for them as individuals and the organization as a whole.
Because organizational development is primarily concerned with humanistic principles, most intervention literature places a high value on the democratic learning style in a given intervention. This style of learning involves helping employees unfreeze and transition by disrupting the established norms of the organization in a controlled way. The discomfort that results from this “normlessness” is meant to engage employees in thoughtful discussion, in which everyone feels that his or her opinions are welcomed. This rule is sometimes referred to in OD literature as the “say everything” rule, and it is meant to “feed back all the institutional unspoken [thoughts] in the sessions” (Faucheux, Amado, and Laurent 359), as well as “develop shared understandings or common cognitive structures regarding application of shared knowledge, and otherwise externalize [what has been learned]” (Rousseau 531). The action cycle process is not a simple undertaking because it involves resistance and discomfort. People tend to prefer the familiar, and action cycles are designed to make people feel uncomfortable (unfreezing and transitioning) so they can become re-familiar in another way (refreezing). For this reason, action cycles often include some negative aspects, such as “the clarification of multiple memberships, of positive and negative references to groups, categories, ideologies which deny the common belonging to the organization, and the analysis of resistances to such an elucidation” (Faucheux, Amado, and Laurent 359).

Once the action cycles are completed and the employees have had a specific amount of time to adapt to the organizational change after the intervention itself, evaluation of the OD intervention process begins. Most of my review of OD literature on intervention evaluations has explicitly stated that very little research on the actual evaluation of interventions has been done. In “Organizational Innovation and Change,” Sociologist J.T. Hage states that “most of the literature on organizational innovation has concentrated on the causes of innovation but has not
considered the feedbacks” (609). In a similar article, “Assessing Organization Development and Change Interventions,” Woodman, Bingham, and Yuan explain several difficulties constraining evaluation research such as resources (time, talent, and energy), measurement issues (differences in qualifications and quantifiable typologies), inconsistent treatment across organizations (primarily because no two organizations are the same), and evaluation biases (189-91). Another issue I foresee, but did not find explicit mention of in the OD literature I reviewed, is the difference of research and practice. It seems as though there are several OD researchers examining the methodology in OD practice but not involved in the practice itself while OD practitioners are involved in the practice but not necessarily seeking to further the scientifically-driven research. There seems to be a gap between the study and the practice of organizational development, and both researchers and practitioners are operating in different ways. This is not necessarily a negative thing, in my opinion, because on one hand, the different viewpoints from practitioners and researchers allow for a more comprehensive understanding of organizational development when combined. However, I believe the two must go hand in hand, or else important issues may be overlooked. Though the current gap may presently have the potential to provide a variety of solutions to organizations struggling with several kinds of problems, practitioners and researchers alike may benefit from a heightened collaboration of their viewpoints, and it would certainly provide for a more holistic understanding of intervention evaluation.

Some current measurements used to explain the success of OD interventions include organizational performance, which can be defined in terms of “productivity, profitability, efficiency, effectiveness, [and] quality,” and individual development, captured in terms of “an actualization of the self that occurs as individuals alter their world views, expand their repertoire
of behaviors, and/or improve their skills and abilities” (Porras and Silvers 58). Obviously, some of these measurements, such as productivity and efficiency, are much easier to quantify than others, such as the alteration of individuals’ world views. At any rate, interventionists seek the best ways to interpret and analyze these or other factors, depending on the organization, against the organization’s original goals of change outlined in the diagnostic step of the process. The evaluation step in the process enables the development of a future intervention, following the feedback cycle process. The interventionist may also educate the employees themselves to begin to analyze the results of the intervention in light of future changes, especially in a continuously-changing organization (Faucheux, Amado, and Laurent 359). Despite the present foggy state of intervention evaluations, “qualitative, quantitative, and historical evidence yields decent support for the conclusion that OD has a net positive influence in organizations” (Jamieson and Worley 107), though there is always room for improvement in the OD technique, which is, in many ways, a feedback process in itself.

One very popular arena of interest for OD interventions has been that of team management. Working with smaller groups or teams within a larger organizational system is historically rooted in organizational development, and it is safe to conclude that the tradition lives on in present practices, though in different ways in many cases. Larry Greiner states that “change methods used by OD have relied primarily on team building and interpersonal feedback…[and] participative methods and group decision making used by OD consultants in attempts to change organizations toward more humanistic practices” (386). However, in the 1980s, organizational development began to shift from these micro-issues to more macro-issues, such as “self-managed work groups, career development, and cultural change in organizations” (Greiner 387). Organizational development’s history in teambuilding goes back to training-
groups, or T-groups, that began to be used in the 1940s. T-groups were groups of people from an organization who would meet at an off-site location with an OD interventionist or facilitator to have open dialogue about their interpersonal relations and exercise their communication skills over a two or three day period (Spector 357). Over the course of the intervention time, T-group members would establish tasks, define norms, reduce interpersonal conflict, and develop a sense of team identity and commitment to the common good of the team (Weiner 343). This model was later adapted by the US Air Force and was used by the Air Force Research Laboratory to improve communication in the cockpit and enhance the “development and functioning of teams on interdependent tasks” (Salas, DeRouin, and Gade 181). Because T-groups had such a great emphasis on the individual as he or she related to the organization as a whole, when work groups or teams became more common in the 70s and 80s, T-group training became obsolete. As Greenberg and Baron say, “if one assumes that work groups are the basic building blocks of organizations, it follows that that organizational change should emphasize changing groups instead of individuals” (644). Although few OD interventionists still utilize the true T-group model, many still borrow elements of team building in their consulting designs.

J. Richard Hackman is often cited in studies about teams. After having done a significant amount of research with flight crews, Hackman is well-versed in team management, and his book, *Leading Teams*, provides insight for successful team building and team management. In his book, he argues for five conditions that create successful teams: “a real team, a compelling direction, an enabling team structure, a supportive organizational context, and expert team coaching” (Hackman 31). *Leading Teams* outlines these conditions from a managerial standpoint in order to help managers build better teams. Guzzo and Dickson also discuss flight crews (and Hackman) at length in their article “Team Effectiveness in Organizations.” They explain that the
relationship between teams and the greater organization is very complex, but that the team model in general is becoming increasingly more popular. In 1990, “it was estimated...that 47% of large US companies made use of self-directed, autonomous work teams and that there was a strong growth trend in the use of such teams from 1987 to 1990” and that “80% of organizations with 100 or more employees used teams in some way” (Guzzo and Dickson 329). The familiarity, boundaries, and context of these teams, however, has a great influence on their ability to create, communicate, adapt, and fulfill their respective tasks. Porras and Silvers (1991) summarize in their article “Organizational Change” that different team interventions work best for different teams depending on the group process variables, group performance variables, and group dynamics variables (63). Again, different organizations with different visions and operational tactics require different applications of organizational development; and, because organizational development is designed to be a forward-looking, highly flexible branch of study and practice, in many cases, its application proves to be successful.

The purpose of this study is to examine organizational development outside of this traditional context. The next chapter will illustrate specifically how this can be done through the application of the model to a non-profit organization, Blount County Habitat for Humanity, and the following chapters will elaborate on the methodology and results of this application. For the sake of explaining this model in the brief outline of organizational development discussed here, I would like to present this study as adapting a teleological episodic change model to a participative intervention strategy that will allow Habitat for Humanity volunteers to create and define their team goals with little control from the interventionist (i.e., myself). This study will describe more of the details of organizational development throughout, in hopes to provide a
rough yet workable paradigm of the many creative ways OD interventions can be used to help individuals and organizations accomplish their goals and maintain their visions.

CHAPTER II

APPLICATION TO A NON-PROFIT SETTING

This chapter explains the application of a model of a typical corporate organizational development (OD) program or model to a non-profit organization, Habitat for Humanity in Blount County. Also, this section will include information about the inclusion of certain elements in my OD program, which is described in detail in Chapter III.
After having analyzed organizational development as the branch of industrial sociology and psychology that specifically works at “promoting humanistic values, developing leaders, and attempting to deal in a systematic way with an organization as a whole,” (Burke 13) it seems that although organizational development is more of an application and practice than it is a branch of study that follows a clear-cut, academically-based paradigm, there are certain elements contained in it, and those elements are not exclusive to the corporate world alone. For the purpose of this study, organizational development is concerned with maximizing employee potential on a micro level within an organization’s environment so that the organization will function at its optimum on a macro level. It is the process of making “healthy” the smallest parts of an organization so that the organization as a whole will be “healthy.” Many OD professionals describe this as a “synergetic” system. In his article “A Contemporary View of Organization Development,” W. Warner Burke states that “synergy is expressed as $2 + 2 = 5$, that a group outcome on a task is more than the simple sum of individual outcomes” (30). He goes on to explain that synergy is one of the major topics that concerns OD practitioners.

This is precisely what I wanted to research—how do people working together in groups transform merely an aggregate of their individual contributions into some greater expression of their combined contributions, and what role can organizational development play in helping them understand and maximize their group potential? From my review of OD literature, I have deduced a pattern of four elements that seem necessary for utilizing some type of organizational development for making this change take place. These elements include employees (or people who work within an organizational structure), a structure itself (or the organization as a whole), some change or challenge to either the employees themselves or the structure itself (such as a change in hiring or some altered practice or new method the organization is implementing, often
described as “organizational change management”), and lastly a \textit{goal or anticipated end result}. Though these elements are often described by OD professionals in corporate models, I believe that they exist in various other places, including non-profit organizations, especially those that thrive on team-based volunteer work.

Some organizational development has been practiced in non-corporate and non-government related settings before, though evaluation of its effectiveness is still somewhat incomplete (Tandon 616). Many OD practitioners are beginning to apply the intervention model to social change organizations, or organizations that are concerned with creating “sustainable improvements in the lives and prospects of impoverished and marginalized groups,” which includes focuses of environmental sustainability, provision of decent housing, poverty alleviation, domestic violence support, or human rights advocacy for oppressed groups (Brown, Leach, and Covey 595). Of course, because the focus of the social change organization is drastically different than that of a profit-driven corporation, OD practitioners in these particular settings must modify their methods. In the article “Organization Development for Social Change,” Brown, Leach, and Covey state that “few social change organizations place a high value on organization and management,” and, therefore, organizational development within this type of non-corporate setting tends to concentrate on the mission-oriented outcomes of their focus for social change (598). Brown, Leach, and Covey specifically studied IRDA (International Relief and Development Agency) and ICSA (International Child Sponsorship Agency) as examples of social change organizations that implemented OD strategies to better achieve their goals (596–97). IRDA was able to utilize OD programming to “help diagnose and manage tensions over racial and ideological differences and the use of authority” (596) and ICSA
was able to clarify roles of the CEO and key staff and formulate new decision-making strategies (597).

Other training programs use OD-like methods to create a safe atmosphere for groups or teams to discuss, address, and solve problems that they are facing in some greater structure. NCBI (National Coalition Building Institute) is one example. NCBI focuses specifically on problem-solving strategies to handle issues related to discrimination and prejudices in professional and informal communities (www.ncbi.org/theory-philosophy/). NCBI trainers facilitate workshops where individuals are encouraged to give feedback on issues that matter to them. Then, small groups are formed to respond to problems in the community or organization proactively with a coalition-mindset that they have allies in their group members to effectively continue to work to solve these problems (www.ncbi.org/constituency-caucus-programs/).

This application of organizational development led me to contemplate the possible benefits of using an OD intervention in a non-profit setting wherein groups of volunteers worked to help the non-profit organization reach its goals. Habitat for Humanity is an international non-profit that seeks to eliminate poverty by working with volunteers and Partner Families to build decent and affordable homes for families in need (www.habitat.org/how/default.aspx). Already three of the four elements I identified for the application of an OD intervention program are present: volunteers and Partner Families (people) working within the structure and under the supervision of Habitat for Humanity (organization) to build houses for those living in poverty (anticipated end result). The final element, which involves a change or challenge, is that most of the volunteers are not full-time construction workers or even people with significant construction experience. In most cases, they are volunteer groups from churches or colleges that seek to do philanthropic work in their communities, or they are Partner Families who are working for their
own Habitat home and must put in a certain number of hours on the construction site as part of what Habitat describes as “Sweat Equity.” The fact that these groups of volunteers are typically outside their area of expertise and in an unfamiliar environment seems to involve the change or challenge element of organizational development.

From an OD standpoint, Habitat for Humanity seemed like the perfect candidate to implement an OD training intervention in order to increase volunteer morale and team skills while on the build site. From a researcher’s standpoint, it also seemed like the perfect candidate because working with Habitat for Humanity would provide the opportunity to obtain data about the success of the training intervention with various groups that each had distinct demographic characteristics. Comparing the team strengths and weaknesses based on demographic characteristics could help to draw correlations between those characteristics and group strengths and weaknesses. This would be possible because the build teams typically have similar characteristics because they are coming from similar places. For instance, most college students that work on the build sites are young, probably dependent on their middle-class parents, and may need to fulfill community service hours for a scholarship or college-related program. Church groups that volunteer may reflect more mixed demographics as far as age and gender than the college groups. And, finally, the Partner Family groups typically come from low-income backgrounds and are more likely to be minorities. I was curious to see correlations within each group’s dynamics, including their strengths and weaknesses, before and after the training program as well as the correlations between the groups themselves.

After collaborating with Blount County Habitat for Humanity’s CEO, Tony Gibbons, about my plan to execute an OD intervention with build site volunteers and submitting my research proposal to the Institutional Review Board for approval, I began to design my program.
I wanted a majority of it to include information about teams and teamwork, and utilize exercises that would help volunteers understand the importance of teamwork in an unfamiliar environment. I also wanted to include communication exercises, a segment on motivation and vision, and some sort of “mock build” in which volunteers could practice applying their new teamwork skills in a controlled environment. I would involve the elements of teambuilding, effective communication strategies, motivation, and the “mock build” in a “retreat-style” OD program. The “retreat” model is commonly used to “remove people from the distractions of the office so they can reflect and focus” and “help increase participation and commitment to decisions” (Greiner 394). I also wanted to use a sub-group model, which breaks up the entire group (typically around eight to fifteen members) into smaller groups of three or four. OD Researcher Larry Greiner describes the sub-group practice as reinforcing program content, because “subgroups usually agree in their overall conclusions, which adds credibility and validity to the points being made” and that individuals are able to give more “objective and honest” feedback because they do not feel pressure from the larger group (395). It also seemed important to cater to various learning styles in each exercise so that all the participants would benefit. I/O psychologist Paul E. Spector states that “individual differences among people in both ability and motivation are important factors in learning” and that “training needs to recognize these differences” (170). For this reason, implementing elements of lecture, question-and-answer, small and large group discussion, hands-on activities, and other elements of audio, visual, and kinesthetic (such as role playing) teaching strategies seemed crucial.

Since the 1960s, OD professionals have been utilizing various methods of teambuilding to “improve boss-subordinate relations, goal and role clarity, decision-making and conflict resolution procedures, and interpersonal relations” (Burke 23). Teambuilding is usually carried
out by a facilitator who gives feedback on the progress of the team (typically a previously-existing team) toward the particular objective of a planned activity (Spector 319). It seemed clear that the emphasis of the program should involve the teambuilding aspect of organizational development, especially because in many cases, an aggregate of people who are not necessarily acquainted with one another are working on the same build site at the same time. However, a group of people working in the same vicinity toward the same end result is not the same thing as a cohesive team working together to optimize strengths and compensate for weaknesses in order to attain a common goal. The goal of a teambuilding workshop, then, is to allow group members to “interact, express their opinions, and then together create a strategic plan that they will own and implement as a team” (Greiner 394). For Habitat for Humanity’s purposes, it seemed most crucial to emphasize goal and role clarity, conflict resolution, and interpersonal relations in the workshop design.

Because Habitat for Humanity thrives on team-based volunteer work, teambuilding needed to be a large part of the workshop. I/O sociologists and psychologists, and early OD practitioners, began using teambuilding strategies in the early 1940s with T-groups to do sensitivity training (Greenberg and Baron 643). These groups used team building strategies to learn to be open and honest with one another so that over the course of working together they would “come to know one another’s special strengths and weaknesses and become highly skilled in coordinating their activities, anticipating one another’s next moves in initiating appropriate responses to them even as those moves are occurring” (Hackman 27). Teambuilding in this way involves creating an atmosphere where both strengths and weaknesses are admitted, deciphered, and remedied so that the team can apply its unique composite skill-set or team personality to the
task at hand. Team members needed to learn to embody (or at least imitate) those qualities that would promote the success of the team.

The next question, then, is which qualities would be best to help teach participants to imitate or try to embody. This part of the program did not need to contain an overwhelming amount of information; too much information would be difficult for participants to remember and even more challenging to impersonate. For this reason, I decided I needed no more than five qualities to explain. I wanted these five qualities, though, to reflect several of the aspects of working with others, such as problem solving, communication, and cooperation. After analyzing these aspects, I arrived at five qualities that seemed to maximize a group member’s ability to solve problems, communicate effectively, and cooperate with others by evaluating each of these three categories. Solving problems in a group setting involves the ability to acknowledge problems and seek the best way to solve them, which entails initiative and strategic decision making. Communicating effectively involves a degree of openness, and I believe is most effective when done in a positive way. Cooperation on a team involves being able to freely express your own desires while still being considerate and respectful of the opinions of others, and ultimately being in accordance with a decision or mindset of the team as a whole. To encapsulate these aspects of being on a team with others, I arrived at five qualities which I term *Team Player, Fixer, Open, Agreeable, and Encouraging*, and here I will explain what is meant by each term.

*Team Player* is used here to represent a general optimistic attitude about working on a team. It is, of course, an obvious fact that not everyone enjoys working with others or on teams, but a shared optimistic attitude of the team itself by most of its members leads to group cohesiveness, the motivation for members to put their respective efforts into the effort of the
team itself (Spector 305). Group cohesiveness is accomplished when members are committed to the team, which means they have an “acceptance of team goals, willingness to work hard for the team, and desire to remain on the team”; and these attitudes lead to “high team performance, low turnover, and team satisfaction” (Spector 306). Moreover, creating a good Team Player involves fostering an appreciation for the other members of the team from each individual. Individuals have “diverse gifts,” and an “artful linking” of those gifts is crucial to “team richness, texture, and ultimately resourcefulness” (Greenberg and Baron 366). By realizing what each member is capable of doing for the team as a whole, participants can learn to see the synergistic benefits of working together.

*Fixer* is used to describe the problem-solving aspect of working on teams. A Fixer is someone on a team who is willing to identify problems and begin to help the team as a whole begin to strategize about methods to solve the problem. Including the element of problem identification is essential to the Fixer quality because “people often distort, omit, ignore, and/or discount information around them that provides important cues regarding the existence of problems” (Greenberg and Baron 536). Once problems are identified, the team as a whole can begin to discuss how the problem should be solved, and, depending on the nature of the problem, they can solve it themselves or present the issue to an authority who has the power to implement their decision (Robbins and Judge 340).

*Openness* is a quality that the Big Five Model, a personality test frequently used for person-job fit analyses, defines as “Openness to Experience,” or the range of “fascination with novelty.” It describes people who are open to be “creative, curious, and artistically sensitive” (Barrick and Mount 5). People who are open tend to be good listeners and are willing to try new things. On a Habitat for Humanity construction site, being open to experience is necessary
because in many cases, volunteers end up doing types of construction work they have never done before. Encouraging teams to exhibit flexibility and an acceptance of others and new ideas would be help them embody the Open quality.

*Agreeableness* is also borrowed from the Big Five Model, and it encapsulates the idea of an individual being “courteous, flexible, good-natured, and cooperative” (Spector 248). In a meta-analysis of the Big Five dimensions and job performance, M. R. Barrick and M. K. Mount found that in a job setting where an individual must constantly work with other people, such as sales or management, Agreeableness was a beneficial personality trait (14). For this workshop’s purposes, there is a greater emphasis on *not being disagreeable* than *being agreeable*. That is to say, this workshop clarifies that a team member should always stand his or her ground and be willing to share his or her opinion, but ultimately it is better to concede to the *group consensus* rather than cause dispute to fulfill some self-interest.

Lastly, the *Encouraging* quality encompasses an aspect of motivation. In their article “Prosocial Motivation,” Batson, Ahmed, Powell, and Stocks explain that this kind of motivation is useful to groups when they are facing a dilemma (143). The goal of group encouragement, or “collective motivation,” is “not to increase one’s own welfare or the welfare of the specific others who are benefitted; the ultimate goal is to increase the welfare of the group” (Batson et al 143). Encouragement is also tied in to efficacy—if a group tells itself it is capable of doing something, it will be more likely to accomplish it. The encouraging quality is also one of the easiest to practice; whereas the other qualities are more personality-based, encouragement is simply the act of encouraging, which can be as easy as telling a team member they are doing a good job.
The strength and weakness survey, described in detail in the next chapter, measures these qualities in participants’ personalities and allows them to identify their stronger and weaker areas. For this workshop, participants are encouraged to use the survey as a tool to help them concentrate on the portions of the workshop that provide solutions for their weaker areas. Examining their weaker areas and asserting the methods for strengthening them in their build experience will allow individuals to learn to compensate for their weaknesses and achieve the group’s goals. By using these methods, the team will be able to “harmonize the contributions of those with shaky interpersonal skills, and do so in a way that minimizes the risk to the team and its work” (Hackman 126).

Apart from these five qualities that are beneficial for people who are working on teams, communication is also a central aspect of a typical OD program or intervention. In fact, in a 1968 survey by Black and Mouton to determine what nearly 200 companies internationally were struggling with most, communication was reported as the most prominent problem (Burke 25). Communication exercises could help volunteers realize that open and honest communication delivered in a careful and respectful manner is most beneficial to helping a team achieve its goals (Burke 25). In the safe atmosphere of the retreat environment, the controlled setting would give participants comfort in sharing their opinions. To encourage communication among participants, small groups would also be helpful because small groups allow members to play a bigger role in the group, increasing trust and openness (Robbins and Judge 656). Effective communication not only relays information, but also allows for control and organization within the group, provides a “release for emotional expression of feelings and for fulfillment of social needs,” and even “fosters motivation” (Robbins and Judge 369). Exercises and strategies that could give participants an opportunity to practice effective communication would certainly be useful to
them. Furthermore, discussion of these exercises could enable the creation of action plans to implement effective communication tactics, and eventually help solidify the importance of effective communication within the group.

Motivation is one topic that has been approached by several OD practitioners in many ways because it is such a central part of an employee or volunteer’s relationship to his or her work. Therefore, CEOs, managers, and I/O sociologists and psychologists have invested a great deal of time and energy into figuring out how to motivate people so that they will be compelled to complete their tasks. Simple motivation systems are solely based on rewards, but these systems do not work for all employees or work environments because rewards (which are typically monetary in nature) do not fulfill a long-term search for meaning in one’s work. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs suggests that people want to participate in activities or careers that will help them achieve self-actualization (i.e., becoming the person one intends to be); and, for many people, self-actualization is not about monetary gain (Greenberg and Baron 118). Because this project is designed around volunteers who do not receive monetary rewards and are already seeking some sort of meaningful work through their desire to participate in a philanthropic cause, a motivation theory that involved an aspect of “self-actualization” would be most beneficial.

One motivation theory of OD is “Theory O,” which involves allowing employees to be the center of the change or challenge within the organization (Beer 407). This method enhances communication and creativity among the employees themselves, allowing them to have a considerable amount of input in decision-making and organizational design. Michael Beer discusses the benefits of Theory O as opposed to Theory E (a strict, hierarchical, monetary rewards-based system) in his article “Transforming Organizations.” Beer explains that Theory O motivation design is grounded in evidence that “financial rewards typically are ranked well
below needs for meaningful work” (414). Theory O seemed applicable to the workshop design because it would allow the participants to decide on their own what is motivating to them, and by allowing participants to create goals based on what motivates them, Theory O serves as a goal-setting theory in this context.

Specific goals are also essential in motivation theory because they “cause people to compare their present capacity to perform with that of a [future capacity of performance]” (Greenberg and Baron 122). Goals also “organize, prioritize, and manage…disparate motives” in a structural sense by transforming abstract motivations or desires into concrete deadlines or tangible outputs (Shah and Kruglanski 217). Furthermore, using a goal theory to motivate participants in such a way so that goals are congruent with their values is crucial. This approach is known as goal-investment theory, and it is specifically concerned with assigning goals to values, which are typically long-term commitments of a person’s character, rather than a one-dimensional focus on a short-term, goal-accomplishment strategy of action (Pomerantz and Shim 394). The values of the Partner Families, who may feel as though their construction work is, in a sense, earning them the opportunity to have their own home, may be different from the other volunteer groups, who may be most concerned with showing support for Habitat for Humanity’s big-picture effort to eliminate poverty by providing affordable housing. Allowing groups to discuss their values and translate them into specific goals would allow them to discover their motivation.

Any motivation theory or design that is concerned with changing people’s minds about their work as opposed to seeking only to change their actions is an internal motivation design. Internal motivation designs tend to have a stronger influence on the behaviors of people over time than external theories such as rewards systems or reinforcement theories (Bandura 460-61).
This is because when people are internally motivated, they “view their work as meaningful and feel personally responsible for work outcomes and receive trustworthy knowledge of the results of their efforts” (Hackman 95). Giving people the opportunity to become self-motivated first involves helping them realize their capacity for “self-efficacy,” or their “judgment of [their] ability to organize and execute given types of performances” (Bandura 21). In *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*, Albert Bandura discusses self-efficacy as a means for organizations to become more self-regulating by encouraging employees to believe they are capable of accomplishing the task at hand. By convincing, or at least attempting to convince, people within an organization that they are capable of doing something, people are likely to follow a self-fulfilling prophecy, or the notion that if people are told what they are going to become, they will become precisely that, because they overlook other possibilities and “accept” the “prophecy” given to them (Robbins and Judge 154). The self-efficacy motivation system works best, according to Bandura, when people’s self-interests are linked to goal attainments, and, therefore, giving people some freedom to define what goals they want to accomplish in accordance with their values and interests will maximize their belief in their own ability to accomplish those goals (136).

For the workshop, I wanted to give participants the opportunity to brainstorm in small groups about what they value in relation to the project they are seeking to complete, i.e., the Habitat home construction. This way, participants will be in an environment in which they can express their opinions freely and share knowledge collaboratively, allowing for the creation of beneficial strategies, heightened group efficacy, and better task completion (Bandura 463). In order to provide some structure to their ideas and efforts, I told participants to create “value” or “vision” statements in which they tried to convey what their work on the build site truly meant to
them. The statements had to be agreed upon by all members in the group and had to include elements from each member’s contribution. To encapsulate the goal-setting aspect of motivation, the statements had to begin with the words “we will.” After each group presented their vision statements and explained why they chose to include certain elements, the entire group would read the statement aloud in unison to help solidify the meaning and commitment of the statement in a pledge-like format.

The last element I wanted to include in the workshop was the element of the mock build. For this portion, the team would be divided into smaller groups and would have to build a “house” out of cardboard and various craft supplies and incorporate both the qualities of the teambuilding and the communication portions of the workshop. OD practitioners use projects like the mock build to allow the program participants to practice their new skills in a controlled environment with access to the OD professional. In this way, the mock build is like a “work sample” which allows participants to “demonstrate how well [they] can perform the tasks involved in a job under standardized conditions” (Spector 123). Of course, the materials provided in the mock build are quite different from the ones the groups will be using on the construction site, but the point of the exercise is to practice their teambuilding skills and not their construction skills, per se. For this reason, the mock build is more like a role play or simulation because it is not an exact representation of the work they will do but more of an analogous context of their task (178).

The mock build is beneficial not only because it allows for practice in a controlled environment and provides access to the OD practitioner, but also because it helps the groups establish norms for the work they will do. Norm creation in this regard is two-fold, though, because some of the norms or standards for group conduct are set into place by the OD
facilitator. I explain that each group member must be responsible for a certain aspect of the work, thus establishing a role structure for each group, though they have freedom to decide who does what. I also give them a time frame and task regulations, such as each “house” can only use ten materials and that each group must build a “house” rather than some other object. These expectations are crucial to each group accomplishing their goal, because it is quite unlikely that teams will create such deliberate parameters as part of their behavioral constraints or norms (Hackman 112). However, allowing the groups to have freedom in determining who fills what role and what sort of “house” to build gives them the opportunity to create “secondary norms” that emerge naturally. Secondary norms that are the result of a team responding to primary norms, such as the deliberate expectations given them by a leader, are likely to be beneficial for “maintaining harmonious interpersonal interactions within the group” (112).

I have here outlined the reasons why I believe an OD program would be beneficial to a non-profit organizational setting; that is, because it contains groups of people working within an organizational structure while coping with the challenge of being outside their regular environment or social context in order to meet a specific goal. I have also explained the general design of the OD workshop I implemented with the build teams, as well as the teambuilding, communication, motivation, and mock build elements included in the design. The application of a conventional OD intervention program to a non-profit setting has hereby proven to be a rather simple task, because many of the elements present in the corporate setting are also present in this particular non-corporate setting. However, certain aspects of the application require some adjustment; for instance, money cannot be used a motivational reward tactic within the volunteer setting. For these instances, alternative program aspects must be modified, which I have attempted to illustrate here, and I will elaborate on in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III

MATERIALS

This chapter seeks to describe in detail the content of the organizational development workshop for each test group. This section includes detail regarding the strength and weakness survey used for each participant in the test group, a description of the room in which the workshop takes place, and thorough description of the workshop itself.

The survey is designed to measure the strengths and weaknesses of the participants in the test groups and help them address their weaker areas of teamwork by applying the strategies and practices as described by the workshop. At the conclusion of the workshop, participants will visit a Habitat for Humanity build site and spend the day working on the construction site. After having spent their time there, another survey is distributed to them in order to determine the success of application of the workshop to their build experiences. This follow-up survey contains
demographic items that describe each group’s characteristics in the following categories: gender, age, occupation, income, race, and education. This information is gathered to describe correlations between each group’s characteristics and their capability of applying the workshop to their build experience. This second survey is also used for the control group (which does not undergo the workshop treatment) to describe their build experience and demographic information so that it may be compared with the test groups that did undergo the workshop treatment prior to the build.

The Group Strength and Weakness Survey

When participants arrive to the workshop, they are given a survey with twenty items on a Likert scale regarding their personal experiences working in groups or on teams. This survey serves as a basis for helping them understand their strengths and weaknesses when working on teams. It is structured to have four questions, two phrased positively and two phrased negatively, per category, representing the five desirable qualities of a team member. These qualities are labeled Team Player, Fixer, Open, Agreeable, and Encouraging, and I have designed the workshop to explain these qualities and provide specific strategies for participants to embody these qualities while on the build site. The survey’s aim is to indicate to participants which qualities are more prominent and less prominent in their personalities when working in groups. For instance, one participant may be described as having a high score in the Open category, but a lower score in the Fixer category. When made aware of these trends, participants should be able to understand which parts of the workshop will be most helpful to them; that is, they should concentrate on the strategies related to their weaker quality areas.

As I have previously mentioned, the survey contains twenty items, four items per each of the five categories, and contains both positively and negatively phrased statements to prevent
biases that may result from using all positive statements. For example, the Open category contains the positive statement, “I find it very easy to express myself in most situations” and the negative statement, “I am often uncomfortable in groups of people I do not know.” Using both positive and negative statements allows for greater consistency in taking the survey because participants must carefully read and respond to each statement by circling one of the following: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, or strongly agree. The survey was constructed with the prevention of biases in mind, and so four statements were written for each category and then a random number table was used to assign each statement a specific number between one (1) and twenty (20). As a result, the order of the statements on the survey are randomly assigned so that there is no trend for items in a certain category, positively-worded, or negatively-worded items to be closer to or farther away from the next one. From the results of the survey, participants have generally agreed with the descriptions of their strengths and weaknesses as being accurate. This face validity helps to ensure the overall precision of the survey in describing these qualities.

The survey is scored on a four-point scale between negative two (-2) and positive two (2). For positively-worded statements, marking a five (5) or “strongly agree” results in two points and marking a four (4), “agree,” results in one point. Marking a three (3), or “neutral” always results in no points, and marking a two (2), “disagree,” or a one (1), “strongly disagree,” results in a negative point (-1) or two negative points (-2), respectively. For a negatively-worded question, the entire scale is inverted, so that marking the “disagree” options results in positive points, and marking the “agree” options results in negative points. When participants complete the survey, items in the same category are scored together. For instance, the scores marked by participants on the survey in the Team Player category, items 1, 11, 12, and 20, are totaled together. Totals within categories will range between negative eight (-8) and positive eight (8).
These scores are useful because they describe both the positive and negative quality in each category, so that if an individual were to score in the negative range, that individual could be described as having the negative quality in the category. For example, if a participant scored a negative seven (-7) in the Team Player category, that participant would be described as a “Solo Soul,” meaning they prefer to work alone and are generally not cooperative about team work. The negative qualities are not necessarily described as being “undesirable” for each and every person (of course, some people will be more likely to want to work alone than with others), but these qualities are defined as being “less desirable” for individuals who are working in groups or on teams because they inhibit the group as a whole from meeting their goals most efficiently. The workshop in this way seeks to provide specific ways for individuals who have lower or negative scores in whichever category to express more desirable qualities of a “good” team member.

The categorical scores between negative eight (-8) and positive eight (8) are then added up to a total score, which will result in a value between negative forty (-40) and positive forty (40). This score is less telling of the specific descriptive qualities of the participant, but does help to indicate how strong of a team member the participant is. A healthy total score will be positive (because a negative score would immediately indicate that one is a “weak” team member) and around twenty (20), which is the midpoint on the positive score. Many people who have taken the survey compute their total score to be between positive fifteen (15) and positive thirty (30). A perfect score would of course be a positive forty (40), but typically participants will have a total score around positive twenty (20).

As I have mentioned, the survey is distributed before the actual workshop begins in order to prevent bias. I explain to participants that the survey contains items relating to their experience
working on teams or in groups and I ask them to fill it out honestly and to the best of their knowledge. After the surveys are collected, scored, and redistributed, I begin the actual workshop.

**Workshop Content Description**

**Room Layout**

The workshop takes place in the Habitat for Humanity classroom at the Blount County Habitat for Humanity Professional Building for Partner Family groups, the Instruction Room in the Lamar Memorial Library, Thaw Hall at Maryville College for the Pilot Group, and the gym at First United Methodist Church, Maryville for the Collegiate Challenge groups. These rooms are designed with a classroom-style with a projection screen and computer and desks or tables and chairs. For the workshop, I put the desks or chairs into a semi-circle so participants are able to see myself and the others in their group. This design helps team members to see everyone with whom they will be working, and it also promotes discussion among the participants themselves. It also allows participants to understand that the workshop will be very conversational and casual, and that they will not be listening attentively to a lecture for two hours. I use a PowerPoint presentation for the workshop as well, and so participants are able to see the presentation on the projection screen at the front of the room. I make sure that there is plenty of space in the middle of the tables and chairs for the communication exercise and the mock build at the end of the presentation, as these are times when participants will be up and moving around the room.

**Workshop Overview**

I begin the workshop by introducing myself and how I became interested in organizational development. I mention that I am studying Sociology and that I am interested in
applying a corporate-based organizational development workshop to a non-profit or volunteer setting. I explain that organizational development helps employees within corporations create strategies in order to improve the corporation’s efficiency specifically during times of change. I explain that typically, organizational development consultants are hired by employers to help employees who are faced with a task in an unfamiliar or stressful setting, environment, or time frame. I then explain the parallel that usually people who volunteer to work on Habitat for Humanity build sites are typically not full-time construction workers and are usually working with people they would not spend time with in a construction situation. Changing the environment in which people interact is enough to change the way people themselves interact with one another.

Understanding this principle and taking appropriate measures to compensate for interacting in an unfamiliar environment is precisely what organizational development seeks to do. Groups that typically interact in a college setting (as with my control group, pilot group, and one test group), a church setting (like many Habitat for Humanity volunteers), or a Habitat for Humanity Budget Basics class (like the Partner Family test group) will interact quite differently when holding hammers and wearing toolbelts. There is an obvious goal that they are trying to accomplish—building the house—but they are faced with a new challenge: operating within the context of the environment, which is neither a church nor classroom. I allow participants to ask any questions at this time and remind them questions are welcome throughout the workshop.

After explaining the purpose of the workshop and the application of the organizational development model, I then briefly describe the qualities that make a good member: Team Player, Fixer, Open, Agreeable, and Encouraging. To illustrate these qualities, I show a picture of a pie chart that is equally divided into five parts on a Powerpoint presentation. Then, I explain that if
everyone were to describe their “team member qualities” on a pie chart like this one, it is unlikely that the parts would be even, because typically we are strong in some areas and weak in others. I simply define each characteristic without going into much detail. The Team Player quality is defined as someone who is optimistic about teamwork and cooperative with others, the Fixer is defined as someone who acknowledges problems and seeks to solve them, and an Open person is open to new people, ideas, and experiences. An Agreeable person is willing to go along with the group consensus rather than cause dispute, and an Encouraging person enjoys praising others for a job well done.

After stating that we will explore each quality more in-depth momentarily, I ask the participants to engage in an icebreaker game so everyone can get to know one another, and so I can begin to learn names. The lighthearted ice breaker involves going around with each participant saying his or her name, where he or she is from, and one thing others are unable to tell by looking at him or her that involves a hand motion. For example, participants may choose a hand motion to match a hobby or some aspect of their personalities, like reading books or being talkative. Before the next person can go, he or she must recite the names and hand motions of everyone who has gone before him or her. This game is funny, but it allows the group to learn things about each other that they probably did not know. It also allows participants to learn things they may have in common or give them insight to someone else’s characteristics. Although participants are somewhat wary before the game begins, by the time everyone has gone around, they are more open and at ease, and, hopefully, they know everyone’s names.

After the game, the workshop actually begins with explanations of each of the five qualities of a good team member. Each explanation involves an illustration, activity, or exercise so that participants are able to “experience” the qualities rather than simply hear a description of
them. For the first quality, the Team Player quality, the illustration is very simple because the participants are still trying to determine precisely what I’m aiming to accomplish with the workshop, and they are not yet closely bonded with one another. I take three Popsicle sticks and place them on the floor where everyone can see them and configure them into a triangle. Then, I take another Popsicle stick and hand it to a participant. I then ask the participant to make a triangle exactly like the one on the floor with their Popsicle stick, without breaking it. Of course, this is impossible, and so the participant usually looks at me questioningly, at which point I pass out two more Popsicle sticks to two other participants. Now, the group of them together is able to make a triangle. I explain that working on teams is like this illustration because everyone on the team has something unique to offer to the end result. When we realize the potential of each individual team member, we realize the new potential of the team. When someone is able to understand that each person in the group has something different to offer to the effort of the whole, they become a “Team Player.”

The next part of this exercise is describing what the Popsicle sticks represent. I ask participants what they think the Popsicle sticks symbolize, and then I record these on a board in the front of the room so everyone can read them. Participants say things like monetary resources, willpower, creativity, problem solving, and I elaborate (or ask participants to elaborate) on these qualities as I list them. By this point, participants are opening up more and learning to listen and feed off of each others’ input. I ask the group members to think about what characteristics their Popsicle sticks would represent, and what characteristics would be beneficial for a group or team as a whole. Their answers often engage them in conversation about good team member qualities, which usually involve one or more of the other qualities that I discuss in the workshop. When they do mention a characteristic that I have chosen to talk about during the workshop, I make a
point to say we will talk about it soon. Before moving on to the next category, I reiterate that a Team Player is someone who is optimistic about teamwork because he or she realizes that each member of a team is able to contribute something different to the group’s goal. I explain that a Solo Soul, the negative quality in the Team Player category, is someone who is not optimistic about teamwork and prefers to work alone. I make a point to say that this quality is not a “bad” quality, but a less desirable quality because it inhibits the group or team from reaching its goals most efficiently.

The next quality discussed in the workshop is the Fixer characteristic. I explain the Fixer quality has to do with solving problems and involves two parts: acknowledging a problem and then trying to solve the problem. Acknowledging the problem is one aspect of problem solving that is often overlooked. If problems are not identified, then they will never be solved. After describing the Fixer quality, I then discuss the negative aspect of it, the Mixer quality. A “Mixer” is someone, who, instead of acknowledging and seeking to solve problems, ignores them or “mixes” them up, either by spreading gossip about the problem or creating turmoil in the situation that only makes the problem worse.

To illustrate the Mixer quality more tangibly, I show some scenes from the sitcom *Seinfeld*. I like to show video clips because it gives the participants a chance to hear a voice other than my own, and the show also provides comic relief. The *Seinfeld* character George Costanza, is the perfect example of a Mixer, and so he serves as a model of what not to do. The first clip I show illustrates ignoring or running away from the problem. In the clip, George is at a birthday party for his girlfriend’s son and a fire starts in the kitchen. Instead of looking for a fire extinguisher and trying to stop the fire, he runs away from the smoke, knocking over several young children and their elderly grandmothers so he can reach the door quickest. The scene is
funny, but it describes how running away from problems can cause harm to others. The second clip illustrates the Mixer’s tendency to complicate a problem by creating more problems instead of seeking to solve the first problem earnestly. In this clip, George lies about buying a cashmere sweater on sale for his friend Elaine. Each time she catches him in a lie, he makes a new one to cover up for it. This video shows participants that mixing up a problem only creates more problems. I ask the group what they noticed about each clip and what aspects of the Mixer they can identify in each one.

After we have spent some time discussing the videos, I engage participants in the first group exercise. In the exercise, I break the participants into pairs and give them freedom to create or act out a scenario describing one of the four parts of being a Fixer or a Mixer. The pairs are either assigned ignoring the problem, approaching the problem, fixing the problem, or “mixing” the problem. I give participants around five minutes to think of a problem that they either respond to as a Fixer or a Mixer. This exercise allows them to work one-on-one with another member of the group and agree on both a creative and expressive component. They have complete freedom with the problem they choose; I tell them it can be related to Habitat but it does not need to be, and so the result is a variety of problems. Each pair presents the problem they came up with and their reaction to the problem, and there is discussion after each presentation of how the Fixer or Mixer component is applied. Also, after each presentation, the entire group applauds the pair in order to show appreciation for their input. When I did the workshop with the Partner Families, the examples the pairs created ranged from ignoring the leftover spaghetti in the refrigerator to spilling dirt in a can of paint on the build site and continuing to paint the walls with it. The participants discussed after each presentation that ignoring the problem (as in the first example) or “mixing up the problem” (as in the second
example) only made matters worse, and that effective problem solving involves an honest analysis of the problem and careful selection of the best solution. I again ask for any further input and welcome any questions concerning the Fixer quality before moving on to the next category.

The next quality we discuss in the workshop is the Open characteristic. There is not really an illustration or exercise for this characteristic; I ask only for input from participants about why having an Open person on your team would be beneficial. I explain that an Open person has an appreciation and sensitivity for the emotions of others, and is willing to branch out of his or her comfort zone and embrace new ideas, people, or tasks. Participants expand on these qualities, and I make a list of more the specific traits they describe. At this point, there is discussion of how an Open person can benefit a team. Participants may say that an Open person would be flexible to work at a particular task that another team member is uncomfortable doing, or that an Open person may be more understanding or compassionate when another team member is in a stressful situation and feels unable to express his or her discomfort.

I explain that Openness in this sense is not necessarily a quality that people are simply able to foster during a two-hour workshop, but that there are steps that participants can take to exhibit Open qualities, which they have already agreed are beneficial to teamwork for various reasons. First, I ask the participants to brainstorm specific ways that they can embody the Open quality. I list the things that they say and elaborate on them. After several of the participants have given input and discussed things they can do to be more open, I may add one or two things to the list. One suggestion I make is to simply ask other team members throughout the day how they are doing. I explain that simply checking up on one another is a great way to show concern for the emotions or experiences of others. I also explain that the person who is asked has a further
responsibility to answer honestly in order to exhibit Openness. If a team is able to confront emotions honestly and openly, many interpersonal and task-related problems can be avoided.

The next section of the workshop, I explain, comes with a disclaimer. The Agreeable quality section is not so much of a detailed description as it is a warning or something that participants should simply be aware of. I explain that being Agreeable is not as important as not being Argumentative. Participants do not necessarily have to agree with every particular aspect of the work they do on their team, because I stress that “standing their ground” or standing up for what they believe is important. I emphasize that they should make a point to make others aware of their feelings about their team or their task, especially when the risk is low for interpersonal or task-related problems, because that is a central principle of the Open quality. However, I also emphasize that being willing to agree with the group consensus is more beneficial for the success of the team as a whole than causing a dispute or being argumentative about some particularity of the team’s work. Being cooperative and willing to get along with others will make the team more successful than being self-interested and unfriendly. Being Agreeable does not mean sacrificing morals or values in any situation, but it does mean cooperating with the consensus of the group even when it may be uncomfortable or out of one’s character or comfort zone.

The last section of the quality description portion of the workshop explains the Encouraging characteristic. Unlike some of the other qualities that are more difficult for participants to internalize during a two-hour workshop because they are personality traits like Team Player and Openness, being Encouraging is easy to do because it only involves simple actions such as praising others for their work. Before I explain the Encouraging characteristic in depth, I ask for a volunteer to come up to the projector screen. I tell participants that the volunteer will try to navigate his or her way through a maze, and whenever the volunteer makes
an error or a wrong turn, the rest of the team must say “that’s wrong” or some other words of
discouragement. Of course, I insist that the team is not allowed to make any personal attacks to
the volunteer or speak at all unless an error is made, and they can only point out the error in the
task. By this time, I have a good understanding of the personalities of the participants based on
their feedback and input, and so I am aware of the volunteer’s ability to cooperate with this
experiment without being uncomfortable. I put a picture of a maze on the screen, and the
participants and I watch the volunteer try to trace his or her way through the maze with a finger
or marker. Every time the volunteer makes a wrong turn, the team and I say “Wrong!” or “That’s
not right!” and the volunteer generally becomes more unsettled as he or she frantically tries to
get to the end of the maze. After the volunteer makes it to the end, I explain that now the
volunteer will go through another maze and the rest of the team can say anything encouraging at
any time. I put a picture of another maze (of the same difficulty level as the first maze) and join
the team in saying encouraging words while the volunteer tries once more to get to the end of the
maze.

After this exercise, I ask the volunteer to reflect on his or her experience. I ask which
scenario made it easier to get through the maze: when the rest of the team spoke words of
discouragement or encouragement. The volunteer hopefully will say that getting through the
maze was easier when the team was being encouraging because he or she felt more confident. I
ask the volunteer to elaborate on why it is important to be encouraged, and then I usually add
that sometimes working at a task is like trying to navigate through a maze. It can seem
overwhelming at first glance, but when you learn the steps to take and work diligently to get
through, it gets easier. A task like building a house is very similar because it seems like an
enormous project; no doubt it is, but when you work diligently at small tasks like putting studs
up, laying cement, or putting on a roof, the idea of building a house is less intimidating. The problem is, in the midst of the small projects, it is sometimes difficult to see or even visualize the end or finished product, much like trying to get through a maze. I summarize that if you work on a team where members encourage you and the team as a whole every step of the way, it is much easier to visualize the finished product, and the task at hand seems less threatening. Participants name specific things they can do to be encouraging and I list them on the screen so everyone can see. Things like simply saying “good job” or “great work” are examples of words of encouragement that can be used throughout the build to keep spirits high and the team motivated. I suggest to the team that they can set a goal for themselves to encourage every person on the team at least once a day, or I recommend they can set a similar goal on their own. Again, I ask if the participants have any questions about the Encouraging quality or any other quality we have discussed before moving on to the next part of the workshop, a focus on effective communication.

By this point in the workshop, participants have a good understanding of the other members on the team from hearing input from the group and working with another person one-on-one during the Fixer exercise. This initial time for participants to bond is necessary before moving to the communication exercise, which may make participants somewhat uncomfortable. For the exercise, the participants are blindfolded, and they step into the center of the room and stand in a circle. I go around between them with one long strand of yarn and put it everyone’s hands. I tie a knot in the yarn so it is a circle, and every participant is holding on to it. I tell the participants that they must make the yarn into a square with four distinct corners and lay the yarn down on the floor when they are done. I give them around three minutes to do this and observe them communicating without visual references to form the shape. When they place the yarn on
the floor, I tell them to remove their blindfolds so they can see how well they were able to make the square. I ask the participants if they were to get a letter grade on their square what they think they would get. Then I have them reflect on how well they were able to make the square without using their sense of sight. We spend some time discussing what strategies made it easier for them to make the square, like designating a leader or deciding which of them would be the “corners.” Then, I ask them to put their blindfolds on again and make a triangle. After they make a triangle, we have a similar discussion, and then I ask them to make a figure eight followed by another discussion.

After the communication exercise, I ask for input about specific ways they can communicate effectively, and I again list their comments on the board. I make a point to say that when teams communicate, especially about problems, they should try to point out the positives first. For instance, if someone in the group was doing a job incorrectly, like painting a doorframe without using masking tape to keep the paint from getting on the walls, another team member may say “you’re doing a good job painting, but it may be a good idea to put some tape on the wall in case you accidently get some paint there.” Also, I suggest to the participants that when they communicate about problems, they should try to eliminate any personal attacks. I explain that in general, people are sensitive about the work they do because it is an investment of who they are. When people on teams can understand that work is viewed this way, it can be easier for them to communicate. Effective communication can make a team operate more harmoniously because it allows for honesty and sensitivity to the needs of others while still moving forward to accomplish a task.

After the communication exercise, I offer the participants an opportunity to take a brief break. I allow them to have around ten minutes to relax and talk with one another. After the short
break, I explain that for the next part of the workshop they will be in two teams and I allow them to divide themselves equally. I give each team a large piece of butcher paper and explain to them that I want them as a team to create a vision statement. I tell them that a vision statement is like a mission statement; it incorporates a sense of dedication to a task and reminder of the significance of the work being done. I tell the participants their vision statements should begin with the words “We will” and from there they have complete freedom. I remind them to make sure everyone has input in creating the vision statement, and I suggest brainstorming specific words or phrases as a team before constructing the actual statement. I give them around ten minutes to formulate their statements and then I take the butcher paper to the back of the room so the teams cannot see what the others have written yet. After I have collected the butcher paper, I ask the teams to reassemble so they are part of a team with different people before we begin the last segment of the workshop, the mock build. This part of the workshop gives participants a hands-on experience of how they can apply the specific strategies of the workshop to an actual task that must be completed by a group.

For the mock build, the teams construct a “house” with arts and crafts supplies and a small cardboard box. This experience is unique in the workshop because it allows participants to apply the skills and strategies they have learned in a controlled environment. One key aspect of the mock build is that teams are organized so that each member has a specific role with a certain task that he or she must fulfill. The roles are Leader, Materials Manager, Secretary, Creative Advisor, Encourager, and Reporter. Teams are given the freedom to choose who will perform each role. After the teams spend around twenty minutes constructing their “houses,” the team Reporters will display their work to me and the other team, and explain to us the teamwork-related processes they went through in order to achieve their finished product.
The Leader’s task is to apply the skills and strategies of the workshop to the construction of the “house,” allowing the rest of the team to understand exactly how the content of the workshop can be applied in a build setting. The Materials Manager is responsible for communicating with the rest of the team and gathering materials to use for construction. The Materials Manager is an important role because teams are only allowed sixteen materials (such as construction paper, pipe cleaners, Popsicle sticks, clay, colored markers, etc.), and so the teams must try to reach a consensus on which materials they will use. The Materials Manager also has to relay information to the team about what kind of materials are available because he or she is the only team member allowed to approach the materials table. In this way, the Materials Manager role seeks to help the team practice communication and decision-making. The team’s Secretary is responsible for taking notes and recording the group’s progress during the mock build. I suggest that the Secretary focus on the specific applications that the Leader points out, and also that he or she records which materials were used for construction. I insist that the Secretary’s notes can be useful for the Reporter’s presentation of the team’s “house.”

The Creative Advisor on the team is meant to provide creative input for the team while paying attention to the creative suggestions from the other team members. This goal of the Creative Advisor role is to help the team learn to be agreeable and open to suggestions. Each team also has an Encourager whose role is to take every opportunity to provide words of encouragement to other members on the team. The Secretary can record the specific phrases that the Encourager says so that the Reporter can inform the entire group during the build presentation.

While the two teams are working on their “houses,” I re-collect the surveys from the participants to create a pie chart of their team’s strengths and weaknesses. I do this by adding up their categorical scores (Team Player, Fixer, Open, Agreeable, Encouraging) and compiling them
into an Excel spreadsheet and creating a chart with the data. I then return the surveys to the participants and inform them how much time they have left to complete their “houses.” When the time is up, the Reporters bring each team’s production to the front of the room and explain how the team was able to build the house together. I consider this exercise to be successful if the Reporter articulates parallels between the content of the workshop and the actual construction of the “house.” My hope is for the teams to understand how cooperation, problem-solving strategies, open-mindedness, consensus formation, and encouragement can be beneficial to their success, whether they are building a model of a house with cardboard and pipe cleaners or an actual house that will serve as a home for a family in Blount County. The teams are proud of the work they do on the cardboard “house,” and this sense of pride hopefully follows them onto the build site. The mock build is a lighthearted way to help the team bond and learn how the team member qualities can be useful for reaching their goals. After each presentation, I join the group in applauding each team’s finished product.

Next, I spend some time showing the group their pie chart results of the team member qualities. It is interesting for them to see their strengths and weaknesses as a group and not as individuals. We spend some time discussing the stronger areas and the benefits of being strong in those areas. We then discuss the weaker areas, and I ask the participants to recall specific strategies related to those qualities so that they can try to implement them. I ask them if they have any questions about the team’s strengths or weaknesses and remind them that their surveys are for them to keep before we move on to the last segment of the workshop.

The final part of the workshop is a focus on the vision statements that the two groups created earlier. I bring the two sheets of butcher paper to the front of the room so that the entire group can see them. I read the statements out loud and ask for clarification or point out
interesting parts of the statements. Each group explains the process of creating their statement and why they chose the specific words or phrases they included. For the conclusion of the workshop, the entire group reads out each vision statement in unison, and I remind them that recalling the vision statements during the build can be a great way to encourage others on the team and remind everyone of the mission of the work they are doing. The Pilot Group and Collegiate Challenge Group’s vision statements were very action-goal oriented, so that they included elements like “work hard” and “don’t give up.” The Partner Family Group’s vision statements, on the other hand, involved elements of community and support, which was very touching after only a ninety minute-long workshop. One Partner Family Group’s vision statement was “We will work to communicate together to be a competent, bright community. We will choose to recognize others' needs and include them, so that we will be a supportive family unit,” and this vision statement, in my opinion, captured much of the mission of Habitat for Humanity.

This chapter has outlined the materials used in this study, including a detailed explanation of the strength and weakness survey and an overview of the workshop itself. The survey attempts to describe participants’ strength and weaknesses in team-related settings by measuring the categories of Team Player, Fixer, Open, Agreeable, and Encouraging. The results of the survey are helpful for allowing participants to understand which portions of the workshop to which they should pay most attention. The workshop involves an icebreaker game, an in-depth discussion, illustration, or activity of each of the five team member qualities, a segment on communication, a segment on vision and goals, and, finally, a mock build which allow participants to practice using their new team member skills.
CHAPTER IV

DATA AND ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the outcomes of both the quantitative and qualitative research carried out with each of the four groups that participated in this study. It will be demonstrated
how comparisons can be made between the four groups and their respective demographics, strengths and weaknesses, and application of the intervention program to their build site experience. Before an in-depth analysis of these groups, however, it is helpful to discuss some history and implications of organization development research in general.

An Overview of Organizational Research Methodology

First of all, an understanding of the nature of organizational research sheds light on the difficulties of obtaining concrete, incontrovertible results. Obviously, not every organization operates in the same manner; organizations typically have unique values, cultures, and norms that distinguish them from other firms. For this reason, organizational research is rarely one-hundred percent reliable in the sense that the results will hold true in any organizational setting. Because organizations are constantly aimed at providing a product or service, it is unsurprisingly difficult for organizational researchers to conduct controlled, experiment-like studies, because, understandably, such research would interfere with the organization’s operations. Some OD practitioners are opposed to experimental design anyway, because they understand experimental designs to subtract from the humanistic values OD seeks to maximize (Porras and Silvers 64). Due to this, most research that is conducted within organizations tends to be case studies or survey-based research (Guzzo and Dickson 327). Organizational development is typically an even trickier subject to research, primarily because it is most pertinent to organizations undergoing change. Some change in organizations is planned by the organization, but sometimes change occurs without forecast, and the unfreeze-change-refreeze process is carried out too quickly to apply an in-depth analysis. In their article “Organizational Change and Development,” Weick and Quinn discuss the change process and the difficulties of applying conceptualizations of it to organizations that continuously or episodically change. Organizations that undergo
episodic change may be more easily researched, because change is “an occasional interruption… created by intention. Change is Lewinian: inertial, linear, progressive, goal-seeking, and requires outside intervention,” whereas continually-changing organizations undergo a “pattern of endless modifications in work process and social practice… driven by organizational instability and alert reactions to daily contingencies” (366). Establishing and applying a research paradigm, though it is typically a loosely-followed paradigm, to organizations undergoing episodic change tends to be a primary focus of OD researchers.

A prominent model described by Jamieson and Worley in “The Practice of Organization Development” contains five common characteristics of an OD process. These characteristics include “a cyclical method [or feedback cycle], an open system orientation, a specific value base, a set of interventions, and desired roles” (109). To break this process down, one can envision a custom-designed process that contains desired behaviors carried out in an open and supportive learning format, promptly followed by an evaluation of outcomes in order to redesign another custom process to increase or optimize outcomes. This process is typically carried out in a “training program” format in which targeted organizational issues are diagnosed and addressed by the researcher or interventionist. A diagnosis and training program design involves developing targeted criteria, i.e., what aspects of the organization (values, norms, culture, work process) need to be addressed by the program; choosing or creating the actual program design or measures in order to assess the criteria; data collection, including the interpretation of results; and finally a re-implementation of the program to further optimize results (Spector 181).

Data collection throughout this process is crucial to understanding the success or shortcomings of the intervention program in the feedback cycle. Data feedback, as OD
Researcher Craig Lundberg explains, is essential to forming “the basis for issue identification and clarification and the basis for situational understanding,” and it “becomes interpreted as a function of the operative organization model” to lead to “diagnostic sensemaking, [i.e.] situational understanding in light of identified issues” (145). Throughout the OD process, researchers and practitioners also find it helpful to consistently assess reliability, or consistency of measures, and validity, or understanding of the inferences of the measures used, of their data (Spector 36, Woodman et al 212). Being aware of both the consistency and inferences of the measures used on data collection materials enables more accurate research to be performed and creates an ease of transition to modify measures when necessary within the feedback process.

To reiterate, experimental designs are less likely to be utilized in organizational circumstances, and so interviews, surveys, observations, and even secondary data methodology is more commonly used by OD researchers (Lundberg 144). Of course, even these methods have their respective challenges. Interviews and observations are more difficult to codify, and, therefore, more challenging to translate into quantifiable data. Surveys, on the other hand, though they are easier to quantify, may neglect opinions and open-ended issues that interviews are more likely to illuminate. Secondary data may be difficult to gain access to and may not be as valid as first-person responses. Because of these reasons, this study’s surveys were designed to include both quantitative information (by means of closed-ended questions and Likert scales) and qualitative information (by means of open-ended questions and “additional comments” sections).

Because the process of an OD intervention is generally cyclical, so is the analysis and evaluation of data. In their article “Assessing Organization Development and Change Interventions,” Woodman, Bingham, and Yuan describe various OD designs and evaluations in true and quasi-experimental, survey research and field studies, longitudinal research, meta-
analyses, qualitative research, and combined paradigm research designs. Depending on the structure of the organization, the change process (e.g. continuous or episodic), and the resources of the researcher, different designs work best for different firms. They make the argument that OD researchers should begin to conduct more controlled, experiment-like studies because of the “tremendous strengths of internal validity,” but also acknowledge the difficulties in doing so (211). They also argue that combined paradigm research designs should be further explored, and longitudinal processes should be utilized whenever possible to fully assess and examine effects that take longer to “unfold” (212).

To recapitulate, organizational development commonly follows a five-step process, in which a four-step diagnostic and designing process is utilized. Different organizations undergoing different kinds of changes require different models of OD interventions, and so the diagnosis and designing process follows a loose paradigm, but ideally includes a feedback cycle. Because of this cyclical nature, continuous data collection and evaluation are necessary components of OD interventions.

Methodology in this Design

For this study’s design, three measurement devices, a demographic survey (which appears on the same page as the application/conclusion survey but is scored separately), a strength and weakness survey, and an application/conclusion survey, have been employed. These surveys are included in the appendix. Four groups, a control group of college students, a pilot group of college students, a group of Habitat for Humanity Partner Families, and a group of Collegiate Challenge students, participated in this study. Each volunteer group filled out each survey, except the control group which only filled out the demographic information and application survey, because they did not participate in the intervention workshop, and the pilot
group, which only filled out the strength and weakness survey because they did not participate in a build. Results from each of the four groups, which will be further described, were obtained and compared to assess any similarities or trends in either their strength and weakness characteristics (variable 1) and demographics (variable 2), strength and weakness characteristics (variable 1) and application (variable 3), and/or demographics (variable 2) and application (variable 3).

Describing these three variables in this way could lead to the determination of which strength and weakness characteristics are correlated with certain demographic backgrounds, which strength and weakness characteristics are addressed more successfully through this particular intervention design, and which demographic characteristics are more likely to lead to a successful application of an intervention program. An analysis of these variables could lead to an explanation of what sorts of interventions work best with certain groups. As Porras and Silver discuss, research on teambuilding interventions with Israel Defense Forces (IDF) officers and separate research on a similar model with coal miners led to drastically different results in the application of the intervention to the group’s work (63). The intervention with the IDF officers “significantly affected [their] self-perceptions of efficacy,” and a follow-up study “showed significant effects on teamwork, conflict handling, and information plans” (64). Research on teambuilding interventions with coal miners, however, “found only marginally significant effects on outcomes” (64). This evidence seems to suggest that some groups are more likely to benefit from OD interventions than other groups, and determining which factors or characteristics make a group more likely to benefit from an intervention will help OD practitioners diagnose and design interventions to better fit their target group and issues.

Because of timing the research with Blount County Habitat for Humanity’s volunteer schedule and shortage of resources, only three of the four groups can be assessed across all three
variables. In an ideal research environment with numerous volunteers and plenty of resources, these three measurement surveys would be utilized for a number of unbiased volunteer groups randomly selected from every volunteer group with Blount County Habitat for Humanity. Furthermore, a true control group would be measured in order to assess the validity of the study itself, and it will be explained why the control group used in this study is not “true.” The results of this research, hopefully, will show that when applied to Habitat for Humanity Partner Families and Collegiate Challenge groups, an OD teambuilding intervention is a practical way to maximize teambuilding skills, improve communication, and help volunteers maintain a sense of vision or motivation in their work.

As I previously mentioned, the control group used in this study is not a “true” control group. To obtain unbiased results with this methodology, the control group would need to be a randomly selected group of volunteers who have little or no construction experience and have rarely or never worked on a Habitat for Humanity construction site together. For this study, however, the control group utilized was Maryville College’s and the University of Tennessee’s Habitat for Humanity Clubs, interest groups of college students formed to work together on Habitat for Humanity construction sites. Obviously, these groups are not the ideal control group because they are interest groups that have worked together and have construction experience, but because the two groups from two different schools would be working together, some marginally significant data possibly could be obtained. Again, because the 27-member control group did not participate in the intervention program and fill out the strength and weakness survey, they only filled out the build conclusion survey. The demographic information of the control group is provided in the appendix. It can be concluded from the demographic portion of the application survey that the college students in this control group are mostly white, upper-middle class, full-
time college students. Because the control group was comprised of all college students, one-
hundred percent of participants circled the “Some College” option on the education portion of
the demographic information section. Most were of sophomore and junior class standing.

The application section of the survey contains aspects of each of the positive
teambuilding qualities discussed in the intervention workshop. Each statement represents a
different quality, so that the Team Player quality is item 1, the Encourager quality is item 2, the
Fixer quality is item 3, the Open quality is item 4, and the Agreeable quality is item 5. Items 2
and 5 are written in a negative manner so that the survey would yield better validity. The
application section results of this survey are below. The numbers in the response columns are the
actual number of students who responded in that way.

Table 4.1 Control Group Application Survey Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement on Survey</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like our group worked well together today.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone in our group did something well, we neglected to praise their good job.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When problems arose in our group today, we approached them and worked to solve them.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members of our group seemed to be accepting of new people and new ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our group tended to argue about tasks and personal issues today.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ideally, for the researcher to conclude that the treatment (in this case the OD intervention) was successful, the control group’s results would not confirm the hypothesis of the treatment outcome compared to the comparative or test group’s results. However, it can be assumed that because the control group in this study was an interest group of college students who had bonded through their shared interest in volunteering with Habitat for Humanity, their teambuilding qualities ranked highly. There were also open-ended elements on the survey to list both the positive characteristics (strengths), and negative characteristics (weaknesses) about the group’s work. For the most part, the positive characteristics listed included “hard-working,” “good teamwork,” and “positive attitudes,” and the negative characteristics included “not including everyone,” “lack of construction knowledge,” “lack of communication,” and “poor organization;” however, six students wrote that they observed no weaknesses or negative characteristics of the group.

The purpose of utilizing a pilot group was to practice the order and logistics of the actual OD intervention. The eight-person pilot group did not fill out a build conclusion survey, because they were not Habitat for Humanity volunteers. Rather, they were a group of volunteers from the Maryville College student body assembled for the purpose of participating in the teambuilding workshop and giving feedback on the content and design of the workshop itself. They are not necessarily a comparative group for this reason, but the results of their strength and weakness surveys are included on the following page to provide further illustration of how the strength and weakness survey can be used to describe group dynamics in regard to the OD intervention workshop.

The strength and weakness survey method, described in detail in the previous chapter, enables the group to visualize its overall team capability (by totaling the scores in each of the
five categories resulting in a number between -40 and 40) as well as observing the higher and lower scores in the five categories themselves (each ranging between -8 and 8).

Table 4.2 Pilot Group Strength and Weakness Survey Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assessed</th>
<th>Percent Team Strength</th>
<th>Average Categorical Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Player</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixer</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percent team strength shows the total of the group’s categorical responses divided by the number in the group to illustrate the stronger and weaker qualities of the group. The average categorical total shows the average total of each quality (between -8 and 8) for each member of the group. The average grand total (between -40 and 40) for the pilot group was 14.8, a decent score because a score of ~20 is defined by the researcher as a healthy score.

The Partner Family group was a main focus of this study. Blount County Habitat for Humanity partners with several Partner Families each year to help them become homeowners. One requirement of their participation in the program involves working on home construction sites themselves. For most families, construction work is quite different from their occupations and may be very unfamiliar for them. Equally unfamiliar to them are the dozen or so other members of the Partner Family group, and so working on a construction site with complete strangers would certainly be challenging. The 12-member Partner Family group participated in the teambuilding intervention in the morning and then went directly to the construction site. At
the conclusion of the same build day, I conducted the follow-up survey. It should be noted that
the size of the Partner Family group was significantly smaller than the control group. The control
group (comprised of two college interest groups) could have been divided into two smaller
groups, but because two groups from different schools were working together on the build site,
the compiled data would be more accurate. For an ideal study, the control group would be
approximately the same in size as the comparative groups. The Partner Family group was
comprised of mostly lower and middle-class women who work in office or service jobs, have
less than a college education, and make between $15,000 and $30,000 a year. Details of the
Partner Family demographics can be found in the appendix.

The Partner Family strength and weakness characteristics are on the following page. This
table uses the same methodology as the pilot group. There were no observed differences between
the Partner Family and pilot group other than a higher Agreeable percentage (13% compared to
4%). The Encourager and Team Player qualities were, for all practical purposes, the same
between Partner Family group than the pilot group (26% compared to 27%). Both the Fixer and
Open categories were lower, however, when compared to the pilot group (26% to 20%, 17% to
14%, respectively). The largest differences between the Partner Family group and the pilot
group were in the Agreeable category (a 9% difference) and the Fixer category (a 6%
difference). The average grand total for the Partner Family group was ~11.7 (based on the -40 to
40 scale).

Table 4.3 Partner Family Strength and Weakness Survey Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assessed</th>
<th>Percent Team Strength</th>
<th>Average Categorical Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Player</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourager</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixer</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the Partner Family’s build conclusion survey reflected improvements in the Fixer, Agreeable, and Open categories after the teambuilding intervention. Fifty-four percent of the group strongly agreed that the group approached and worked to solve problems, and 36% agreed that the group approached and worked to solve problems. Seventy-three percent strongly disagreed that the group argued about tasks and personal issues. Fifty-five percent strongly agreed and 45% agreed that the group was accepting of new people and new ideas. These percentages are, for the most part, consistent with those of the control group, but they do show significantly higher Team Player responses than the control group (81% of the Partner Family group strongly agreed that the group worked well whereas only 67% of the control group strongly agreed that the group worked well, a 14% difference). Comments in the “strengths and positive characteristics” response box included “hardworking,” “teamwork,” “open,” “problem solving,” “communication,” and “compassion.” Comments in the “weaknesses or negative characteristics” response box included socializing, “lack of experience,” “communication,” and “initiative.” Socializing may not be a weakness at this stage of the group process, however, because at early group forming process, deliberate social interaction can be a very positive element in group bonding (Hackman 27). Although in comparison to the control group, the Partner Family group does not show consistent improvements, compared to the Partner Family
strength and weakness survey results, the weaker areas (Fixer, Agreeable, and Open) show improvement from the build conclusion survey after the teambuilding intervention. These results indicate a benefit of a teambuilding intervention in Habitat for Humanity’s team-based volunteer setting, especially for the Partner Families. The Partner Family group’s build conclusion survey responses are below.

Table 4.4 Partner Family Application Survey Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement on Survey</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like our group worked well together today.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone in our group did something well, we neglected to praise their good job.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When problems arose in our group today, we approached them and worked to solve them.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members of our group seemed to be accepting of new people and new ideas.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our group tended to argue about tasks and personal issues today.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blount County Habitat for Humanity hosts different volunteer groups from all over the country to stay in Maryville for a week and work on Habitat homes. The Collegiate Challenge program offers college students an alternative spring break to participate in philanthropy activities. The Collegiate Challenge groups that participated in this study were from the University of Central Florida and Kutztown University in Pennsylvania. Altogether, twelve students from these respective schools volunteered in this study. Their demographic information
is also in the appendix. Most of the Collegiate Challenge students are white females under age 20 who come from households that make more than $75,000 a year. Most of them are employed in service positions such as fitness trainers, waitresses, and counselors on campus. One-hundred percent of the participants selected the “Some College” as their education. Demographically, they are very similar to the control group (which was also comprised of college students), in that they are mostly age 20 or under, white, and come from upper-middle class homes and lifestyles. However, there is a much higher percentage of the Collegiate Challenge students that are employed (81% compared to 48%), as well as a much higher percentage of female participants (91% compared to 48%). The Collegiate Challenge group’s strength and weakness survey results are below.

Table 4.5 Collegiate Challenge Strength and Weakness Survey Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assessed</th>
<th>Percent Team Strength</th>
<th>Average Categorical Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourager</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Player</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixer</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Collegiate Challenge group reflected a very similar pattern to the pilot group with Encourager being the strongest quality. Unlike the pilot group and the Partner Family group, though, the Collegiate Challenge group’s weakest category was Openness. The Collegiate Challenge group was stronger than the pilot group in the Agreeable category, but weaker in every other category. They were stronger than the Partner Family group in the Fixer and
Agreeable categories, but lower in the other categories. However, the Collegiate Challenge group’s average grand total was ~15.6 (on the -40 to 40 scale), a higher average than both the pilot group and Partner Family group. Unlike the Partner Family group who filled out the build conclusion survey the same day as the intervention, because of timing, the Collegiate Challenge group did not fill out the build conclusion survey until the following day. They participated in an evening rather than morning workshop and then went to the build site the following day. The results of the Collegiate Challenge group’s build conclusion application survey are on the following page.

The build conclusion study shows consistency with the strengths of the Team Player and Fixer categories: 58% agreed and 42% strongly agreed that the group worked well together, and 75% strongly agreed and 25% agreed that the group approached problems and worked to them, each totaling 100%. Not as consistent, surprisingly, was the Encourager category, where only 50% strongly disagreed and 25% disagreed that the group was not very encouraging, only 75%. Eight of the twelve (67%) of the Collegiate Challenge group members’ strength and weakness surveys indicated that the Encourager category was the strongest quality. The Open and Agreeable categories, identified from the strength and weakness survey as being the weakest qualities, seemed to be positively influenced through the teambuilding intervention; 75% either responded strongly positive or positive on each category, compared to nine of the twelve (75%) surveys that indicated at least one if not both the Open and Agreeable quality as the lowest-scoring category.

Table 4.6 Collegiate Challenge Application Survey Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement on Survey</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like our group worked well together today.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Score 6</td>
<td>Score 3</td>
<td>Score 2</td>
<td>Score 1</td>
<td>Score 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone in our group did something well, we neglected to praise their good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When problems arose in our group today, we approached them and worked to solve them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members of our group seemed to be accepting of new people and new ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our group tended to argue about tasks and personal issues today.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses in the “strength or positive characteristics” comment box included “teamwork,” “communication,” “encouragement,” “agreeable,” and “hardworking.” Responses in the “weaknesses or negative characteristics” comment box included “impatience,” “disagreements,” “encouragement,” “irritation,” and “not open.” Four of the twelve participants (33%) observed no negative characteristics.

Both the Partner Family group and the Collegiate Challenge group participated in the intervention and the Habitat for Humanity build day, and each indicate some improvement on at least one quality based on the results of the strength and weakness survey compared to the results of the build conclusion study. Though the demographics of each of the volunteer groups are different, mostly on age and socioeconomic background (including education), the strengths and weaknesses of each are relatively similar across the board; the Team Player and Encouraging category were both the two highest-scoring, the Fixer quality was precisely in the middle for each group, and the Open and Agreeable category were both the two lowest-scoring, consistently. From assessing the build conclusion surveys, there seem to be improvements in
the Team Player, Fixer, Open, and Agreeable categories, but the Encourager quality does not seem to be significantly impacted either way as a result of the intervention, which is surprising because it is an action and not an innate personality characteristic. It seems as though each group indicated improvement despite their demographic characteristics, making this model applicable to generally any volunteer at Blount County Habitat for Humanity.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION
This final chapter will summarize the study and practice of organizational development as a branch of organizational sociology, briefly explain the overall OD model and how it has been applied in this study, recapitulate some of the methods and results of the study itself, and provide suggestions for further research in the area of OD interventions in non-profit volunteer settings. It has been my hope that this study has been able to creatively facilitate a familiar OD model in the unfamiliar context of a non-profit in order to demonstrate the flexible and beneficial nature of OD interventions. Eventually, Blount County Habitat for Humanity will be implementing some of this study’s intervention elements into their Partner Family curriculum, as well as their volunteer orientation program with Collegiate Challenge students, thus illustrating the effectiveness of this branch of applied organizational sociology.

Organizational sociology is a branch of applied sociology that is concerned with using the scientific method and sociological behavior theories to conduct problem-solving research within organizations. I/O psychologist Paul E. Spector describes it as a branch of social science that “looks at Sociological and Psychological principles within organizations to analyze, diagnose, and improve organizational functioning on the individual and organizational levels” (5). The concern for employee job satisfaction and organizational team functioning seems to be growing as corporations expand and are able to utilize large human relations and research and development departments. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, psychologists began to observe and research applications of psychological principles in organizations. Originally, they were primarily concerned with using psychological marketing approaches, but soon they began to look within the organizations at the employees themselves rather than the consumers, and issues like productivity and selection were researched in an empirical way (Spector 9-10). Since the turn of
the twentieth century, sociologists and psychologists have examined the various facets of organizations from their respective fields.

One of these areas is organizational change, which is where organizational development is primarily concerned. Organizational development is a “set of social science techniques designed to plan and implement change in work settings for purposes of enhancing the personal development of individuals and improving the effectiveness of organizational functioning” (Greenberg and Baron 642). Organizational development is also concerned with teams within organizations. Some of the first organizational development work was done in the 1940s with training groups, or T-groups, that underwent sensitivity training in order to help individuals in organizations be open and honest with one another (Greenberg and Baron 643). An organizational development practitioner, facilitator, or interventionist, will guide individuals through open dialogue and encourage communication and appreciation of shared knowledge within the group.

The practitioner uses a feedback cycle process that involves determining the appropriate diagnostic measures that need to be taken in order to best approach targeted issues within the organization and then formulating action cycles to put the diagnostic measures in place. After these cycles of learning, supporting, resisting, and finally changing to the planned change outlined by the organization and the practitioner, individual development and organizational improvement are measured against the original desired behaviors of the employees to determine the success of the intervention (Jamieson and Worley 109). The practitioner then redesigns the process of planned change to better meet the needs of the organization and the process repeats. For this reason, organizational development is an ever-changing and constantly developing field of study and practice. It does not follow a set of theories that are applicable for any organization
in any circumstance; but, rather, it adapts, modifies, and borrows from several theories and paradigms while generally following the basic feedback cycle model.

Because organizational development involves enabling people within organizations to solve problems when facing some change or challenge so that goals can be achieved, it seemed feasible to take the OD model and adapt it to a non-corporate situation. Though some research has been done on the benefits of OD interventions in non-corporate settings, the research is limited (Tandon 616). This study worked with Blount County Habitat for Humanity volunteers so that they participated in an OD intervention, and the study used survey methodology to assess the benefits of its applicability to their experience on a Habitat for Humanity construction site. The goal of this study was to illustrate the flexible nature of OD interventions and the application of them in creative ways beyond the corporate world. Also, this study provided Habitat for Humanity with a new element of volunteer training and orientation to foster optimal teamwork, communication, and motivation among volunteers of all ages and backgrounds. To include the elements of the basic OD feedback cycle process, this study used a strength and weakness survey (the diagnostic element) and then engaged volunteers in an intervention to assess those strengths and weaknesses (the action cycle or education element). Volunteers then spent time on the Habitat for Humanity construction site to try to apply the skills addressed in the intervention (a trial period to determine individual development or organizational improvement) before administering a follow-up survey to identify new target issues of the volunteers’ experience (the re-assessment and design element).

Due to limited time and resources, this study involved only four groups, two of which were true comparative groups. The study involved a control group of twenty-seven college students from the Habitat for Humanity clubs at Maryville College and the University of
Tennessee, a pilot group of eight Maryville College students, a comparative group of eleven members of Habitat for Humanity Partner Families, and a comparative group of twelve Collegiate Challenge college students from the University of Central Florida and Kutztown College, Pennsylvania. The control group did not participate in the intervention but was administered the follow-up survey to identify members’ satisfaction of the team on the construction site. The pilot group did not participate in a Habitat for Humanity build but participated in the intervention before the Partner Families and Collegiate Challenge students to provide feedback of the intervention itself to the researcher. The Partner Families and Collegiate Challenge students both participated in the intervention, the build, and the follow-up survey, and positive results were obtained from the application portion of both of the follow-up surveys.

The groups that participated in the intervention were given a survey to measure their strengths and weaknesses when working on teams. The surveys had twenty items on a Likert scale with five options—strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree—for each item. The survey was constructed around five qualities that make a “good team member,” as defined by the researcher. These qualities were: Team Player, a general optimism about working on teams; Fixer, acknowledging and seeking to solve problems; Openness, being open to new ideas, tasks, and people; Agreeable, agreeing with the group consensus rather than causing dispute; and Encouraging, enjoying celebrating success of others and the group as whole. This survey was distributed, scored, and redistributed at the beginning of the workshop to illuminate individual group members’ strengths and weaknesses, as well as serve as a springboard for discussion of each of the qualities in depth. The survey serves as the diagnostic portion of the organization development design.
After the survey is given back out, the intervention begins with an icebreaker to learn names and something interesting about every member of the group. Then, there is an in-depth discussion of each of the five qualities that involves an illustration, game, or role-playing exercise. After the five qualities, the team participates in a communication exercise, writes goal or mission statements, and finally does a “mock build” in which they must build a “house” from cardboard and craft supplies on two or three smaller teams. The mock build serves as a simulation or work sample, and gives the team a chance to practice their new teambuilding skills in a controlled environment with access to the researcher. The entire intervention is meant to imitate the “action cycle” portion of the OD process because learning and changing takes place in a controlled setting with the researcher or interventionist acting as a guide.

After their participation in the intervention, the group moves to the construction site and spends a day working on a Habitat for Humanity house. The Partner Family group did this the same day as the intervention and the Collegiate Challenge did this the following day. At the conclusion of their build experience, the groups are given another survey to assess the applicability of the intervention to their experience on the construction site. The Partner Family’s conclusion surveys indicated improvement in the qualities that ranked lowest on their strength and weakness surveys, Fixer, Open, and Agreeable. The Collegiate Challenge group’s surveys also indicated improvement in their lowest categories, Open and Agreeable. The conclusion survey serves as the re-diagnostic or feedback cycle portion of the OD process. From here, the interventionist would analyze the results and design another intervention to target the other qualities or issues of concern indicated by the survey or the organization.

This study was quite limited in time and resources, but redeveloping this study (or any other OD study for a non-profit) would be greatly beneficial to the field and practice of
organizational development. There are a handful of elements of concern in this study, and future designs should take note of them. First of all, a true experimental design in any organizational setting is quite hard to achieve because few organizations want to risk lost products, service, or operations at the expense of research. For this reason, many organizational designs, including this one, are quasi-experimental; for the most part, this means that the environment is not one-hundred percent controlled. This study itself was not able to utilize a “true” control group, and so the results obtained from the control group (Habitat for Humanity clubs at Maryville College and the University of Tennessee) were more than likely biased, because the groups had worked together before and had construction experience. As a result, the control group’s conclusion survey responses indicated great teamwork and strength in the five qualities identified by the researcher. Future designs in this area should make every effort to employ a true, randomly-selected control group, preferably one that is either unfamiliar with its own members or the task itself, so that the results will be more comparable to the Partner Family and Collegiate Challenge groups outlined in this study.

A second element of concern is the diagnostic intervention. This study did not custom-design an intervention for any specific group as most, if not all, OD interventions try to do for an organization. Rather, this study utilized a “general diagnostic design;” an attempted holistic workshop seeking to target many facets of teambuilding (e.g., the five qualities and communication exercise) indicated from research as being areas of concern for many organizations. In a study not limited by time constraints, the researcher would spend weeks, maybe months, with a team in their environment to understand the specific issues that the team is trying to cope with in order to custom-design an intervention or retreat for them. This design was, comparatively, designed very briefly to begin to scratch the surface of the broadest areas of
concern for teams in general. If a study were able to truly engage with a team in a non-profit for a year or two to comprehensively address these issues, I’m certain the results would be quite different. However, I will say that for Habitat for Humanity’s purposes, some general intervention design may be best after all because in almost all cases, the teams do not spend five workdays a week out on the construction site together for years at a time. Most of the work is done by a team who volunteers for a weekend or two, and so perhaps a diagnostic survey that targets what the team believes are issues for concern would best indicate what sort of intervention should take place. At any rate, the intervention design in this study is greatly modified from the typical OD model.

A third concern is validity. In this study, it is quite possible that the groups I worked with wanted my study to be successful, and so they may have filled out their surveys, especially their conclusion surveys, in the way they anticipated I would want them to. Future studies should take note that OD models are meant to best help the team, not to best help the researcher, and perhaps should make that point clear to participants who sincerely want the researcher’s study to go well. Longitudinal designs are perhaps one way to tackle this tricky problem. Following up with a team after a week or month of them working together, may help a study shed light on new problems, dissatisfactions, and issues that were not addressed during the time of the first intervention. Latent effects of the intervention are certainly plausible as well, and longitudinal designs would be likely to illuminate those sorts of side effects.

Though this study has been limited, in my opinion (and the opinion of Habitat for Humanity staff and volunteers), it has been incredibly helpful in illustrating the power of a teambuilding, communication, and motivation workshop in a non-profit, volunteer setting. Groups that were unfamiliar with one another and construction work, in general, were able to
approach the work sites with confidence, energy, and a sense of alliance in their new teammates. When I went to the build site to administer the conclusion survey to the Partner Family group, I noticed the participants, who did not even know anyone’s names earlier that morning before the intervention, working and laughing in a spirit of confidence and friendship, and in that moment I felt my study had been a success. To have seen them only hours earlier nervously wander into the classroom and quietly sit down, not conversing with those around them, was like remembering an entirely different group of people than the smiling and energetic group they had become. The Collegiate Challenge group was very much the same way; two groups from two very different schools spending a week together on a construction site did not make for the most cohesive group of volunteers when I first met them. At their intervention, they sat with their friends from their respective schools, and they seemed very uninterested that I was there to teach them about teamwork. After I arrived on the construction site the following day with the conclusion surveys, however, they were sitting in one large circle eating pizza on their lunch break and were all sharing in the conversation—no one was excluded. Seeing an aggregate of people in the same place at the same time doing the same thing transform into an energetic and supportive network of team members working diligently to achieve a task was precisely what I predicted this study would do, and I believe I saw that transformation take place twice.

I have, hopefully, outlined here an application of an OD design to a non-profit setting in which team-based volunteer work is the model for goal accomplishment. This study’s aim is to serve as an example of a very adaptive paradigm that can be utilized by non-profits that operate in this way in order to help volunteers on teams become supportive, self-managed and encouraged groups of people sharing the same values and vision. Organizational development is, in itself, a very creative and adaptive field of study and practice that has proved to be beneficial
for many organizations undergoing change. Understanding this change to be the challenge of working with people one has just met in an environment in which one has little experience makes this model extremely applicable to Habitat for Humanity’s particular method. This study has indicated the benefits of the OD design to this specific non-profit, but the researcher in me still says, “why stop there?” I believe in the success of this model, and I believe its boundaries are practically limitless.
APPENDIX I

CONSENT FORMS AND SURVEYS
Participant Consent Form

You are being asked to participate in an important study to learn about the benefits of organizational development education within a team-based volunteer setting. This study is being conducted by Miranda Coffey, a senior student in the Sociology Department at Maryville College. You will be asked as part of this study to fill out a simple survey about your group work on the Habitat for Humanity Build Site, as well as very basic demographic information. This study’s goal is to help non-profits understand the usefulness of applying industrial sociology and organizational behavior to volunteers who will be carrying out their work in groups.

By signing this form you agree to the following:

- Your participation in this project is completely voluntary; the decision is up to you and no one else.
- You can change your mind at any time— even after signing this form—and receive no penalty.
- The personal information you provide such as your name, age, and other demographic information will be kept confidential (that is, the identity of the information will not be revealed) to the extent of the law. At the conclusion of this study, the survey will be destroyed; however, information from the survey will be compiled with the other surveys to visually describe the group on a pie chart, at which point, the information will be aggregated and not associated with any individual.
- The only known risk is the possibility of some emotional discomfort.

If you have any questions about this study, you may contact Miranda Coffey at 865-680-9911 at any time. Or, you may contact Dr. Susan Ambler, the faculty supervisor of this research at 865-981-8232 with questions about your rights as a participant in this study.

I have read the consent form and fully understand it. All my questions have been answered. I agree to take part in this study, and I have the right to receive a copy of this completed form at my request.

Signature of Researcher___________________________ Date________________________

Signature of Participant___________________________ Date________________________
Build Conclusion Study

Please fill out the demographic information listed below:

Gender: M/F  Age: _____  Do you have a job? If Yes, What do you do?___________

Race/Ethnicity:  Education:  Household Income:
White  Less than High School  Less than $15,000
Hispanic  High School/GED  $15,000-$30,000
African-American  Some College  $30,000-$45,000
Asian/Pacific Islander  Trade School  $45,000-$60,000
Native American  4 Year College Grad  $60,000-$75,000
Other___________  Graduate School  More than $75,000

Please circle 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 for each item below based on your experience at the Build Site today.

1= Strongly Disagree  2=Disagree  3=Neutral  4=Agree  5=Strongly Agree

1. I feel that our group worked well together today.  1  2  3  4  5

2. When someone in our group did something well, we neglected to praise their good job.  1  2  3  4  5

3. When problems occurred in our group today, we approached them and worked to solve them.  1  2  3  4  5

4. The members of our group seem to be accepting of new people and new ideas.  1  2  3  4  5

5. Our group tended to argue about tasks and personal issues today.  1  2  3  4  5

Please respond to the items below in one or two sentences.

6. Please describe some of the strengths or positive characteristics of your group today:

7. Please describe some of this group’s weaknesses or problem areas:
You are being asked to participate in an important study to learn about the benefits of organizational development education within a team-based volunteer setting. This study is being conducted by Miranda Coffey, a senior student in the Sociology Department at Maryville College. You will be required as part of this study to fill out a simple survey about your personal strengths and weaknesses involving group work, as well as very basic personal demographic information. Then, you will attend a workshop, approximately one hour long, at the Habitat for Humanity office classroom in which you will be asked to participate in some role-playing exercises, along with 10 or 15 other people on your build team, to address basic group problem solving tactics as well as communication exercises. Then, after working on the Habitat for Humanity build site and hopefully applying some of your education to your experience on the build site, you will be asked to complete a final survey assessing the applicability of the workshop’s lessons to your day on the build. This study’s goal is to help non-profits understand the usefulness of applying industrial sociology and organizational behavior to volunteers who will be carrying out their work in groups.

By signing this form you agree to the following:

- The workshop may be videotaped.
- Your participation in this project is completely voluntary; the decision is up to you and no one else.
- You can change your mind at any time—even after signing this form—and receive no penalty.
- The personal information you provide such as your name, age, and other demographic information will be kept confidential (that is, the identity of the information will not be revealed) to the extent of the law. At the conclusion of this study, the first survey will be destroyed; however, information from the survey will be compiled with the other surveys to visually describe the group on a pie chart, at which point, the information will be aggregated and not associated with any individual.
- The only known risk is the possibility of some emotional discomfort.

If you have any questions about this study, you may contact Miranda Coffey at 865-680-9911 at any time. Or, you may contact Dr. Susan Ambler, the faculty supervisor of this research at 865-981-8232 with questions about your rights as a participant in this study.

I have read the consent form and fully understand it. All my questions have been answered. I agree to take part in this study, and I will receive a copy of this completed form.

Signature of Participant_____________________________ Date____________________________

Signature of Researcher_____________________________ Date____________________________
Participant Strength/ Weakness Survey

Please Circle 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 for each item below based on your experiences working with others.
1=Strongly Disagree  2=Disagree  3=Neutral  4=Agree  5=Strongly Agree

1. I can easily work with others to complete a task.
   1  2  3  4  5

2. If I have a problem with something or someone, I am unlikely to take action to solve the problem.
   1  2  3  4  5

3. I have been known to make assumptions about others based on stereotypes.
   1  2  3  4  5

4. I am willing to sacrifice my particular way of doing something if others have a better way to do it.
   1  2  3  4  5

5. I am quick to praise others for a job well done.
   1  2  3  4  5

6. I am often uncomfortable in groups of people I do not know.
   1  2  3  4  5

7. I often forget or overlook opportunities to give others a “pat on the back.”
   1  2  3  4  5

8. It is easy for me to see things from someone else’s point of view.
   1  2  3  4  5

9. I am tolerant of almost every kind of person, even people I don’t see eye to eye with.
   1  2  3  4  5

10. I get wound up in heated discussions and sometimes it causes me to lose my focus.
    1  2  3  4  5

11. I feel like I accomplish more working alone.
    1  2  3  4  5

12. I believe teamwork has the potential to be fun and get the job done.
    1  2  3  4  5

13. I enjoy applauding people for their achievements.
    1  2  3  4  5

14. When a problem arises, I often complain about it to others instead of seeking a solution right away.
    1  2  3  4  5

15. If I know I’m right about something, it is often difficult for me to let it go.
    1  2  3  4  5

16. I find it very easy to express myself in most situations.
    1  2  3  4  5

17. I have been known to verbally discourage others when they do something I personally do not like.
    1  2  3  4  5

18. If a problem arises, I like to discuss it openly and honestly with others.
    1  2  3  4  5

19. I often provide solutions when problems come up.
    1  2  3  4  5

20. I prefer not to work in groups.
    1  2  3  4  5
APPENDIX 2

DEMOGRAPHICS
# Control Group Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income (Parents' income)</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15-$30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30-$45,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45-$60,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60-$75,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $75,000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Type</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Partner Family Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/GED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year College Grad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15-$30,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30-$45,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45-$60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60-$75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Type</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Collegiate Challenge Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Type</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/African American</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income (Parent’s Income)</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15-$30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30-$45,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45-$60,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60-$75,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $75,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Works Cited


