

**IMPORTANT OUTCOMES OF SUCCESS: A TEAM BUILDING PROGRAM**

**by**

**JANET MARY PACHAL**

**B.A., The University of Alberta, 1990**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF**

**MASTER OF ARTS**

**in**

**THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION**

**(Department of Educational Studies)**

**We accept this thesis as conforming  
to the required standard**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

**April 2000**

**© Janet Mary Pachal, 2000**

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Educational Studies

The University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, Canada

Date April 27/00

## Abstract

There is little information about how the criteria or outcomes used to judge a program varies between stakeholders. When organizational development initiatives such as team building programs are designed, the expected results or outcomes are often pre-determined by those responsible for the programs. Consequently, the views of individuals directly affected by the initiative are often not considered. Therefore, the intent of this study is to determine which outcomes males and females at various positions within an organization identify as most important in judging the success of a team building program.

A questionnaire was distributed to a sample of individuals employed at a large public sector organization. From the results it was determined that the outcomes both employees and managers consider important include increasing trust and support in supervisors, improving communication and working relationships between co-workers and increasing leadership/management effectiveness. In terms of differences in important outcomes, the male managers place importance on outcomes related to increasing productivity, female managers value improving culture, male employees are interested in increasing job satisfaction and female employees are interested in improved respect from co-workers. By being aware of all of the outcomes various individuals consider important in judging the success of a program, senior officials and program managers can adapt initiatives that better meet the needs of the individuals within the organization.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	ii
Table of Contents .....	iii
List of Tables .....	v
Acknowledgements .....	vii
Chapter 1 Introduction .....	1
Purpose and Problem Statement .....	4
Questions .....	5
Significance of the Study .....	5
Chapter 2 Literature Review .....	7
Values .....	8
Approaches to Evaluation .....	9
Gender Issues in the Workplace.....	18
Organizational Development and Team Building Interventions .....	21
Definition of Terms .....	36
Chapter 3 Research Methodology.....	39
Survey Design .....	39
Subjects .....	40
Instrumentation .....	42
Data Collection Procedure .....	44
Data Analysis .....	46
Validity .....	47
Limitations of the Design.....	48
Timing of the Project .....	51

Chapter 4 Results .....	52
Results of the Most Important Outcomes by Frequency of Responses.....	52
Results of the Three Most Important Outcomes by Frequency of Responses .....	63
Results by Organizational Position.....	74
Results By Sex .....	75
Results By Organizational Position and Sex .....	75
Chapter 5 Conclusions .....	82
Highlights of the Results.....	82
Implications of the Research.....	84
Recommendations for Further Research.....	88
References.....	92
Appendix I   Initial Contact Letter to Potential Participants.....	95
Appendix II   Follow-Up Letter to Potential Participants .....	96
Appendix III   Important Outcomes of Success Questionnaire .....	97
Appendix IV   List or “Other” Outcomes Identified from Questionnaire.....	101

## List of Tables

Table 1:	Total Population of Employees.....	41
Table 2:	Survey Sample .....	42
Table 3:	Survey Response Rate.....	45
Table 4:	The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Employees” for the Manager Group.....	54
Table 5:	The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Employees” for the Employee Group.....	55
Table 6:	The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Co-workers” for the Manager Group.....	56
Table 7:	The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Co-workers” for the Employee Group.....	57
Table 8:	The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Departments” for the Manager Group.....	58
Table 9:	The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Departments” for the Employee Group.....	60
Table 10:	The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting the Organization” for the Manager Group .....	62
Table 11:	The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting the Organization” for the Employee Group .....	63
Table 12:	One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Employees” for the Manager Group .....	65

Table 13: One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Employees” for the Employee Group .....	66
Table 14: One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Co-workers” for the Manager Group. ....	67
Table 15: One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Co-workers” for the Employee Group .....	68
Table 16: One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Department” for the Manager Group .....	69
Table 17: One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Department” for the Employee Group .....	70
Table 18: One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting the Organization” for the Manager Group .....	72
Table 19: One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting the Organization” for the Employee Group .....	73

## Acknowledgements

To my husband, David, for providing me with continual encouragement and inspiration.

Your belief in me, made me believe in myself. I could not have completed this thesis without you. We earned this degree together.

To my Dad and Mom and my sisters, Jaci and Jodi, for always believing in my ability to succeed and once again helping me to achieve my dreams.

To my daughters, Madison and Karley who through your hugs and kisses continually reminded me of the truly important and precious parts of life.

I love you all.

To Dr. Frank Echols for sharing your knowledge and experience. You challenged me to think with a broader perspective. I am grateful for your support and direction. To Dr. Tom Sork, for your input. I appreciated your constructive comments. To Dr. Lesley Andres, for your thoughtful and thorough reading of my thesis. Your ideas made this a better paper. My thanks to all three of you for taking the time to be apart of this project.

## Chapter 1

### Introduction

Organizational development (OD) interventions are implemented for various reasons within the business community. The intended outcomes of the initiatives are often pre-determined by those responsible for the design of the program prior to the beginning of the intervention. As a result, the expectations of individuals participating in the intervention are often overlooked. The purpose of this study is to identify the outcomes considered important to stakeholders and to determine if there is a difference in the outcomes considered important by individuals from one organization participating in an OD initiative.

This study focused on an intervention that took place in a municipal government corporation in Western Canada. Departments within this organization included engineering, fire, police, planning, parks and recreation, finance, human resources and general administration. At the time of this study there were approximately 1200 employees within these eight departments. The departments varied in size from twelve to three hundred individuals. Of the employees, over 50% were located on one site that encompassed the city hall and the police headquarters. The city hall location was primarily composed of administrative staff in professional attire. A portion of the remaining staff worked throughout the municipality in the various community centres, arenas, fire halls, and libraries. The other portion of staff were outside workers in the engineering and parks and recreation departments. The organizational structure of each Department was a traditional hierarchy with several levels of reporting relationships.

In an attempt to increase organizational efficiency, the organization underwent restructuring and downsizing in the mid-1990s. There was a strain on the relationship between management staff and the unionized employees as a consequence of these changes. In 1995, after many of the changes had occurred, steps were taken to improve staff relations, morale and culture within the corporation. Employee focus groups were initiated to identify how employees felt about working for the organization and what employees believed was required to improve the organization. Based on feedback from these focus groups, a consultant worked with senior officials to develop a master plan that included several OD initiatives. One component of this plan was a team building program. This team building intervention is the focus of this study.

The team building program was divided into three components and was scheduled to take approximately three years to complete. The first phase, the Team Skills Workshops, began in April 1997. The training was for full-time and permanent part-time employees, including front-line staff and managers. Originally designed as a three-day workshop, initial feedback from participants and instructors indicated the course could be conducted in two days and it was subsequently condensed. Each session included a cross section of employees representing various departments. The workshops were based on six concepts:

- (1) people must communicate effectively with each other;
- (2) each team member is considered as an equally valuable resource;
- (3) individuals who work effectively as part of a team are more innovative;
- (4) teams are more effective and efficient than individuals working alone;
- (5) a team approach will result in better customer service;
- (6) improved communication is required for effective teamwork.

In the spring of 1999, nearly all of the eligible staff had completed the Team Skills Workshop.

The second component of the training focused on the development of skills for management and supervisory staff. The purpose was to provide them with additional training in the areas of coaching, facilitation and team building. Managers attended these sessions with the other managers and supervisors from their own department. By mid-1999, approximately 50% of management staff had completed the Phase 2 training.

In the third component of the training, Customized Team Skills, employees participated in a customized workshop with their identified work-place team members. The size of these teams varied within each department or section. There were eight modules, or areas of focus, developed for this component of the training. By the summer of 1999, six of the eight departments had completed at least some of the modules.

In the summer of 1999, due to changes in the senior management and a corresponding alteration of priorities, the team building initiative seemed to lose its focus within the organization. Shortly after the management change, the Team Skills Workshops became voluntary for each department. Managers were given the option to decide whether employees would attend the workshops. Allowing voluntary attendance may have been a factor that led to fewer workshops. By the late summer of 1999, the workshops had been cancelled. Despite the cancellation of Phase 1, some managers who believed in the value of the program continued to have their staff participate in the second and third phases of the program. In the fall of 1999, the manager responsible for designing the overall program resigned. With the departure of this individual the remaining training related to team building ceased and the program was discontinued.

This program, which started with good intentions with respect to organizational development, was very costly in terms of individual time invested by employees and monetary costs of administering the program. Perhaps one of the factors leading to the organization's change in commitment to this program could be related to the different expectations of managers and employees regarding the potential outcomes for the program. If the expected results amongst various individuals had been determined before starting the program, discrepancies could have been addressed and the program adapted according to the identified needs. Although the team building program was discontinued, it is still worthwhile to determine what outcomes are most important to staff and how the opinions of various individuals differ in regards to the program outcomes considered important. Doing so would provide a better understanding of the different perspectives of individuals so future programs could address the variety of expectations of participants.

#### Purpose and Problem Statement

The purposes of this study are (1) to identify the outcomes individuals within the organization consider most important in judging the success of the program and (2) to determine the outcomes are considered most important to individuals based on their position level within the organization and their sex. There is limited information about what outcomes those employed within an organization deem to be important in judging the success of a team building program. The objectives for OD interventions, such as team building, are often pre-determined by the staff responsible for planning the initiative. Consequently, the views of those directly affected are often not included in the development of the criteria to judge the success of the program. In this study, two factors were chosen that might have an influence

on the outcomes considered important in a team building program. Survey results will be analyzed to determine if responses of individuals are influenced by their position within the organization and by their sex. Because the team building program was discontinued, it is not possible to incorporate the outcomes indicated as most important by these stakeholders as a basis for determining whether the program was successful. Additional types of research to build on the information of this study will be discussed in Chapter 5.

### Questions

The two main research questions of this study are:

1. What outcomes do individuals identify as most important for judging the success of a team building program?
2. What are the differences, if any, in the outcomes for judging the success of the team building program based on organizational position and by the respondent's sex?

### Significance of the Study

There is substantial literature on the importance of including a variety of stakeholders in developing the criteria to be used as part of the program evaluation process. One of the reasons for representing various point of views in the process is the belief that the expected outcomes will differ between individuals. This study specifically examines the influence of organizational position and sex. If the outcomes identified as important are different between the groups, this will provide reinforcement of the significance of including those directly affected by a program in the initial stages of the development of the evaluation criteria.

Additionally, program managers could use the results of this study to develop OD and other training programs to better meet the needs and expectations of participants.

## Chapter 2

### Literature Review

In this study, employees were asked to provide their opinions regarding what outcomes they believe important in judging the success of the team building program. Ultimately, in making their choices employees were placing greater value on certain outcomes than on others. This concept of valuing and its implications for the evaluation process is examined in the first section of the literature review.

The second section of the literature review presents a summary of six approaches to evaluation. Although the purpose of this study is not to provide an evaluation of this team building program, it is important to have an understanding of the different approaches to evaluation. The focus of this portion of the review is to provide a synopsis of different methods of including stakeholders in the evaluation process.

The third section describes the influence of gender in the workplace. As one of the questions in this study is whether there are differences in the outcomes considered most important in judging the success of the team building program based on sex it is worthwhile to introduce the issue of gender in the workplace in this review.

In the forth section of the literature review, organizational development and team building interventions are discussed. The purposes of this section are:

- 1) to provide information on how and when these types of interventions can be used and for what purposes;

- 2) to determine which stakeholders have been included in these initiatives;
- 3) to use the effects or outcomes discussed as a basis for development of a list of criteria for the questionnaire used in this study.

### Values

When individuals are asked to provide their opinions regarding an issue or question in an evaluation process, they are being asked to provide a value judgement. This is to say “values are, in effect, descriptors of what people think is good, just and appropriate. They represent the opinions, attitudes, needs and beliefs of those to whom the program is addressed and they always underlie the choice of criteria used to judge the program” (Hurteau, 1991, p. 120). Values may be influenced by a variety of factors including age, gender, occupation, and life experiences.

The Joint Committee of Program Evaluation Standards (1994) states that “good evaluations require the involvement of many people with different perspectives” and “that any particular evaluation task should not automatically or permanently be assigned to a person solely because that individual occupies a particular position in an organization or in society” (p.4). By giving the responsibility of the evaluation process, including the determination of outcomes, to only one person there is a risk that other important viewpoints will not be considered. Weiss’ (1972) perspective is inclusive in terms of who should be involved in an evaluation and for whom the evaluation is done. She suggests: (1) determine who wants the evaluation; (2) decide what they want to learn or know as a result of the study; (3) describe how the evaluative information is going to be used and (4) identify who is going

to use it. She believes consideration of these components will determine who should be involved in the evaluation process and ultimately whose values will be considered.

This discussion of values provides an understanding of why it is important to have different stakeholders included in the evaluation process. It is diversity of ideas, practices and actions that people value as important that results in different items being identified as important during an evaluation process. By asking a variety of individuals to provide opinions of what outcomes they believe most important in judging the success of this team building program, different perspectives can be included and a combination of values represented. Furthermore, the program could be adjusted to address the various expectations influenced by the different values of participants.

### Approaches to Evaluation

This summary of perspectives is included to provide an overview of six different approaches of evaluation which incorporate views of stakeholders. An important component of the evaluation process in terms of this particular study is the examination of the various ways that stakeholders could be included in the development of the criteria for evaluating a program. A summary of each approach will be outlined including a description of the key ideas of the process, followed by a brief discussion of the main strengths and limitations of each approach as they relate to this study.

1) Behavioral Objectives (Goal-Based) Approach: The Behavioral Objectives approach is one of the longest standing orientations to evaluation and has been used in educational settings since the 1950s. One of its first supporters was Ralph Tyler. Due to his extensive use of the

Goal-Based Approach, it is often referred to as the Tylerian Model of program development and evaluation (House, 1980, p. 27). This approach relies on the development of measurable goals and objectives for the program prior to the initiation of program activities. Weiss (1972) describes this process as “there are goals; there is a planned activity (or several planned activities) aimed at achieving those goals; there is a measure made of the extent to which the goals are achieved” (p.25). In terms of measurability, this means when goals and objectives are initially determined, benchmarks or standards are established for judging the success of the program. During the evaluation process evidence is collected to determine whether the program achieved the predetermined goals. By having goals initially established for the program, those who are responsible for the evaluation have a benchmark upon which to measure the success of the program. The difference between the initial goals set for the program and what the program actually achieved are used as the measure of success or failure. This objective measure against a pre-determined standard makes this approach widely accepted both in educational and business communities.

The fact that the Goal-Based Approach provides measurable results is perhaps its greatest strength and one of the reasons for its long time use. Managers, funding agencies and others responsible for the administration of programs need to have a method of evaluation that enables them to justify their decisions for the programs they support or cancel.

The main drawback of this approach in relation to this study is the way the goals for the program are typically established. Traditionally, the goals are determined by those responsible for the program (e.g., managers, coordinators) with little or no input from the

participants. Often the identified goals only represent the results decision-makers want to see the programs achieve. These results do not always correspond with the criteria or outcomes other stakeholders may use to judge the success of the program.

2) Goal-Free Approach: This approach is strongly associated with Michael Scriven (Shadish *et al*, 1991) who advocates that goals should not be pre-determined prior to the start of the evaluation. Unlike the Goal-Based Approach, this method suggests that the evaluator not be aware of what is expected in terms of program outcomes. "The evaluator's job, according to Scriven, is to locate any and all program effects, intended or not, that might help solve social problems" (Shadish *et al*, 1991, p. 80). The goal-free evaluator ignores program goals in formulating questions, looking for all possible important effects that the evaluand might have" (Shadish *et al*, 1991, p.85). Scriven believes this knowledge will potentially bias the evaluator during the program evaluation. "The goal-free model reduces the bias of searching for only the program developer's pre-specified intents by not informing the evaluator of them. Hence, in not knowing the goals the evaluator must search for all outcomes" (House, 1980, p. 30).

By its very nature this approach considers the needs of stakeholders. Scriven (1993) describes this approach as a consumer-oriented view, rather than a management approach to program evaluation (p.9). Scriven (1993) sees:

the main function of evaluation is the determination of the merit and worth of programs in terms of how effectively and efficiently they are serving those affected,

particularly those receiving, or who should be receiving the services provided and those who pay for the program (p. 9).

This is an aspect of the evaluation process not seen in the Goal-Based approach but is potentially extremely informative as far as evaluating the success of a program. This needs-based approach focuses on the effects the program has on stakeholders directly involved in the program. If the program fulfills the expectations or needs of stakeholders, the program achieves its purpose and therefore can be considered successful.

The main drawback of this approach is that Scriven (1993) indicates a need to reduce bias in the evaluation in terms of including the perspectives of managers and the evaluator. Scriven states “in a good evaluation of a program impacting people other than the evaluator, it should be impossible to identify the values of the evaluator” (Scriven, 1993, p.22). However, it is not realistic to believe that evaluators can remain completely bias-free and not let their pre-conceptions impact the information they review during the evaluation. House explains that this approach is not widely accepted in the evaluation field:

evaluators and developers often find it difficult to envision where the evaluator would find criteria for the evaluation if not from the program developer’s goals. They presume the evaluator merely substitutes his (sic) own goals for those of the developers (House, 1980, p. 30).

3) Responsive Evaluation Approach: The Responsive Approach, a qualitative method of evaluation, has been extensively developed and supported by Robert Stake (Shadish *et al*, 1991). The main question and purpose related to this evaluation approach is:

What are the various points of view of different constituency groups and stakeholders? The responsive evaluator works to capture, represent, and interpret these varying perspectives under the assumption each is valid and valuable (Patton, 1997, p. 194).

The strength of this approach, similar to the Goal-Free approach, is that the evaluation process directly involves stakeholder views in determining what the evaluator should look for and therefore, what ultimately constitutes a successful program. The aim of the process is to “improve the understanding of the reader/audience of the evaluation, primarily by showing them how others perceive the program being evaluated” (House, 1980, p. 39). This is most often done through the qualitative method of case study, as “Stake advocates that case study methodologies be used to improve local practice. He pays little attention to indicators of program success, wanting local projects to bear primary evaluation responsibility” (Shadish *et al*, 1991, p. 271). Stake believes people at the local level should have responsibility for improving programs and he sees the use of the case study method as the best way to achieve this goal.

In regard to limitations, the use of this approach is quite specific, as a case study is the preferred type of research method. A case study involves extensive resources including the time of the researcher in understanding and documenting the program. Although this process is worthwhile, due to the types of questions asked in this study and the resources available, this level of involvement was not attempted.

4) Stakeholder Approach: In order to address some of the criticism of the other methods of evaluation, (e.g., the inclusion of input from stakeholders, the development of appropriate questions, the utilization of information) the Stakeholder Approach “was designed explicitly both to increase the use of evaluation results for decision making and to bring a wider range of people into active participation in the evaluation process” (Weiss, 1986, p. 150). The Stakeholder Approach enables stakeholders at various levels to participate in the development of the evaluation after the program is complete and become participants in the “design, conduct, and/or interpretation of the evaluation” (Weiss, 1998, p. 337). By involving a wide variety of interested people in the initial process, proponents expect the results will be taken more seriously and, therefore there will be an increase in the use of the results:

The stakeholder approach was expected to build support for commitment to the findings the evaluations produced. People who had helped to plan and design an evaluation would have bought in. They would take the results seriously. If and when they took part in subsequent decision making, they were expected to use the data that evaluation provided (Weiss, 1986, p. 155).

The strength of this approach is the inclusion of those not traditionally involved in the entire evaluation process. Interested individuals become active participants in all steps in the process. This approach goes beyond what decision-makers may want from the program and attempts to identify from participants what they consider a successful program. This brings the control of the evaluation process to the people using and affected by the programs, rather than to those who develop the program.

The main drawback of the Stakeholder Approach is actually raised in Weiss' assessment of its success. Even though individuals and groups may be committed to the program, they may not necessarily want to be involved in the entire evaluation process as "it is the program and its future that concern them, not information about the program" (Weiss, 1986, p. 195). Secondly, since the program is evaluated after it has occurred, adjusting the program to match the desired outcomes cannot be done.

5) Participatory Approach - Similar to the Stakeholder Approach, the Participatory Approach relies on the input of those involved in the program to assist in the development of the entire evaluation process including the basis for judging the success of the program. However, apart from this similarity, these two approaches are quite unique. Those involved in the Participatory Approach are individuals directly affected by the program. Cousins and Earl (1992) describe those typically involved in the process as 'primary users' a term initially developed by Alkin (1991). Primary users are defined as "organization members with program responsibility, or people with a vital interest in the program" (Cousins and Earl, 1992, p. 400). Those involved in the Stakeholder Approach encompass a wider variety of stakeholders including those representing various organizations or individuals. In the Participatory Approach, the primary users are involved in all components of the evaluation from problem formation to the final reporting procedure. Ultimately, the evaluation process is the joint responsibility of the evaluator and the primary users.

The strength of this approach is the inclusion of only primary users in the evaluation process. Their level of commitment, knowledge and interest in the program is potentially greater than those who have limited involvement. The evaluation has the potential to be

developed with a very specific focus and purpose as a result of the limited perspectives of those involved.

In terms of potential limitations, the Participatory Approach requires individuals to be involved in all components of the evaluation process. Similar to the discussion regarding the Stakeholder Approach, not everyone directly involved in the program is interested in active participation in the entire evaluation process.

6) Fourth Generation Evaluation: Guba and Lincoln (1989) proposed an alternative approach to traditional conceptions of evaluation. The first three generations they describe are measurement, description and judgement. They used the term Fourth Generation Evaluation, or Responsive Constructivist Evaluation, to distinguish this approach from the previous evaluation models. Responsiveness refers to the inclusion of stakeholders in the process of designing the parameters and boundaries of the evaluation. The term constructivist refers to the methodology used in doing the evaluation. The basis for this methodology is the belief there is a subjective reality (ontology), interaction between observer and observed (epistemology) and interaction between the observation and the observed (methodology).

As with Responsive Evaluation, the idea of including various stakeholders from within the organization is vital and like most of the other approaches, it is the most beneficial

aspect of this approach. The potential drawback of the constructivist component is the level of ambiguity in the results, making it difficult to formulate propositions about the activity being evaluated.

### Conclusion

The six approaches discussed are:

1. Behavioral Objectives (Goal-Based) Evaluation
2. Goal-Free Evaluation
3. Responsive Evaluation
4. Stakeholder Evaluation
5. Participatory Evaluation
6. Fourth Generation Evaluation

The six approaches do not represent an exhaustive list of the various possible evaluative approaches. Rather, the approaches represent six recognized perspectives that incorporate the views of stakeholders in different ways.

With the exception of the Goal-Based Approach, the views of various stakeholders involved in or affected by the program are important in determining the criteria to eventually evaluate the successfulness of the program. The level of the involvement of stakeholders ranges from consideration of their views during the evaluation (e.g., Goal-Free Approach) to direct involvement of stakeholders throughout the entire evaluation process (e.g., Stakeholder Approach). For the most part, research done in the area of evaluation emphasizes the importance of including a variety of stakeholders in the evaluation process and this idea is one of the fundamental components of this study.

One area that was not addressed in the explanation of these six approaches was whether the responses of different stakeholders actually do vary depending on the interest, perspective or background that each person brings to the process. The information did provide a sound background to the fundamentals of each evaluation approach. However, there is little information about the criteria or outcomes used to judge the successfulness of a program. It is, therefore, necessary to investigate whether differences exist between various stakeholders regarding the criteria or outcomes indicated as most important for judging the success of one specific program - a team building program.

### Gender Issues in the Workplace

Over the last several decades there has been a steady increase of women in the workplace. Women have continued to be employed in the traditional occupations of nursing, teaching and secretarial work, and additionally in more recent years, they have gained employment in more senior positions, both managerial and professional, within a variety of industries and organizations.

However, even though in many cases women have gained equality to men in terms of professional positions and associated pay, there are still differences between the way in which men and women are treated and recognized due to their gender. The following literature provides an introduction to the type of issues associated with gender cultures and expectations of women in the workplace.

In the early 1990s, Maddock and Parkin (1994) identified a variety of gender cultures through conducting equity audits, training sessions and discussions with men and women managers in British Public sector. The authors explain that gender is only one factor that

influences the distribution of power in the workplace but still “a person’s gender continues to determine where they work and the type of work they do” (p.30). The authors describe two specific groups of gender cultures. First there are the traditional cultures: (1) the Gentleman’s Club, (2) the Locker Room, (3) the Barrack Yard. The common theme amongst these cultures is that men and women each have fundamentally different roles to play in society. Women tend to feel accepted because they adhere to stereotypical behaviours of mother or caregiver that reinforce their role in the workplace. The second group of cultures (1) Gender Blind, (2) Smart Macho and (3) the Pretenders “show how the dynamic of gender relations persists even when participants proclaim men and women equal and no different in their abilities” (Maddock and Parkin, 1994, p.30). In the ‘Gender Blind’ and ‘Smart Macho’ cultures, the concept of equity is acknowledged but potential barriers to equity are not necessarily addressed. In the ‘Pretenders’ culture male managers also believe in equity but do not necessarily want to give up their power and control.

The authors state that women are generally more aware of gender issues in the workplace as it often affects their career opportunities within the organization. However, that in order to change the existing gender cultures within a company there needs to be a dedicated challenge by both men and women.

The description of the gender cultures provided by Maddock and Parkin is an interesting perspective of the relationships between males and females in the workplace. Although this material was developed based on British organizations, the types of gender cultures described are also likely to be evident in the Canadian business environment.

In her book, Stivers (1993) discusses the issue of gender in public administration within the United States. The author specifically describes the issues women face related to gender within this organizational structure. Stivers writes,

women's experience of life in public agencies has been materially different from men's. Women have been paid less, done a disproportionate share of the routine work, struggled with the question of how to accommodate themselves to organizational practices defined by men, brooded over how to turn aside men's advances without losing their jobs, and fought to balance work demands with what was expected of them on the domestic front. Those who have made it to the middle ranks find themselves bumping up against a glass ceiling that keeps a disproportionate number of women from top positions (Stivers, 1993, p. 33).

Stivers recommends trying to re-examine the definitions of competence, leadership and virtue within the traditional public administration structure and to redefine these terms in a way that encompasses a more flexible and participatory environment.

Although this book focuses on the public administration structure in the United States, the comments the author makes are also applicable within the Canadian public sector environment. Stivers provides insight as to the reasons for the differences in perspectives and behaviours of men and women in the workplace.

Rosener (1990) discusses a new generation of female managers that "are succeeding because of – not in spite of – certain characteristics generally considered to be "feminine" and inappropriate in leaders (p.12). She describes a leadership style she calls "interactive leadership". This style of leadership encourages participation, sharing power and information, and energizing others. The female managers she spoke with, who were typically

employed in medium-sized and fast paced organizations, “believe that employees and peers perform better when they feel they are part of an organization and can share in its success” (Rosener, 1990, p. 125).

The author explains that the economic environment requires rapid change and that even large, established corporations need to develop and accept a more interactive leadership style in order to grow and succeed. This article was written ten years ago and the characteristics of interactive leadership style are still worthwhile and being displayed by the most progressive female managers.

### Conclusion

The literature included in this section has provided an introduction to the issues of gender in the workplace. The literature provides a basis for understanding how the different perspectives towards men and women are created and then maintained. It is important that managers within organizations are aware of issues related to gender so that barriers can be addressed and individuals can be encouraged to use their unique skills and abilities to foster development within the organization. Based on this literature review, gender will be an important variable in this study.

### Organizational Development and Team Building Interventions

As the workforce of the 1990s changed, (e.g., organizational downsizing and new technology) corporations had to develop ways to increase effectiveness and efficiency of their employees. One way of doing this was the initiation of organizational development (OD) interventions. One type of intervention is team building training. It is suggested that if done

properly, team building has the potential to increase the working capacity of employees since “the research has clearly established that organizations functioning as teams are significantly more productive and long lasting” (Harvey and Drolet, 1994, p. 12). But increasing the productivity of employees is only one possible outcome of organizational development and team building. There are several potential outcomes important to the organization to be discussed throughout this section of the literature review, including:

- an overview of the types of organizational development intervention and team building programs that have been implemented in organizations;
- the most common outcomes of organizational development interventions and team building programs and how these anticipated outcomes are identified and by whom.

There are a large number of references on organizational development and team building. However, only materials that had a connection to the purposes of this study were included in this review. Specifically, materials that discussed the implementation and evaluation of OD interventions or team building programs, studies that discussed outcomes of organizational development initiatives and a research article focusing on the difference between employees at different levels within the public sector environment were reviewed.

### Organizational Development

Porras and Berg (1978) conducted a meta-analysis of thirty-five empirical studies to investigate the impact of organizational development (OD) activities. They developed a typology to “investigate both the overall impact of OD and the differential impact of unique classes of interventions” (p. 249). In the article OD is referred to as “a set of specific change interventions focused on people and organizational processes” (Porras and Berg, 1978, p.

250). The organizational development initiatives included several techniques, of which team building is one method. The authors categorized these variables or outcomes into the two areas of process and outputs. From the research:

the impact of OD has been investigated in two general areas of organizational life - its effects on individual and systems *outputs* and its effects on human interactive *processes*. The first refers to OD's impact on organizational outputs (typically performance types of variables such as profits, costs, productivity and efficiency but also other outcome measures such as absenteeism and turnover, employee satisfaction, individual job effectiveness and quality of group meeting). The more general term, outcome variables, describes this group. The second area of assessment refers to OD's effects on behaviors and attitudes and on various characteristics of the organization's human side, labeled process variables: processes in the organization such as openness, self-awareness, work facilitation, goal emphasis, decision-making, motivation and influence (Porras and Berg, 1978, p. 251-252).

From the research reviewed for their study, the authors analyzed and identified effects or outcomes of organizational development programs. Overall, the results indicated the OD interventions had varied effects, depending on the variables. The results, in terms of outcome variables, indicated that organizational development interventions have the greatest effect on group performance. In terms of process variables, organizational development had the greatest impact on individuals.

Although this research is over 20 years old many of the results are still relevant in comparison with the results of other studies (e.g., Neuman *et al*). The most useful component of this research is the extensive list of process and outcome variables. Many of

these variables were used in the development of the categories and items on the questionnaire for this study.

In a similar study, Porras and Hoffer (1986) wanted to “identify and specify common behavior changes characteristic (sic) of successful change efforts”(p.477). Via a telephone interview, the authors surveyed forty-two scholars and practitioners involved in the organizational development field. Participants were asked two questions regarding what should be the focus of organizational development interventions. After completing the interviews, responses were analyzed and categorized into common characteristics. The first category consisted of behaviors seen at all levels within the organization such as communicating openly, collaborating, taking responsibility, maintaining shared visions, solving problems effectively, respecting/supporting, processing/facilitating interactions, inquiring and experimenting. The second category consisted of behaviors specific to management including generating participation, leading by vision, functioning strategically, promoting information flow and developing others. The outcomes listed relate mostly to effects on process skills (e.g., generating participation) rather than outputs within the organization or department (e.g., increased productivity). The results of this study determined the outcomes listed were very similar between scholars and practitioners.

The process used to determine the behavior change characteristics as well as the characteristics themselves are both relevant to this research. Porras and Hoffer’s study provides one example of a process for surveying different stakeholders as to what outcomes they believed are important and should be the focus of an OD intervention. Although the procedures for gaining the information and the types of individuals involved are different

between the study by Porras and Hoffer and this research, the underlying component in determining important outcomes from a variety of individuals is similar.

In 1989 Neuman *et al* conducted a meta-analysis of 126 studies. The original studies were conducted between 1950 and 1986. The purpose of the Neuman *et al* study was to examine what effect organizational interventions had on satisfaction and/or other attitudes. The studies were categorized into three intervention areas: Human-Processes, Technostructural and Multi-faceted. Human-Processes interventions involved examining how employees deal with one another. Specific interventions these authors looked at included laboratory training, participation in decision making, goal setting, management-by-objectives, realistic job previews, team building and grid OD and survey feedback. Technostructural processes involved a change in the structure of work or work process (e.g., change of work hours or a change in responsibilities). Multi-faceted interventions included a combination of human-processes and technostructural interventions.

This study concluded, "OD's effect on overall satisfaction and other attitudes has been moderate but variable" (Neuman *et al*, 1989, p.477). This means that there was some degree of positive change in the level of satisfaction as a result of the intervention but that the degree of change varied between different interventions. Possible reasons for the variability of results may include such dimensions as the type of work employees are responsible for or the level of authority of an employee. In so far as the finding that specific effects are related to each type of intervention, "interventions that used more than one OD technique were generally superior to an intervention that used only one human-processes or technostructural technique" (Neuman *et al*, 1989, p.479). Similar to the results of the previous study by Porras and Berg (1978), Neuman *et al* also found that the OD intervention has a variable

impact on the outcomes of focus within this study. However, this study by Porras and Berg did provide support for the concept of team building indicating that “team building was the most effective OD intervention for modifying satisfaction and other attitudes” (Neuman *et al*, 1989, p.480). Because satisfaction was a major component of this study, outcomes relating to increasing satisfaction as a result of team building were included in the questionnaire for my study. This study demonstrates that for different desired outcomes, various OD interventions should be employed. Therefore, being able to determine what improvements are necessary within an organization and what areas are most important is critical in selecting an OD initiative.

While two of the three previous studies discussed focused on the information gained through the process of meta-analyses. In this study by Norman and Keys (1992) the program discussed is an organizational development intervention that took place in a public social services department in the United States. The two methods of OD used were process consultation and team building. In this organization, process consultation involved a consultant acting as a facilitator and assisting the group in learning how to better work together. This particular team building process involved the group meeting regularly to discuss and resolve organizational issues.

Norman and Keys (1992) also discussed why OD interventions have not typically been successful in public sector organizations. They explain that the centralized decision making processes, hierarchical structure and divided responsibilities are too rigid to enable the types of changes necessary for a successful OD initiative. The authors believe the support senior officials demonstrate for a program can influence the success of the initiative. Norman and Keys (1992) state that “when top management, as a group, supports organizational

change efforts through an explicit display of values, philosophy and behavior (sic) the rank and file will follow (p. 149). In this study, partially due to the commitment of management to the program, the results of the intervention had a positive effect. Norman and Keys summarize the results by saying “the case example illustrates how the components of leadership at the management level and flexibility in the approach of the OD practitioner can accomplish tangible results over a short period of time” (Norman and Keys, 1992, p. 163).

The OD intervention of focus in the study by Norman and Keys took place in a public organization. The authors discussed reasons why OD initiatives are not typically successful in the traditional public sector environment. As the organization described in my study is in the public sector, the reasons discussed as to why OD interventions are not typically successful is of particular relevance.

In 1998 Mikkelsen wrote an article about a pilot organizational development intervention that was carried out in two post offices in the Norwegian postal services. The key concepts of the intervention “reflected three strong OD traditions: 1) the literature on participation and workplace democracy; 2) the literature on workplace stress, especially focusing on job re-design and environmental factors; and 3) the literature on organizational learning” (Mikkelsen, 1998, p.6). Mikkelsen goes on to say “the core ideas in these three traditions is that the direct involvement of employees in workforce decisions is an essential element in undertaking planned change” (Mikkelsen, 1998, p.9). Additionally “employee participation, management involvement in giving feedback to employee, and continuous processes may be present in public sector settings occasionally, but this is far from the typical public sector situation” (Mikkelsen, 1998, p.9). All supervisors and employees within the two units participated in the OD intervention. As part of the initial process,

participants were asked two questions: “What are the key factors needed to make this a good work environment?” and 2) “What kind of actions are required to reduce the gap between the desired outcomes and the current reality?” (Mikkelsen, 1998, p. 11).

In response to these questions, consensus was reached through the process of small group activity and plenary sessions as to the seven most important elements of the workplace that needed to be improved. Work groups were then established to suggest activities to address these needs. Action plans were created as a result of ongoing dialogue between management, union representatives, the steering committee and the work groups. Target activities were explained in the action plans and the facilitator worked with the groups at each unit to implement the activities over a twelve-week period. Six months after the program was completed, the results between the two units were quite different. Post Office 2 maintained a formal system where management set the direction and the employees followed the instructions. Mikkelsen explained there was some uncertainty regarding layoffs and restructuring at Post Office 1 during the time of the intervention, which may have effected the results. However, at Post Office 2, the initial improvements were implemented and changes continued after the completion of the twelve-week program.

The intervention and process discussed in this article is very applicable to my study. Not only was the intervention conducted in the public sector but also, there was the opportunity for participation by a variety of stakeholders as to what should be the important outcomes or purposes of the intervention.

In 1997 Jurkiewicz and Massey conducted a study examining the differences and similarities between the work factors which motivated supervisory and non-supervisory employees. They then compared the results to what employees believed is the degree to

which they had these motivational work factors in their jobs. Participants in the study were employed in five communities in the mid-western United States.

The research process contained two specific components. First, participants were asked to rank 15 work related motivational factors they would like see in their jobs by level of importance. Then each person ranked the same 15 items in the order they believe they are achieving these factors in their present positions. There was overall agreement between what the groups wanted from their jobs in terms of the ranking of the 15 items. However, in terms of what the employees believed they could actually attain from their jobs, the factors differed significantly. Supervisory staff appeared to have balances between what they wanted from their jobs for half of the items, whereas non-supervisory staff had agreement on only one of the items – the chance to use their special abilities.

Jurkiewicz and Massey's study has particular applicability to my study. First, it is the only study that analyzed the similarities and differences between supervisory and non-supervisory staff in reference to work-related motivational factors. Second, the study was conducted in municipal government settings. Even the potential value of the findings is similar in that both studies could be used to better meet the needs of the organization. For Jurkiewicz and Massey, they saw the information from their study assisting managers to better meet the needs of employees regarding work-related motivational factors. The main differences between this study and my study are most obviously, the questions posed. In terms of breadth, Jurkiewicz and Massey incorporated the results from five municipal settings within the United States, whereas this particular study, on team building, focused on one Canadian municipal government setting.

### Team building

The previous articles discussed OD interventions in general. However, there are articles and studies that specifically discuss team building programs. It is important to note that even though there are a number of sources that discussed team building, many of the programs are quite different from the type of programs initiated in the organization discussed in my study. For example a majority of the studies discussed either outlined experiential-based programs or the development of work teams.

The types of studies located can be categorized into three areas. First, programs which focus on some type of experiential team building training which may involve wilderness activities, sailing expeditions, weekend retreats or even creating a banquet. These types of programs were not included in this review as they typically include a select group of individuals, usually managers, and the program structure is very different and more experiential than typical team building programs. The second program type focuses on the development of work teams. These types of programs are prevalent in organizations involved in manufacturing. Typically, such programs include a small group of employees who become self-regulating and inter-dependent on each group member. Studies regarding work teams were not included as the type of training associated with these type of teams is typically not organizational wide and the purposes of implementing the teams is often specifically related to increasing productivity. The type of programs that were included in this review were initiatives that included a variety of levels of employees, included both female and male employees and the programs had a variety of anticipated or expected outcomes for the training.

Bradford (1989) discusses how team building can be used to improve working relationships within an organization. Bradford indicates that team building can be effective in a number of situations including (p. 38-39):

- after downsizing, when new management and other teams must be built
- when an organization or unit is already lean and productivity needs to be enhanced
- as an integral part of a quality enhancement program
- as part of a major policy and program shift
- to facilitate the introduction of technological change

He cautions, however, that “team building is a tricky business. It can produce a gamut of results from spectacular success to outright failure” (Bradford, 1989, p. 39). An environment is desired where employees trust one another, where there is opportunity to make decisions independently and then opportunities given for employees to judge their success as a team. Bradford provides an overview of one specific team building process. The team building intervention involves five-steps:

- 1) the orientation of the consultant to the work environment,
- 2) interviews with each participant to discuss the opportunities and potential barriers within a successful team building initiative,
- 3) a summary of the findings developed for the managers to read, followed by diagnostic interviews,
- 4) participation of the managers in a “residential session”(defined as a three to six day workshop to become familiar with the concept of team building and how to

make it work in their workplace including coaching sessions, personal reflection of management style and creation of a “buddy system” for support)

- 5) completion of a post-residence process including completion of progress assessments and renewing commitment to the process.

Bradford concludes by suggesting the “success of a team building effort is not dependent solely on the methods and processes used. Rather, its essence is found in a group of managers learning to respect each other as human beings; learning to maturely acknowledge their competencies and their weaknesses; learning to solve problems in an open and trusting environment; making a commitment to become a learning community” (Bradford, 1989, p. 50).

Bradford’s article provides background as to why a team building program may be initiated within an organization. Several of the factors described are to some degree relevant to the situation faced by the organization in my study. In an article to be discussed later, Morley describes how the program outlined by Bradford was actually implemented in an organization within the Canadian public sector.

Buller and Bell (1986) looked at examining “the effects of two prominent intervention techniques, team building and goal setting, on individual’s productivity” (p. 305). The purpose of their study was “to test team building’s independent effects on performance using objective criteria of performance” (p. 307). The key component of this study was defining objective measures of performance in terms of increased productivity within a private mining company. As opposed to the other studies reviewed, this study focused specifically on

system productivity. It was included in this review because the team building conducted in this company was broad in scope and included individuals from various levels of the organization.

Twelve individuals from each production slope, which are small underground workplaces in the mine, participated in the study. The team building component consisted of six 45-minute sessions conducted over a ten-week period. The sessions involved an explanation of team building, discussion of major issues negatively affecting the work environment and a discussion of actions to solve the problems. Crews of employees interacted with supervisors and a consultant to determine how work could be done better, how the organization could be made a better place to work and how the job site could be made safer. From the issues that emerged, which included poor communication between areas and between the crews and management, poor working conditions, poor repair and maintenance of equipment and pay systems, processes of improvement were developed.

The second component of the intervention was goal setting training and development whereby the crews set measurable and attainable production goals with their supervisors as a measure of whether the program was successful. The measures for this study were: 1) quantity of production measured in tons per manshift, 2) quality of production measured in grade of ore and 3) a change in the miners' abilities to identify grades of ore as measured by the grade strategy checklist.

Although the quantitative analysis indicated there was little or no effect as a result of the training, personal interviews with some of the miners' and supervisors who participated in the training revealed positive comments. Those interviewed "generally liked and accepted the intervention although we noted some negative reaction. Further results from the

questionnaire showed that employees perceived team building as having improved the specific problems it had identified” (Buller and Bell, 1986, p. 323).

Morley (1991) describes how the Ontario Region of the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission (CEIC), a public corporation, used a team building initiative comparable to the one described by Bradford (1989) to improve the working environment within the overall commission. Through the late 1980s, the CEIC initiated a team building process to: 1) improve the quality of service to clients and 2) to enhance situations dealing with staff relations such as communication, the work environment and rewarding achievement. Forty senior managers participated in the first phases of the program. As a result of the positive feedback, a five and a half-day program was developed with twenty managers trained as facilitators. At the time the article was written, over 350 managers in the Ontario region had completed the training including the pre-residential stage, the interviews and orientation to team building. The residential stage consists of a five and a half-day program including team building exercises, team diagnostics, personal and team visioning and finally, a post-residential stage that included the reassessment of needs and commitment by managers to the team building process.

Of the thirty team building training outcomes, twenty-one indicated positive results based on managers rating themselves or others rating them compared to those managers who had not completed the training. The six areas studied in the evaluation were: 1) leadership and management effectiveness, 2) overall job satisfaction, 3) organizational climate, 4) cooperation and support from others, 5) experience of self at work, and 6) teamwork and

group functioning. It is important to note that the authors discussed an evaluation of thirty outcomes but only sixteen were listed. These outcomes included both individual behaviors and attitudes and group interactions.

This article provided a discussion of a team building process used in a Canadian public sector environment. Many of the outcomes were similar to outcomes discussed in other articles. However, no explanation was given as to how these objectives were determined and there was no indication of employee involvement.

### Conclusion

This section of the review included literature on organizational development initiatives (Porras and Berg (1978), Porras and Hoffer (1986), Neuman *et al* (1989), Norman and Keys (1992) and Mikkelsen (1998)), team building programs (Bradford (1989), Morley (1991) and Buller and Bell (1986)) and one study (Jurkiewicz and Massey (1997)) that examined the differences in motivational factors of employees at different levels within an organization. The articles and studies discussed were included to identify a list of potential outcomes and to increase the level of understanding and awareness regarding the types of programs and purposes of a variety of OD interventions, such as team building.

In the studies by Porras and Hoffer and by Mikkelsen, there was an explanation of how different groups or stakeholders were involved in determining what criteria was important in the initiatives. For example, in the article by Porras and Hoffer, managers and scholars were asked what the focus should be in terms of behaviour changes specific to all individuals within an organization and those behaviours specific to managers. Despite this study focusing specifically on behaviours of an OD intervention, it did enable input of two

interested groups. In Mikkelsen's article, both employees and supervisors were included in the process of developing the list of elements to be improved within the organization and also in determining how the OD process would be implemented. Although the study by Jurkiewicz and Massey did not focus on OD interventions, it was the only study located that discussed a process to determine the difference expectations of staff based on position level, in this case supervisory and non-supervisory employees.

Overall, how the outcomes were determined and by whom was not the focus of the majority of the studies in the literature review. This lack of information regarding the opinions of various participants in the development of the criteria used to judge the successfulness of team building programs is an apparent gap in the literature. None of the studies located, addressed the potential differences of expectations based on whether participants were male or female. The demographic variables of sex and position are potentially two factors that influence the expectations of individuals regarding the outcomes of importance for a team building program. This study provides evidence as to whether differences exist by occupational position and sex amongst individuals who participated in a team building program. It also presents findings regarding criteria for judging the success of the program.

### Definition of Terms

Teams – The word team has become a common term in many organizations. Working “as a team” or “in a team environment” denotes a positive connotation of a group effort. Syer and Connolly (1996) discuss a team as “groups that constitute a system whose

parts interrelate and whose members share a common goal” (p.1). The definition addresses three important components of a team: there is more than one member, the purpose of the team is critical and there are common goals. Larson and LaFasto discuss similar elements of a team but their explanation has a more human element. To them a team “has two or more people; it has a specific performance objective or recognizable goal to be attained; and coordination of activity among the members of the team is required for the attainment of the team goal or objective” (Larson and LaFasto, 1989, p.18). It is this latter definition that is best suited for the purposes of this study.

Team building training – The process for team building includes various forms. It may involve all or some individuals within a department, a location or an entire organization. The program could be conducted outdoors, which might involve wilderness-based activities or the training may be conducted in a traditional environment such as a classroom or office. Harvey and Drolet (1994) state that team building “stresses strategies for welding capable individuals together into an effective and high functioning group” (p. 8).

This group process of team building needs to be distinguished from self-managing work teams (SMWT). When an organization moves from a traditional hierarchical structure to one in which the team members have control over their tasks, the process then involves self-managing work teams. “The shifting of control, authority, and responsibility further down in the organization (*e.g.*, to the team level) distinguishes SMWTs from various other group-orientated participative management interventions” (Rogers *et al*, 1995, p. 53). The focus of the program for the organization in this particular study was initiated in an attempt to improve a variety of work- related factors, not to develop self-managing work teams.

Stakeholders - The reference to stakeholders is used throughout this study.

Stakeholders include anyone or any group who has an interest in the program or activity.

This interest is not limited to those participating in or responsible for the program. Weiss (1998) describes stakeholders as “those people with a direct or indirect interest (stake) in a program or its evaluation. Stakeholders can be people who conduct, participate in, fund, or manage a program, or who may otherwise affect or be affected by decisions about the program or the evaluation” (Weiss, 1998, p. 337). The definition of The Joint Committee on Program Evaluation Standards is similar to that of Weiss. The Committee (1994) refers to stakeholders as “individuals or groups that may be involved or may be affected by a program evaluation” (p.3). Both definitions are broad in terms of who is considered a stakeholder. As the focus of this study was a program, Weiss’ definition is more appropriate as she describes stakeholders as those with an interest in a program or and evaluation. In my study the stakeholders of particular interest are individuals who participated in the team building program.

## Chapter 3

### Research Methodology

The focus of this study is to determine the similarities and differences in the types of outcomes considered important to a variety of individuals participating in a team building program. There are several potential ways of determining the outcomes considered important. In considering the timing of the project, the resources available to the researcher and the potential receptiveness of the respondents, a questionnaire was deemed the most appropriate means of data collection.

#### Survey Design

There are many reasons why an organization may decide to conduct a survey. Kraus (1996) explains that companies conducting research may want to provide leverage for organizational and cultural change, assess employee views and/or stimulate and evaluate management and organizational development. Though all of these reasons are in some way applicable to this study, assessing employee views is the main purpose.

Posavac and Carey (1980) suggest that "evaluators are faced with the task of motivating the program participants to provide personal information about their attitudes and judgments" (p. 49). In this study there is no such evaluator. However, since employees were asked to provide their opinions it was necessary to consider the hesitation or apprehension

that employees may have in being asked to complete the questionnaire. To address these concerns, a survey was chosen versus a more personal format such as an interview as it provides more anonymity and confidentiality.

### Subjects

The accessible population for this study was the twelve hundred full-time and permanent part-time staff within the organization. A sample from five groups of respondents was identified to ensure participation from individuals within the various organizational levels. The five levels included general managers, division managers, section managers, employees (both union and exempt) and trainers for the Team Skills Workshops. The general managers, division managers and section managers represented the three management levels. The employee group was not subdivided due to the variety of positions. The trainers for the Team Skills Workshops included both management and employee members.

A list of employees, along with the department in which they worked, was generated from the Human Resources Information System (HRIS). Because of the varying number of individuals within each group, a systematic stratified sampling procedure was developed. Due to the smaller number of general managers and division managers, all individuals in these two groups were surveyed. For the positions of section managers and employees approximately half of all males and females from within each department were included in the survey sample. All six of the trainers for the Team Skills Workshops were also surveyed. As these individuals are either section managers or employees, they were included in the sample population within these two groups. A sample of six hundred full-time staff members representing all departments from within the corporation was surveyed. The total population

within this organization is summarized in Table 1. Table 2 provides information about the survey sample for this study.

Table 1

Total Population of Employees

Position	Male	Female	Total
General Managers	5 0.4 %	0 0.0 %	5 0.4 %
Division Managers	16 1.3 %	8 0.7 %	24 2.0 %
Section Managers	40 3.4 %	17 1.4 %	57 4.8 %
Employees	762 64.0 %	343 28.8 %	1,105 92.8 %
Total:	823 69.1 %	368 30.9 %	1,191 100.0 %

Table 2

Survey Sample

Position	Male	Female	Total
General Managers	5 100.0 %	0 100.0 %	5 100.0 %
Division Managers	16 100.0 %	4 50.0 %	20 83.3 %
Section Managers	20 50.0 %	9 52.9 %	29 50.9 %
Employees	377 49.5 %	169 49.3 %	546 49.4 %
All Staff	418 50.8 %	182 49.5 %	600 50.4 %

Instrumentation

The literature on organizational development initiatives and team building programs identified a number of possible outcomes. From these, a list was created that represented the types of outcomes this program was designed to accomplish. Some outcomes were omitted, as they did not specifically relate to training such as improving workspace or improving workflow processes. Outcomes were then separated into the four categories of Outcomes Affecting Employees, Outcomes Affecting Co-workers, Outcomes Affecting Departments and Outcomes Affecting the Organization. Additional space was provided within each category for respondents to provide additional outcomes not previously listed, but important to them.

Czaja and Blair (1996) suggest that the use of open-ended questions on mail questionnaires should be limited because of potential problems with illegible handwriting, unclear abbreviations and ambiguous answers. Consequently, the majority of the questions were close-ended, designed in a Likert-type scale format. McMillan and Schumacher (1993) describe scales as "a series of graduations, levels, or values that describe various degrees of something. Scales are used extensively in questionnaires because they allow fairly accurate assessments of beliefs or opinions" (p.24). Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each item on a scale of 1 (not important), 2 (slightly important) 3 (moderately important) or 4 (very important). One problem with using a Likert-type scale "is that all answers can be the same, making it difficult to differentiate between them" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1993, p.246). Therefore, questions were included that asked respondents to choose the three outcomes in each category most important to them. By including this question style, the answers would provide a distinguishable level of comparison between the responses. The final questions asked respondents to provide demographic information including their position within the organization, sex, education level, phases of the program they had completed, whether they had completed similar training and the number of years they had worked for the organization. A copy of the questionnaire is located in Appendix III.

Bell (1987) states that "all data gathering instruments should be piloted to test how long it takes recipients to complete them, to check that all questions and instructions are clear and to enable you to remove any items which do not yield useable data" (p. 65). She further explains that "the purpose of a pilot exercise is to get the bugs out of the instrument so that subjects in your main study will experience no difficulties in completing it and so that you can carry out a preliminary analysis to see whether the wording and format of questions will

present any difficulties when the main data are analyzed” (p. 65). Therefore, to refine the clarity and understanding of the questions, twenty employees were asked to complete a pilot questionnaire. Because Human Resources staff was privy to ongoing discussions about the intentions of the initiative, ten of these staff members were recruited as pilot participants rather than as potential respondents. Ten staff members from other departments within the organization also were recruited for the sampling. These twenty employees consisted of both exempt and unionized staff. Of the twenty pilot questionnaires sent out, fourteen were returned. The comments from the pilot questionnaires were used to revise the questionnaire and the final version was sent out to the larger sample group.

#### Data Collection Procedure

The survey was piloted in June 1999 to twenty staff within the organization. The revised questionnaire was sent out through the inter-office mail system to 600 employees in early July. Respondents were asked to put the completed surveys in the envelopes provided and return them by inter-office mail. From the first mail-out, 85 questionnaires were returned in the first week and a half. A reminder letter and second copy of the questionnaire was sent out to all 600 respondents two weeks after the first mail-out. Copies of the letters sent to respondents are in Appendix I and II. From the second mail-out, 93 questionnaires were received. Of the total 178 questionnaires, seventeen were unusable due to improper completion or non-completion. The final total of questionnaires entered and used in the data analysis portion was 161. This is a 26.8% response rate to the questionnaire and represents 13.5% of the total population of the organization. Table 3 summarizes the response rate to the questionnaire.

Table 3

Survey Response Rate

Position	Male	Female	Sex Not Indicated	Total
General Manager	3	0	N/A	3
	60.0 %	N/A		60 %
Division Manager	9	2	N/A	11
	56.3 %	50.0 %		55.0 %
Section Manager	14	6	N/A	20
	70 %	66.7 %		69.0%
Employees	65	52	2	117
	17.2 %	30.8 %	N/A	21.4 %
Position Not Indicated	7	1	N/A	10
	N/A	N/A		N/A
Total	98	61	2	161
	23.4 %	33.5 %	N/A	26.8 %

## Data Analysis

All 161 completed questionnaires were used in the data analysis portion. There were some questionnaires in which the questions asking about position level or sex were not completed. As a result, the actual number of responses varies slightly between each segment of the analysis.

Since only three of the five general managers initially responded, these responses were combined with the division manager category and entitled senior managers. Also, prior to the final analysis, the section managers were combined with the senior managers and the entire group consisting of general managers, division managers and section managers was re-named “managers”. As the number of trainers who responded was also low, this category was not analyzed individually. However, since these individuals are employed by the organization as either section managers or employees, their responses were included in either the manager or employee group.

Data analysis for this research was done using SPSS for Windows 7.5. In order to answer the questions posed in the research, the responses were examined in three ways:

- 1) The frequency of responses, the items chosen as the single most important outcome for each category, for the manager and employee groups
- 2) The frequency, that an outcome was one of the top three outcomes chosen in each category, for the manager and employee groups
- 3) Comparisons were made between respondent’s organizational position and sex to determine statistical significant differences in the rating of outcomes for the team building program

When using a Likert-type scale, attention must be given to the level of measurement of the variables. In this study organizational position and sex are nominal categories and the four-point rating scale of importance is an ordinal scale. The Chi-square analysis is used as an inferential statistic with data that is measured at the nominal and ordinal level. The most appropriate way to present the data was to complete a non-parametric type of analysis by use of the Chi-square statistical procedure incorporating the variables of position and sex.

The cross-tabulated tables produced as output by the statistical package compares the distribution of the observed frequencies to a theoretical distribution of expected frequencies. The greater the discrepancy between the observed and expected frequencies, then the greater the likelihood that factors other than chance are influencing the distribution.

### Validity

There are two types of validity that need to be reviewed in relation to the results of this study. They are: (1) external validity and (2) construct related validity.

The term external validity, “refers to the generalizability of the results, the extent to which the results and conclusions can be generalized to other people and settings” (McMillan and Schumacher, 1993, p.158). The external validity of this study was potentially influenced by two factors:

- (1) the low response rate of male employees
- (2) the history of the organization

Half of the male employee population was surveyed. Unfortunately, of the 377 questionnaires distributed to male employees, only 65 were returned. Consequently the number of responses reflects only 17.2 % of the total male employee population. Therefore

the results may not be indicative of the potential results within the larger population for this group.

Second, there was a recent history of organizational change and strained labour relations within this corporation. These circumstances may have influenced the responses of participants and therefore would have an effect on the generalizability of the results to other similar organizations.

In terms of construct related validity, it is possible that respondents may have had different interpretations of the questions. As the researcher was not available to provide an explanation of the questions for each individual, participants completing the questionnaire may have interpreted the questions differently. This difference in interpretation may have influenced the answers of respondents, which may have effected the final results.

### Limitations of the Design

#### Generalizability

The generalizability of this study to other organizations is limited by three factors.

These factors are:

1. the type of organization,
2. the characteristics of the organization
3. the low response rate.

This research project was conducted in only one public sector organization. Consequently the results of this study may not be representative of results found in other types of organizations, specifically private sector companies.

Additionally, the organization in this study has a history of recent corporate downsizing, re-structuring and strained labour relations. As a result of these unique characteristics the results are potentially only generalizeable to this particular organization.

With respect to the response rate, of the 600 questionnaires that were distributed, only 161 were returned completed. This represents a 26.8% response rate and, in terms of the overall percentage of the 1200 employees, it accounts for 13.5% of the population. As a result of the low response rate the results may not be representative of the total population of staff. This is specifically applicable to male employees as the response rate from this group was only 17.2%.

One of the reasons for implementing a team building program within this organization was to improve the organizational culture. As previously noted morale was low and the relationship between union and management extremely strained. From telephone calls, conversations and written comments, it was apparent that some individuals still harboured resentment and distrust for the organization and potentially any process seen to be associated with the organization, including this research project. Although a few years had passed since the large-scale changes occurred within the organization, there were apparently employees who did not want to participate in a research project on the team building program. From the variety of comments received during the distribution component of the survey, some employees indicated a lack of interest, lack of willingness and a lack of trust in regard to this process and how the results may be used. From the fifteen to twenty written comments or

conversations, it is likely that other employees may have had similar feeling and chose not to complete the questionnaire, ultimately affecting the response rate.

#### Expense

In order to potentially increase the response rate it would have been necessary to survey more individuals within the organization. This would have increased the costs of the project in terms of providing a copy of the questionnaire to these individuals.

#### Information Regarding Departments

Although it would have been interesting and possibly worthwhile to compare the results by department and by position, it was decided that in order to ensure anonymity of respondents a question related to the department in which individuals worked would not be included in the questionnaire. As a result of not identifying for which department respondents worked, it is possible there may be over representation of some departments and under representation of other departments in the overall responses.

#### Employment Status of Staff

Individuals participating in the first phase of the team building program included all full-time and permanent part-time staff. Permanent part-time employees work a minimum of 20 hours per week whereas full-time staff work between 35 to 37 ½ hours per week. A question was not included in the questionnaire asking respondents to indicate their

employment status (e.g., full-time or permanent part-time). Not including this type of question and therefore not being able to determine if in fact there are differences based on employment status is a potential limitation of this study.

#### Social Appropriateness of Responses

Some of the survey questions asked respondents for their personal opinions that relied on respondents providing honest answers that reflected their individual viewpoints. It is reasonable to expect that a small percentage of respondents may have provided answers they believe were appropriate and expected. If this was a fact in some instances, the results may be slightly skewed but realistically it would not have a significant effect of the overall ratings or findings.

#### Timing of the Project

When the questionnaires for this study were distributed in June and July of 1999, there were individuals within the organization who had not taken any of the training, some staff who had completed one or two phases of the training, and other staff who had completed all three components. Responses to the questionnaire may have been influenced by the varying degrees of knowledge of individuals regarding the program and their concepts of team building.

## Chapter 4

### Results

Five analyses were carried out to address the research questions posed in this study.

The findings are discussed in the following order:

- Results of the Most Important Outcomes by Frequency of Responses
- Results of the Three Most Important Outcomes by Frequency of Responses
- Results by Organizational Position
- Results by Sex
- Results by Organizational Position and Sex

#### Results of the Most Important Outcomes by Frequency of Responses

Respondents were asked to rank the three outcomes within each category they believed were the most important in judging the success of a team building program. This section of the results summarizes the frequency that each of the outcomes was chosen as the first, or top choice, for each of the four categories of outcomes:

1. Outcomes Affecting Employees,
2. Outcomes Affecting Co-workers,
3. Outcomes Affecting Departments and
4. Outcomes Affecting the Organization.

The results are listed in Tables 4-11, with each table corresponding to an outcome category. The term “Other” identifies outcomes not initially listed in the questionnaire, but

written in by respondents. These items are not identified in the tables, as the majority of the items are unique to each questionnaire. A listing of the "Other" items is provided in Appendix IV.

The frequencies of the most important "Outcomes Affecting Employees" are tabulated in Table 4 and 5. The difference in frequency between the first six most important outcomes selected by the managers is relatively small. The items ranked the highest were *increased personal sense of trust in direct supervisors and managers by employees* and *increased personal support by direct supervisors and managers*. These two items were followed by *improved personal satisfaction with job*, *improved personal satisfaction with the organization*, *improvement in personal problem solving skills* and *increased personal motivation towards job performance*.

For the employees there was one outcome clearly identified as most important. The item, *improved personal satisfaction with job* received the highest frequency of responses. The *personal opportunity for self-development* were also identified as being the most important by outcomes of *increasing personal sense of trust in direct supervisors and managers by employee* and *increased the employees*.

Table 4

The Most Important Outcomes in the Category "Outcomes Affecting Employees" for the  
Manager Group.

Item	Count	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Increased personal sense of trust in direct supervisors and managers by employee.	5	15.2%	15.2%
Increased personal support by direct supervisors and managers.	5	15.2%	30.4%
Improved personal satisfaction with job.	4	12.1%	42.5%
Improved personal satisfaction with the organization.	4	12.1%	54.6%
Improvement in personal problem solving skills.	4	12.1%	66.7%
Improved personal motivation towards job performance.	4	12.1%	78.8%
Increased personal opportunity for self development.	2	6.1%	84.9%
Increased personal responsibility for individual actions.	2	6.1%	91.0%
Increased personal comfort in approaching direct supervisors or managers.	1	3.0%	94.0%
Increased personal comfort in experimenting with new ideas.	1	3.0%	97.0%
Other	1	3.0%	100.0%
Increased personal respect towards direct supervisors or managers.	0	0.0%	100.0%
TOTAL:	33		

Table 5

The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Employees” for the Employee Group

Item	Count	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Improved personal satisfaction with job.	45	37.8%	37.8%
Increased personal sense of trust in direct supervisors and managers by employee.	22	18.5%	56.3%
Increased personal opportunity for self development.	14	11.8%	68.1%
Increased personal support by direct supervisors and managers.	9	7.6%	75.7%
Increased personal responsibility for individual actions.	8	6.7%	82.4%
Improved personal satisfaction with the organization.	6	5.0%	87.4%
Improved personal motivation towards job performance.	4	3.4%	90.8%
Other	4	3.4%	94.2%
Increased personal comfort in approaching direct supervisors or managers.	2	1.7%	95.9%
Increased personal respect towards direct supervisors or managers.	2	1.7%	97.6%
Increased personal comfort in experimenting with new ideas.	2	1.7%	99.3%
Improvement in personal problem solving skills.	1	0.7%	100.0%
TOTAL:	119		

The order in which the outcomes were listed in the second category, “Outcomes Affecting Co-workers,” was almost identical between managers and employees. Interestingly, even the percentage each item received was similar. The outcomes of

*improving working relationships between co-workers and improving communication skills between employees and managers and improved communication skills between co-workers* were deemed more important than increasing trust, support and respect. The outcomes related to increased respect and support between co-workers are not as important for either the manager or the employee group. Whereas, the items of increased trust were ranked in the middle.

Table 6

The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Co-workers” for the Manager Group.

Item	Count	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Improved working relationship between co-workers.	10	30.3%	30.3%
Improved communication skills between employees and managers.	9	27.3%	57.6%
Improved communication skills between co-workers.	8	24.2%	81.8%
Increased sense of trust between co-workers.	5	15.2%	97.0%
Increased respect between co-workers.	1	3.0%	100.0%
Increased support between co-workers.	0	0.0%	100.0%
Other	0	0.0%	100.0%
TOTAL:	33		

Table 7

The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Co-workers” for the Employee Group.

Item	Count	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Improved working relationship between co-workers.	37	31.1%	31.1%
Improved communication skills between employees and managers.	28	23.5%	54.6%
Improved communication skills between co-workers.	20	16.8%	71.4%
Increased sense of trust between co-workers.	16	13.4%	84.8%
Increased support between co-workers.	9	7.6%	92.4%
Increased respect between co-workers.	7	5.9%	98.3%
Other	2	1.7%	100.0%
TOTAL:	119		

In the third category, “Outcomes Affecting Departments,” the outcome of *increased departmental productivity* (n=13) was chosen by managers three times more often than the next most frequently chosen item, *improved overall satisfaction with the department* (n=4), *improved motivation of staff within the department* and *decreased absenteeism within the department* were each identified by three respondents as being one of the most important outcomes.

Table 8

The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Departments” for the  
Manager Group

Item	Count	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Increased departmental productivity.	13	39.4%	39.4%
Improved overall satisfaction with the department.	4	12.1%	51.5%
Increased motivation of staff within the department.	3	9.1%	60.6%
Decreased absenteeism within the department.	3	9.1%	69.7%
Improved quality of meetings within the department.	2	6.1%	75.8%
Increased enthusiasm amongst employees within the department.	2	6.1%	81.9%
Clearer understanding of the department goals.	2	6.1%	88.0%
Improved culture within the department.	2	6.1%	94.1%
Increased employee influence in setting the department direction.	1	3.0%	97.1%
Other	1	2.9%	100.0%
Increased involvement in group decision making sessions within the department.	0	0.0%	100.0%
Increased involvement in setting the department goals.	0	0.0%	100.0%
Improved overall conflict resolution within the department.	0	0.0%	100.0%
Decreased turnover rate within the department.	0	0.0%	100.0%
TOTAL:	33		

For the employee group improved motivation of staff within the department received the highest ranking. The outcomes of increased departmental productivity and increased involvement in group-decision making sessions within the department were also indicated as important. The range of frequencies between the items chosen by the employee group was narrow, compared with the range of frequencies between outcomes in the manager group.

Table 9

The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Departments” for the  
Employee Group

Item	Count	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Increased motivation of staff within the department.	22	18.3%	18.3%
Increased departmental productivity.	14	11.7%	30.0%
Increased involvement in group decision making sessions within the department.	13	10.8%	40.8%
Increased enthusiasm amongst employees within the department.	12	10.0%	50.8%
Improved overall satisfaction with the department.	11	9.2%	60.0%
Increased employee influence in setting the department direction.	8	6.7%	66.7%
Clearer understanding of the department goals.	8	6.7%	73.4%
Improved quality of meetings within the department.	7	5.8%	79.2%
Improved overall conflict resolution within the department.	6	5.0%	84.2%
Improved culture within the department.	6	5.0%	89.2%
Decreased absenteeism within the department.	4	3.3%	92.5%
Increased involvement in setting the department goals.	3	2.5%	95.0%
Decreased turnover rate within the department.	3	2.5%	97.5%
Other	3	2.5%	100.0%
TOTAL:	120		

It was not surprising to see managers ranking increased productivity as an important outcome as their performance is often measured based on the level of productivity they achieve within their area of responsibility. The fact employees place importance on increased productivity, as an important outcome was unexpected. It is important to mention, however, that the frequency this outcome was chosen within the employee group (12%) is much lower than the frequency within the manager group (39%).

In the fourth category, "Outcomes Affecting the Organization," the manager group chose the outcome *increased organizational productivity* most often, followed by *improved leadership/management effectiveness within the organization*. For the employee group the percentages for the top items were very similar. The items with the highest rankings were *improved leadership/management effectiveness within the organization* followed by *improved communication skills between employees within the organization* and *increased organizational productivity*.

As mentioned in the previous category, it is not surprising to see managers concerned with department and organizational productivity, due to the responsibilities of their positions. It was unexpected to see employees consistent in their rating of increasing productivity as an important outcome. The most significant result in this part of the analysis is that both groups identified increasing leadership/management effectiveness as one of the most important outcomes.

Table 10

The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting the Organization” for  
the Manager Group

Item	Count	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Increased organizational productivity.	13	39.4%	39.4%
Improved leadership/management effectiveness within the organization.	9	27.3%	66.7%
Improved communication skills between employees within the organization.	3	9.1%	75.8%
Clearer understanding of the organization's goals.	3	9.1%	84.9%
Increased enthusiasm amongst all employees within the organization.	2	6.1%	91.0%
Increased employee influence in setting organizational direction.	1	3.0%	94.0%
Decreased absenteeism within the organization.	1	3.0%	97.0%
Other	1	3.0%	100.0%
Improved culture of the organization.	0	0.0%	100.0%
Decreased turnover rate within the organization.	0	0.0%	100.0%
TOTAL:	33		

Table 11

The Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting the Organization” for the Employee Group

Item	Count	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Improved leadership/management effectiveness within the organization.	25	21.2%	21.2%
Improved communication skills between employees within the organization.	24	20.3%	41.5%
Increased organizational productivity.	22	18.6%	60.1%
Increased enthusiasm amongst all employees within the organization.	13	11.0%	71.1%
Increased employee influence in setting organizational direction.	10	8.5%	79.6%
Clearer understanding of the organization's goals.	10	8.5%	88.1%
Decreased absenteeism within the organization.	6	5.1%	93.2%
Other	4	3.3%	96.5%
Improved culture of the organization.	3	2.5%	99.0%
Decreased turnover rate within the organization.	1	1.0%	100.0%
TOTAL:	118		

Results of the Three Most Important Outcomes by Frequency of Responses

In this summary the outcomes are analyzed by the frequency each item was ranked as one of the top three important outcomes in each category. Where the previous summary focused upon the single most important outcome, this analysis takes a broader approach by

calculating the frequency each outcome was chosen as either the first, second or third choice. This type of summary provides a broader assessment of the items considered important.

In the category, "Outcomes Affecting Employees," the manager group chose *increased personal sense of trust in direct supervisors and managers by employee* most often followed by *increased personal responsibility for individual actions*, then *increased personal satisfaction with the organization and improved personal motivation towards job performance*.

For the employee group *increased personal satisfaction with job* was chosen most often, with *increased personal sense of trust in direct supervisors and managers* second, and *increased personal support by direct supervisors and managers* third. The results identified both groups as being concerned with the issues of increasing trust in managers or direct supervisors. Outcomes that focused on improving satisfaction were also indicated as important for both groups. However, where the managers placed importance on satisfaction with the organization, employees consistently selected increasing personal job satisfaction.

Table 12

One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting  
Employees” for the Manager Group

Item	Count	Frequency
Increased personal sense of trust in direct supervisors and managers by employee.	16	48.5%
Increased personal responsibility for individual actions.	13	39.4%
Improved personal satisfaction with the organization.	12	36.4%
Improved personal motivation towards job performance.	12	36.4%
Increased personal comfort in approaching direct supervisors or managers.	10	30.3%
Increased personal support by direct supervisors and managers.	9	27.3%
Improved personal satisfaction with job.	8	24.2%
Increased personal opportunity for self development.	6	18.2%
Improvement in personal problem solving skills.	6	18.2%
Increased personal comfort in experimenting with new ideas.	3	9.1%
Other	3	9.0%
Increased personal respect towards direct supervisors or managers.	1	3.0%
TOTAL:	99	

Table 13

One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category "Outcomes Affecting Employees" for the Employee Group

Item	Count	Frequency
Improved personal satisfaction with job.	70	58.8%
Increased personal sense of trust in direct supervisors and managers by employee.	54	45.4%
Increased personal support by direct supervisors and managers.	50	42.0%
Increased personal opportunity for self development.	35	29.4%
Improved personal satisfaction with the organization.	31	26.1%
Increased personal responsibility for individual actions.	23	19.3%
Improved personal motivation towards job performance.	23	19.3%
Increased personal comfort in approaching direct supervisors or managers.	20	16.8%
Increased personal comfort in experimenting with new ideas.	16	13.4%
Improvement in personal problem solving skills.	14	11.8%
Other	12	9.9%
Increased personal respect towards direct supervisors or managers.	7	5.9%
TOTAL:	355	

The items with the highest percentage in the second category, "Outcomes Affecting Co-workers," varied between the two groups, but the frequencies were virtually the same. Managers and employees both chose the outcomes of *improved communication skills between managers and employees, improved communication skills between co-workers, improved working relationship between co-workers and increasing sense of trust between co-*

workers as their four most important outcomes. The outcome *improved working relationships between co-workers* is probably the most important item regardless of position as it was listed first for employees and second for managers.

Table 14

One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category "Outcomes Affecting Co-workers" for the Manager Group.

Item	Count	Frequency
Improved communication skills between employees and managers.	24	72.7%
Improved working relationship between co-workers.	23	69.7%
Increased sense of trust between co-workers.	17	51.5%
Improved communication skills between co-workers.	17	51.5%
Increased respect between co-workers.	9	27.3%
Increased support between co-workers.	8	24.2%
Other	1	3.0%
TOTAL:	99	

Table 15

One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting Co-workers” for the Employee Group

Item	Count	Frequency
Improved working relationship between co-workers.	75	63.0%
Improved communication skills between co-workers.	69	58.0%
Improved communication skills between employees and managers.	64	53.8%
Increased sense of trust between co-workers.	54	45.4%
Increased support between co-workers.	47	39.5%
Increased respect between co-workers.	39	32.8%
Other	6	5.0%
TOTAL:	354	

In the category, “Outcomes Affecting the Departments,” the item selected most frequently for the manager group was *increased departmental productivity*, followed by *increased motivation of staff within the department* and then *clearer understanding of department goals*.

For the employee group the most frequently selected items were *increased motivation of staff within the department*, *improved overall satisfaction with the department* followed by *increased enthusiasm amongst employees within the department*.

Increasing staff motivation was selected as one of the top three most important outcomes indicated as important to both managers and employees. Increasing productivity and understanding department goals were selected as important to managers. Consistent with

previous selection of outcomes, the employee group selected outcomes related to satisfaction. Not only are they interested in increasing personal job satisfaction, as identified in the category "Outcomes Affecting Employees," they also place importance on increasing satisfaction within the department.

Table 16

One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category "Outcomes Affecting Department" for the Manager Group

Item	Count	Frequency
Increased departmental productivity.	17	51.5%
Increased motivation of staff within the department.	15	45.5%
Clearer understanding of the department goals.	11	33.3%
Improved overall conflict resolution within the department.	10	30.3%
Increased involvement in group decision making sessions within the department.	8	24.4%
Improved overall satisfaction with the department.	8	24.2%
Increased involvement in setting the department goals.	6	18.2%
Increased enthusiasm amongst employees within the department.	5	15.2%
Improved culture within the department.	5	15.2%
Decreased absenteeism within the department.	5	15.2%
Increased employee influence in setting the department direction.	3	9.1%
Improved quality of meetings within the department.	2	6.1%
Decreased turnover rate within the department.	2	6.1%
Other	2	6.1%
TOTAL:	99	

Table 17

One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting  
Department” for the Employee Group

Item	Count	Frequency
Increased motivation of staff within the department.	46	38.3%
Improved overall satisfaction with the department.	40	33.3%
Increased enthusiasm amongst employees within the department.	37	30.8%
Improved overall conflict resolution within the department.	34	28.3%
Clearer understanding of the department goals.	30	25.0%
Increased departmental productivity.	29	24.2%
Increased involvement in group decision making sessions within the department.	28	23.3%
Increased employee influence in setting the department direction.	23	19.2%
Decreased absenteeism within the department.	20	16.7%
Increased involvement in setting the department goals.	18	15.0%
Improved culture within the department.	18	15.0%
Decreased turnover rate within the department.	15	12.5%
Improved quality of meetings within the department.	14	11.7%
Other	4	3.4%
TOTAL:	356	

The outcomes with the highest frequency for the manager group, in the category “Outcomes Affecting the Organization” were *improved leadership/management effectiveness within the organization, increased organizational productivity and clearer understanding of the organization’s goals.*

In the employee group the items of importance were *improved communication skills between employees within the organization, improved leadership/management effectiveness within the organization and increased enthusiasm amongst all employees within the organization.* The findings for this category are similar to the results reported in Table 4. The outcomes of improved leadership/management effectiveness and improved communication are identified as important to both groups. The fact that both groups, especially managers, are consistently placing importance on increasing leadership and management effectiveness is interesting to note. Managers were consistent in choosing increased productivity as an important outcome while employees were concerned with issues such as increasing enthusiasm.

Table 18

One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting the Organization” for the Manager Group

Item	Count	Frequency
Improved leadership/management effectiveness within the organization.	23	69.7%
Increased organizational productivity.	17	51.5%
Clearer understanding of the organization’s goals.	15	45.5%
Improved communication skills between employees within the organization.	13	39.4%
Increased enthusiasm amongst all employees within the organization.	10	30.3%
Increased employee influence in setting organizational direction.	6	18.2%
Improved culture of the organization.	6	18.2%
Decreased absenteeism within the organization.	5	15.2%
Decreased turnover rate within the organization.	2	6.1%
Other	2	6.0%
TOTAL:	99	

Table 19

One of the Three Most Important Outcomes in the Category “Outcomes Affecting the Organization” for the Employee Group

Item	Count	Frequency
Improved communication skills between employees within the organization.	72	61.0%
Improved leadership/management effectiveness within the organization.	70	59.3%
Increased enthusiasm amongst all employees within the organization.	51	43.2%
Increased organizational productivity.	43	36.4%
Increased employee influence in setting organizational direction.	33	28.0%
Clearer understanding of the organization's goals.	32	27.1%
Decreased absenteeism within the organization.	20	16.9%
Improved culture of the organization.	15	12.7%
Decreased turnover rate within the organization.	10	8.5%
Other	6	4.9%
TOTAL:	352	

In the following three sections the data is examined through the employment of the Chi-square statistical procedure. The criterion for statistical significance in this study is  $p < .05$ . The presentation of results is organized into four parts: (1) by organization position only; (2) by sex only; (3) by organizational position and sex; and (4) by sex and organizational position.

### Results by Organizational Position

In this section there are six items out of the 39 outcomes that result in a statistically significant relationship between organizational position and a specific team building outcome. The items were:

- *increased personal satisfaction with job* ( $p=.011$ ),
- *increased departmental productivity* ( $p=.001$ ),
- *improved culture within the department* ( $p=.019$ ),
- *increased organizational productivity* ( $p=.039$ ),
- *clearer understanding of the organization's goals* ( $p=.029$ ) and
- *improved culture of the organization* ( $p=.021$ ).

For the item *increased personal satisfaction with job*, the results indicate that the employee group placed greater importance on this item than the manager group. More managers than expected rated this item as *moderately important*, whereas more employees rated this item as *important*. It is not surprising this item would be important to employees. This outcome was identified earlier by the employees as being one of their most important outcomes in summaries 4.1 and 4.2.

For the items *increased departmental productivity*, *increased organizational productivity*, *clearer understanding of the organization's goals*, *improved departmental culture*, and *improved organizational culture* managers rated these outcomes as having greater importance than the employee group. The number of managers who chose the *important* rating was over-represented. Conversely, the number of managers who chose the ratings of *slightly important* and *moderately important* was under-represented. The results for

the first three outcomes were anticipated and reconfirm two areas managers use to measure the success of the team building program. They are increasing productivity, both within the department and within the organization, and increasing understanding of the organization's goals. On the other hand, the outcomes related to improving culture did not receive a high frequency of responses by the managers in summaries 4.1 and 4.2 consequently the significance associated with the outcomes in this portion of the analysis was unexpected.

### Results By Sex

A second Chi-square analysis was done to assess outcomes that were statistically significant based on the variable of sex. Two items were identified as significant:

- *increased personal support by direct supervisors or managers ( $p=.044$ ) and,*
- *increased respect between co-workers ( $p=.027$ ).*

For both of these items females rated the outcomes higher than their male counterparts. This difference was attributed to more females than males rating this outcome as important and more males than expected rating this item as moderately important.

### Results By Organizational Position and Sex

A third and fourth Chi-square analyses were conducted to examine whether organizational position and sex were related to the ratings of team building outcomes.

### Analysis of Chi-square crosstabs: (1) Organizational Position by (2) Sex

The third Chi-square analysis compared female managers with female employees as well as male managers with male employees. There were eight items of statistical significance. For four of the items it was male managers that placed more importance on the items than male employees. These items were:

- *Increased personal responsibility for individual actions ( $p=.024$ ),*
- *Increased departmental productivity ( $p=.002$ ),*
- *Increased organizational productivity ( $p=.026$ ) and*
- *Increased motivation of staff within the department ( $p=.045$ ),*

It is not surprising that male managers would place a greater importance on motivation and individual responsibility compared to male employees. In a unionized, public sector environment managers are often challenged with trying to maximize productivity through motivation and imparting responsibility on their staff. Whereas the employees may believe they already take on the appropriate responsibility for their position and that perhaps increases in productivity should be addressed by increasing staffing levels.

For the items listed below, it was the female managers who were more likely than the female employees to rate these items as important. This result may be attributed to the female managers' desires to be viewed as more approachable to their employees and their interest in the developing a workplace with a positive environment.

- *Increased personal comfort in approaching direct supervisors or managers ( $p=.01$ ),*
- *Improved culture within the department ( $p=.038$ ),*
- *Improved culture within the organization ( $p=.041$ ).*

The only item in which the significance in the results was influenced by the higher ratings from the employees was *improved personal satisfaction with the job* (.046). In this case it was the male employees who were more likely to rate the outcome higher than male managers.

The results of this analysis are fairly consistent with the position only Chi-square analysis (Section 4.3) in that five of the statistically significant items are common to both analyses (*improved personal satisfaction with the job, increased departmental productivity, increased organizational productivity, improved culture within the department, improved culture within the organization*).

#### Analysis of Chi-square crosstabs : (1) Sex by (2) Organizational Position

The fourth Chi-square analysis compared female managers with male managers as well as female employees with male employees. In this analysis there were only three items of statistical significance:

- *increased personal responsibility for individual actions* ( $p=.019$ ),
- *increased respect between co-workers* ( $p=.016$ ) and,
- *improved culture within the organization* ( $p=.038$ ).

For the items, *increased personal responsibility for individual actions* and *increased respect between co-workers*, female employees were more likely than male employees to rate these items as *important* whereas male employees choose the ratings of *slightly* or *moderately important* more often than expected. Additionally, in the case of *individual personal responsibility for individual actions* the statistically significant result provides further

evidence of the lower ratings of this item by the male employees. When compared to the male managers in the third Chi-square analysis (Organizational Position by Sex), the male employees rated this outcome lower than expected.

In regard to *increased respect between co-workers*, female employees placed more importance on this outcome than female managers. This result is not surprising because some females may believe they are not as respected for their abilities and knowledge as their male counterparts.

Finally, for the item, *improved culture within the organization*, female managers were more likely than male managers to rate this item as important. This result is consistent with the position and position by sex chi-square analysis and serves to re-enforce the importance that the managers, specifically female managers, place on improving organizational culture.

The fact that all three of these outcomes were statistically significant in one of the three previous Chi-square analyses reinforces the probability that these results were not by chance.

#### Conclusions:

The results of the questionnaire were analyzed by two methods:

- (1) the outcomes that were ranked as most important in both the top choice or as one of the three top choices and
- (2) the items in which there was a statistically significant difference in the outcome rating based on the influence of the respondent's organizational position or sex.

In summary, outcomes important to both groups included increasing trust in direct supervisors or managers, increasing motivation within the department, improving

communication and working relationships between co-workers and increasing leadership/management effectiveness. Considering the history of this particular organization over the past several years, (e.g., downsizing and restructuring, several changes in senior management and strained management and union relations) it is not surprising that individuals placed importance in those issues. Of particular interest was that increased management/leadership effectiveness was indicated as important to both groups. There appears to be a recognized need by all individuals for strong direction from those in the traditional leadership positions within the organization. Staff may be looking for stable management structure to provide support over the long term of the organization.

There were also differences in the outcomes identified as important to the two groups. Managers placed importance on items related to increasing productivity, improving culture and understanding goals. It was not a surprise to see the importance managers placed on increasing productivity, as their responsibilities include issues related to productivity<sup>1</sup> and their performance is often based on their ability to increase productivity. Further analysis determined there was a significant difference in the value male managers placed on items related to increasing productivity, increased motivation of staff within the department and increasing responsibility for individual actions. The level of importance seen for this outcome by male managers may reflect their need for results-driven outcomes.

More than any of the other groups, female managers identified the items of improved culture, both within the department and within the organization, and increased personal comfort in approaching direct supervisors as being most important. Generally speaking females tend to be more cognizant of issues related to interpersonal and relationship

---

<sup>1</sup> The employee group placed importance on increasing productivity, but not to the same level as the manager group.

development. These results are potentially a reflection of the 'interactive leadership style Rosener (1990) described in her article where the female managers improve and increase enthusiasm and participation.

The outcome of *increasing the understanding of goals* within the department was indicated as being more significant to managers than employees. This was the only item that did not have a corresponding statistical significance difference based on gender.

There was one outcome in which the significance was as a result of a higher rating of the responses from the employee group. That item was improved personal job satisfaction. Within this group it was the male employees who clearly identified that they would measure the success of the program based on increasing personal job satisfaction. Perhaps the importance placed on increased job satisfaction is due to a perceived decrease in some other factors such as trust, support, motivation and communication that are associated with the reason for initiating the team building program in the first place.

Items related to increased support and respect were identified as most important to female employees. The importance that the female employees placed on these outcomes compared with their male counterparts may be a reflection of the female employees not receiving the support and respect they would like. In many organizations there continues to be barriers for females to overcome in terms of gaining equality and in terms of position levels and responsibilities.

The outcomes both groups chose as important and the difference seen amongst the groups may be a reflection of general tendencies and values of men and women. In that males are often concerned with measurable results and females are concerned with process orientated issues. The results may also be related to experiences encountered by individuals

based on their roles within this organization and their entire work experience. Through further studies such as this, evidence can be gained to identify which outcomes are typically important to males or females, managers or employees, or to a larger group, within a broader business environment.

## Chapter 5

### Conclusions

The literature on team building and organizational development is extensive. There is also an abundance of material in evaluation research related to the importance of enabling participation of stakeholders in the evaluation process. However, there is limited research that examines the involvement of stakeholders, specifically those employed with an organization, in developing the evaluation criteria for a team building program.

One way this involvement can be facilitated is by enabling individuals to indicate which outcomes should be considered most important in judging the success of a team building program. This approach to participation and inclusion was the focus of this study. Two main questions were advanced in this study:

- 1) What outcomes do individuals employed within an organization identify as the most important criteria for judging the success of the team building program?
- 2) What are the differences, if any, in the outcomes for judging the success of the team building program, based upon position within the organization and sex?

### Highlights of the Results

The outcomes which both managers and employees valued as most important were associated with increasing trust and support in managers and supervisors, increasing motivation and/or enthusiasm, improving satisfaction, improving communication and improving leadership/management effectiveness.

There were some differences in the rating of outcomes that were statistically significant. For the outcomes rated higher by the manager group, it was male managers who were concerned with increasing departmental and organizational productivity. In addition, male managers rated outcomes that related to increasing individual responsibility and motivation within the department, higher than the male employees. Another item of interest was that importance female managers placed on outcomes related to improving culture. For the outcome related to increasing comfort in approaching supervisors or managers, female managers rated this item higher than female employees. The employees, specifically males, were concerned with improving job satisfaction. Female employees placed more importance on outcomes related to increasing respect from co-workers and increasing support from supervisors or managers.

There were a limited number of outcomes that were significantly different between the groups and for some of the outcomes the results may have been predictable (e.g. male managers concerned with increasing productivity or male employees being interested in increasing job satisfaction). However, this survey process does provide empirical evidence that there are differences between the outcomes considered important by managers and employees, and males and females. Consequently, justification exists for involving a variety in the evaluation process and developing ways to address the different expectations of stakeholders.

## Implications of the Research

The literature review was divided into the four areas of (1) values, (2) evaluation approaches, (3) gender issues in the workplace and (4) organizational initiatives and team building programs. The summary of how the literature is linked to the findings will be discussed in terms of these four areas.

### Values

People rely on their values as a foundation for determining the ideas and concepts they consider important. Hurteau (1991) discusses the ideas of values being present whenever a choice is made regarding the criteria to judge a program. The main reason for discussing values in the literature review was to identify the influence values may have regarding the outcomes considered important for a program or program evaluation. A second reason was to demonstrate the importance of including a variety of perspectives and associated values in the evaluation process. Sometimes these values reflect those of program organizers, the managers, the evaluators or the participants. The purpose of this study was to involve individuals directly affected by a team building program to reveal the outcomes they consider most important. In this study the questions posed centred around the belief that depending on the position a person has within an organization and their sex, to some degree affects which outcomes they consider to be important when judging the success of a team building program. It was anticipated the outcomes respondents identified may have differed from others based on the demographic factors of position within the organization and sex. The process used in this study provides a framework for enabling individuals to identify the outcomes they value in terms of this team building program. In total there were 11 items

identified as significantly different between the managers and employee or males and females and several outcomes indicated as important to groups of managers and employees. There is sufficient evidence to indicate the importance for program planners to be aware of potential difference in values of the stakeholders involved in a program. The only way to ensure a variety of values are incorporated in the evaluation criteria is to include the perspectives of stakeholders in the process of identifying the outcomes to be attained.

#### Evaluation Approaches:

In the second portion of the literature review, six approaches to evaluation were discussed. The purpose of this section was to identify how the various approaches included stakeholders in the evaluation process. One of the reasons discussed in the literature for having stakeholders participate in the evaluation process is so a variety of individuals and groups could provide input as to criteria that should be used to judge the success of a program. Program managers can then address the needs and expectations of stakeholders.

The process used in this study provides an example of how individuals within an organization can be involved in the initial stages of the evaluation process. The two key elements of this study were to identify the outcomes considered important to both groups and to identify the outcomes more important to one group than the other, based upon organizational position and sex. Although there were a limited number of outcomes with a significant difference between the groups, there is enough variation in the responses to support the belief in the importance of including a variety of perspectives in the development of the evaluation criteria. When developing and initiating OD interventions, program planners and senior officials need to identify the outcomes of importance to individuals

within the workplace. Without this information, those responsible for the initiative ultimately only address the concerns they believe are important to staff within the organization.

### Gender Issues in the Workplace

The results of this study support the literature regarding the types of issues females would be concerned about in the workplace. For example, female managers are interested in improving culture within the department and the organization. Improving culture involves the characteristics Rosener (1990) spoke of in her description of “interactive leadership” including: encouraging participation, sharing information and energizing people.

The female employees in this study placed importance on increasing respect between co-workers and increasing personal support by direct supervisors or managers. The interest of female employees in these outcomes is understandable, considering the history of traditional public sector organizations where the jobs women have held (e.g., primarily clerical positions) are not typically valued as much as the jobs of their male counterparts.

It is important for employers to be aware of the general history of women in the workplace for two reasons. First, to be able to appreciate the concerns and issues facing women in terms of career development and opportunities and second, to be able to create an environment that challenges all individuals. By doing so “several things might happen, including the disappearance of the glass ceiling and the creation of a wider path for all sorts of executives – men and women – to attain positions of leadership” (Rosener, 1990, 125).

### Organizational Development Initiatives and Team building Programs

The impact of this study on team building is related to three areas. First, identifying the important outcomes of stakeholders would assist program managers to develop programs to meet the needs of those directly affected. Two studies discussed in the literature review focus on incorporating the priorities of staff. Jurkiewicz and Massey (1997) examined work-related motivation factors of both supervisory and non-supervisory staff. One of the purposes was to provide information to organizations to better meet the needs of employees. In the study by Mikkelsen (1998) employees were involved in the process of determining the issues to be addressed in the OD intervention. Ultimately if a process, such as the one outlined in this study is initiated, program managers would be able to adapt the program if necessary or develop another more appropriate intervention if warranted. The funding and resources would be better spent to develop a program to meet specific needs of individuals rather than implementing a "blanket" solution to solve a variety of issues of concern in the workplace.

Second, a framework was provided for program planners to allow individuals employed by an organization to actually be included in determining evaluation criteria for a program. The results of this study provide preliminary information regarding the influences of organizational position and sex on the outcomes considered important in a team building program. It is extremely expensive for an organization to conduct a team building program. Therefore, a strategy such as this survey-based process need to be developed to ensure the most effective program is designed to meet the unique needs of the organization.

Third, the cancellation of the team building program at this organization provides further evidence that OD interventions within public sector organizations often achieve little or no success. Norman and Keys (1992) state "it has been the absence of leadership on the

part of public social services management that has contributed to the absence of OD experiences. This is perhaps understandable in a system that rewards short-term efficiency over long-term effectiveness” (p. 149). Although the authors are speaking about social services management the statement is applicable for most public sector companies, including the organization in this study. Often senior managers are hired on two or three-year contracts, or leave the organization after a few years. As a result stable long-term leadership is often lacking. Consequently due to changing priorities, the necessary time and resources are not devoted to ongoing OD interventions. By developing programs that address the expectations of all staff, perhaps initiatives such as team building can gain enough support to continue and succeed in spite of potential changes to the organization.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

The idea that differences exist between the outcomes that participants value in a program is a concept that has been thoroughly discussed in the evaluation literature. However, conducting a research study in a business environment regarding what outcomes individuals consider important and where there are differences in the outcomes considered important has not been extensively studied. This study looked at the similarities and differences between managers, employees, males and females regarding a team building program in a public sector environment.

Subsequent research to my study can be categorized into four areas:

- 1) to conduct similar types of research examining other background factors;
- 2) to conduct similar research in other public sector organizations;

- 3) to compare the results regarding the outcomes of the team building program from public sector organizations with private sector organizations;
- 4) to expand the type of process used in this study to address other organizational issues

There were a limited number of outcomes identified as significant amongst the respondents, thus there were actually more similarities than differences. However, the importance of knowing what outcomes had varying importance is crucial information when planning an OD initiative. Therefore, it would be worthwhile to expand this type of analysis to include other factors. This study examined only the variables of position within the organization and sex. A variety of background data could be examined to identify their influence on outcomes identified as important to those stakeholders involved in the program. By using this survey-based process to identify criteria, program managers would have an understanding of several factors that influence which outcomes stakeholders consider important when judging the success of a program.

It would also be worthwhile to conduct and compare the results between other public sector organizations. The corporation in this study had a history of recent significant organizational change and strained labour relations. This environment potentially impacted staff values, regarding the team building program. Gathering information from several public sector companies would either confirm the results of this study or identify variations amongst the outcomes indicated as important. If the results of other studies were similar to those of this study, this would provide support that responses are related to the type of organization. If the results were different, there would be evidence that the outcomes considered important are unique to the values of individuals within each organization. The team building initiatives could then be adapted accordingly, prior to implementation. By developing an

understanding of the patterns in important outcomes program organizers could identify commonalties and uniqueness between their organization and other similar companies. This awareness of unique values within the organization would result in effective planning of initiatives.

Similarly to the comparison within the public sector, it would also be worthwhile to compare the results with private sector organizations to determine the outcomes identified as similar or different. It would be beneficial to assess which outcomes employees and managers value in private sector organizations and compare these responses with those of the public sector. There are many stereotypes of issues associated with public sector organizations (e.g., bureaucracy, minimal organizational change, and perceived lower productivity). All of these characteristics potentially impact training programs. As a result it would be interesting to compare the outcomes considered important to public and private sector personnel.

Lastly, it would be extremely informative to initiate this type of process on a broader scope within any organization. This study specifically examined a team building program but this survey process could be used as a mechanism to include staff in other initiatives such as strategic planning. Senior officials could review the results to identify significant differences and similarities between responses. This information could ultimately be used to develop an awareness of items previously not recognized as being important or to gain support for initiatives under consideration.

The survey instrument used in this study was specifically designed for this research project, but it could be adapted and used to assess the importance of various priorities within an organization. Given the cost and potential investment of time associated with any organizational initiative it would be beneficial for senior officials and program planners to

utilize a similar methodology to determine the needs of the stakeholders within the organization. Effectively, this will ensure any processes are strategically planned increasing the potential for success.

## References

- Alkin, M. C. (1991). Evaluation theory development: II. In M.W. McLaughlin and D.C. Phillips (Eds.), Evaluation and education: At quarter century (ninetieth yearbook of the national society for the study of education) (pp. 91-112). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bell, J. (1987). Doing your research project. A guide for first-time researchers in education and social science. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Bradford, J. (1989). Getting together: a composite study in team building. Optimum, 20(2), 38-51.
- Buller, P. F. and Bell, C. H. Jr. (1986). Effects of team building and goal setting on productivity: A field experiment. Academy of Management Journal, 29(2), 305-328.
- Cousins, J. B. and Earl, L. M. (1992). The case for participatory evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14(4), 397-418.
- Czaja, R., and Blair, J. (1996). Designing surveys: A guide to decisions and procedures. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Guba, E. G. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth-generation evaluation. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Harvey, T.R. and Drolet, B. (1994). Building teams building people. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Technomic Publishing Company Inc.
- House, E. R. (1980). Evaluating with validity. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Hurteau, M. (1991). Strategic choices in program evaluation. In A.J. Love (Ed), Evaluation methods source book (pp. 106-125). Ottawa: Canadian Evaluation Society.
- Jurkiewicz, C. L. and Massey, T. K. (Jr.). (1997). What motivates municipal employees: A comparison study of supervisory and non-supervisory personnel. Public Personnel Management, 26(3), 367-372.
- Krause, D. (1996). Effective program evaluation: An introduction. Chicago - Nelson Hall Publishers.
- Larson, C.E. and LaFasto, F.M. (1989). Teamwork: What must go right/what can go wrong. Newbury Park: Sage Publications

- Maddock, S. and Parkin, D. (1994). Gender cultures: How they affect men and women at work. In M. J. Davidson and R. J. Burke (Eds.), Women in management: Current research issues (pp. 29-40). London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- McMillan, J. H. and Schumacher, S. (1993). Research in education: A conceptual introduction. New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.
- Mikkelsen, A. (1998). Learning from parallel organizational development efforts in two public sector settings. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 18(3), 5-22.
- Morley, D. (1991). Team building: changing managerial attitudes and behavior in a quality environment. Optimum, 22(3), 17-24.
- Neuman, G. A., Edwards, J. E., and Raju, N. S. (1989). Organizational development interventions: A meta-analysis of their effects on satisfaction and other attitudes. Personnel Psychology, 42(3), 461-489.
- Norman, A. J. and Keys, P. R. (1992). Organization development in public social services: The irresistible force meets the immovable object. Administration in Social Work, 16 (3/4), 147-165.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Porras, J. I. and Berg, P.O. (1978). The impact of organizational development. Academy of Management Review, 3, 249-266.
- Porras, J. and Hoffer, S. J. (1986). Common behavior changes in successful organization development efforts. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 22(4), 477-494.
- Posavac, E.J. and Carey, R. G. (1980). Program evaluation: Methods and case studies. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Rogers, E.F., Metlay, W., Kaplan, I.T., and Sharito, T. (1995). Self-managing work teams: Do they really work. The Journal of the Human Resource Planning Society, 18(2), 53-57.
- Rosener, J.B. (1990, November -December). Ways women lead. Harvard Business Review, 119-125.
- Shadish, W.R., Cook, T.D., and Leviton, L.C. (1991). The foundation of program evaluation. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Scriven, M. (1993). The nature of evaluation. New Directions for Program Evaluation: Hard-Won Lessons in Program Evaluation, 58, 5-48.

- Stivers, C. (1993). Gender images in public administration: Legitimacy and the administrative state. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Syer, J. and Connolly, C. (1996). How teamwork works. The dynamics of effective team development. London: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.
- The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1994). The Program Evaluation Standards. How to Assess Evaluations of Educational Programs (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Weisbord, M.R. (1995). Team effectiveness theory. Training and Development Journal, 39(1), 27-29.
- Weiss, C. H. (1986). The stakeholder approach to evaluation: Origins and promise. In E. R. House (Ed.), New Directions in Educational Evaluation, 17 (pp. 145-157). Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.
- Weiss, C.H. (1972). Evaluation research. Methods of assessing program effectiveness. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.
- Weiss, C. H. (1998). Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies (2nd ed). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

### Appendix III Important Outcomes of Success Questionnaire

In 1997 a citywide team building program. There are three phases of the program: (1) Team Skills, (2) Building High Performance Teams and (3) Customized Team Development Activities. All three phases of the program have been initiated. As part of the evaluation process, the purpose of this questionnaire is to identify what employees consider being important outcomes in judging the Program's success.

**Completed questionnaires should be returned in the enclosed self-addressed envelopes. Demographic data will be used for statistical information only.**

There are many different kinds of outcomes that may result from team building training programs. This questionnaire is structured around four categories of potential outcomes:

- 1) Outcomes Affecting Individual Employees (Questions 1 and 2),
- 2) Outcomes Affecting Co-workers (Questions 3 and 4),
- 3) Outcomes Affecting Departments (Questions 5 and 6), and
- 4) Outcomes Affecting the Organization (Questions 7 and 8)

As you answer Questions 1 through 8, please consider the outcomes in terms of the overall Team building Program.

#### 1. OUTCOMES AFFECTING EMPLOYEES

In your opinion, how important is each of the following Outcomes Affecting Employees in judging the success of the Team building Program? (CIRCLE one number for each line).

	Extent of Importance			
	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important
a) Improved personal satisfaction with job .....	1	2	3	4
b) Improved personal satisfaction with the organization.....	1	2	3	4
c) Increased personal sense of trust in direct supervisors and managers by employee .....	1	2	3	4
d) Increased personal support by direct supervisors and managers .....	1	2	3	4
e) Increased personal opportunity for self development.....	1	2	3	4
f) Increased personal comfort in approaching direct supervisors or managers.....	1	2	3	4
g) Improvement in personal problem solving skills.....	1	2	3	4
h) Increased personal respect towards direct supervisors or managers.....	1	2	3	4
i) Increased personal responsibility for individual actions.....	1	2	3	4
j) Increased personal comfort in experimenting with new ideas.....	1	2	3	4
k) Improved personal motivation towards job performance .....	1	2	3	4
l) Other (please identify) .....	1	2	3	4
m) Other (please identify) .....	1	2	3	4

2. From the list of **Outcomes Affecting Individuals** in Question #1 on the previous page, please rank the three outcomes you consider the most important.

1<sup>st</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

2<sup>nd</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

3<sup>rd</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

3. **OUTCOMES AFFECTING CO-WORKERS**

In your opinion, how important is each of the following **Outcomes Affecting Co-workers** in judging the success of the Team building Program? (CIRCLE one number for each line).

	Extent of Importance			
	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important
a) Improved working relationship between co-workers.....	1	2	3	4
b) Increased sense of trust between co-workers. ....	1	2	3	4
c) Improved communication skills between co-workers.....	1	2	3	4
d) Increased support between co-workers. ....	1	2	3	4
e) Increased respect between co-workers. ....	1	2	3	4
f) Improved communication skills between employees and managers.....	1	2	3	4
g) Other (please identify) _____	1	2	3	4
h) Other (please identify) _____	1	2	3	4

4. From the list of **Outcomes Affecting Co-workers** in Question #3 above, please rank the three outcomes you consider most important.

1<sup>st</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

2<sup>nd</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

3<sup>rd</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

5. **OUTCOMES AFFECTING DEPARTMENTS**

In your opinion, how important is each of the following **Outcomes Affecting Departments** in judging the success of the Team building Program? (CIRCLE one number for each line).

	Extent of Importance			
	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Important
a) Increased departmental productivity. ....	1	2	3	4
b) Increased motivation of staff within the department.....	1	2	3	4
c) Improved quality of meetings within the department.....	1	2	3	4
d) Increased involvement in group decision making sessions within the department.....	1	2	3	4
e) Increased involvement in setting the department goals.....	1	2	3	4
f) Increased employee influence in setting the department direction. ....	1	2	3	4
g) Improved overall satisfaction with the department .	1	2	3	4
h) Improved overall conflict resolution within the department.....	1	2	3	4

Extent of Importance			
Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important

- i) Increased enthusiasm amongst employees within the department.....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- j) Clearer understanding of the department goals.....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- k) Improved culture within the department. ....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- l) Decreased absenteeism within the department.....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- m) Decreased turnover rate within the department.....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- n) Other (please identify) \_\_\_\_\_ 1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- o) Other (please identify) \_\_\_\_\_ 1 .....2 .....3 .....4

6. From the list of Outcomes Affecting Departments in Question #5 above, please rank the three outcomes you consider most important.

- 1<sup>st</sup> \_\_\_\_\_
- 2<sup>nd</sup> \_\_\_\_\_
- 3<sup>rd</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

#### 7. OUTCOMES AFFECTING THE ORGANIZATION

In your opinion, how important is each of the following Outcomes Affecting the Organization in judging the success of the Team building Program? (CIRCLE one number for each line).

Extent of Importance			
Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important

- a) Increased organizational productivity.....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- b) Increased employee influence in setting organizational direction. ....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- c) Improved communication skills between employees within the organization .....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- d) Increased enthusiasm amongst all employees within the organization .....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- e) Clearer understanding of the organization's goals.....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- f) Improved leadership/management effectiveness within the organization .....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- g) Improved culture of the organization.....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- h) Decreased absenteeism within the organization.....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- i) Decreased turnover rate within the organization.....1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- j) Other (please identify) \_\_\_\_\_ 1 .....2 .....3 .....4
- k) Other (please identify) \_\_\_\_\_ 1 .....2 .....3 .....4

8. From the list of Outcomes Affecting the Organization in Question #7 above, please rank the three outcomes you consider most important.

- 1<sup>st</sup> \_\_\_\_\_
- 2<sup>nd</sup> \_\_\_\_\_
- 3<sup>rd</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

**9. What is your position within the organization? (Please check ✓)**

*(If you are a trainer for any of the Team building Phases, please also check that category)*

General Manager ..... ☐ Trainer ..... ☐  
Division Manager ..... ☐ Employee, ..... ☐  
Section Manager ..... ☐ Union ..... ☐  
Exempt ..... ☐

**10. Are you:**

Male ..... ☐  
Female ..... ☐

**11. What is your age range?**

under 20 ..... ☐ 30 - 39 ..... ☐ 50 - 59 ..... ☐  
20 - 29 ..... ☐ 40 - 49 ..... ☐ 60 - 65 ..... ☐

**12. What is your education level (Please check ✓ highest level completed)**

Completed some high school ..... ☐  
Completed Grade 12 ..... ☐  
Completed some Post Secondary Education ..... ☐  
Completed Certificate or Diploma Program ..... ☐  
Completed Bachelors Degree ..... ☐  
Completed some Graduate Education ..... ☐  
Completed Graduate School ..... ☐  
Attained Professional Designation, (i.e. LLB, P.Eng, CGA) ..... ☐

**13. Have you completed any phases of the Team building Program?**

No ..... ☐  
Yes ..... ☐

If yes, please which phases of the program you completed:

Phase 1 (Team Skills) 2 day program ..... ☐ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_  
Phase 1 (Team Skills) 3 day program ..... ☐ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_  
Phase 2 (Building High Performance Teams) ..... ☐ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_  
Phase 3 (Customized Team Development Activities) ..... ☐ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_

**14. Have you previously completed a similar type of Team building Training?**

*(i.e. with other organizations and/ or previously with another organization)*

No ..... ☐  
Yes ..... ☐

If yes, please indicate the number of programs:

1-2 ..... ☐  
3-4 ..... ☐  
5 or more ..... ☐

**15. How many years have you been employed with the organization.**

Less than 1 year ..... ☐  
1 to 5 years ..... ☐  
6 to 10 years ..... ☐  
11 to 15 years ..... ☐  
16 to 20 years ..... ☐  
21 to 25 years ..... ☐  
more than 25 years ..... ☐

**Thank you for participating.**

#### Appendix IV List of "Other" Outcomes Identified from Questionnaire

Category	Outcome
Employee	<p>Job enthusiasm.</p> <p>Increased sense of family.</p> <p>Improved personal morale and ethics.</p> <p>Improved personal sense of contribution.</p> <p>Improved education.</p> <p>Improved diversity of work.</p> <p>Increased personal respect towards team members by management.</p> <p>Increased fairness and equity between team members by management.</p> <p>Increased ability to express opinions.</p> <p>Buy-in from city manager and acceptance of role as team member.</p> <p>Improved recognition.</p> <p>Team building skills useful outside work.</p> <p>Improved management commitment to team skills.</p> <p>Increased trust and communication.</p>
Co-Workers	<p>Ability to problem solve in teams.</p> <p>Improved morale.</p> <p>Stopping lies.</p> <p>Stopping snide remarks.</p>
Departments	<p>Improved department optimism.</p> <p>Improved work environment.</p> <p>Improved employee appreciation.</p> <p>Improved morale.</p>
Organization	<p>Respect from managers.</p> <p>Management buy-in.</p> <p>Improved organizational optimism.</p> <p>Improved work environment.</p> <p>Improved trust in management.</p> <p>Improved trust within the organization.</p> <p>Improved communication between employee and managers.</p>