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DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Organizational Training for a Community Action Agency Staff:
A Case Study   (September, 1972)

Jean M. Westcott, B.A., Rutgers University (Douglass)
M.A., Ohio University
Directed by: Dr. Kenneth H. Blanchard

The purpose of this research was to present a case study of an organization development intervention within a community action agency. The investigator's intent was to document the planning, implementation and evaluation phases of an OD intervention in an ongoing system. It was hoped that through the presentation and analysis of the case study data it would be possible to identify conditions which blocked or facilitated organizational change.

The organization in this study had grown rapidly over a two year period and was experiencing difficulty in adapting to that change. Specific problems which the OD consultants were asked to help the organization deal with included: (1) power limited to the top level of the organization; (2) ineffective use of staff resources for problem-solving; and (3) minimal staff participation in agency planning and evaluation activities.

The consultants used an action-research model as a basis for the OD effort. As a part of that action-research model, the consultants worked closely with a team of client system staff members in all phases of the intervention.
The organizational training program took place over a five month period. A variety of measures were used to assess the impact of the OD effort. Postmeeting reactions, systematic observation and informal and formal interviews were among the measures used. A follow-up interview was carried out two months after the last day of total-agency training.

Results of the intervention, as reported by staff and observed by the consultants, included the following. Structural changes had taken place, e.g., an employee association had been created and the Training Team had been legitimized as an ongoing part of the organization. Staff members felt that their personal effectiveness had increased and that the agency was better able to reach its goals. Problem-solving abilities had increased and increased staff participation was noted.

An analysis of the change process within the organization suggested that the following elements of the training design contributed to the changes which took place. The training program was held away from the work setting and training activities were closely related to work problems. An inside training team served as facilitators of much of the training activities. Finally, a training program which focused on increasing technical, rather than interpersonal skills, seemed to have been a helpful element in the training design.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"One thing that is new is the prevalence of newness, the changing scale and scope of change itself, so that the world alters as we walk on it... (Oppenheimer, 1955, p. 11)."

Not even the "prevalence of newness" is any longer new. Our awareness of a constantly changing environment has grown since 1955. Only recently, however, have we begun to seriously confront and find means of dealing with the consequences of living in such a world. It seems, at this point in time (1972), that our awareness of chronic change is yet greater than our ability to respond in a healthy fashion to such a world (Toffler, 1970).

Concern over our ability, or inability, to respond to a rapidly changing environment is not limited to a concern with the lives of individuals. Organizations, too, must find ways of coping with the complexities of rapid change, of remaining "Healthy" (Bennis, 1966). For most of this century, organizations have maintained themselves and functioned effectively, while utilizing a "bureaucratic model" of organization. Characteristics of bureaucracy, as described by Bennis, include: a rigid division of labor, a well-defined hierarchy of authority, a system of procedures for dealing with work situations, and impersonality of communications within the organization. The bureaucratic form of organization was well suited to requirements of our society during its period of industrialization. Such an organizational form serves well when the "goal of the organization requires the performance over long periods of time of a number of repetitive operations; when nearly all problems can be foreseen and appropriate rules developed for coping with them... (Shepard, 1970, p. 261)."
Such a stable, predictable environment no longer exists. As a result, organizations have increasingly felt the need to respond to changes within the environment and to find ways of responding to the "human side of enterprise" (McGregor, 1960). The end goal for organizations is to become self-renewing systems (Gardner, 1963). In order for organizations to maintain themselves in a rapidly changing environment, they must be able to "constantly monitor the changing community, to compare the results of its own reactions with what it would accept as movement toward its goals, and to establish new forms whenever movement toward the goals falls below a criterion (Schmuck & Runkel, 1970, p. 1)."

In attempting to become self renewing systems, organizations increasingly look to a new process, i.e. to the process of organizational development (OD). Sherwood (1971) defines OD as "an educational process by which human resources are continuously identified, allocated and expanded in ways that make those resources more available to the organization and therefore improve the organization's problem solving capabilities [p. 1]."

The roots of OD in this century go back to the "scientific management movement" under the leadership of Frederick Taylor. Organizational improvement efforts, as undertaken by "scientific management" advocates, utilized time and motion studies. The goal of those studies was to increase production output through more efficient accomplishment of tasks.

After almost three decades of "scientific management," the work of Elton Mayo (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939) at Western Electric, began to suggest a second focus for organizational improvement efforts. Mayo's research emphasized the significance of the human group and affiliation as a primary need of organizational members.
This concern with the "human side of enterprise" continued. Beginning in 1947, social psychologists and educators, stimulated by the work of Kurt Lewin, began holding training conferences for the purpose of improving human relations skills. The field of human relations training, centered around the intensive, relatively unstructured, small group (T-group) experience, grew rapidly. In the early 50's, management people began experimenting with the use of T-groups as a means of organizational improvement.

During the late 50's, a major development in organizational improvement activities occurred. At that time, the Esso Company undertook a comprehensive program to improve organizational functioning. That program involved training in problem solving and resolution of conflicts between subsystems within the organization, as well as T-group experiences (Foundation for Research on Human Behavior, 1960). The Esso program was the most extensive OD effort undertaken at that time. Its utilization of more than 50 T-group trainers resulted in the development of a group of capable consultants whose work with intensive group methods seemed to contribute successfully to organizational improvement (Schmuck & Miles, 1971).

Following the experience of the Esso program, the new movement, labeled OD, began to spread. A number of major companies, e.g. Alcan, Union Carbide, and Non-Linear Systems, established new departments to carry out an OD function. Throughout the 60's, OD efforts continued to increase. Those efforts began to take place in schools and other social service settings, as well as in industry.
Although there has been relatively little research done regarding the actual impact of OD on organizational effectiveness, the movement continues to grow. For more and more organizations, OD's promise of "self renewal," of assisting organizations to improve problem-solving capabilities and to implement decisions via a collaborative model, becomes attractive and perhaps necessary as the need to cope with rapid change becomes urgent.

I. THE PROBLEM

The relative effectiveness of OD efforts is uncertain. Most of the OD literature has been primarily concerned with establishing the need for OD (e.g., Bennis, 1966), and the development of theoretical models of the OD process (e.g., National Training Laboratories, 1966). It seems as if the theoretical models of intervention strategies far exceed explorations of the practical utility of such models. An urgent need, within the organizational development field, is the need for "systematic information...about the process of intervening in on-going organizations to help them become more effective.... Research on intervention is practically non-existent (Argyris, 1970, p. 7-8)."

A recently negotiated contract (Jan. 1972) between Dumont Community Action Commission (DCAC) and the Springfield Human Development Center (SHDC), for an "organizational training program" is perhaps typical of the increasing number of requests for OD intervention.

DCAC is a community action agency, established as the coordinating body for anti-poverty programs in Dumont County. The number of programs within DCAC has doubled within the past two years as the agency has
attempted to better serve its clients (low income residents of the county). The change in agency size has not been accompanied by concomitant changes in organizational decision making structures or communications channels. Organizational staff noted, with some regret, the passing of a "small, family-like" atmosphere which once characterized the agency. They spoke too of "communications problems," and "inability to use human resources within the organization and low morale." The training program hoped to help DCAC staff find means of dealing with those concerns. A descriptive case study of the DCAC Training Program, as planned, implemented, and evaluated seemed potentially to be a useful contribution to the knowledge about effective intervention activity.

**Purpose of the study**

The purpose of this study was to present a systematic case study of an OD effort, as planned, implemented, and evaluated within an on-going organization. The research problem, to the extent one could be stated, was: "By what means may a system develop capabilities to cope with the conditions it faces as a consequence of rapid change?" The case study was a study of the Organizational Training Program undertaken by Dumont Community Action Commission (December, 1971- July, 1972). It was hoped that the reporting of the intervention process, of its successes and failures, and an analysis of those successes and failures, could be used to suggest guidelines for future OD activities.

The study hoped to demonstrate that organizational change and development can be facilitated by an intervention strategy that does not focus primarily on interpersonal relations. It was also hoped that an analysis of the case study data would contribute to an increased understanding of
conditions that block or facilitate change in the direction of: movement toward increased participation, utilization of staff resources, equalization of power, and collaboration and innovativeness within an organization.

**Design of the Study**

The primary concern of this study was to describe the process of intervention as it took place at DCAC. Descriptive data for this case study was made available for all aspects, i.e. planning, implementation, and evaluation, of the Training Program. Sources of descriptive data included: consultants logs, systematic observations of major interventions, postmeeting reaction forms, and formal and informal interviews with program participants.

A secondary and closely related concern of the research was to assess the extent to which change occurred within DCAC along the following dimensions: participation of staff, taking of responsibility for work tasks, problem-solving, collaboration, and number of innovations. The data collected as a part of the descriptive process (observation and interview) included a primary focus on those dimensions of organizational change.

**Significance of the Study**

As noted earlier, there is a need for increased research activity within the OD field. A more specific and primary research need is the need for case studies of organizational development activities. The kind of case studies needed, are those which attempt to "capture and chronicle the detailed process on the changes we seek and often observe ... rather than presenting a fairly static, dull description on a
company, followed by the use of a series of T-groups...followed inevitably by another dull description of how people's attitudes changed (Bennis, 1968, p. 230)."

A further shortcoming of OD practice is the disinclination of practitioners to use an intervention strategy other than an interpersonal one. If OD is truly to meet organization needs, practitioners must explore change strategies which focus on organizational structure and work flow (Margulies & Raia, 1972).

In addition, systematic case studies of OD efforts can serve as an effective teaching tool, can provide sufficient data for alternative interpretations and theory building and can help "demystify" the role of the behavioral scientist in change efforts (Schmuck & Miles, 1971).

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

In order to clarify pertinent terms for the reader and to limit their interpretation to this study, the following definitions are presented:

**Consultant System.** The term consultant system refers to the Springfield Human Development Center (SHDC). Staff of that center contracted to provide consulting services to Dumont Community Action Commission as that agency attempted to carry out an organization-wide Training Program.

**Primary Consultant** (PC). This term refers to that member of the SHDC staff who had the primary responsibility for the Training Program and who maintained an on-going relationship with DCAC staff throughout that program.

**Secondary Consultant** (SC). This term refers to that member of the
SHDC staff who assisted the PC with all aspects of the Training Program.

Client System. This term refers to the recipient of consulting services, i.e., Dumont Community Action Commission (DCAC). The name of that system is a contrived name, in order to assure the anonymity of those involved.

Training Program. This term refers to all activities related to the planning, implementation and evaluation of an OD effort within DCAC. One set of activities was the primary training sessions as called for in the consulting agreement. Those training sessions, major interventions (MI’s) included: an Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop, a Programatic Training Conference, a Board of Directors Workshop and a Training Committee Workshop. Secondary interventions (SI’s) refer to the seven planning and evaluation sessions which either preceded or followed major interventions.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. While advantages of the case study method have been cited, there are also disadvantages to the case study method. A limitation of this study was the lack of an explicit statement of experimental variables and a consequent lessened ability to establish cause-effect relationships between the Training Program in-puts and organizational change outcomes.

2. Time-duration of this study was limited to the time period between December, 1971 (initial SHDC-DCAC contact) and July, 1972 (follow-up interview with DCAC staff). Additional follow-up activities, if reported here, would have given sounder evidence of stable
organizational changes.

3. The proposed case study, description of planning, implementation, and evaluation of the Training Program, generated a wealth of detailed information. In order to more effectively analyze some of that data, certain types of data, e.g., observations of component functioning as it changed during the Training Program, was selected as a primary focus. In selecting areas of the study for more intensive consideration, there was a need to exclude other, potentially fruitful areas (e.g., development of an "inside" training team) from systematic consideration. A second case study, undertaken by the PC (Harris, 1972) presented and analyzed the consulting style and the development of an "inside training team.

4. The investigator responsible for the documenting of this case study effort was also a member of the SHDC consulting team, the SC, and at times was undoubtedly less able than would have been ideal, to objectively analyze the case study data.

IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

Chapter I dealt with the background and significance of the problem to be studied. Chapter II presents a review of literature related to the case study. The third chapter specifies data collection procedures. Chapter IV is a case study of the Organizational Training Program as undertaken at DCAC. Chapter V includes a discussion and analysis of specific aspects of the case study data. The final chapter, Chapter VI, presents a summary of the findings of the study, as well as implications and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to place this study in proper perspective, a review of the organizational development literature is presented. The review is divided into five sections. The first section focuses on the literature related to definitions and assumptions underlying OD practice. The second section presents and comments on the variety of models and techniques used for organizational development. Section three summarizes the literature related to methodological difficulties encountered in evaluating OD efforts. The fourth section deals with studies of OD programs as undertaken in a variety of organizational settings. The fifth section of this chapter presents the major conclusions which emerged from the review of literature and notes their implications for this study.

I. OD-DEFINITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

As noted in Chapter I, OD is a concept of recent origin. During the developmental stages of any field, there is likely to be a lack of consensus regarding definition of terms. Organizational development would seem to be no exception.

Bennis (1969), defined OD as "a response to change, a complex educational strategy intended to change the beliefs, attitudes, values and structures of organizations so that they can better adapt to new technologies, markets and challenges...[p. 9]."

According to Beckhard (1969), OD is "a planned, organization-wide effort, managed from the top, to increase organization effectiveness..."
and health through planned interventions in the organization's 'processes' using behavioral science knowledge [p. 9]."

Lippitt (1969), saw OD as "the strengthening of those human processes in organizations which improve the functioning of the organic systems so as to achieve objectives [p. 4]."

Sherwood's definition of OD, as referred to earlier, is probably closest to the definition used by the consultants in this case study. That is, OD is "an educational process by which human resources are continuously identified, allocated and expanded in ways that make those resources more available to the organization and therefore improve the organization's problem solving capabilities [p. 1]."

Although there are differences in these definitions of OD, similarities are also evident. OD is defined as a continuing process, rather than a single event. The focus for OD activities is the organization and organizational processes. OD involves deliberate, planned, change efforts and relies on behavioral science knowledge and concepts.

The behavioral science knowledge and concepts, which underlie OD theory and practice, have a number of sources. Among the most significant contributors are: Argyris, 1964; Bennis, 1966; Coch & French, 1948; McGregor, 1960. Coch and French (1948) found that group members who are unable to exercise influence over a decision are unlikely to contribute their resources to a decision and are less likely to carry out the decision when action is required. Bennis (1966), in his work on planned organizational change, cited and supported the need for organizations to move toward some decentralization of decision making.
functions. Major support for that contention came from McGregor (1960), who speaks of Theory X and Theory Y assumptions about man. The former assumes that men are lazy, motivated to work only from survival needs, and ultimately rational. The latter, Theory Y, assumes that men work because of multiple gratifications and that behavior is affected by emotional and social events as well as by material incentives. Argyris (1964) supported Theory Y assumptions about man, and described an ideal organization where the individual's need for self-actualization is integrated with the organization's goals and objectives.

The above assumptions about man and the focus of OD efforts served as a base for work undertaken by OD consultants in this study.

II. MODELS AND TECHNIQUES

Although there appears to be general agreement regarding assumptions and goals of OD, there is considerably less agreement regarding appropriate, or most effective, means of implementing a successful OD program.

Practitioners in the OD field have, at this time, attempted to develop system-wide change models on a very general level, or subsystem models, each of which deals with a specific aspect of the change processes. OD practitioners who have attempted to develop and to categorize change models include: Chin, 1967; Bennis, 1963; National Training Laboratories, 1966; Buchanan, 1967; Lippitt, Watson and Westley, 1958.

Typical of those models is the Lippitt-Watson-Westley model which focuses on the relationship between the consultant and the client systems.
That model includes the following stages:

1. The development of a need for change.
2. The establishment of a change relationship.
3. The clarification or diagnosis of the client system's problem.
4. The examination of alternative routes and goals; establishing goals and intentions of actions.
5. The transformation of intentions into actual change efforts.
6. The generalization and stabilization of change.

Maguire (1970) noted a great deal of variety within the various models. Gross, Giaquinta and Bernstein (1971) went a step further and noted the inadequacy of those models. At this stage of development, the problem of implementation in OD is still speculative. There is little research evidence to support the various speculative models (Argyris, 1970).

A further review of the OD literature (Fordyce & Weil, 1971; Hornstein, Bunker, Burke, Gindes, & Lewicki, 1971; and Schmuck & Miles, 1971) suggested the variety of techniques, or modes of intervention, which are available to the OD practitioner. Some of the major modes of intervention are:

1. Training or education- direct teaching or experience-based learning including lectures, exercises, simulations and T-groups.
2. Process consultation- observation and aid in changing on-going processes, e.g. decision making or problem solving within an organization.
3. Confrontation- bringing together individuals or groups who are experiencing communication difficulties.
4. Data feedback—collection of data regarding organizational functioning, followed by feedback of that data to organizational members as a base for organizational change efforts.

5. Techno-structural activity—action primarily aimed at changing the organization structure, work-flow and means of accomplishing tasks.

In the above listing of intervention modes, the individual modes are not intended to be completely distinct from one another. Ideally, an OD program would involve some use of each of the modes (Schmuck & Miles, 1971).

The literature related to theoretical concerns within OD includes a variety of means for implementing OD efforts. However, a review of case studies of actual OD programs (Margulies & Raia, 1972) found an almost exclusive reliance on strategies which focus on the organization's personal-cultural subsystem. Bennis (1968) reviewed OD case studies and commented, "one cannot help but think we're a one-product outfit with a 100% foolproof patent medicine [p. 228]." Bennis urged practitioners to consider models other than human relations ones; to pay more than lip service to models which focus on structural change.

A more organic means of presenting strategies in the OD field has recently been provided by a number of the field's most able practitioners. Argyris (1970) described his means of working with organizations in assisting them to become more effective. He described three major types of intervention activity and recommends the third, i.e., interventions which make use of the resources of the client system, and resources of the consultant, in an effort to help the client understand the nature of its problem and thus more effectively deal with it, and add to the basic
theory of intervention activity. Argyris' description of intervention methods includes a number of samples of case materials, accompanied by the interventionist's comments, which effectively suggest to practitioners one consultant's means of carrying out intervention activities.

Additional material related to OD strategies was made available with the publication of the Addison-Wesley Series on Organizational Development in 1969. Models of OD, as presented in that series, range from Schein's (1969) description of "process consultation," to Blake and Mouton's (1969) "grid organizational development." Schein described an OD method which entails third party assistance in the observation of human interaction processes with the aim of assisting a client system to diagnose its own problems and develop corrective actions. OD method for Blake and Mouton consists of a program aimed at system managers and designed to "educate" them regarding important dimensions against which effective organizational performance can be measured. Other books in the series (Beckhard, 1969; Bennis, 1969) provide excellent overviews of OD and OD methodology.

III. EVALUATION OF OD

Practitioners, and their critics, note the lack of systematic research undertaken in the OD field (Campbell, 1970; Schmuck & Miles, 1971; and Gross, Giaquinta and Bernstein, 1971). In his comprehensive review of the training and development literature, Campbell (1970) noted that OD practitioners have seldom collected data to test theories of change or to assess the results of an intervention. He attributed that lack of
research activity to practitioners' consistent choice of action over research and to the numerous methodological difficulties encountered in field research. Two of the most consistent difficulties in undertaking such research, Campbell suggested, are the lack of available control groups for comparison purposes, and the non-specificity of objectives within an OD program.

Perhaps the first of many difficulties in evaluating OD programs, is practitioners' inability or unwillingness (Campbell, 1970) to specify what is to be learned as a result of training. Things to be learned are frequently listed as a particular set of attitudes. Unfortunately, much of the literature (e.g., Argyris, 1966) suggested that behavioral change in systems is not a necessary consequence of attitude change. In the study cited above, Argyris' tape recorded the behavior of 165 executives as they participated in problem-solving, decision making, and implementation meetings. Approximately 95% of the subjects in that study expressed attitudes which emphasized the importance of openness, risk-taking and trust. An analysis of the tapes found that risk taking, helping others to be more open, and trust were behaviors with decidedly low frequencies.

A few studies have undertaken to measure behavioral change following an OD program. The form of measurement used by Kline (1966), and Wilkie (1967), is typical of such studies. Assessment of behavioral change in both of those studies was made solely by means of interviews with participants. A concern for more careful measurement would suggest the need to collect and analyze data based on systematic observation (Campbell, 1970). The study reported in the present research has made use of that
suggestion, and incorporated systematic observation as one measurement means.

Another broad question, related to evaluation of OD efforts, is the question of the utility of experimental or quasi-experimental designs in field research (Weiss & Rein, 1970). Weiss and Rein noted the limitations of such research designs. These limitations include: the difficulty in selecting satisfactory criteria; the lack of a controlled situation; the lack of standardized treatments; and the limited scope of information which can be produced by most experimental designs. The above mentioned study recommended the use of process oriented, qualitative research and case analysis, as alternative research means for field studies.

A further alternative, for field study research, is suggested by Kirkpatrick (Catalanello & Kirkpatrick, 1968). Kirkpatrick's model directs the researcher to: measure participant's reactions, i.e., how well they like the program; learning, the extent to which content was assimilated; behavior, changes on the job; and results, the changes in organizational variables such as costs, productivity and turnover. Catalanello and Kirkpatrick (1968) surveyed 110 firms in order to ascertain which of the above variables were used in evaluating training programs. Results of that study showed a high concern for assessing participant reactions, but relatively few attempts to measure behavior or results. Those authors concluded that training research is in need of a great deal of innovativeness and development.

A final overview of research needs in OD is presented in Schmuck and Miles' (1971) study of OD in schools. Those authors recommended
that in studying the effects of OD efforts: (1) increased emphasis be
given to documenting the sequence of events; (2) detailed, ordered in-
formation regarding incidents during and between training events be in-
cluded; and (3) more frequent use be made of a variety of measures,
including systematic observation, postmeeting reactions, and interviews.
Research studies which take heed of those recommendations would be a
major contribution to the development of OD theory and practice. This
investigator's awareness of the above recommendations led to the inclusion
of a variety of measures for the documenting and evaluation of events, in
the study presented here.

IV. OD STUDIES

This section of the review reports results of major studies of OD
interventions.

A great many studies have investigated the effects of specific as-
psects of an OD intervention. Among such studies are: Oliver, 1965;
Buchanan and Brunstetter, 1959; Campbell and Dunnette, 1968; Friedlander,
1968; Goodson and Hagstrom, 1972; Lake and Callahan, 1972; Zurcher, 1969.
A major study, from that group, is that of Campbell and Dunnette. Their
study is a comprehensive review of the research related to the use of
T-groups and the effect of T-groups on organization development.
Campbell and Dunnette concluded that: "the assumption that T-group
training has positive utility for organizations must necessarily rest
on shaky ground. It has been neither confirmed nor disconfirmed [p. 85]."
above list of studies include: the use of change agent teams (Goodson & Hagstrom, 1972); studies of the entry process in OD (Lake & Callahan, 1972); and a consideration of intervention practices which stimulated or thwarted the process of group development in selected groups within an organization (Zurcher, 1969). Those last three studies have additional significance as studies of OD in other than industrial settings. The first two (Goodson & Hagstrom, 1972; Lake & Callahan, 1972) represent an increasing number of OD studies in school settings. The final study (Zurcher, 1969) is one of the few undertaken in a community action setting.

Considerably less research has attempted to report and systematically assess the impact of a comprehensive OD strategy over a period of several years. The few studies of that sort include: Blake, Mouton, Barnes & Grenier, 1964; Beckhard & Lake, 1971; Marrow, Bowers & Seashore, 1967.

Blake, Mouton, Barnes & Grenier reported results of a Grid OD program which involved line managers within a large organization, over a one-year period. Increased profits were noted within the organizations and attributed to procedural improvements related to the Grid program. Participants in the study also reported increases in work group performance, increases in meetings and transfers, improved working relationships, and greater success in problem-solving activities. The study reported definite changes, but was unable to determine conclusively whether those changes were more a result of the OD program, or were equally related to environmental pressures and management's support of organizational improvement.

Beckhard and Lake (1971) presented an intensive OD program which attempted to develop a team approach to management in a large banking
organization. Over a two year period, the group worked with most intensively improved productivity, reduced turnover and absenteeism, developed better internal communications, greater structural innovativeness, and improved problem-solving capacities. Data from superiors within the organization indicated that intergroup conflicts were reduced and more productive work was being accomplished. Lower levels within the organization reported that they had more frequent access to superiors, whom they saw as more egalitarian, less closely supervising, and more open to suggestion. The same organization, when studied four years later, had generally maintained those changes, due in part to the extension of the OD program through more divisions.

Marrow, Bowers, and Seashore (1967) studied the process and outcomes of an OD effort in a garment manufacturing firm in poor financial condition, and with a past history of authoritarian management. The initial study was carried out in 1962-1964 with follow up data collected four years later (Seashore & Bowers, 1970). Follow up data showed that the 1964 increases in employee satisfaction, motivation and performance, the profitability of the firm, and job satisfaction, had been improved or been maintained. Management style moved toward a participative direction, and work facilitation of superiors was seen to have increased. Speculation about the causes of the durability of the impact of change included: (1) the presence of structural changes which tended to "lock in" new participative norms; (2) legitimization of continuing organizational self awareness and self study; and (3) the inherently attractive character of life in a participative system.
The above findings are incomplete and subject to methodological difficulties. They do provide, however, some suggestion of what OD can do.

V. SUMMARY

This chapter presented the results of a review of OD literature as it related to definitions and assumptions about OD, OD models and techniques, methodological difficulties in OD research, and the effect of OD programs within organizational settings. The review of literature suggested the following. There is a need for further exploration of assumptions on which much of OD practice is based. More in-depth studies of the implementation phase of OD effort, i.e., studies which utilize a variety of measures over an extended period of time, would make a significant contribution to the field. There is a need for studies of OD practice which report attempts to bring about changes in organizational structure, work flow, and means of accomplishing organizational tasks. The implications of the above findings have been considered in carrying out the present study. The study is an in-depth case study of an attempt to make structural changes within a community action agency. Results of that intervention activity were assessed by use of systematic observation, postmeeting reactions, and interview data.
CHAPTER III

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

The purpose of this research was to present an intensive case study of the planning, implementation and evaluation of an OD intervention in a community action agency. In determining which of a number of research procedures were to be utilized in this study, a point of view expressed by Homans (1949), served as a helpful guideline:

People who write about methodology often forget that it is a matter of strategy, not of morals. There are neither good nor bad methods, but only methods that are more or less effective under particular circumstances in reaching objectives on the way to a distant goal (p. 330).

I. RATIONALE FOR USE OF THE CASE STUDY METHOD

The case study, as was suggested in the review of literature, is a research method particularly well suited to studies undertaken in a developing field. This method is designed to utilize, as fully as possible, the advantages of seeing a situation as a whole, and of attempting to understand fundamental relationships. "From this...can come the insights which can furnish the hypotheses for later, more detailed, quantitative study (Katz & Festinger, 1953, p. 138)."

II. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Case studies have the advantage of permitting students and practitioners to observe the process of growth or change. In order for a case
study to fully provide such an advantage, it must include: data from several phases of the intervention; provide rigorous description of process; and conceptualize about the process, e.g., interactions, critical incidents, and their effect on subsequent actions (Walton, 1972).

In attempting to describe the processes of change in a field study, the most useful data gathering techniques are interview and observation. The interview permits "detailed study of individuals' attitudes by facilitating free and spontaneous expression (Lombard, 1968 p. 244)." Observation permits systematic study of activities and behaviors.

With the above stated objectives of the case study in mind, and considering the recommendations for most effective data gathering techniques, the following data gathering procedures were designed and utilized.

Consultants log of intervention activity. Throughout all phases, planning, implementation, and evaluation, of the OD intervention, primary and secondary consultants maintained logs of training activities. These logs were essentially anecdotal, narrative accounts of the consultants perceptions of each aspect of the intervention process. Log entries were made during and immediately following each of the major and secondary interventions. Within 24 hours after each of those interventions, the two consultants cross-checked log entries and selected shared materials which they felt were critical for description of process.

Systematic observation. Change goals as stated by DCAC staff included: increased participation of staff, increased use of human resources within the agency, and increased influence of the staff in
decision-making processes. The following systematic observation scheme was developed to provide data to assess movement toward those goals as a result of the OD intervention.

As a part of the implementation phase of the intervention, DCAC component groups met on several occasions during the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshops. During these first two days of training, component groups met to identify component goals, list perceived problems which blocked reaching those goals, and to learn and practice a problem solving procedure. The final day of Orientation and Goal Setting was planned as a follow up session in which component members would: report the results of two months activity in relation to problem-solving; to identify whatever processes of problem solving they had used; and, if time permitted, to continue problem solving activities.

It was assumed that some measure of movement toward the goals of "increased participation, increased influence, and increased awareness of staff resources" could be collected via the process of systematic observation as carried out by the consultants during both of the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshops. Observation data was collected in the following manner. At various times, i.e., whenever component groups were meeting during the March 7th, 8th, and May 15th workshops, both consultants observed staff participation and interaction. Design of the workshop activities for those three days made use of DCAC Training Team members as group facilitators. SHDC consultants were available but not instrumental in the ongoing meeting activity. The relatively inactive role assigned PC and SC during the component group meetings,
allowed them to more fully observe group interaction. During each of the meetings, the two consultants recorded their observations to whatever extent was deemed appropriate. On most occasions, several component staff were also taking notes, for their own information, and so the consultant's note-taking did not appear to be a concern of group members. On one occasion, i.e., at the end of the first day of training activity, a Training Team member made reference to the note-taking activity of the consultants, and asked for feedback. The primary consultant felt that such feedback was a very appropriate part of the skill and development of Training Team members, and summarized and reported significant results of his observations that day. The secondary consultant also shared her observations of the component meetings and the other activities of the training session. Feedback was given, both as a means of support for Training Team members, and secondarily, to help Training Team members focus on a few selected dimensions of group activity, i.e. participation and climate.

In recording the results of their observations, the consultants attempted to record anecdotal, narrative data, as well as specific behavioral events. Non-anecdotal observations necessitated that the observers count, rather than rate, frequencies of certain leader and member behaviors during a 20 minute observation period. Behaviors observed included: participation, information seeking, information giving, supporting and clarifying. The frequency of those behaviors were noted for participants and for the group leader. Results of those observations are reported in the case study (Chapter IV).
Postmeeting reactions. In order to add to descriptive materials for the case study, and to provide some assessment of participants' response to the intervention activity, Postmeeting Reaction Forms (Appendix B) were circulated and returned at the end of the Orientation and Goal Setting workshops. Those two interventions involved the largest number of participants and so were less likely to provide an opportunity for the more informal, on-going evaluation which took place during the other training activities.

Postmeeting reactions are a common means of measuring member satisfaction with a meeting and of assessing some aspects of that experience as participants perceived the experience. The form used in this study was a brief one which included both open-ended and closed questions. Open-ended questions were included to encourage more spontaneous responses, and to assure a more open collection of data, i.e., to assure that data reported not be limited to the investigator's selection of important dimensions. Examples of questions included are: "In thinking about your experience in this workshop, what did you like best? . . . least?", "How would you describe the effects of this workshop on you?", and "Rate the quality of today's training experience." Results of participants' responses to the Postmeeting Reaction Forms are presented within the case study, following the training sessions in which they were used.

Problem-solving activity. An important evaluation measure was built into the design of the OD intervention. A major objective of OD, as described by Sherwood (1971), is the improvement of an organization's
problem-solving capabilities. The DCAC Training Program design called for component groups to: (1) list problems and learn and practice a problem-solving process during an early phase of the program (Orientation and Goal Setting, March 7th and 8th); and (2) report on the results of that problem-solving activity and continue the activity, two months later (Orientation and Goal Setting, May 15). A full report of the results of those two training activities, i.e., number of problems solved and determination of the process of problem solving (as reported by participants and observed by the consultants) was felt to be an important part of the descriptive and evaluative activity undertaken in this study, and is reported in the case study (Chapter IV).

**Follow-up interview.** Approximately two months after the last agency-wide training meeting (May 15, 1972), Training Team members interviewed a sample of DCAC staff who had participated in the agency Training Program. The interview schedule (Appendix D) was designed by Training Team members, following the conclusion of the Training Program. In designing questions for the interview, an attempt was made to include questions related to: realization of results in relation to specified objectives; assessment of staff feelings about the Training Program; and a report of continued use or impact of Training Program activities. A fuller description of the process of designing the interview schedule is reported in the case study. Interview results are also summarized and reported in the case study and in Appendix E.

**Summary.** The case study method of research was selected as most appropriate for this study. Data collection procedures relied on
systematic observations of DCAC staff's participation in the training program, and on interviews with staff. Postmeeting reactions were collected following two of the training workshops. A further assessment of the impact of the Training Program was made available through staff reports of problem-solving activities. The investigator felt that the above data collection procedures allowed for the measurement of attitudinal and behavioral change, and assessed change from the perspective of participants and consultants. Thus, a significant shortcoming of previous studies of OD activity (see Chapter II) was dealt with.
CHAPTER IV

THE CASE STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

The following case study is a description of an action-research model for organization development which guided the consultants' efforts as OD practitioners in working within a community-action agency setting. The OD program described here includes data relating to all phases of the client-consultant relationship from December 21, 1971 through July 20, 1972. The OD program consisted of a series of training events and related planning and evaluation sessions.

The four major training events are referred to in the case study as major interventions (MI's), and the planning and evaluation sessions are referred to as secondary interventions (SI's). All interventions are reported in the sequence in which they occurred. A summary of all interventions is presented in Table I. (Throughout the case study the initials PC have been used to refer to the SHDC staff member who served as the primary consultant, and SC to refer to the secondary consultant.)

There are some particulars about the organization in this study, The Dumont Community Action Commission, which need to be considered in generalizing the results obtained in this study to other organizations. First, is the "maximum feasible participation of the poor" stipulation in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which directs community action agencies to hire as many low income staff as possible. A first concern in hiring, then, is economic status, rather than some measure of past
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 21, 1971</td>
<td>(SI-1 and SI-2) Planning First Action Steps</td>
<td>Training Director and Executive Director, Training Committee</td>
<td>Clarify contractual agreement, define problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 12, 1972</td>
<td>(SI-3) Training Team Development</td>
<td>Training Team Members</td>
<td>Planning and Skill Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 25, 1972</td>
<td>(SI-1a) - Orientation and Goal Setting</td>
<td>All DCAC Staff</td>
<td>Clarify goals, problems and develop skills for problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6, 1972</td>
<td>SI-4 - Evaluation and Planning</td>
<td>Training Team</td>
<td>Evaluation, Orientation &amp; GO, Planning Programmatic Training Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 1972</td>
<td>SI-2a - Programmatic Training Conference</td>
<td>Program Directors and Training Team</td>
<td>Improvement of personnel practices within each component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17, 1972</td>
<td>SI-3 - Board of Directors Intervention</td>
<td>Board Members and Program Directors</td>
<td>Diagnosis Board's Attitude Toward Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 1972</td>
<td>SI-5 Planning for Final Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop</td>
<td>Training Team</td>
<td>Develop Training Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 1972</td>
<td>SI-1b - Orientation and Goal Setting Evaluation Session</td>
<td>All DCAC Staff</td>
<td>Follow-up and Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 1972</td>
<td>SI-2b - Programmatic Training Conference (Second Day)</td>
<td>Program Directors and Training Team</td>
<td>Development of Diagnostic and Planning Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 1972 (AM)</td>
<td>SI-6 - Training Team Planning</td>
<td>Training Team</td>
<td>Learn Lab Design by Designing Training Committee Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 1972 (PM)</td>
<td>SI-4 - Training Committee Workshop</td>
<td>Training Committee and Training Team</td>
<td>Evaluate and Clarify Future Training Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20, 1972</td>
<td>SI-7 - Evaluation of Training</td>
<td>Training Team</td>
<td>Design of Final Agency Evaluation and Feedback to Primary Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
experience and competency, although the latter are also considered.
Second, the major source of financial support for DCAC was federal
government funding sources, rather than agency clientele. The avail-
ability of those federal funds also reflected the changing political
climate toward program priorities. For example, during the time period
of this study a major agency component, Health Start, ended its pilot
project year and was not refunded, while a new component, Foster Grand-
parents, was funded for over $100,000. Finally, DCAC's client population
is both defined and limited by Federal guidelines to low income residents
of the county. Federal guidelines also defined goals for each of the
agency components as well as for the over-all agency.

The Consulting Model

The consulting firm, Springfield Human Development Center, is in-
corporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, "to
canduct a center for family and individual counseling; to provide
psychotherapy to individuals and groups; to provide psychological and
educational services and in general to offer services in the area of
human psychological development (Springfield Human Development Center,
Articles of Incorporation)." Past work of the Center has included:
counseling for individuals, families and groups; educational testing
and tutoring; and provision of consulting services to businesses,
educational and service agencies, in the areas of organizational develop-
ment, leadership and communication problems.

The consulting model verbalized by SHDC in general and the Primary
Consultant (PC) for the DCAC Training Program in particular, defines OD
according to Sherwood's definition as presented in Chapter I, and works from an action-research orientation, which may be summarized as follows:

There are three processes in an action-research approach, all of which involve extensive collaboration between a consultant and the organization: data gathering from individuals and groups; feedback to key client or client group in the organization; and joint action planning based on the feedback. Action research is designed to make data available from the entire system and then to use that information to make plans about the future of that system. (Sherwood, 1971, p. 4)

The value orientation of SHDC is broadly defined as humanistic, with persons viewed as having the right to participate in all decisions that directly affect them.

History and Background of DCAC

The Dumont Community Action Commission, Inc. is a private, non-profit corporation chartered in Massachusetts and incorporated in October, 1965. "This agency was created in an attempt to coordinate local, state, federal and private resources into a more effective attack on the problems or conditions which keep approximately 13% of the County residents living in poverty."

(Annual Report, DCAC, 1971). Major programs which operated to meet the above goal included: Central Administration, Neighborhood Centers, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Head Start, Day Care, Alcoholism Prevention Program and Health Start. DCAC's main office and component program offices are located in Dumont, the County seat. Several of the component programs, e.g., Head Start, have two or three of their centers located in other towns within the county. The geographical spread to agency-affiliated programs meant that many of the
DCAC staff had not had opportunities to know one another and were relatively unfamiliar with activities of programs other than their own.

Each of the programs had its own director who reported to DCAC's Executive Director, who in turn reported to an agency Board of Directors. That Board of Directors was composed of equal numbers of representatives from 3 sectors of the economy: low income, private, and public sectors. The Board was ostensibly the policy making body for DCAC. In actuality, however, agency policies were largely determined by federal guidelines and the Executive Director's view of how the organization ought to function. The organization was bureaucratic in nature, with power at the top and most communication originating there and being directed downward.

DCAC's Executive Director had held his position since the agency was incorporated in October, 1965 and was instrumental in the creation of the agency. The Associate Director had been with the agency, in that position, for four and one-half years. While a number of DCAC employees had been staff members since the early days of the agency's existence, a number of new staff had been recently added as agency programs and staff doubled in number within the past two years. Longer term employees were excited about the growth of the agency, but noted with regret the passing of a small family-like atmosphere which once characterized the agency. The agency Training Director noted the agency's rapid growth and lack of parallel changes in organizational decision making structures and communications channels.

Initial Client Contact

In the summer of 1971, the Associate Director and Training Director
At DCAC became aware of the availability of Federal Training and Technical Assistance Grants. In hopes of securing such a grant for DCAC, the Associate Director assumed major responsibility for the development of a training proposal. He was concerned with the agency's relative ineffectiveness in dealing with the consequences of rapid growth and change. Also, he was concerned with the agency's seeming inability to utilize the wealth of human resources available within DCAC. In writing the Training Proposal, the Associate Director attempted to include program Directors' input via a "Needs Assessment Questionnaire."

The proposal was completed after numerous revisions (in order to meet federal grant criteria) and submitted to OEO. Tentative approval for the granting of Training and Technical Assistance funds was given in December, 1971. At that time, the DCAC Training Director assumed major responsibility for inviting a number of consulting firms to submit bids for the implementation of an agency-wide training program based on the Training Program Proposal. Among the consulting firms contacted and the firm finally awarded the training contract was Springfield Human Development Center, Inc. According to DCAC's Executive Director, a primary reason SHDC received the training contract was the insistence of SHDC's staff representative that the development of an "internal" (agency staff) Training Team be considered a major part of any consulting agreement.

II. PROBLEM DEFINITION AND

ESTABLISHMENT OF CLIENT-CONSULTANT RELATIONSHIP
Secondary Intervention: Planning and First Action Steps (SI-1)

DATE: December 21, 1971  
PARTICIPANTS: Training Director and Executive Director  
GOALS: Clarification of Contractual Agreement and Definition of Problem.  
LOCATION: DCAC Central Office

The concerns of DCAC's Training Director and Executive Director at this meeting were to clarify the terms of the contract, including duration of contract and budget considerations, and to get some sense of what SHDC consultants had planned as a result of reading the Training Proposal. SHDC consultants responded that planning from this moment on would be a joint SHDC-DCAC effort. The Training Director and Executive Director seemed receptive to that idea, and then stated that the Training Proposal had been written primarily with an eye to meeting Federal Grant criteria in order to secure training funds. They assured the consultants, however, that the training proposal had some flexibility and was not necessarily a complete picture of agency needs.

As discussion continued, DCAC staff made frequent reference to the agency's past experiences with training. The consultants were told that DCAC staff was highly resistant to training, especially training that might focus on interpersonal conflict. The staff also reported that there had been no follow-up on problems and issues dealt with during past training.

The following specific problems were identified at this meeting as a result of the consultant's repeated request for more explicit statements of agency's problems.
1. Organization functioning relatively ineffectively as a result of a 50% increase in staff and programs in the past two years.

2. No related increase in physical facilities and no change in communication channels and decision making structures.

3. Administrative function of Associate Director being underutilized because Executive Director dealt directly with Component Directors.

4. Low morale evidenced by high number of recent resignations.

5. Staff meetings held to discuss and deal with numerous agency problems, but action decisions rarely made.

6. Agency staff relatively unaware of resources and programs other than within their own component.

7. Lack of ability to effectively utilize staff resources already available within DCAC.

8. Minimal support for training from Executive Director.

Consultant observations. The consultants left this meeting with some awareness of agency problems, but also aware that more information was necessary from a variety of levels within the agency. Thus a meeting was proposed and arranged with the agency's training committee, which was composed of six staff members and a representative from the board of directors. The consultants were concerned with the Training Director's high expectations of training. In spite of past unsatisfactory experiences with training, the Training Director continued to express hope that the outside consultants would somehow solve the agency's problems, and
that "training will fix everything." The consultants felt that a great deal of work would have to be done to move toward a collaborative effort related to the training program.

DATE: January 12, 1972
PARTICIPANTS: Training Committee, Associate Director and Executive Director
GOALS: Continue Clarification of Contractual Agreement and Definition of Problem.
LOCATION: DCAC Central Office

Discussion during this meeting restated staff concerns over the low use of staff resources, poor communications within the agency, and low participation of staff in all agency activities. A great deal of time was spent discussing potential training days and means to assure staff participation. The PC indicated that he felt the responsibility for assuring participation rested with the agency and expressed concern about the relative ineffectiveness of a training program that did not include agency-wide participation. The Executive Director informed the consultants that DCAC had assumed this responsibility and had made attendance mandatory. The consultants suggested then that training sessions be held during normal working hours.

The Executive Director left the meeting early. Following the Executive Director's departure, the Associate Director expressed hopes that training would help to increase the influence of the Training Committee on agency decision-making. Although the Training Committee had a variety of roles, it originally had been formed to bring pressure on the Executive Director for changes in agency personnel policies and make grievance procedures more available to staff. Other attempts to increase staff influence on agency decision-making had failed.
The consultants restated their desire to work with an internal training team. The training committee enthusiastically supported this idea and named five members (including the Associate Director) to this team. Dates were set for the first MI, Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop, and for the first meeting of the Training Team, for February 25, 1972.

**Consultant observations.** The PC and SC shared the perception that a primary agency concern was low staff influence in decision-making, confirmed by the way in which this meeting evolved, i.e., the Executive Director made decisions, left the meeting, and then the staff began to talk about power.

### III. THE TRAINING PROGRAM

**Secondary Intervention: Training Team Development (SI-3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>February 25, 1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANTS:</td>
<td>Training Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOALS:</td>
<td>Planning for Orientation and Goal Setting Workshops; skill development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
<td>SHDC Training Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting began with the PC presenting a tentative design for the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop, and for Training Team member's roles in that workshop. In proposing a design for those two days of agency-wide training, the PC had attempted to respond to "training needs" as described in the training proposal, and expressed during SI-1 and SI-2. Agency concerns as understood by the consultants included: lack of intercomponent communication and awareness of total agency program and resources; low morale related to a tremendous number of loosely defined problems which staff seemed unable to solve; and relative
inability of staff to influence planning and decision making within DCAC. This one-half day training session included training in the use of Force Field Analysis as a Problem Solving Technique, training in Carrying out a Problem Census, and the development of minimal skills in group facilitation. Operating under an assumption that learning is more likely to take place if it is experience-based and related to real life, the consultant taught Force Field Analysis to Training Team members by asking them to use it. That is, the PC gave an initial verbal description of the technique in dealing with problems they identified. As a second part of the day's training, Training Team members were asked to carry out their own Problem Census, i.e., to list the issues which were keeping their components from reaching goals. The final input of this training session was a lecture and discussion about group facilitation skills. Highlights of that section included identifying a few facilitative behaviors, e.g., encouraging, supporting, being non-judgmental, and not pressuring for participation.

**Consultant observations.** The work with the Training Team was seen as being a developmental process in which the Training Team would be given support and experience-based training to better enable team members to accept increasing responsibility for all aspects of the training program. The consultants were pleased with the high involvement of the Training Team members, but also aware of team member's questions about their abilities to carry out roles as trainers.

In responding to those concerns, the PC assured the Training Team members that consultant help would be available throughout the two day
workshop. For the consultants it seemed essential to have Training Team members in high visibility roles for this agency-wide workshop, so that a process of building an awareness of the Training Team as inside experts and resources could begin. This could hopefully make the training program more effective, less threatening, and assure more likelihood of follow-up.

**Major Intervention: Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop (MI-1a)**

**DATE:** March 6, 7, 1972  
**PARTICIPANTS:** All DCAC Staff  
**GOALS:** Clarify agency's goals, problems and develop skills for problem solving.  
**LOCATION:** All Saints Church, Dumont

Arrangements for the workshop were made by the Training Team. The meeting started late because the Training Team waited for the Executive Director to arrive. Plans for the day included a high degree of structure, including a decision to give each Program Director no more than seven minutes to present his program's goals, according to national guidelines. The opening session was designed to provide a general framework, overall agency goals, in which staff members could function at a low threat level, i.e., reaffirming or looking anew at individual component goals. This also provided a simple way for staff to get a general understanding of the overall nature and goals of DCAC, as well as some specific information regarding each component and its activities. It was also hoped that staff would become aware of the similarity of goals and populations served, and, through this, an initial atmosphere of agency and component interdependence could be created. As goals were articulated, that first morning, staff members expressed a new awareness of the significance of
their particular component in DCAC operations.

During the morning, component groups met to identify and prioritize local program goals as they saw them, and then to carry out a Problem Census. The technique of Problem Census was used in each component group to find out what were the blocks to reaching the agreed upon goals. Problem Census, as used here, was a simple technique whereby the trainer facilitated the group efforts to articulate, in brainstorming fashion, "Those problems that keep you from doing your job, that something can be done about." In other words, the focus was to be on real problems. An attempt was made to avoid such general problems as, "No one in Washington understands us.", and to keep the problems that were articulated out of the general gripe category. Once an opening statement was made by the trainer, no attempt was made to censor the free-flowing listing of problems. The number of problems articulated via the Problem Census varied from group to group. In order for a problem to be listed, only one person needed to see it as a problem.

Once the problems were listed on newsprint, the groups moved to a clarification session. The PC referred to this session as "Setting the record straight." In this session, administrative staff were available to answer questions, give information and to dispel rumors. An attempt was made to sort out problems that did not actually exist, i.e., were the result of rumor or misinformation. Problems were not removed from a list, even if staff were told "It's just a rumor," unless there was consensus among group members to remove that problem statement. It was the trainer's responsibility to facilitate this process and to
ascertain whether or not there was consensus for removing a problem. Following the clarification session, the problems remaining on lists were ones that component members felt they really needed to contend with.

In a general session that afternoon, each component presented the goals and problems it had identified. The purpose here was to share information and identify common elements within DCAC that cut across components. The identification of common problems seemed to give participants some sense of "We're in this together.", and to highlight those issues which might be worked on across component lines. At the end of this session, fourteen common problems had been identified. All fell within the general category of structural or organizational concerns, e.g., transportation, space, public relations, more staff. Organizational staff seemed at once overwhelmed, "Wow, we really do have a lot of problems.", and relieved to know that many of the problems were shared and seemingly less suggestive of, "We're a bad component program."

Remarks of the Associate and Executive Director, near the end of this general session, defended the present organizational structure but agreed that, "These problems do exist."

An agenda setting session (for the second day of workshop) was held at 4:30 p.m. Participants were invited to observe and participate. It was made clear that the Training Team would set the agenda for Tuesday, but that participant input would be valued in planning the agenda to meet workshop goals as initially stated. Seven participants joined the Training Team, and the PC and SC, in exploring alternatives
for the second day.

In planning for the problem solving activities for the second day, the PC frequently helped Training Team members focus on problem-solving as a process. As lists were briefly reviewed and commented on during this session, there began to be a move toward now solving these problems. The Associate Director was especially interested in moving toward solutions for fear the day's work would end up as "just another session where problems were identified and nothing done about them." The PC suggested that there was more mileage to be gained in working on learning a process. The idea was to learn the skill, and then to practice it using real problems for the practice, but placing emphasis on developing a useful tool and an attitude toward problem-solving that would be available to staff in a variety of settings.

The second day began with a general session in which some attempt was made to rank order agency problems. The emphasis for this second day was placed on problem solving within each component. Each group met with the Training Team member they had worked with on the previous day. Trainers gave theoretical input and presented steps for problem solving via Force Field Analysis. Component groups had the opportunity to practice the problem solving technique as it related to problems within their own components, and also as it related to organizational changes that could be made without any policy decisions necessitating the Board of Directors approval.

In the afternoon, recommendations, i.e., solutions to problems that had been worked on in component groups, were presented at a general
session. It was assumed that this would enable the entire staff to participate, on some level, in decisions which might be made regarding organizational changes. It was also assumed that if there was general agreement on changes to be made, implementation of the changes would be facilitated.

Of all the recommendations presented in this final General Session (Appendix A) the proposal for establishment of a "Sounding Board" elicited the most discussion and staff support. As presented at this meeting, the Sounding Board was to be an employee association which hoped to improve communications within DCAC and to give staff greater influence in decisions which related to them. Each component agreed to participate in creation of a Sounding Board, and volunteers were recruited from each group. Two basic guidelines for the Sounding Board were accepted: (1) that each component be represented by two persons; and (2) that no one from the Central Staff should be a member of the Board (staff felt they would be freer to make recommendations if Central Staff were not included). Six other recommendations were accepted by participants (see Appendix A).

The day ended with participants being asked to complete Postmeeting Reaction Forms (sample form see Appendix B). In general the answers to questions on that form expressed optimism about progress made and a feeling that the problem solving skills would be put to use during the months ahead. In specifying what they liked most about the workshop, participants listed: working with people, collaboration, participation, and meeting within component groups.
Consultant observations. The consultants were pleased with the first two days of training. One of the initial concerns of the PC had been a tendency on the part of DCAC staff to see themselves as unable to affect things in their environment, i.e., to solve problems. The optimism, expressed verbally by participants, and responses on the Post-meeting Reaction Forms, suggested that that negative perception was beginning to change.

The creation of a Sounding Board was seen as a positive step because it gave opportunity for increased participation and had the potential for increasing staff influence on agency decision-making.

The Training Team was also optimistic about the workshop. They frequently had looked to the consultants for support and input, but were pleased about their ability to function as facilitators of the Problem Census and problem-solving process.


DATE: March 15, 1972
PARTICIPANTS: Training Team and Program Directors
GOALS: To continue involvement of staff in planning and evaluation.
LOCATION: DCAC Central Office

The meeting opened with an announcement that one of the Training Team members was now Acting Training Director. This change was necessitated by the original Training Director taking pregnancy leave. An additional Training Team member was selected by the Training Team.

As a part of evaluating the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop, Training Team members reviewed staff responses on the Post-meeting Reaction Forms. They were pleased and felt progress had been made. They felt,
however, that real evaluation would have to take place two months later during the final session of the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop (MI-1b).

The PC and SC spent some time commenting on the Training Team's role and reviewing the areas in which the PC and SC felt the Training Team had given real assistance to the learning process during the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop.

The second major agenda item was to plan the Programmatic Training Conference. That conference (MI-2a) was originally conceived as a means of developing career ladders (specification of steps, i.e., training and experiences which enable para-professional staff to advance within the organization). The Training Team members, however, felt that this was not a good way to use scarce training time. Consequently, they proposed that the Programmatic Training Conference should deal with: (1) human relations problems within components; (2) how to deal with personnel issues; (3) how to function effectively within DCAC structure; and (4) how to effectively diagnose the needs of each component and what to do with such a diagnosis. The original plan had also been for Training Team members to be instrumental in the planning and implementation of this training segment. However, due to the fact that all but one of the four Training Team members was also a Program Director, it was decided that the Training Team members would assist with planning, but function as participants in the workshop.

Major Intervention: Programmatic Training Conference (MI-2a)

DATE: March 17, 1972
PARTICIPANTS: Training Team Members and Program Directors
GOALS: Improvement of Personnel Practices within each Program Component.

LOCATION: SHDC Training Center

This training session began with the PC's outline of a proposed day's agenda. The agenda was accepted without comment. The PC made an additional comment regarding a definition of training. For him, training was the learning of skills and not the creation of an experience that made people feel good. He expressed hopes that learning of skills by the Training Team would enable those individuals to become sensitive to, and able to respond to, training needs within DCAC.

The first agenda item for this workshop was a theoretical, cognitive presentation. The topic was the concept of meaningful work; the idea that in order for work to have meaning and be valued by persons doing it, those persons need to be included in all aspects of that work, i.e., planning, implementation, and evaluation. That concept was discussed and led to an exploration of how such a concept could be implemented in a community action agency. The discussion then turned to a consideration of personnel functions workshop participants needed to fill, as Program Directors. Participants agreed that DCAC lacked a coherent or consistent system for dealing with personnel issues. There was also consensus that poor communication was both symptom and cause of many personnel problems and other problems within components.

Following this discussion, participants were asked to explore one way of looking at communication problems; to consider differing consequences of one-way and two-way communication and to consider the notion that communication takes place on two levels, i.e., content and
feeling. To illustrate this idea, a role play was undertaken. In that role play, a supervisor was asked to talk with an employee who had just received a negative evaluation. During the role play, the role player in the supervisory role undertook to fix the situation and talked only to the content level of what was being said.

Next, a second role play situation was undertaken. Discussion related to that role playing, as well as the previous one, suggested that participants were fearful of responding to feelings. They seemed to see feelings only from a negative perspective, i.e., feelings meant anger, hurt, and frustration. Discussion focused on these concerns through lunch time. The session seemed productive. At least one participant commented, "I really need to learn to listen better. I've been missing a lot."

After lunch, time was used for PC input and staff practice related to giving effective feedback. The Associate Director saw a direct application of the learnings from this session for the improvement of staff meetings.

From there the discussion moved to a look at a variety of communications problems within DCAC. One of the problems discussed related to the Executive Director's Secretary interpreting memos she was asked to write. For example, after being asked to send out a memo announcing a Senior Staff meeting, she was likely to add, "attendance is mandatory." The PC noted the effect that that sort of miscommunication could have on climate within the organization. One Program Director nodded in agreement and noted that because of limited physical facilities, his
clientele needed to go through two secretaries, including the one referred to above, in order to see him. The group supported his view that this was detrimental to relationships with his particular clientele (low income youth). As a result, he resolved to actively seek new facilities for his component.

Discussion about communications problems continued. The PC noted frustrations being expressed and people wanting to act, but wondered why no action was taken. The PC pushed further, asking, "Where is it that decisions get made within this organization?" The Associate Director said that he didn't know. One program director said, "We don't have the power." A second program director said that she did not know where to go when she needed decisions to be made or when she needed help with her component. The Associate Director commented about his new awareness of his past lack of response to this Director. "I guess it looks as if I'm giving you the cold shoulder," he said, "but I mean it as a message, as encouragement for you to assume more responsibility, autonomy in operating your program. I have a lot of confidence in your ability to do that." The program director responded, "I'm glad to know that. That's really helpful."

The PC intervened at this point to ask, "Why is this discussion going on here? What's been going on at staff meetings?" One response was, "I don't feel free to say what I need to at staff meetings. There's no way I can risk being fired at this point." The PC asked, "Is the Executive Director the issue? It seems as if his absence today is the only observable difference between today's meeting and a regular staff
meeting." Following that comment, discussion continued about what blocks staff perceived to their assuming more power within the agency. As a result of that discussion, program directors realized that there was no need for their staff meetings to include the Executive Director since all were accountable, on the organizational chart, to the Associate Director. At that point, participants began to talk about the difficulties which their present lack of power had let to. Directors had no control of their component's budget and, in fact, even did not know the total amount of money in those budgets. As a consequence, they felt unable to plan effectively. As an action step toward more effective planning, the program directors decided to meet weekly, on their own, to start exploring budget and other component concerns. They also decided that their Friday staff meetings suggested a past-orientation, and thus changed their meeting day to Monday, more future oriented.

After the decision was made to meet without the Executive Director, the PC responded to comments from the participants which suggested that they were feeling guilty about the decision to meet only with the Associate Director. He pointed out that what they were doing was completely within the organizational structure. Also, he suggested that, in being concerned about the Executive Director's possible negative response, they were not considering the possibility that the Executive Director's involvement in their staff meetings might be motivated by a wish to be helpful. That is, the Executive Director might be doing work for program directors, that he didn't think they were able to do.

**Consultant observations.** One of the major objectives of the consultants in this workshop was to increase the skill level of program
directors. Emphasis was placed on the development of skills in two areas, i.e., listening and effective feedback. The consultants made the assumption that these two skills were essential in dealing with personnel issues and therefore necessary for program directors. A secondary objective of the workshop was continued development of training skills for the Training Team.

With that secondary objective in mind, the PC made comments regarding his use of certain tools. For example, the PC suggested that role playing had the potential for creating a low threat, experience-based learning situation and, in addition, had merit as a relatively simple training tool. It relies on observation rather than sophisticated interpretation.

The PC had been aware throughout the session that Training Team members had frequently directed their comments to him rather than to the group, and noted that this apparent dependency would have to be considered in future contacts with the Training Team.

The meeting was felt by the consultants to have been productive as evidenced by the program directors' decision to work together and seek additional responsibilities. The fact that program directors had no responsibility for their own budgets further suggested to the consultants that the agency was indeed not utilizing the potential resources of its program directors.

The meeting was also seen as positive because consultants observed an increasing openness and lack of defensiveness on the part of the Associate Director. The Associate Director's defensive responses had
previously functioned as one of the blocks to training.

**Major Intervention: Board of Directors Intervention (MI-3)**

**DATE:** May 3, 1972  
**PARTICIPANTS:** Board Members and Selected Staff at Annual Meeting  
**GOALS:** Diagnose Board Attitude toward Training.  
**LOCATION:** Holiday Inn, Dumont

For six weeks there had been only incidental contact with DCAC staff because of staff's increased involvement with clientele, as the program year was drawing to a close. On May 1st, the Executive Director of DCAC phoned and invited SHDC consultants to the agency's Board of Director's annual meeting. He requested that SHDC staff get some reading of the Board's attitude toward training since he had been unable to get the Board to set a date for their phase of training. (Training for the Board of Directors had been a part of the original training contract.) He hoped, also, that the PC would make some comments regarding training since this was an item on the Board's agenda for discussion.

The Board meeting was attended by the PC and SC. Initial Board agenda items included: a farewell to old members, approval of two new members, a financial report, approval of the appointment of an educational specialist to Head Start, and welcome to the newly appointed Day Care-Head Start Director. Business was carried out in a perfunctory manner, i.e., presentation, request from chairman for comments, no comments forthcoming, and a move to approve whatever motion was on the floor. After about 45 minutes, the Chairman asked for a Training Committee report.

The Board member, who was the representative to the Training Committee, gave a positive picture of training to date and expressed regret that Board training had not yet taken place. Two or three comments
were made about training and a motion made to go on to other business. A new Board member noted the lack of response to the report about training and the possible involvement of Board members in training. She followed her initial statement with, "I'm new on the Board and I'd like to know what's happening. It seems as if that was a hot issue?" A few Board members, in response, reopened a discussion related to Board training. A quick polarization took place. Those "for" training and those "against" training were the sides taken.

At that point, the Board member who had been Acting Head Start-Day Care Director got up to speak. She indicated that previously she had been opposed to training. She then made a brief presentation of what the training experience had included for her: learning problem solving skills, which she had since used several times in her work; working together; and seeing agency talent being used more effectively. In addition, she noted that the training experience seemed to have renewed the agency staff's commitment and enthusiasm for work they were doing. At the conclusion of her remarks she sat down. A Board member, a Superintendent of Schools, responded, "What's that got to do with the organization? That's just an emotional response. I'm against training. What I need is orientation. I move we adjourn." His motion was defeated by only a two vote margin. Five of the Board members continued the discussion about training. At this time, the Chairman invited the PC to make some remarks regarding training.

The PC expressed concern over the way the work "training" was being used and responded to, without being given a definition. He was
quite sure that no one there was opposed to learning or growing. Therefore, for Board members to take sides for or against training seemed an unproductive activity. He suggested, instead, that the Board look at its previous concern about orientation for their members and that they might also consider other needs for skills or knowledge, as these needs related to their expressed desire to accomplish goals related to roles as Board members. There appeared to be tentative agreement with such a proposal. The Superintendent of Schools who had earlier moved to adjourn announced his disagreement. The possibility of Board training at this time was left in the hands of the joint chairman of the membership and training committees. The new Board member indicated she would follow this up because of her concerns about how uninformed current Board members seemed to be "about the real issues facing the poor in this county." The meeting was adjourned.

Consultant observations. The consultants were aware that during this meeting none of the Board Members representing low income residents had participated, nor was invited to contribute to the discussion, even though this is the population the agency is chartered to serve.

The PC and SC agreed that at this point there was little to be gained in pushing for a date for Board training. It was decided to deal with this issue at the next training committee session.

Secondary Intervention: Planning for final Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop (SI-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>May 8, 9, 1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANTS:</td>
<td>Training Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOALS:</td>
<td>Develop Training Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
<td>Associate Directors Apartment, DCAC Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The PC and SC met with the Training Team in order to plan the third day of the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop. A member of the Sounding Board, the employee group that had been established as an outgrowth of the first Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop had asked the Training Director for permission to attend the planning session.

The meeting was held in the Associate Director's apartment and began at 2:30 with the Training Director introducing the visitor and his reason for being at the planning session. The Sounding Board member proposed that training time be used for a Sounding Board meeting. A considerable time was spent discussing the merits and implications of having Sounding Board business as an agenda item. The Training Team's assessment of staff expectations for the workshop was unclear. There was some indication that follow-up to the first two day workshop (Orientation and Goal Setting) was a primary concern, and that a business meeting might thwart this. Discussion ran beyond 5:00 p.m. and plans were made to continue the next day.

The meeting began at 1:00 p.m. the following day, in the DCAC offices, with all but one of the Training Team members present. The Executive Director had sent word via his Associate Director that he wanted to talk with the Training Team about the plans for the upcoming workshop. After he arrived he made some comments about the hectic time in the agency and announced that a new project (Foster Grandparents Program) seemed to have good prospects of funding.

The Executive Director assured Training Team members that he was enthusiastic and hopefully supportive of efforts to improve communications within DCAC. He felt that the work of the Sounding Board was an
important part of that change effort. However, he felt it was important for the Training Team to know that he could not allow, nor would the Board of Directors condone, use of training funds to have a Sounding Board business meeting. Although such a meeting was important, it could not be considered "training."

The Training Director reviewed the content of the previous day's meeting. The Training Team shared the Director's concern that the second Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop should be used for additional training, e.g., continued development of problem solving skills. After some discussion, a proposal was made, and agreed upon, that the Sounding Board be given time to report on its progress and current status. That amount of Sounding Board input seemed appropriate as follow-up to the first Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop.

After that decision was made, additional planning for the upcoming workshop continued. An agenda was developed and Training Team roles for the day were decided upon.

**Consultant observations.** The PC and SC were in agreement that the Executive Director was concerned about the use of training time and other resources, but seemed to be over-reacting from the data available.

The consultants were impressed with the Training Team's ability to plan for the final day of the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop. An agenda was agreed upon after exploration of various alternatives, and there was skill exhibited in the allocation of staff resources to conduct the different sessions of the workshop. The PC and SC were aware of the difference between this planning session and the original one for the
Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop. The Training Team seemed confident, planned the major portion of the day, and looked to the PC for minimal assurance.

**Major Intervention: Orientation and Goal Setting Evaluation Session (MI-1b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>May 15, 1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANTS:</td>
<td>All DCAC Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOALS:</td>
<td>Follow-up and progress reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
<td>All Saints Church, Dumont</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting began 45 minutes late due to a number of late arrivals and a seemingly strong desire, on the part of staff, to socialize. The general session opened with component directors introducing their component's staff. The Executive Director gave a few introductory comments in which he shared his optimism about the training program to date.

After the introductions and welcoming comments, the Training Director distributed Work Sheets to all participants. (These Work Sheets were typewritten pages of each component's goals and problems as listed two months earlier, during the first two days of training. See Appendix A for a copy of those lists.) Room assignments for component meetings were announced, participants obtained coffee, and began work with their component groups. The task for each group was to begin looking at which problems had been solved, which seemed no longer to be problems, and which remained as unsolved problems. A second task was, with the help of the facilitator, to explore what had been the process by which problems had been solved.

The Training Director functioned as facilitator for the Head Start/Health Start group. Participants began to give positive responses to the facilitator regarding a number of improvements that had occurred.
over the past two months in their components. Examples of how some problems had been solved showed a broader understanding of staff and agency resources. One staff member told about involving parents for the first time in pre-registration with the result that the process was far ahead of last year. The sharing of success stories resulted in general agreement to encourage more collaboration between those who had solved problems with those who still had similar unsolved problems.

The Day-Care group started slowly, but after reviewing the present status of the problems which they had identified two months earlier, they became excited and enthusiastic over the changes that had occurred. The facilitator from the Training Team helped the group to explore how their own initiative had started action that resulted in most of the positive outcomes they were now viewing. There were several spontaneous plaudits awarded to training and two examples given of the use of Force Field Analysis in solving problems which confronted Day Care staff.

One group was composed of four smaller components in DCAC. Although the extent of problem solving varied among the four components, there was agreement that progress was being made. The staff morale had improved, and some aspects of very difficult problems were being solved. An example of this group's problem-solving activity: The senior citizens group had finally been able to make some headway on the transportation problem that seemed to plague the entire agency. They had obtained money for a mini-bus and had negotiated for a Youth Corps driver. Ways of problem solving were shared within the group. But because of the diverse nature of the components (Senior Citizens, Youth Corps, Alcoholism Prevention Program), there seemed to be limited enthusiasm, as
compared with the other work groups.

At 11:15 a General Session was held. The Sounding Board report was made by a staff representative. He reported on the problems which had been encountered (meeting times, regular participation, etc.). He explained that the Sounding Board, as presently composed, saw itself as an interim group. Now he felt that there ought to be elected members from each component.

The interim Sounding Board members had decided to draft by-laws, establish priorities, and to limit its meetings to a 60 minute time period in order to keep themselves on track with specified agenda. There were some questions from the floor regarding left over items from the first Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop. One question was, "What has the Sounding Board done on speakers bureau and resource book?" The speaker responded that the Sounding Board had decided, that to work on these two issues right away was too much to undertake. Creation of a speaker's bureau and resource book had much lower priority than the development of a Sounding Board structure.

The PC briefly pointed out, by using the Sounding Board as a positive example, important dimensions in the process of organizational change, i.e., that there was a commitment to change; structure had been agreed upon; leadership was forthcoming from a number of sources; and original goals were kept clear.

After lunch, the general session continued with Head Start and Day Care reporting on their plans to work together. The arrangement was essentially for Day Care to be relieved by Head Start staff on Mondays
in order that Day Care staff could devote time to planning and training.

Each component group reported on what had taken place in the morning work session, and then the groups reassembled. (The PC and SC had the opportunity to observe only one group because of the limited time in the afternoon agenda for component meetings.)

In the afternoon session, Day Care staff reassembled with chairs together in a smaller circle than in the morning. After exploring options suggested by the Training Team facilitator, the group decided to focus on specific problems affecting their day-to-day operation, e.g., storage problems and outside observers coming into centers. Using problem clarification and brainstorming, participants began to develop a strategy for solving their problems, designating areas of responsibility and follow-up, rather than just talking about the problems as they had done two months before.

At 3:30, a brief general session was held for final evaluation, component feedback to total groups, and to give participants an opportunity to complete Postmeeting Reaction Forms. Head Start reported that it had begun to plan for the fall, and to plan staff meetings as workshops. They further agreed to put a calendar of events in the Central Office to aid communication and decrease the possibility of meeting-time conflicts. The other group reported it had explored ways of better using the agency newspaper.

Following the session, the Sounding Board held a brief meeting to elect new representatives, adopt by-laws, and set the next meeting date.

Answers to questions on the Postmeeting Reaction Forms were quite
positive and reflected a growing optimism within the agency for meeting its goals. People were enthusiastic about the increased participation and collaboration within their component groups.

Consultant observations. The consultants observed a definite change in the agency staff between the March 7th workshop and this follow-up meeting two months later. They observed that staff were more sociable, more responsive to humorous comments, more active participants in discussions, and more aware of each other as resources in problem solving. The consultants felt that these changes indicated more positive morale. A number of DCAC staff also verbalized a new awareness of their own effectiveness in getting work done.

Results of the workshop, i.e., reports of problem-solving, suggested that the agency was more effectively reaching its goals, particularly with regard to increased involvement of the client population in program efforts.

The consultants also were aware of the beginning of real structural change in basic decision making, through the development and acceptance of the Sounding Board.

The Training Team functioned almost exclusively on its own, i.e., independent of the PC. Observation of the Training Team facilitator in component groups indicated growing skill on the part of Training Team members. (For a more specific comparison of facilitator behaviors and participant responses in component group meetings during the March 7th workshop and this May 15th workshop, see Appendix C.) DCAC staff acceptance and positive response to the Training Team was indicated by the
verbal encouragement and thanks expressed to Training Team members. The consultants felt pleased that the data generated by the workshop was being utilized by staff in true action-research manner, and that, indeed, the PC and SC were now definitely in the background.

The PC and SC were aware, however, that not all evidence pointed to positive change. Although component groups were now working together more effectively, there was only limited indication of any progress toward inter-component collaboration.

**Major Intervention: Programmatic Training Conference (MI-2b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>May 27, 1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANTS:</td>
<td>Training Team and Program Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOALS:</td>
<td>Development of Diagnostic and Planning Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
<td>SHDC Training Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting began with a report by the Training Director that the Health Start project had just received word that the project would not be refunded. This meant that the Health Start Director (who was in attendance at this session) would probably no longer be employed by DCAC.

The PC outlined a tentative agenda and received minimal response and no changes. The agenda included: (1) diagnostic skills; (2) how to translate diagnosis into training needs; (3) how to plan for components; and (4) how to evaluate.

The PC used newsprint notes and verbal commentary to present a Diagnostic Inventory (Havelock, 1971). Questions included in that inventory are listed below.

1. What are the systems goals?

2. Is the structure adequate for achieving those goals?
3. Is there open communication throughout the system?

4. Does the system have capacities for working toward stated goals?

5. Does the system reward members for working toward stated goals?

Following the PC's presentation, participants discussed the relationship of that inventory to DCAC. There was a great deal of discussion regarding the rewards system at DCAC. For example, a reward for attending training sessions seemed to be that one did not get fired. Staff began to question whether negative rewards really work. The PC commented and referred the participants to the concepts of Theory X and Theory Y. The next step in this session was for Program Directors to carry out a Diagnostic Inventory for their own component. Individuals worked alone, using component outlines of goals and problems (the March Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop) for about 45 minutes.

An open discussion related to the inventories that had just been completed, followed most questions focused on how to involve staff and the concepts around the delegation of authority. The PC gave theoretical input on the concept that increased responsibility and authority for an individual within an organization is a developmental process.

At this point the discussion shifted abruptly to a question of the Health Start Director's about what to do with staff members who are resistant to training. This discussion focused on one individual who presumably had been resistant to training, but had also been retained as a staff member, while at the same time, most other Health Start staff members were being released for lack of funds. The Director of Health
Start also shared some of her self doubts about her competency with the group. She felt the Associate Director did not regard her very highly as an employee. For the first time, in a training session, the program staff began to deal with feelings. The session concluded with the Associate Director and others giving the Health Start Director positive feedback regarding her directorship.

In the afternoon session (which was brief because the morning session ran two hours over lunch time) the program directors expressed some desire to return to work on component diagnostic inventories. However, discussion continued in a general fashion and before participants realized it, the time for the session to end was coming near.

One of the participants suggested that staff share with the consultants the results of the first Programmatic Training Conference. The following information was shared with the consultants.

1. Neighborhood Youth Corps staff had been able to find new office facilities. (During the first Programmatic Training Conference, the NYC component director had realized the importance of moving out of the DCAC main office. He had not been optimistic about the chances of finding new facilities.

2. A secretary who had been the source of many miscommunications within the organization, was no longer with the agency. (Consultants had no information regarding the reasons for that departure.)

3. Program Directors had been meeting regularly at each other's homes. They agreed that those meetings were more relaxed and
that more work was being done. "We're acting like friends," was one director's comment. They had been able to work together more effectively and also had been able to obtain information (previously unavailable) about their component budgets.

This day of work ended with a decision not to deal with the results of the morning Diagnostic Inventory in the short time remaining. The Program Directors agreed that the inventory results could be fruitfully discussed during regular staff meeting time.

**Consultant observations.** The consultants were pleased about the session because of the ability of the program staff to work together, as partly evidenced by the fact they dealt with the feelings and content which grew out of their working relationships.

The session, however, did not focus on the expressed goal of this intervention, which was skill development related to diagnosing agency needs. Both the PC and SC agreed, however, that the course of action chosen by the participants, i.e., the decision to deal with a number of present issues, was a good one.

**Secondary Intervention: Training Team Planning (SI-6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>June 12, 1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANTS:</td>
<td>Training Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOALS:</td>
<td>Learn Lab Design by Planning Training Committee Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
<td>SHDC Training Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All members of the Training Team participated in this planning session for the Training Committee workshop, although two of the members arrived 45 minutes late. There continued to be a delay in beginning the task, i.e., designing a workshop, because Training Team members engaged
in casual conversation for 25-30 minutes. Much of the conversation related to feelings about the recent Board of Directors meeting (May 3, 1972). Training Team members expressed concern about the Board's negative response to training, as indicated by their refusal, thus far, to take part in Board Training. Training Team members feared that the lack of Board support for training would have a negative effect on the possibilities for future staff training.

Finally, the group began work on the morning agenda. They agreed that the agenda had two major parts. First, a look at training designs in general was important, and second, they needed to plan for the afternoon session with the Training Committee. The PC gave a short lecture about training designs and the Training Team participated in relating that information to the task of planning the afternoon session.

After some discussion, the Training Director took over the session. In leading this part of the session, she made use of the PC's input on lab design, and his proposal that the Training Team might want to share roles as needed for the afternoon session. This was agreed to by the Training Team. Even the most reticent member of the Training Team agreed to the idea of each Team member taking a clear role in the afternoon.

The Training Team saw the Training Committee as the key to the possibility of Board Training taking place. Consequently, a major objective of the session was to have the Training Committee know more of the role of training in DCAC, their role in that training, and the advantages of agency and board training. The afternoon was planned as
follows, with each Training Team member taking responsibility for an agenda item.

1:30 Share Goals, find out expectations.

2:00 Role Clarification--What does the Training Committee understand about function of the Training Team? How does that relate to their functioning as a Training Committee?

2:30 Assessment of Present Training Situation at DCAC.

3:30 What can Training Committee and Training Team do in the future to foster training?

4:00 General evaluation.

Consultant observations. Both consultants felt that the Training Team members participation in planning and their awareness of each other as resources (as evidenced by their behaviors in this meeting), suggested their growing ability to work together. PC and SC also noted the team members concern about lack of Board support for training, and the implications for the agency of that lack of support. That concern seemed to be indicative of some increased consciousness of a need for long-range planning within DCAC.

Major Intervention: Training Committee Workshop (MI-4)

DATE: June 12, 1972
PARTICIPANTS: Training Committee
GOALS: Evaluate, and clarify future training needs
LOCATION: SHDC Training Center

In the afternoon session, four of the six Training Committee members arrived for the workshop.

Participation related to the first two items on the agenda, i.e., Goals and Role Clarification, was limited with facilitators doing most
of the talking. There was some clarification regarding a distinction between Training Committee, a policy making group and Training Team, an implementation group. As a result of further discussion and the realization that Training Team members have major full-time duties within the agency, a recommendation was made to expand the Training Team to 12 members. It was hoped that the increase in Training Team membership would spread the availability of skills and resources and also respond to the present Training Team concern that there was too much for them to do in heading all training efforts as well as doing their full-time jobs.

An assessment of the present training situation dealt with how to get more money for training. The Associate Director talked about future training needs and his present writing of a Training and Technical Assistance Grant proposal. At the request of workshop participants he gave assurances that a needs assessment would be requested from program staff, and used in developing that proposal.

Following a brief discussion about what the Training Committee could do to foster training, the committee members recommended that training be looked upon as a year-round effort and not as a single, discrete event. There was general agreement that the first group to be included in any expansion of training should be teachers and teacher aides.

Evaluation was brief but a feeling of high enthusiasm prevailed. Training Committee members expressed the view that the afternoon was profitable, due to the clarification of function and roles and the potentiality that the Training Team would be expanded.

**Consultant observations.** The PC and SC did not view this intervention as a formal training session. However, it appeared that some
important steps had been taken regarding the place of training in DCAC and the responsible role the Training Committee would play.

**Community Organizer's Training - An Additional Intervention**

Although not included in the original design of this study, SHDC also conducted a series of Community Organizer's training sessions for DCAC. These sessions were originally planned as a more traditional, classroom-type course. The course was to deal with interviewing skills, listening skills, agenda development, needs assessment for community workers, and community organization skill development. The PC and SC did not have a major role in this intervention, nor were plans made to observe this course. The SHDC staff member responsible for teaching these sessions did not use a traditional approach and, in fact, used a style similar to the PC's. For this reason, persons from DCAC who participated in the course (nine in number) did not make any distinction between this course and the four major training interventions. Thus, many saw this experience as part of the total intervention. Because no systematic observations of this course were made, it has not been included in the case presentation.

This course appeared to be of value to DCAC, because it tended to model in depth the values exhibited by the PC. For example, it dealt with community organization as a process, and contrasted that process with establishment organization. The former places emphasis on persons identifying their own needs and participating directly in decision making, while the latter tells the community what its needs are, and makes the decisions for the community about how to meet those needs.
The influence of these sessions on DCAC's modes of operation cannot be measured, but it is assumed that the Community Organizer's course was an important factor (variable) which this study can only surmise had some influence on the data collected.

IV. FOLLOW UP

Secondary Intervention: Evaluation of Training (SI-7)

DATE: July 20, 1972
PARTICIPANTS: Training Team
GOALS: Design of Final Agency Evaluation and Feedback PC
LOCATION: DCAC offices

On July 20th, the PC and SC met with three of the Training Team members (others were unable to attend because of their need to attend an out-of-state meeting). The purpose of this meeting was to devise a means of evaluating the training that had taken place during the contract period, collect data for future training, and to provide feedback to the PC regarding his consulting style.

In advance of the meeting, the Training Director had prepared a draft of an evaluation interview. Before development of interview questions was undertaken, the SC gave input on evaluation and the advantages of an interview for the type of training program which had recently been completed.

Plans for interviewing were made by the Training Team, taking into account their time schedule, time needed for each interview, and availability of staff members at that time of year (mid-July). A decision was made by the group to have each of the three persons on the Training Team interview five persons plus themselves, for a total of 18 interviews.
The Training Team decided to try to make the population as representative as possible of each component, and levels of staff within each component. The Training Team, along with the SC, then worked from the Training Director's draft interview schedule, to develop a final form. After extensive work on developing questions, the interview schedule was completed (Appendix D). At their own initiation, the training members then spent about 45 minutes role playing and working on their interviewing skills.

As an additional part of the evaluation process, Training Team members were asked to participate in a feedback session related to the PC's consulting style. In order for that feedback to be systematic, the three Training Team members were asked to complete a short data sheet which contained questions relating to the PC's consulting style and to the Training Team development. These forms were completed. For purposes of maintaining the informal, personal style the PC had attempted to model, the SC and PC used the data sheet responses as a takeoff point for a group interview and discussion. From the data sheets and verbal responses, the view of the Training Team was that the PC's style was supportive, encouraging, and showed that he respected their ideas. Training Team members felt a need for additional skills, particularly skills related to design of training. They also felt confident and increasingly aware of their abilities as "trainers." (A more detailed report and comments, regarding this phase of evaluation, are reported in a second study, i.e., Harris, 1972.)

Consultants observations. The consultants felt this session was an important part of the Training Team development. Training Team members
had been involved in the evaluation of the Training Program, as well as in the planning and implementation phases of that program. This workshop had also contributed to their skill repertoire, i.e., adding to their interviewing and evaluation skills. Both consultants had been pleased to see the Training Team members assume major responsibility for all aspects of this session.

Four days later, the evaluation interviews had been completed. A summary of those interview results follows. Staff felt that the Training Program had helped them to solve work-related problems and had increased their awareness and communications with other programs. All but three of those interviewed expressed strong positive feelings about their experiences in the Training Program and about training in general (of the remaining 3 responses, one was negative and 2 did not give a direct response to the question). Staff attributed their positive changes in attitudes about training to seeing themselves as more effective, and having found new ways of accomplishing work tasks. (Complete responses to interview questions are reported in Appendix D.)

Planning for Additional Follow-up

Training Team members, DCAC staff and consultants were in agreement that additional training interventions could be fruitfully made in the future. Plans to continue OD activities were being made as this study was being completed. In order to assure that additional training would take place, the Training Director was working with DCAC staff and SHDC consultants to develop a new Training and Technical Assistance Grant proposal. That proposal is planned to include: additional training for
an expanded (12 member) Training Team; training interventions aimed at increasing inter-program contact within DCAC; and training for teachers and teacher aides within Head Start and Day Care programs. In addition, work continued to involve the Board of Directors more closely with DCAC on-going activities.
Chapter IV presented a case study of an organization development program, as that program took place within DCAC, a community action agency. This OD effort took place over a five month period and involved all organizational levels in at least one major intervention of the Training Program. The consultants, who were responsible for the OD effort, worked closely with a team of DCAC staff members to plan, implement and evaluate all aspects of the Training program.

Organizational changes, as reported in the case study, included: (1) changes in organizational structures which opened communications channels and allowed for increased staff influence in decision making and greater use of human resources within the organization, e.g., creation of an employee association (the Sounding Board) and change in Program Director meetings (meeting without the Executive Director) which allowed those staff members to assume additional responsibility for their programs; (2) an increase in problem-solving capabilities within component groups; and (3) greater participation of component staff in the ongoing work of components. In addition, changes within the organization have carried over into DCAC's relationships with its clientele. Staff reported their increased effectiveness in involving clients in planning, implementation and evaluation of services provided by DCAC (a major agency goal).

A follow-up interview, conducted two months after the final day of agency-wide training, found that agency staff reported that as a result
of the training program they had found several new ways of doing work related tasks. Among changes they saw in ways they were carrying out work related tasks were: making use of the concept of meaningful work, i.e., involving people in all aspects of work—planning, implementation and evaluation; program director's assuming additional responsibility for their programs; using force-field analysis as a problem solving skill and people working together to solve problems. Most agency staff interviewed felt their effectiveness in their jobs had increased. Staff also noted improved communication within the agency and within component groups, and more realistic goals set within the agency.

Although full assessment of the impact of the organizational training program will not be available for 2-3 years (length of time usually needed for a complete OD program), changes have continued. Structural changes, i.e., changes in the way work is done, have been "built in" and should help maintain the other changes within the agency.

What can be learned from the experiences of this OD effort? How did the changes come about? Schein (1961), has developed a model, based on Lewin's work, which attempts to describe the change process. He suggests that there are three stages which need to take place for change to be effective, and that there are certain general conditions which help to bring about and to support change. This case study of an OD effort has been examined in relation to Schein's process model. From that, the investigator identified aspects of the training program which seemed significant in bringing about changes within the agency studied.

I. THE PROCESS OF CHANGE
Schein's model, of the influence process, sees that process as one which includes three phases: unfreezing, changing, and refreezing. In looking at the change process within DCAC, each of Schein's phases was described more fully and then discussed in relation to events during the organizational training program. The specific component of the Training Program, which was analysed, is the Orientation and Goal Setting intervention. The change referred to in the following analysis is the change in staff modes of working. That is, the change from asking Central Staff to change, to component groups undertaking their own problem-solving activity.

Unfreezing

1. Unfreezing; an alteration of the forces acting on the individual, such that his stable equilibrium is disturbed sufficiently to motivate him and to make him ready to change; this can be accomplished either by increasing the pressure to change or by reducing some of the threats or resistances to change p. 106.

Schein's model is based on an initial premise that change does not occur unless the individual is motivated and ready to change. That is, the individual must perceive some need for change, must be able to change and must perceive the influencing agent as one who can facilitate such change in a direction acceptable to the individual. The model also proposes that all unfreezing situations have four common elements: (1) the physical removal of participants from accustomed routines; (2) the undermining of social supports; (3) a demeaning or frustrating experience; (4) a consistent linking of reward with willingness to change and punishment with unwillingness to change.
Initially, DCAC staff were aware that things were not going well within their components or within the agency. Blame for that state of affairs was generally assigned to, "central staff not getting things we need, and insufficient time and transportation to carry out work tasks." Staff appeared not to consider that they personally might need to change. The day-to-day work situation, as described by staff, was fast moving and tended to be crisis oriented.

The first training session involved all DCAC staff in two days of meetings. The agenda for the first day called for: a general session to introduce program directors and program goals (as determined by federal guidelines); meetings with component groups in which staff were asked to list all their goals for their component; list all problems—things which blocked them from reaching those goals; sort out, by information being made available, which of those problems were not real problems; and meet in a general session to present component goals and problems.

The second day of training included: meeting in a large group to assign a rank order (most important to least important) to agency problems; DCAC Training Team member presenting problem solving technique, i.e., Force Field Analysis for component groups; staff selecting a problem and practice problem solving; and component staff reporting back to large group results of their problem solving activity.

Consultant observations, at the end of the two days, noted an increase in staff optimism and a feeling that something had been accomplished, i.e., that some positive steps had been taken. At the end of the two day training session, staff seemed ready to change and with the creation of
the Sounding Board staff reported that they had begun to feel that change was possible. Unfreezing had begun. Change was also underway. The "change" was that component staff had done problem-solving and taken a role in implementing action steps in the problem's solution.

The four common elements of Schein's unfreezing step seemed to be a part of the unfreezing process at DCAC. (1) The meetings took place in a large church building in Dumont. Presumably it was helpful for staff to be away from work sites. (2) Undermining of social supports—this may have happened to some degree by the inclusion of all agency staff in the training, so that to some extent, staff were meeting with a new group. Much of the training took place in component groups, but component staff had had little previous contact with each other due to centers being in two or three different geographical locations. (3) A demeaning or frustrating experience—listing of component problems. Staff listed numerous problems and were initially overwhelmed and frustrated by the number of unsolved problems. (4) The presentation of a problem solving technique, Force Field Analysis, followed by an opportunity to practice that technique seems to have been an important element. In order to be motivated and ready to change, the individual needs to feel he is able to change, and see the "influencing agent" as one who can facilitate change in a direction acceptable to the individual. The experiences with problem-solving seemed helpful in motivating staff to change and in assuring them they were able to change.

Elements of the two day workshop seemed to both increase the pressures to change and reduce the threat of changing. The latter part of that
statement needs some further consideration. If we assume that much of
the threat element of change is related to fears about not being able to
change, then the simple problem solving technique and success with that
technique may have reduced some of the threat of changing. Working in
component groups, also meant that individuals were not asked to change
alone. The fourth common element in unfreezing, i.e., reward and punish-
ment was present, also. The reward for changing was built into the
change. That is, the problem-solving activity included its own reward.
Staff in the past, had not undertaken problem-solving activity. During
the training session, they experimented with problem-solving. Built into
that activity was a final step which assured that someone would take
responsibility for implementing the change. Thus staff were able to see
concrete action, e.g., creation of the Sounding Board and thus able to
get something they wanted from the change.

Changing

2. Changing: the presentation of a direction of
change and the actual process of learning new at-
titudes. This process occurs basically by one of
two mechanisms: (a) identification— the person
learns new attitudes by identifying with and em-
ulating some other person who holds those attitudes;
or (b) internalization— the person learns new
attitudes by being placed in a situation where new
attitudes are demanded of him as a way of solving
problems which confront him and which he cannot
avoid; he discovers the new attitudes essentially
for himself, though the situation may guide him
or make it probable that he will discover only
those attitudes which the influencing agent wishes
him to discover (Schein, 1961, p. 106).

Much of the initial part of this step occurred on some level, as
a part of the unfreezing process. Problem solving was presented both as
a skill and as a process. In practicing that skill and experiencing that process, staff were able to practice new behavior and with that, they experienced some beginning attitude change. The "attitude change" was related to: seeing that other components had problems also—which suggested "We're not so bad"; and a proposal of tangible, realizable change. As staff were able to see positive changes take place, they were able to see themselves as increasingly effective or capable.

The two change mechanisms, referred to by Schein, i.e., identification and internalization, were both a part of the change process at DCAC. Schein also suggests that both mechanisms are greatly facilitated if the environment is saturated with the new message or attitude to be learned. The major components of the Training Program were listing problems and learning how to solve them. In a way that was "saturation," i.e., there was nothing else on the agenda, to be done during those two days. Then, when staff left the workshop, the problem lists were lists of things they needed to contend with daily. Acceptance of the changes was probably facilitated by the presence of DCAC staff as trainers, thus making it easier for other DCAC staff to identify with the influencing agent. Internalization occurred as staff experienced a situation where new attitudes were "demanded" of them, i.e., staff were urged to assume that problem solving is possible and that no change will occur unless you are willing to take action. Schein says that internalization is more likely to occur if the direction of change is left to the individual. That occurred in this situation. That is, staff were not forced to change, i.e., could choose another direction—not to change.
Refreezing

3. Refreezing: the integration of the changed attitudes into the rest of the personality and/or into ongoing significant emotional relationships (Schein, 1961, p.106).

The refreezing step took place over a two-month period, i.e., the time between the first and last days of agency-wide training sessions. The final day of training in which staff shared information and experiences of problems solved and problem-solving can be seen as the integration of the changed attitudes and behaviors into the work situation. The reports of successful problem-solving suggest that the more effective of two change mechanisms, i.e., internalization, had been the primary mechanism in the changes which took place. While staff may have identified with Training Team members, those same Training Team members were not present in their component group's (group they had worked with during the training session) back-home work situation. Yet, problem-solving continued to occur. The presence of agency staff as trainers may have made it easier for staff to accept or to consider the proposed direction of change as an attractive one.

In the initial problem-solving experience (during training), staff worked with members of their local center and also with unknown staff from the same program but from other geographical locations. That combination of "new group"/"old group" seemed to help with the unfreezing process. It also helped to assure that refreezing would take place. Schein emphasizes the importance of social support, if behavioral or attitudinal changes are to be maintained. Changes which occur during a
training program are unlikely to continue if no support is available for those changes back-home. DCAC staff returned to work with people who had shared the training experience. Therefore support and encouragement for continued change was available after the training sessions. In addition, the training experience directly related to actual back-home work problems. Thus the transfer of learning from the training program to the work setting was facilitated and the new modes of operating were more readily integrated into daily activities.

A final element of the Training Program design which facilitated change, was the two-month space between training days. That time period between the two Orientation and Goal Setting Workshops gave time for real change to occur, and for problem solutions to be acted upon. The sharing of successes in problem-solving with all agency staff and within component groups, built in reward for the change. By reporting publicly the results of problem-solving, staff were able to further confirm that changes had occurred. As staff were able to compare a past list of problems with a decreased present list of problems, the changes were dramatically apparent. Also, during this session, staff began to ask staff from other components for assistance. Knowing that someone wants help, i.e., "sees me as a resource," can also be considered as part of the reward for changing.

II. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM

Elements of the Training Program which seemed helpful, according to the analysis of change using Schein's model, included: (1) meetings took place away from the work setting; (2) all staff were included in the
training; (3) training sessions focused on a single major activity; (4) staff were asked, in the opening session, to make a list of all problems, thus presenting themselves with a frustrating experience; (5) a direction for change was made available via the presentation of a problem-solving tool; (6) staff met in "new groups" which included some "old group" members; (7) agency trainers lead training groups; (8) training was directly related to the work situation; and (9) a follow-up session helped to confirm successful change.

With that analysis of one aspect of the Training Program, and a more informal analysis of the case study report, the strengths and weaknesses of the Training Program are reviewed below.

Strengths

1. **Total agency staff participation in training.** Unlike most training programs, this program involved all staff simultaneously. Thus the risk of creating an "in group"/"out group" situation, and consequent resistance to change, was not present. The inclusion of all staff in training sessions also meant that encouragement and support for change were available in the back-home situation.

2. **Meeting in component groups.** These meetings gave staff an opportunity to become more familiar with resources within their own components. It also meant that the problem-solving activity was more a shared experience, i.e. there was no need to spend time "educating" each other regarding the problem "context."

3. **Agency Training Team.** This was probably the greatest strength of the Training Program. Outside consultants and agency staff were able to effectively use the skills and outside perspective of the consultants and
the agency experience of the staff to jointly plan the training. The presence of agency staff as trainers seemed to help decrease the resistance to training which had been anticipated. The Training Team has been enlarged and made a permanent committee within DCAC. That team of inside consultants can be instrumental in future OD efforts.

4. Presentation of problem-solving as a skill and process. Staff were required to attend training and were initially resistant to training. Designing the initial training experience so that it utilized a structured activity was probably helpful in decreasing resistance to training. The problem-solving skill could be learned readily and gave staff an immediate chance to experience some success and see some tangible results of the training. In addition, trainer emphasis on understanding the process of problem-solving meant that learning from the training could be more readily transferred to the work situation.

5. Flexibility of the training design. One place where this flexibility was evidenced was the second Programmatic Training Conference. The design of that workshop called for learning diagnostic and planning skills. The work on skills was put aside as the group dealt with feelings and the miscommunication that had taken place regarding the refunding of Health Start. The Health Start Director's negative feelings and staff's lack of information, i.e., not knowing from the start that the program had been for one year only, could have generated a great deal of negative feeling within the agency and put a damper on the growing optimism.

6. Focus on structural vs. Interpersonal relations changes. Staff
had reported past negative experiences with training. There was also a lot of blaming, i.e., "identifying bad guys who are responsible for the problems." In the short time period allotted for the Training Program, it would have been difficult to overcome the resistance to dealing with interpersonal relationships. Even had the resistance been decreased, it is uncertain whether that change would have had positive, important effects on the functioning of the organization. Staff needs, as they presented them, related to knowing how to get work done more effectively, i.e., learning skills and ways of working together. The problem-solving taught a skill and the structural changes helped staff to get work done more effectively.

7. **Introducing a new concept.** The concept of meaningful work, i.e., the idea that in order for work to have meaning for individuals, those individuals need to be involved in planning, implementation and evaluation of that work, seemed to give the Training Team and some staff a "handle" for the direction that positive changes within the agency might take.

8. **Training session with two-month delayed follow-up.** This aspect of the training design meant that staff had an opportunity to much of their own evaluation of the impact of the training experience.

9. **Training directly related to work.** Training of this sort helped to make the training results transferable to the work situation.

**Weaknesses of the Training Program**

1. **Interpersonal conflicts not directly dealt with.** Conflicts between some DCAC staff were definitely present. Those unresolved conflicts no doubt lessen individual effectiveness. At the end of this Training Program there was some indication that staff were more ready for training
which focuses on interpersonal relationships.

2. **Board training did not take place.** The lack of Board inclusion in the training activities meant there will probably be, and was, less support for the organization development effort to continue.

3. **Selection of Training Team.** All of the Training Team members were also program directors, i.e., there was no representation from other organizational levels. One of the team members was also actively involved in other training related to his new program. Consequently, he was frequently not available for Training Program sessions.

4. **Need for more skill training.** Program Directors indicated they needed to learn skills related to budgeting and program planning. Other staff want interviewing, counseling and group leadership skills.

5. **Low focus on total organization.** Staff are more aware of resources outside of their components and Head Start and Day Care are working together on some levels. However, the effectiveness of the organization could be much improved were there less duplication of services and more resource sharing.

**Summary**

This chapter has reviewed organizational changes which took place as a result of the Training Program. Schein's model (1961), which describes the process of change, was used to identify elements of the Training Program which may have facilitated change taking place. Additional strengths and weaknesses of the Training Program were also identified and discussed.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this research was to present a case study of an organization development intervention in a community action agency setting. Organization development, as defined in this study, "is an educational process by which human resources are continuously identified, allocated and expanded in ways that make those resources more available to the organization, and therefore, improve the organization's problem-solving capabilities (Sherwood, 1971, p. 1)."

A review of related literature suggested the need for case studies of OD interventions, which would describe the processes of change, and thus make additional data available for much needed theory building within the OD field.

The organization in this case study was a community action agency. That agency had grown rapidly within a two year period, and was having difficulty adapting to that change. Specific problems which the OD consultants were asked to respond to included: (1) power limited to the top level of the organization; (2) ineffective use of staff resources for problem-solving; (3) minimal staff participation in agency planning and evaluation activities; and (4) one-way, ineffective communications.

The consultants in this study made use of an action-research model of consulting. That model directs consultants to solicit data from the entire organization, and then to use that data to plan, with system members
for the future of that system. The organizational Training Program, as implemented by SHDC consultants and a team of DCAC staff, was comprised of the following components. The major interventions were: three days of Orientation and Goal Setting Workshops; two days of Programatic Training Conferences; and a half day of training for a DCAC Training Committee. A fourth major intervention, i.e. Training for the Board of Directors, was called for in the initial training contract, but was not feasible within that contract period (Jan. 1972- June, 1972). Secondary interventions were the seven training, planning and evaluation meetings which preceded or followed major interventions.

The Training Program made use of a few simple OD tools, e.g. problem-solving through Force Field Analysis, and practicing effective communication and feedback through role playing. The intervention was directed toward structural changes within the organization, rather than toward changes in norms related to interpersonal relations.

Descriptive and evaluative data regarding the intervention were made available through a variety of data collection procedures. Those procedures were designed to make a wealth of descriptive data available and to assess attitudinal and behavioral changes from the perspective of organizational members and system consultants. Data collection procedures included: process logs maintained by consultants throughout the contract period; consultants records of systematic observations of component group meetings during training sessions; postmeeting reactions; a final staff report of problem-solving activity undertaken during the two month period between the first and last days of agency-wide training; and a follow-up
interview with a sample of DCAC staff who had participated in the Training Program.

Results of the intervention, as reported by participants and observed by consultants, included the following. Structural changes had taken place, e.g. creation of an employee organization, the Sounding Board, which created an opportunity for two-way communication and for increased staff influence on agency decision making. Also, staff had found new ways of carrying out some of their ongoing work tasks. Those new ways of working relied on problem-solving skills and on increased staff participation in all aspects of work. Staff members felt that their personal effectiveness on the job had increased, and that the agency was meeting its goals more successfully. A final significant change within DCAC, was the institutionalization of an agency Training Team, of 12 members. Organizational changes had occurred and been maintained over a two month time period. Organizational staff, and the consultants, agreed that additional training interventions would be helpful were those changes to be maintained.

Schein's model (Schein, 1961) of the influence process, was used to identify significant elements of the Training Program. Elements of that program which seemed to contribute to the organizational changes which took place were: training took place away from the work site; all agency staff were involved in the training activities; agency staff were used as trainers; training was directly related to work problems; and a follow-up session was built into the training design.

II. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Implications for Future Case Studies

The case study presented in Chapter IV included a great deal of descriptive material related to the process of organizational change. With the completion of this case study, a teaching tool has been made available to students of OD. In addition, further analysis of the case study data can be undertaken and perhaps contribute to theory building within the field.

Although the data presented in this study give a relatively comprehensive picture of the OD intervention and process, some of the dynamic, organic quality of the experience has been lost. The investigator attempted to include anecdotal data, as well as observation and interview data. However, in trying to provide data which would allow systematic analysis of the intervention, a wealth of anecdotal data has been omitted. An example of such data follows. During the first day of training, Linda, the Head Start/Day Care Director, announced that she was attending the training session only because it was mandatory. She saw no value to the training and would have much preferred to have been in her office getting some real work done. On the second day of training, Linda had a difficult time deciding which of her two programs to meet with. She decided to spend most of her time meeting with the Day Care staff, but interrupted the Head Start staff twice in her enthusiasm about what she saw taking place. Linda felt that a number of important problems were being realistically dealt with and that staff were working together very effectively. The consultants were later told that the Day Care staff, at Linda's initiation, had made use of a Training Program tool, i.e., Force Field Analysis, to help them make an important decision. The final contact the consultants had with Linda
was at the annual Board of Directors meeting. At that meeting, Linda intervened in the midst of a heated discussion, to recommend that additional training activities take place. She felt strongly that training had contributed greatly to increased staff effectiveness and commitment to agency work. Linda's positive experience with OD, and her consequent attitude change was certainly a part of the positive changes organizational staff have reported. Any number of incidents of this sort occurred, and were a part of the feedback that the consultants found encouraging. Unfortunately, there seemed to be no way of reporting such incidents in quantifiable fashion, and it seemed unwise to add to the length of the case study by the inclusion of further anecdotal material.

Recommendations. In order to assure that future case studies will be able to provide sufficient data for theory building and analysis of change processes, the following recommendations are made: (1) In future studies, there could be much less concern about the length of the study. A lengthier study, if presented in a systematic fashion, could readily include much of the anecdotal data which has been excluded from this study. A means of sorting out some of the most significant anecdotal data would be helpful. A possible means might be the use of a critical incident questionnaire. The critical incident questions would attempt to collect observed incidents, which had taken place during the OD program and had special significance for participants. (2) An increased amount of observational data might be made available, and add to the objectivity of reported observations, through the use of observers other than the consultants. An outside observer might be introduced into the system, or or-
ganizational staff could be trained as process observers. The latter suggestion would enable staff to learn an additional skill as well as provide data for case analysis. Observational data could also be collected during work activity, in addition to the data collected during the training sessions. (3) Future case studies could take fuller advantage of a joint study arrangement. The case study reported here is one of two studies undertaken of the DCAC Training Program. (Harris, 1972 is the second study.) A more complete picture and analysis of the total intervention process is provided if the research undertaken is not limited to a single study. (4) The reporting of case study data could be facilitated, but should not be limited, by the selection of a basic model for that reporting. Buchanan (1967) has suggested such a model. His model assumes that a consultant needs to ask certain semi-standard questions as he proceeds with an OD program. Those questions include the consultants assessment of organizational capabilities and support for change, and his data which help to focus the intervention activity. Future case studies which respond to those questions as a part of the case report would more readily allow for comparative studies of intervention activity.

Implications for OD Practice

This study would seem to be an important one, as it presents an OD model which focuses on bringing about structural changes, rather than changes in interpersonal relations. The most important need of the organization in this study appeared to be the need to learn ways of accomplishing work related tasks more effectively. The learning of a simple
problem-solving skill had a tremendous impact on organizational effectiveness. Etzioni (1961) has proposed a typology of organizations which can be used to understand why the most important organization needs were related to work competence rather than interpersonal competence. Etzioni describes three types of organizations, according to the rewards the organization makes available for member involvement. The basis of authority, related to those organizational types, ranges from pure coercive, to utilitarian, to normative. Participation within DCAC would seem clearly to have a normative base. Staff of the organization verbalize a semi-moral commitment to organizational goals, i.e., increasing opportunity for low income residents of the county. Staff within such an organization are likely to have strong, value related feelings about their work and consequently to assign strong priority to getting the job done. Therefore, they may be highly resistant to training which does not directly relate to the job, e.g., human relations skill training.

This study also has implications for OD practitioners who continue to involve themselves in a search for a best intervention strategy for each situation. Stuart-Kotze (1972) suggests that consultants ought to select an intervention strategy according to the level of technical skills and interpersonal skills possessed by managers within the organization. The organization in this study definitely fell into the portion of Stuart-Kotze's typology labelled "low technical skills, low interpersonal skills." In intervening in such an organization there seems to be no clear best strategy. However the most likely strategy to be recommended is usually one which aims first to increase interpersonal skills. In this OD inter-
vention, the primary concern was to increase the technical skills of organizational members. As reported in the case study, that choice of a change strategy seems to have been an effective one and merits further consideration as future OD efforts are undertaken.

The comments above suggest an additional question for OD practitioners. Practitioners have frequently advised colleagues not to enter a system where the values of the system do not seem to be in accord with the values of OD. To heed such advice, means to limit OD activity to a few, progressive organizations. Most of the organizations in this country continue to function according to a bureaucratic model. The values of bureaucracy are certainly not those of OD. DCAC staff and SHDC consultants would have disagreed initially on the work-related value of free and open communication. However, the client system and the consultants had other shared values which seemed sufficient for successful intervention activity to have taken place. The client system and consultants were in agreement regarding ends, e.g. doing work effectively, doing it well, but disagreed about the most effective means of realizing such an end. That disagreement did not negate the success of the OD program.

The study also implies that in order for an OD intervention to be successful, the intervention need not have support of upper organizational levels. In this case study, the Executive Director was highly skeptical of training and Board members were actively resistant to being included in training activities. The Executive Director attended some of the training sessions, but spent much of his time during those sessions engaged in other work. In this case it seemed sufficient to keep the
Executive Director informed about some aspects of training activities. The success of those training activities no doubt contributed to the intervention being an effective one without the support of the Executive Director.

A final implication of this study is that OD interventions may be far more available to organizations than they have been in the past. In the past, organizations have needed to make a lengthy time commitment to an OD effort and to have extensive financial resources available for that effort. The model of OD practice presented here did not require that the organization have more than minimal financial resources available. The study also suggests that the organization's relationship with an OD consultant need not be maintained over a period of years. The involvement of an agency training team in all aspects of the intervention means that some OD skills are available within the organization. Additional work with an outside consultant will, no doubt, add greatly to attempts to continue OD activities at DCAC, but there is some hope that that activity may continue even without the help of an outside consultant.

Recommendations. Recommendations for future OD efforts include the following. First, practitioners should be more willing to undertake change efforts in systems where the value orientation of staff does not seem to agree with the humanistic means value orientation of OD. In addition, it seems important to continue exploring possible uses and training of teams of organizational staff members as inside consultants. The perspective of an outside consultant seems of primary importance if change is to take place, but the inside perspective and familiarity with organizational
practice, available only to insiders, seems of equal and complementary importance. A final recommendation is that additional studies of intervention activity which attempts to bring about structural change be undertaken and reported. The experience of OD consultants in this study suggests that intervention activity which focuses on structural change can lead to a later openness to training activity related to increasing interpersonal skills. There is also some support for the idea that increasing technical skills may serve to decrease interpersonal difficulties in work relationships. That idea needs further exploration.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This study of an OD intervention has presented an action-research model for organizational change. As a result of the intervention, structural changes have been implemented and seem to be contributing to the organization being better able to cope with the demands of a rapidly changing environment. OD is indeed able to make good on some of its promise of self-renewal. Hopefully that promise can be more readily available to other organizations as they too attempt to maintain an organizational identity and to grow within a world of constant change.
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APPENDIX A
PROBLEMS (Please note: This is a list of "problems" listed by various components during a "Problem Census"...
In order to get on this list, an issue had to be seen as a problem by only one person, the person naming it as a problem. This may not mean that it is a real problem to the component. This was developed as a work list and not as something to circulate with the idea that this represents the problems facing HCAC. It may, but that is decided in work groups. With this in mind, this kind of list can be most helpful in focusing concern on issues.)

NYC PROBLEMS:

1. Space--centralized location
2. Making people in the community sensitive to the needs of the youth in our program--making job site supervisors sensitive to the needs of enrollees and getting them to meet those needs. (Change of attitudes.)
3. More beneficial job situations
4. (See goals)
5. New employees don't have a designated person to aid in orientation and clarification of all HCAC programs.

A.P.P.

1. Need for more dollars
2. Staff counselors (Meeting clients needs)
3. Clients living quarters
4. Job placement
5. Public relations
6. Clinic for alcoholics
7. Access to Joe Paul., open door policy as promised in last years training session.

NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

1. Transportation--insurance coverage enabling others to drive.
2. Placing people who are "eligible" in fact but not according to guidelines.
3. Space--more slots
4. Communication (P.R.)

COUNCIL ON AGING

1. Transportation
DAYCARE (---* represents agreement as very important.)

1. Facilities*
2. Time---staff---overall planning*
3. Lack of educational specialist and director*
4. Storage
5. Equipment*
6. Food*
7. Wages*
8. Training*
9. Substitutes---back-up staff*
10. Communication---directives
11. Interaction between staff*
12. Volunteer orientation
14. Turnover in children
15. Working parents*
16. Toilet training*
17. Lack of understanding of agency and Daycare program
18. Needs of welfare referrals*
19. Up-grading staff
20. Unity of centers and staff
21. Professional ethics
22. Poor image of Daycare in HCAC
23. HCAC ignorant of Daycare (daily program)
24. Evaluation of staff (two-way)
25. State and local guidelines and requirements*

(More internal problems)

1. Noise level--facilities
2. Outside play area
3. Moving facilities, i.e., furniture; children
4. Lack of equipment
5. Lack of staff time---utilize resources
6. Communication between staff
7. Bathroom facilities
8. Lack of hot water
9. Room dividers
10. Demands from HCAC--center*
11. Back-up for conferences*
12. Advance notice and planning
13. Time for internal training
14. Accept inconvenience---within limits*
15. Budgetary limits*
16. Staff made to feel free to use own judgement
17. Coverage of centers*
18. Lack of time for coffee-tea breaks
19. Breathers
20. More staff and parent meetings in Northhampton*
21. More staff and parent meetings, aides, NYC*
22. Release time*
23. Staff input on decisions of enrollment of child— i.e.,
30 day evaluation— trial period.
24. Parent involvement*
25. Job descriptions*
26. Evaluation*
27. Lack of goals*
28. Confusion of goals
29. Transportation— parent, children, staff*
30. Lack of allowing decision making to staff
31. Public relations— image of program*
32. Problem children*
33. Special needs of children*
34. Available consultants with follow-through
35. Follow-up after Day care

HEAD START
1. Transportation network, a. money, b. lack of parent
owned cars, c. lack of volunteers in community, d. lack of
public transportation, e. lack of staff.
2. Setting up of priorities within classroom— a. too many
responsibilities for teacher, b. lack of time for classroom
responsibilities.
3. Follow-through with parents and children— a. not enough
staff, b. not enough money, c. not enough training, d. not
enough time, e. lack of awareness in community, f. lack of
commitment.
4. Record keeping— a. lack of familiarity with forms
(staff and parents), b. lack of consistency, c. more com-
munication between staff and parents, d. recognition of
importance of record keeping (staff and parents), e. lack
of time (parent coordinator).
5. Training and educational programs for teachers and
especiallyparents, a. time, b. transportation and baby-
sitters lacking for parents, c. commitment, d. lack of re-
sources— locality of centers, e. how to involve curriculum
committee, f. motivation, g. recognizing needs of parents
and knowing how to meet these needs.
6. Really meeting needs (individual) of children, a. time,
b. lack of people, c. budgets, d. outside commitments,
e. lack of complete knowledge of early childhood education,
f. not knowing how to meet needs, g. lack of ed. specialist,
b. lack of resource people, i. helping parents understand
child's needs, j. lack of commitment from agency to child-
ren's needs.
7. Training of staff in evaluation of children, a. time,
b. budget, c. (all of the above)
8. Organized system of recruitment, a. knowledge of the
community, b. time, c. lack of publicity, d. funds, e. lack
of adequate staff, f. stigma attached to H. S., g. area-
geographical, h. lack of knowledge of target area residents
9. Involvement with public schools, a. stigma attached to pre-school programs, b. lack of knowledge about our programs, c. effective public relations, d. communication, e. time
10. Role of parents and volunteers in classroom, a. communication, b. time, c. expectations of volunteers and teachers, d. lack of training for volunteers and parents
11. Learning good health habits, a. definition of responsibility, b. time, c. lack of communication for appropriate dress, d. conflict of values between home and schools and expected behavior
12. Lack of training, teachers, staff, parents
13. Curriculum development, better physical ed., a. lack of knowledge, b. time, c. resources, d. coordination of objectives and total program
14. Bridging gap between home and school
15. Gaining support of community agencies, a. lack of knowledge on part of professional community, b. lack of their time, c. lack of time on part of ourselves, d. need for public relations, maintaining good PR with landlords, (i.e., church)
16. Create a more effective career ladder

CENTRAL STAFF
1. Lack of clear role definitions
2. Inability of Executive Director to delegate authority and responsibility
3. Lack of professional behavior on part of staff
4. Lack of demonstrated administrative ability on part of staff (program directors).
5. Rumors
6. Lack of commitment—Board and staff
7. Reluctance of Board and Staff to accept training
8. Failure to delegate programmatic responsibility to consumers
9. Lack of monitoring and evaluation techniques
10. Lack of communication
11. Morale problem
12. Lack of information
13. Lack of timely submission of reports
14. Role of fiscal officer in agency
15. Inability to cope with agency growth rate
16. Office space
17. Lack of accessibility
18. Executive Director is too accessible
19. Lack of Board code of ethics
20. Lack of adequate community relations
21. Lack of planning and foresight (crisis orientated)
22. Budget limitations
SOME GENERAL (RELATED TO ALL COMPONENTS) PROBLEMS HIGHLIGHTED:

1. Transportation  
2. Money  
3. Space  
4. Public Relations  
5. Staff  
6. Communication Co-ordination  
7. Consumer involvement  
8. Evaluation  
9. Meeting individual needs  
10. Training follow-up  
11. Administrative accessibility  
12. Commitment

SOME RECOMMENDATIONS AS A RESULT OF THE OD SESSION (afternoon of second day):

1. Complete a resource book with contributions from willing programs to include: a.) individual functions and services, b.) outside resources used by each program.
2. Make available the above through a publication to all programs.
3. Schedule monthly staff meetings (all staff).
4. Reinforcement of lines of communication among staff and program directors.
5. Agency Newspaper...more input and description of program goals and problems.

Persons to participate on resource book:
NYC--Fred  
APP--Bill  
Amherst Senior Center--Ethel

Neighborhood services--Janice  
Training information--Rosemary

Other agencies--

Coordination of Day Care and Head Start Staffing selected at OD session: Cindy Henry (Interim coordinator) plus: Jenny, Liz, Mary and Marilyn.

SOUNDING BOARD established to do following: a.) Establishment of Speaker Bureau, b.) Attempt to compile present resource persons and materials, and c.) Future needs.

On Sounding Board:
Vi T.--Neighborhood Center  
Fred Shea--NYC  
Sue F.--H. S.  
Mark F.--Day Care  
Dianne M.--H. S.  
Mary Ellen--Central Staff  
Bob K--A. P. P.  
Bev T.--Health Start  
Paul G.--H. S.  
Marilyn--Day Care
HCAC WORKSHOP EVALUATION (March 7, May 15)

1. Rate the quality of the (two) day training experience:
   Poor                      Excellent
   1  2  3  4  5  6

2. How would you describe the effects of the workshop on you?

3. In thinking about your experience in the workshop, what did you like
   Best?
   Least?

4. If you had been responsible for this workshop, what would you have changed?

5. Do you think that you will find the problem-solving skill of Force
   Field Analysis helpful in your work? (March 7).

   As a result of today's workshop, what have you learned about Organizational development? (May 15)

6. As a result of this workshop, I plan to....

7. Any other comments (positive or negative) you would like to make about this workshop?

March 7-1:00 a.m. Health Start/Head Start; Trainer MS; observation of first 20 minutes of the session

Session began with MS asking people to introduce themselves...introductions began with the Interim Head Start/Day Care Director "growling" her name. (She had not wanted to attend the training, felt that as a member of the Board she should not have to, but the Exec. Director had demanded that she attend.)......MS kiddingly said, "C. seems to be in a bad mood."...Goals for the session were outlined by MS...group members then began listing "Local Component Goals"...(Excerpt from SC Observation Log)

MEETING CLIMATE: semi-formal..."people sitting up and paying attention" awaited for MS to tell them what to do...Tense beginning as C. made her negative comment...MS's response seemed to relax group...smiles for the first time... group participants spread out over 2/3 rds of the room.

MEMBER BEHAVIOR/ PARTICIPATION: two thirds of participants gave some verbal input...other one third appeared attentive, maintained eye contact with MS...most of the talking was done by two group members...other participants responded to MS's encouragement but gave no spontaneous input...Counted 17 independent (own agenda, not directly related to a previous comment) statements...and 4 linking statements (e.g., "Yes, I agree with...").

LEADER/TRAINER BEHAVIOR: MS appeared to be apologetic about the number of questions she was asking...was issuing participants invitations to comment, but being careful not to pressure them...group asked MS what they were supposed to be doing...MS responded, then looked to check out the appropriateness of her response with SC...occurred a few times...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encouraging participation</th>
<th>FREQUENTLY</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for clarification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 15, Health Start/Head Start meeting; MS, Trainer; observation of 1st 20 min.

Noticed that three participants took initiative to place newsprint sheets (lists of problems and goals from March 7,8 meeting) on the wall....MS opened meeting with a question..."What's been happening?".....RESPONSE, "Its not as bad as it was....."....D. talked for a few minutes about what had been happening in her Head Start center....MS extracted from that, "Sounds as if has been happening.".....RESPONSE, "Yes, it is, and that's new for us.".....MS noticed non-verbal response from one participant and asked her what she was thinking....MS observed...."Seems as if people are taking responsibility...."....got immediate agreement...(Excerpt from SC Observation Log)
May 15, Head Start/Health Start cont.

CLIMATE: positive, low key enthusiasm...started with "Things aren't as bad..." and moved to..."Hey, we've really done a lot!"...participants had arranged their own chairs and were sitting close to one another...seating arrangement allowed eye contact with other participants and leader.

MEMBER BEHAVIOR/Participation: meeting characterized by discussion and interaction...sharing of ..."what we have done about that is...."...collaborating on solving problems...members looked to MS for any change in direction of discussion, but also felt comfortable saying they wanted to stay with the topic that was being discussed until it was finished...verbal input from two thirds, non-verbal from one third...about six participants gave equal amount of input....

LEADER/TRAINER BEHAVIOR: was aware of MS's low awareness of the presence of an observer (the SC)...eye contact at one point=MS smiled and winked...MS had high awareness of total group, e.g., would notice head nods and use that observation to invite input...was very aware of her group's task, i.e. To look at problems solved and the Processes which had contributed to problem-solving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encouraging participation</th>
<th>FREQUENTLY</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting.................</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying..................</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for clarification..</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking information.......</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing/observations..</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining focus..........</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments- Comparison of March 7th meeting and May 15th meeting:

Differences between the two meetings were apparent. There seemed to be a more positive climate/attitude about the meetings. Group members sat closer together and interacted more frequently with each other in the second meeting. PARTICIPATION: numbers of participants giving input remained about the same, but the quality of inputs changed from "own agenda" inputs to increased collaboration and interaction. Participants during the second meeting waited less for invitations before giving input. LEADER: MS looked less to the SC for input or support during the second meeting. She also seemed comfortable in taking a variety of roles in the group.
March 7; Day Care meeting; DD, Trainer; Observations of last 20 minutes

Noticed group members leaning forward in their seats... lists of about 50 "problems" on newsprint sheets... one participant talked at length, gave a "story" about a problems she wanted put on the list... noticed DD responses were frequent... she supported what had been said and was likely to add to each input... and to ask for other ideas... got some responses... (Excerpt from SC Observation Log).

CLIMATE: positive, i.e. "Problem" statements consistently took the form of "We need more of..." vs. "We don't have..." or "We can't get..." Chairs scattered around the room... seating allowed eye contact with leader only.

MEMBER BEHAVIOR/PARTICIPATION: seven-eight members spoke frequently... input was essentially participant to leader... independent vs. linking statements... frequent head nodding... lengthy "story" inputs.

LEADER/TRAINER BEHAVIORS: Leader was very active... responded directly to almost every statement with "Yes, that's good." or "Yes, that reminds me..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encouraging participation...</th>
<th>FREQUENTLY</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting ..................</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying ...................</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking clarification.......</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking information.........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing ..................</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining focus ..........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 15; Day Care meeting; DD, Trainer; Observation last 20 minutes of p.m.

Meeting began with DD suggesting that participants move their chairs in closer together... she then suggested two options she saw for the p.m. agenda and asked the group to make a choice... 3 members gave input for one of these alternatives and the rest of the group agreed... group began looking at the "problems" list... first comment was about a problem one group member felt nothing could be done about... DD RESPONSE... "Assume that you can do something about it..." Discussion about storage problem in the Day Care center kitchen... someone asked for fuller definition of the problem and the group began problem solving, agreed on an appropriate action and DD asked who was taking responsibility for the action part... (Excerpt from SC Observation Log).

CLIMATE: Members of the group were involved and working hard... some optimism, pushed by DD... moved from negative to positive via successful problem-solving experience within the group, in relation to three major problems... Group began spontaneously to assume something could be done about problems.

MEMBER BEHAVIOR/PARTICIPATION: most members participated, interacted with each other, did not wait for an invitation... participation was shared...
May 15, Day Care meeting cont.

LEADER/TRAINER BEHAVIOR: DD was able to assume a variety of roles...supported, clarified, initiated, etc....became less active as the meeting progressed...helped the group carry through on problem solving each time that activity was undertaken...DD looked to the SC for decision on ending meeting...time was running short...SC encouraged her to make own decision...group agreed to continue another time...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENTLY</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging participation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments- Comparison of March 7th meeting and May 15th meeting:

There were definite differences in the amount and quality of participation, i.e., from a few participants giving much detail about a specific event TO several participants interacting/ problem-solving, using each other as resources....LEADER was still not entirely at ease in the second meeting, but was able to lead the meeting with a great deal of skill....She was able to take various roles in the group according to her sensing of the group's need...also was able to encourage group members to assume some of the roles she had taken early in the May 15 meeting and in the March 7th meeting.
FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION INTERVIEW

The following interview questions are extracted from an original, lengthier interview schedule. Questions not included below were questions that only two or three staff responded to, e.g., questions about Training Committee training or the Programatic Training Conferences.

EVALUATION OF AGENCY TRAINING PROGRAMS

I. As an agency, we've recently completed an agency wide training program. That program had several components. What parts of the program did you participate in?

a. Orientation and Goal Setting 
   March 7th & 8th
b. Training Committee Workshop

c. Program Director Training

d. Community Organizer's Course

Could you tell me what were the results of the training program for you? (Record response verbatim)

(IF NOT INCLUDED IN ABOVE RESPONSE) How do you feel about your experiences in the training program? (RECORD VERBATIM)

II. Now I'd like to ask you some more specific questions. In thinking about your experiences in the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshops, would you say that as a result of that training, you are:

a. More familiar with the resources of other agency components?

   VERY ( ) NOT AT ALL ( )

b. More familiar with people in other programs and what they do?

   VERY ( ) NOT AT ALL ( )

2. As a result of training, has your use of agency resources outside of your component increased? Yes; No

   (If yes) Can you think of an example, some specific time when you've used an agency resource outside of your component? (RECORD)

3. Would you say that as a result of training, you are more aware of a "total picture" of problems and concerns- a. Within DCAC  Yes  No  Some  b. Within your own component?  Yes  No  Somewhat.

4. One final question about the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshops. What happened in those workshops that was... Most helpful for you

   Could you tell me how that was helpful?

   What was least helpful?

   What about that was not helpful?
...Just a few more questions...

1. As a result of this training program, would you say that your feelings about training have become...

   MORE POSITIVE  [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]  NEGATIVE

2. What has happened that has made a difference in your feelings about training? (RECORD)

3. Would you say that the training program has:

   a. Increased your own effectiveness.
   b. Improved communication within DCAC.
   c. Improved communication within your component.
   d. Increased participation within your component.
   e. Helped establish more realistic goals.
   f. Helped people be more willing to take responsibility for getting needed things done.

4. One possible outcome of training is that people find new ways of doing things. In thinking of the way things are done within your component, has the training program been helpful in finding new ways of operating, of getting things done? (RECORD ANY "NEW WAYS" OF DOING..)

5. We're trying now to prepare a proposal for future training, could you make any recommendations for future training? (RECORD)

   What other kinds of things would you like to be able to do better?
SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW DATA

1. WHAT WERE THE RESULTS OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR YOU? 

(*Number in parentheses = number of participants giving that response, Total N's are varied as each response was not limited and in some cases interviewees gave no response)

Agency coordination increased (2); More positive feelings about DCAC (2); More aware of other components (2); More aware of individual training needs and for more training on my job (5); Know others better, improved communication (3); Awareness of other programs (5); Learned skills-ways to solve problems (7)

II. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCES IN THE TRAINING PROGRAM?

15 responses indicated that participants felt "good" about the training experience. Specific reasons attached to that "good" feeling included: good trainers (2); agency togetherness (1); learning experience-skills.

One (1) staff member indicated she was neutral about the experience; another (1) felt badly.."because others had not profited as much." (That response was from one of the 8 participants who had participated and been enthusiastic about the Community Organizer's course.

II. AS A RESULT OF THE ORIENTATION AND GOAL SETTING WORKSHOPS, ARE YOU MORE FAMILIAR WITH RESOURCES OF OTHER COMPONENTS?

Very | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | Not at all

III. MORE FAMILIAR WITH PEOPLE AND TASKS OF OTHER COMPONENTS?

Very | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | Not at all

C. HAS YOUR USE OF RESOURCES OUTSIDE OF YOUR COMPONENT INCREASED?

| Yes | 8 | No | 2 | N.R. | 2 |

III. ARE YOU MORE AWARE OF A "TOTAL PICTURE" AT DCAC?

| Yes | 16 | Somewhat | 2 | No | 1 |

III. WITHIN YOUR COMPONENT?

| Yes | 14 | Somewhat | 1 | No | 2 | No | 1 | No | 1 |

4. WHAT HAPPENED IN ORIENTATION AND GOAL SETTING THAT WAS MOST HELPFUL TO YOU?

Problem-solving, Force Field (7); Planning Sounding Board (1); Overall knowledge of DCAC (4); Communications within component (2); Listening and understanding (2); Encouragement from SHDC (1); Experience as a facilitator (2).

III. HOW WAS THAT HELPFUL TO YOU?

Gave perspective (1); was aware of the comonality of problems(2); Helped unity (1); Helped in analyzing problems (2); Was able to talk about problems (2).
4 b. WHAT WAS LEAST HELPFUL?

Not long enough; gripes; negative attitudes; solutions not realized; large group sessions; non participation by some staff.

HOW WAS THAT NOT HELPFUL?

It made me uneasy; some people were afraid to talk; had input that couldn't be presented; got tired.

GENERAL QUESTIONS- 1. AS A RESULT OF THIS TRAINING PROGRAM WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT TRAINING HAVE BECOME....?

More positive (15) (3) Negative

2. WHAT HAS HAPPENED THAT MADE A DIFFERENCE IN YOUR FEELING ABOUT TRAINING?

Saw some positive things happen; saw some feelings being dealt with; people helped to take responsibility; being involved, listening, seeing the need; I learned; it helped the agency; skills developed; trainees accepted; role playing, tape recorders; gave techniques; meeting with component groups, staff trainers; found out information; way program was organized.

4. WOULD YOU SAY THE TRAINING PROGRAM HAS

a. Increased your own effectiveness .............
   
   YES 16
   NO 1
   SOMEWHA 2

b. Improved DCAC communications.....
   
   YES 11
   NO 2
   SOMEWHA 6

c. Improved communication within your component.........
   
   YES 10
   NO 3
   SOMEWHA 6

d. Increased participation within your component...........
   
   YES 4
   NO 5
   SOMEWHA 7

e. Helped establish more realistic goals.....................
   
   YES 14
   NO 2
   SOMEWHA 3

f. Helped people be more willing to take responsibility........
   
   YES 8
   NO 4
   SOMEWHA 7

5. ANY NEW WAYS OF DOING THINGS?

Meaningful work, involving people in planning, implementation and evaluation; Giving more responsibility to other people; Instituting senior staff meetings, Program Directors with more control; Budgets; using Force Field in work; Trust relationships; More communications; Willingness to work together to solve problems; Sounding Board; Organizing Parent Meetings; Each person plans for Day Care

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE TRAINING.......

Workshop on racism; Awareness/sensitivity training; Total agency; OD; Teacher training; Counseling and interviewing; small groups, communications; Board training; Orientation for all staff.