

Theses and Dissertations

2014

Drum circles as a team-building intervention

Jason J. Stubbers

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Stubbers, Jason J., "Drum circles as a team-building intervention" (2014). *Theses and Dissertations*. 475.
<https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd/475>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Pepperdine Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Pepperdine Digital Commons. For more information, please contact bailey.berry@pepperdine.edu.

DRUM CIRCLES AS A TEAM-BUILDING INTERVENTION

**A Research Project
Presented to the Faculty of
The George L. Graziadio
School of Business and Management
Pepperdine University**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science
in
Organization Development**

**by
Jason J. Stubbers
August 2014**

This research project, completed by

JASON J. STUBBERS

under the guidance of the Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the faculty of The George L. Graziadio School of Business and Management in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT

Date: August 2014

Faculty Committee

Committee Chair, Terri Egan, Ph.D.

Committee Member, Kent Rhodes, Ed.D.

Linda Livingstone, Ph.D., Dean
The George L. Graziadio
School of Business and Management

Abstract

The purpose of conducting this research was to compare the effectiveness of drum circles and appreciative inquiry as team-building interventions. The researcher conducted two team-building interventions in the same organization—one intervention used a drum circle design; the other used an appreciative inquiry design. Both interventions measured the following aspects of team effectiveness: collaboration, trust, authenticity, communication, creativity, commitment, interrelatedness, and recognition. Data was collected from the two teams through pre-, immediate post-, and four-week post-workshop surveys. There were no significant differences in immediate post-workshop perceptions of their teams. The two teams did not differ significantly in their four-week post-workshop perceptions of their teams, contrasted with earlier findings from pre-workshop independent samples findings. Four main conclusions were drawn. First, based on the survey results, it appears that drum circles and appreciative inquiry are equally useful team-building interventions. Second, it can be suggested that appreciative inquiry has an effective use for team building in the areas of communication, trust, teamwork, and strategy. Third, it can be suggested that drum circles have an effective use for team building in the areas of teamwork, communication, and trust. Fourth, both drum circles and appreciative inquiry can be suggested as team-building interventions in the areas of teamwork, communication, and trust.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	iii
List of Tables	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Significance of Study.....	2
Purpose of Research.....	2
Definition of Terms.....	2
Team building	2
Drum circle	3
Appreciative inquiry	3
Study Setting.....	3
Outline of Thesis.....	4
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	5
Team Building.....	5
Definitions of team building	5
Team-building model.....	6
Team effectiveness surveys.....	8
Peer-reviewed studies.....	9
Summary.....	13
Drum Circles	14
Appreciative Inquiry	18
Gaps in Knowledge	24
Summary.....	25

Chapter 3: Research Methodology.....	26
Research Design	28
Participants.....	30
Confidentiality	32
Data Collection	32
Data Analysis	33
Chapter 4: Results.....	34
Quantitative Data Key Findings—Pre- and Immediate Post-Workshop	34
Appreciative inquiry intervention	37
Drum circle intervention	37
Qualitative Data Key Findings—Pre- and Immediate Post-Workshop.....	39
Qualitative Data Key Findings—Four Weeks Post-Workshop.....	48
Quantitative Data Key Findings—Four Weeks Post-Workshop	48
Appreciative inquiry workshop	49
Drum circle workshop	51
Summary.....	54
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	56
Conclusions and Recommendations for Organization Development Practitioners	56
Pre- and immediate post-workshop surveys	56
Four-week post-workshop survey	57
Drum circle workshop	57
Appreciative inquiry workshop	58
Limitations of this Study.....	58
Implications of the Study.....	59
Implications for Practice.....	59

Suggestions for Further Research	60
Summary.....	61
References	62
Appendix A: <i>HealthRHYTHMS</i> Drum Circle Team-Building Workshop Protocol	66
Appendix B: Appreciative Inquiry Vision Board and Possibility Statement Workshop Design	71
Appendix C: Pre-Workshop Team-Building Survey	74
Appendix D: Immediate Post-Team-Building Workshop Survey.....	77
Appendix E: Four-Week Post-Team-Building Workshop Survey.....	80

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics.....	31
Table 2. Mean and Standard Deviation of Questions by Intervention and Timing.....	35
Table 3. Responses Regarding Perceptions of Team Pre- and Immediate Post- Workshop—Appreciative Inquiry.....	38
Table 4. Responses Regarding Perceptions of Team Pre- and Immediate Post- Workshop—Drum Circle.....	39
Table 5. Summary of Key Qualitative Findings—Appreciative Inquiry	40
Table 6. Appreciative Inquiry Theme 1: Open Communication	41
Table 7. Appreciative Inquiry Theme 2: Group versus Individual	41
Table 8. Appreciative Inquiry Theme 3: New Strategy.....	42
Table 9. Summary of Key Qualitative Findings—Drum Circle	42
Table 10. Drum Circle Theme 1: Listening.....	43
Table 11. Drum Circle Theme 2: Sense of Team.....	44
Table 12. Drum Circle Theme 3: Fun	45
Table 13. Drum Circle Theme 4: Creativity.....	46
Table 14. Qualitative Analysis Codes.....	47
Table 15. Mean and Standard Deviation of Questions by Intervention—Four Weeks Post- Workshop	50
Table 16. Responses Regarding Perceptions of Team Four Weeks Post-Workshop— Appreciative Inquiry	52
Table 17. Responses Regarding Perceptions of Team Four Weeks Post-Workshop—Drum Circle	53
Table 18. Key Responses to Questionnaire Immediately Post-Workshop by Intervention.....	54

Chapter 1: Introduction

Several years back, the researcher worked at a cancer institute and collaborated with two social workers, one being an art therapist, to develop a six-week music-for-healing program for the institute's patients, survivors, and caregivers. The music-for-healing program was a success, and from that a community chorus for the cancer institute and its community was founded and directed by the researcher. The researcher's interest in music and its healing qualities coupled with his interest in team effectiveness and his experience of a drum circle led him to this research study topic of drum circles as a team-building intervention.

When organizations are looking at improving efficiency amongst teams, they must first think of each "team as a system" (Pollitt, 2012, p. 27). Team members must both think of their individual roles and recognize how their roles and contributions affect both their individual teams and the company "in order for the system to work" (p. 28).

In the past decade, research studies using recreational music-making, in the form of drum circles, have been conducted in the areas of reducing employee burnout and improving mood states (Bittman, Bruhn, Stevens, Westengard, & Umbach, 2003). Stevens (2012) stated "Bittman developed a friendlier approach to the act of drumming—a protocol later called *HealthRHYTHMS*" (p. 35). Stevens added,

Since Bittman's initial experiment, there have been four additional studies on group drumming, all of which were published in peer-reviewed journals. The *HealthRHYTHMS* group-drumming protocol developed for Bittman's experiment has been shown to reduce employee burnout, decrease anger in adolescents in corrective institutions, improve mood states and participation in seniors and reduce the impact of stress in nursing students in the academic setting. These studies continue to point to the functional use of rhythm across a variety of populations. (p. 36)

Significance of Study

This research study investigated drum circles as a team-building intervention. The researcher conducted two team-building interventions in the same organization—one intervention used a drum circle design; the other used an appreciative inquiry design. The importance of this study was to see if there was a significant difference in the two team-building interventions on the following areas of team effectiveness that were measured in this study: collaboration, trust, authenticity, communication, creativity, commitment, interrelatedness, and recognition. This study is significant because the literature shows that people connect on a much deeper and more universal level through music in general and drumming in particular, thereby impacting lasting learning and individual change in ways that can improve organizational effectiveness.

Purpose of Research

The purpose of conducting this research was to compare the effectiveness of drum circles and appreciative Inquiry as team-building interventions. The goal of this research was to assess the effectiveness of drum circles as a team-building intervention and, to do so, the researcher compared it with another typical team-building intervention—appreciative inquiry.

Definition of Terms

The focus of this research study is in three areas: team building, drum circles, and appreciative inquiry. The following sections contain the working definitions for this study.

Team building. Kriek and Venter (2009) defined team building as the following:

Teambuilding is a specific intervention to address issues relating to the development of the team. Typically, it consists of a one (or more) day programme focused on improvement of interpersonal relations, improved productivity or better alignment with organizational goals. Examples include emphasis on fun and enjoyment (such as

paintball, river rafting), simulation of workplace dynamics (such as ropes courses), assessment (such as personality type or roles assessments) or problem-solving activities (indoor or outdoor experiential games). (p. 113)

Drum circle. Hull (2006), “the father of the modern facilitated drum circle movement in our nation” (p. 13) defined a drum circle as “a fun drum and percussion jam, typically with players of varying musical levels, ages and ethnicities. Most commonly, a drum circle is an entry-level event into the world of recreational musicmaking, as you need no previous musical experience” (p. 24). Hull additionally stated, “in its simplest form, a drum circle is a group of people who use drums and percussion to make in-the-moment music” (p. 23).

Appreciative inquiry. Bascobert Kelm (2005) defined appreciative inquiry as

the co-evolutionary search for the best in people, their organizations, and the relevant work around them. It is a positive, strength-based approach to change. It includes co-creating inspiring images of what we want, and then building on positive aspects to make them happen. It means becoming more aware of our internal and external dialogues and intentionally shifting them to focus on what we want more of. It unleashes the positive potential within people and situations through attention and focus on the positive core. It suggests we build on our strengths, successes, and best practices to achieve our greatest hopes and dreams. (p. 3)

Study Setting

Two teams—the site directors and the legacy site directors from the Boys and Girls Clubs of Long Beach, California—participated in this study. The site directors team consisted of 11 participants, and the legacy site directors team consisted of 13 participants, ranging in age, race, ethnicity, and years with the organization.

The two teams participated in a one-time-only, 90-minute team-building workshop. The site directors were the participants for the drum circle team-building workshop, and the legacy site directors were the participants for the appreciative inquiry team-building workshop. Each

participant completed pre-, immediate post-, and four-week post-team-building workshop surveys.

Outline of Thesis

Chapter 1 provided an introduction to the research study and a description of a few significant drum circle research studies that have been conducted in the past decade. It also discussed the significance and purpose of the research study and provided a brief description of the research setting and the participants involved.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the existing literature in three topics areas: team building, drum circles, and appreciative inquiry. Gaps in knowledge are also presented to show where further research needs to be conducted.

Chapter 3 is an overview of the research methodology. This chapter describes the research design, details the participants and research setting, explains how the human subjects were protected, describes how the data will be collected, and gives an overview of the data analysis.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the study. Three sets of mix-methods quantitative and qualitative data, laid out in tables, are presented. They are pre-workshop, immediate post-workshop, and four-week post-workshop.

Chapter 5 draws conclusions from the study, discusses limitations, makes recommendations, and offers suggestions for further research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of conducting this research was to compare the effectiveness of drum circles and appreciative inquiry as team-building interventions. The goal was to assess the effectiveness of drum circles as a team-building intervention by comparing it with another commonly used team-building intervention: appreciative inquiry.

A review of existing literature which addresses the purpose of this study was conducted. The information developed was then organized into three specific categories as follows: team building, drum circles, and appreciative inquiry. Additionally, gaps in knowledge were identified and are discussed.

Team Building

There is a vast amount of literature written on team building and team effectiveness. The researcher selected professional articles that presented thoughts and definitions of team building; reviewed a team development model; examined team effectiveness surveys; and reviewed five peer-reviewed research studies that focused on perceived success of team building by participants, team building with newly formed teams, team-building activities on group climate and cohesion, effects of team-building interventions, and testing the effectiveness of team-building interventions.

Definitions of team building. Team building is mentioned in a number of peer-reviewed and professional articles. McInnes Miller, Kimball, Korinek, Shumway, and Arredondo's (2003) article cited a definition of team enhancing as "helping teams harness their creative potential by conducting exercises in an effort to create a climate that helps members resolve conflict, create cohesion, identify goals and delineate roles" (p. 37).

Rohlander (1999) stated that “building an exceptional team takes persistence, high energy and deliberate focus on fundamental principles. The results of the team-building process, whether good or bad, can be traced back to the quality of its leadership” (p. 22).

Swanson’s 1997 article entitled “Building a Successful Team Through Collaboration” discussed Senge’s earlier work:

Peter Senge’s precepts suggested that people should put aside their old ways of thinking (mental models), learn to be open with others (personal mastery), understand how their organization really works (systems thinking), form a plan everyone can agree on (shared vision) and then work together to achieve that vision (team learning). (p. 71)

Stapleton’s 1998 article entitled “Team-Building; Making Collaborative Practice Work” used Evan’s 1994 definition of collaboration:

Collaboration is significantly more complex than simply working in close proximity to one another. It implies a bond, a joining together, a union and a degree of caring about one another and the relationship. A collaborative relationship is not merely the sum of its parts, but it is a synergistic alliance that maximizes the contributions of each participant, resulting in action that is greater than the sum of individual works. (p. 12)

Senecal, Loughhead, and Bloom (2008) cited Newman’s 1984 research, calling team-building a method to “promote an increased sense of unity and cohesiveness and enable the team to function together more smoothly and effectively” (p. 187).

Team-building model. There are many team development models to review and choose from; the researcher chose to review Lencioni’s “Five Dysfunctions of a Team.” Lencioni stated that

as difficult as it is to build a cohesive team, it is not complicated. In fact, keeping it simple is critical, whether you run the executive staff at a multi-national company, a small department within a larger organization, or even if you are merely a member of a team that needs improvement. (2002, p. 185)

The model is made of the five following elements: absence of trust, fear of conflict, lack of commitment, avoidance of accountability, and inattention to results.

Absence of trust is the first dysfunction amongst team members. “Essentially, this stems from their unwillingness to be vulnerable within the group” (Lencioni, 2002, p. 188). Fear of conflict is the second dysfunction, and its tone is set due to the team members’ “failure to build trust” (p. 188). “A lack of healthy conflict is a problem because it ensures the third dysfunction of a team: lack of commitment” (pp. 188-189). Without teams having the opportunity to air “their opinions in the course of a passionate and open debate, team members rarely, if ever, buy in and commit to decisions, though they may feign agreement during meetings” (p. 189). Avoidance of accountability is the fourth dysfunction amongst teams. “Without committing to a clear plan of action, even the most focused and driven people often hesitate to call their peers on actions and behaviors that seem counterproductive to the good of the team” (p. 189). Inattention to results is the fifth and final dysfunction amongst teams. The fifth dysfunction “occurs when team members put their individual needs (such as ego, career development, or recognition) or even the needs of their divisions above the collective goals of the team” (p. 189).

Lencioni added that

another way to understand this model is to take the opposite approach—a positive one—and imagine how members of truly cohesive teams behave:

1. They trust one another.
2. They engage in unfiltered conflict around ideas.
3. They commit to decisions and plans of action.
4. They hold one another accountable for delivering against those plans.
5. They focus on the achievement of collective results. (2002, pp. 189-190)

This model is simple, “at least in theory” according to Lencioni; however, in practice, “it is extremely difficult because it requires levels of discipline and persistence that few teams can muster” (2002, p. 190).

Team effectiveness surveys. There are many scholarly surveys one can choose from to assess team effectiveness. The researcher chose to review the following surveys in order to adapt questions for his survey: Tuckman's Group Detector (Tuckman, 2001); the Team Development Survey (Dyer, Dyer, & Dyer, 2007); the Team Maturity Survey (Dyer et al., 2007); and the Team Effectiveness Survey (adapted from Goodstein & Pfeiffer, 1985).

Bonebright's 2009 article, "40 Years of Storming," noted that in 1965 Tuckman created and then in 1977 revised, along with Jensen, the model of small group development known as forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning. "This model has a unique history in that it was initially popular among HDR practitioners and later became common in academic literature as well" (Bonebright, 2009, p. 111). Bonebright further stated that Tuckman's model is the most known and referred-to model in organizational literature. She summarized that there are similar other models that "examine external factors affecting group development, including organizational roles, resource allocation, and pressure from external stakeholders. They do not, however, provide the same breadth of application" (p. 119).

Dyer et al. (2007) stated that "one of the most common approaches to gathering data is to conduct a survey of all team members" (p. 84). In general, there are two types of surveys: "open- and closed-ended surveys" (p. 84). Both the Team Development Survey and the Team Maturity Survey are closed-ended surveys, which "force the person responding to choose a specific response" (p. 84). Dyer et al. further stated that "in addition to following a process for turning an immature group or staff into a competent, mature team, an ongoing team can use an assessment tool to examine its processes to see what level of competence it has achieved" (p. 65). This assessment tool is known as the Team Maturity Survey.

The Team Effectiveness Survey tool was published in *The 1985 Annual: Developing Human Resources* report (Goodstein & Pfeiffer, 1985) and was reviewed as a possible tool to adapt survey questions from for this study.

Peer-reviewed studies. The researcher reviewed the following peer-reviewed studies as they focused on perceived success of team building by participants, team building with newly formed teams, effect of team-building activities on group climate and cohesion, effects of team-building interventions, and testing the effectiveness of team-building interventions.

Kriek and Venter (2009) conducted a study that looked at the perceived success of team-building interventions in South African organizations. They cited earlier research conducted by Boss in 1983 which stated that team building can be defined as “interventions designed to improve . . . effectiveness in working together by confronting and resolving problems” (Kriek & Venter, 2009, p. 113). However, they used the following team-building definition for their study:

Teambuilding is a specific intervention to address issues relating to the development of the team. Typically, it consists of a one (or more) day programme focused on improvement of interpersonal relations, improved productivity or better alignment with organizational goals. Examples include emphasis on fun and enjoyment (such as paintball, river rafting), simulation of workplace dynamics (such as ropes courses), assessment (such as personality type or roles assessments) or problem-solving activities (indoor or outdoor experiential games). (p. 113)

Kriek and Venter (2009) cited earlier research by Kriek which indicated that “organisations utilise a variety of types of teambuilding to facilitate interventions . . . , for a variety of purposes, including improving interpersonal relationships, increasing motivation, aligning with change programme, increasing productivity, finding direction and resolving conflict” (p. 113). The purpose of Kriek and Venter’s study was not to “measure the success of

the interventions” (p. 114), but “focuses on the reactions of participants and reports on the perceived success of teambuilding by participants” (p. 115).

Kriek and Venter (2009) tested 13 hypotheses with a sample of 314 individuals who had participated in team-building exercises. Results pertaining to the first research objective, “perceived success,” (p. 120) reported “that 9.2% of the respondents perceived teambuilding interventions as extremely successful, while 34.3% reported a fairly successful verdict” (p. 120). Results under the second research objective, relationship between respondent characteristics and the perception of team building, reported that out of 13 hypotheses, 3 were accepted and 10 were rejected (p. 120).

Sandor, Copeland, and Robinson’s (1998) case study was conducted on a newly formed interdisciplinary team that had been formed from two units from two separate hospitals and was in need of team building. Their case study used Katzenbach and Smith’s definition of a team: “A team is a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, set of performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable” (1993, p. 112).

Within the Sandor et al. case study, five team-building seminars were developed and took place over a three-month time period. “Each 90-minute seminar was conducted immediately prior to a regularly scheduled staffing meeting so almost all team members could attend” (1998, p. 292). Attendance was not mandatory, but those who attended received educational credit.

Sandor et al. (1998) stated, “The first seminar focused on patterns of communication, territoriality, and the specialty language (i.e., jargon) that might be used with the team”

(p. 292). The focus of the second seminar was nursing rounds. “The third seminar, attendees discussed an overview of family systems based on Minuchin’s (1974) theory of family dynamics, which involves transactional patterns, adaptation, family subsystems, and boundaries” (p. 293). “During the fourth seminar, team members discussed the need for developing behavioral treatment plans to achieve behavioral change” (p. 293). The fifth seminar, which ended the series of team-building seminars, “involved a role-playing exercise” (p. 293).

The study examined the development of the group “in the context of Wheelan’s (1994) five stages of group development” (Sandor et al., 1998, p. 293). Wheelan’s five stages of group development are “dependency and inclusion, counterdependency and fight, trust and structure, work and productivity, and termination” (p. 290). After more than one year, the study showed the newly formed team had “reached Wheelan’s fourth stage of work and productivity” (p. 293). They concluded that “the next step for ensuring the ongoing success of this unit would be to conduct a long-term evaluation of team functioning and then, on the basis of that evaluation, follow up with additional team-building activities” (p. 293). Sandor et al. concluded that “team building is an ongoing and lengthy process. Every time a member leaves or a new member arrives, a team has to make adjustments” (p. 294).

Stroud’s 2006 research “investigated the effects of team-building activities on group climate and cohesion” (abstract). Two groups of participants made up the sample for this study. Participants in the control group were comprised of 11 undergraduate students, and participants for the experimental group were “high school students with disabilities” (p. 23). Both group met for two hours each meeting over the period of five weeks and “participated in team building activities” (p. i).

Engagement, avoidance, and conflict were the subscales that Stroud measured in her study in regard to group climate. The results of Stroud's study "suggest that team-building activities are effective in increasing group climate, cohesion, and development of newly formed groups" (2006, p. i). The results also showed a "significant increase in group engagement, a significant decrease in group conflict, and a significant increase in group cohesion when team-building activities are used" (p. i).

Munns (1995) conducted a research study on the effects of team-building interventions using an experimental design. In her study, she compared "the team process and productivity effects of outdoor experiential and traditional team-building interventions to a control group" (p. ii). Participants for this study consisted of eight teams of 10 to 15 participants each, all of whom volunteered their time. Each team was "randomly assigned to one of three types of treatment: a three-day outdoor experiential team-building intervention, a one-day traditional team-building intervention or no intervention" (p. ii).

Immediate post-workshop and three months post-workshop, each participant completed Campbell and Hallam's Team Development Survey which measured "participants' perception of team process" (Munns, 1995, p. ii), "Anova results indicate that the team-building groups were significantly different in a positive direction compared to the control group on information, leadership, team unity, empowerment, conflict resolution and team assessment" (p. iii). Further results showed that when comparing the group that participated in the traditional team-building intervention to the group that participated in the experiential team-building intervention, there was a significant difference "in a positive direction for team unity, empowerment, and team assessment" (p. iii) for the outdoor experiential group. Additionally,

“the outdoor experiential group scored higher than the traditional group on each of the evaluation scales and reported more positive changes in team behaviors following the intervention when compared to the traditional intervention group” (p. iii) at both the three- and six-month follow-up mark.

Murray (2013) conducted a research study testing the effectiveness of team-building interventions in community group exercise settings. In her study she utilized three categories of a team-building protocol—the group’s environment, the group’s structure, and the group’s processes—and implemented these three categories within community exercise groups. The main purpose of her study “was to determine if the intervention categories differed in terms of developing and/or maintaining cohesion, satisfaction, intention, and adherence. A second purpose was to investigate if perceptions of cohesion predicted satisfaction, intention, and adherence over time” (abstract).

Participants for the study consisted of “166 adult group exercisers drawn from 27 community classes distributed across two clubs” (abstract). Over a period of eight weeks, participants were exposed to condition-specific strategies which were implemented by the fitness instructors teaching the classes. Results of the study “revealed that the four conditions did not differ in terms of cohesion, satisfaction, intention, or adherence. However, when combined, the team building groups had significantly higher attendance rates than the control condition” (abstract).

Summary. In summary, this section of the literature review presented definitions of team building from both peer-reviewed and professional articles. It also included a review of Lencioni’s “Five Dysfunctions of a Team” model as well as notable team effectiveness surveys

from which questions were adapted for the surveys for this research study. All five of the research studies reviewed on team building showed some type of perceived success of the team-building interventions or activities that took place. Out of the five studies reviewed, one (Munns, 1995) compared an experiential team-building activity, as in this current study, to a traditional team-building activity. The immediate post-, three-, and six-month results showed a positive direction in team unity, empowerment, team assessment, and team behaviors. The next section of this literature review presents empirical studies on the effectiveness of drum circles in organizational contexts.

Drum Circles

“There is an enormous amount of anecdotal evidence suggesting that group drumming interventions have many therapeutic benefits” (Snow & D’Amico, 2010, p. 16). There are few empirical studies on the effectiveness of drum circles in organizational contexts, and no studies were located where drum circles were used as the sole team-building intervention or were compared to other typical team-building interventions.

Bittman, a medical doctor, research scientist, chief executive officer of the Yamaha Music & Wellness Institute, and co-author of the *HealthRHYTHMS* protocol, which is used in this study, is the co-author of four research studies using recreational music-making in the form of drum circles. Out of those four research studies conducted by Bittman and his colleagues, who had interest in demonstrating positive results, the researcher chose to review and summarize two studies linked most closely to the topic and purpose of this current research study. Two research studies by Bittman et al. (2003, 2004); one additional peer-reviewed study on drum

circles (Moore & Ryan, 2006); and one website article (Stevens, 2007) were included in this literature review.

The goal in conducting this study was to add new information and results to the small body of knowledge that exists on drum circles and the effectiveness that they have in team building.

Whether drum circles are used to build community, focus on group engagement, heal, or build teams, each experience is centered around the use of rhythm, which Stevens (2012) defines as follows:

Rhythm literally is the pulse, the life force, of music medicine. Rhythm organizes time and sets the beat that allows all other elements of music to coexist. Pulse, durations, and tempo are aspects of rhythm that move music through its dynamics of fast, slow and everything in between. But the best place to discover the artistry of the beat is within the body. Rhythm is all about feeling. (p. 28)

Bittman et al. (2003) conducted a peer-reviewed study which appraised the “clinical and potential economic impact” (p. 4) of using a six-session “Recreational Music-making (RMM) protocol” (p. 4) with an interdisciplinary group of long-term care workers in the areas of burnout, mood dimensions, and Total Mood Disturbance (TMD). The protocol for the study was “based upon Group Empowerment Drumming” (p. 5). Bittman, Stevens, and Bruhn (2006) defined “empowerment drumming as a comprehensive whole-person, evidence-based therapeutic approach based upon an emerging discipline we call rhythmacology” (p. 3). One hundred and twelve staff members participated in the Bittman et al. (2003) study. The six sessions focused on “building support, communication, and interdisciplinary respect utilizing group drumming and key board accompaniment” (p. 4). Between sessions, through homework assignments, participants were encouraged to practice insights from the sessions and look for

opportunities for “growth and team-building.” (p. 12). The Maslach Burnout Inventory and the Profile of Mood States following were used to assess “changes in burnout and mood dimensions” (p. 4). An independent consulting firm calculated the cost savings, and an economic impact model was developed. Significant attrition of “burnout and mood dimensions, as well as TMD scores” (p. 4) were statistically noted. Cost savings were calculated at \$89,100 for a “single typical 100-bed facility” (p. 4). They concluded that a potential \$1.46 billion could be saved industry wide.

Bittman et al. (2004) conducted a similar peer-reviewed study using the same protocol and assessment tools which “examined the impact of 6-session Recreational Music-making (RMM) protocol on burnout and mood dimensions as well as Total Mood Disturbance (TMD) in the first year associate level nursing students” (abstract). Seventy-five students participated in this study. Subjects were divided into Group A or Group B, and “two 6-week interventions (1 session/week) were carried out during the 2003 fall semester” (p. 7). “Statistically significant reductions of multiple burnout and mood dimensions as well as TMD scores were noted” (abstract). The researchers concluded that the calculated “retention improvements” (p. 17) could save the U.S. healthcare industry more than \$1.5 billion.

Moore and Ryan conducted an experiential peer-reviewed study with university management students and published their results in 2006. Drumming circles were introduced to classrooms within the university, representing “an opportunity for innovative teaching that could create positive experiences replete with learning potential” (p. 435). Seventeen university students provided written feedback on the drumming circles experience. Once the feedback was analyzed, evidence suggested that “drumming circles can create a resonant and complex

way of exploring some of the central themes associated with organizational dynamics and teamwork” (pp. 435-436). Furthermore, Moore and Ryan stated that drumming and percussion are gaining momentum as tools in the field of management education and training.

In Iraq, Stevens (2007) conducted a “five-day conflict-resolution and leadership training program using recreational music making in the form of drum circles” (p. 1). The diverse religious and ethnic groups not only bonded, but also experienced and implemented “key leadership skills within the drum circle program to address elements of peace-making, youth empowerment, economic development, alternative health applications and preservation of drumming” (p. 1), which is indigenous to Iraqi culture. Stevens noted that “in the course of the training program, leaders became drummers and drummers became leaders” (p. 1). The results of the five-day conflict-resolution and leadership training program showed a “ninety-two percent satisfaction rate” (p. 2) and “demonstrated an 80% level of connection with their fellow trainees” (p. 2).

In summary, the two Bittman et al. studies (2003, 2004) used recreational music-making in the form of drum circles over a six- week period, using the RMM protocol. Results from both studies showed that drum circles aided in reducing burnout and improving mood states. Moore and Ryan’s 2006 study with university management students concluded that drumming circles can help organizations explore organizational dynamics and teamwork in creative and complex ways. That study also noted that drumming and percussion are gaining momentum as tools in the field of management education and training. The results from Steven’s (2007) five-day conflict-resolution and leadership training program showed a very high satisfaction rate and level of connection with their fellow trainees. In conclusion, all four studies results showed that

recreational music-making in the form of drum circles has a positive impact in organizational contexts.

The next section of this literature review explores literature in the field of appreciative inquiry.

Appreciative Inquiry

In 1987, researchers Cooperrider and Srivastva of Case Western Reserve University claimed that “action research’s transformative potential had been constrained by the pervasive problem-oriented view of organizing. They introduced the idea and the term appreciative inquiry” (Fitzgerald, Murrell, & Miller, 2003, p. 5).

Bascobert Kelm (2005) defined appreciative inquiry as

the co-evolutionary search for the best in people, their organizations, and the relevant work around them. It is a positive, strength-based approach to change. It includes co-creating inspiring images of what we want, and then building on positive aspects to make them happen. It means becoming more aware of our internal and external dialogues and intentionally shifting them to focus on what we want more of. It unleashes the positive potential within people and situations through attention and focus on the positive core. It suggests we build on our strengths, successes, and best practices to achieve our greatest hopes and dreams. (p. 3)

“As a philosophy, AI emphasizes collaboration and participation of all voices in the organization and approaches change as a journey rather than an event” (Martinetz, 2002, p. 34).

“You’ve got to accentuate the positive, Eliminate the negative and Latch on to the affirmative, but Don’t mess with Mr. In-between. No! Don’t mess with Mr. in-between!” (Fitzgerald et al., 2003, p. 5). These words are from Arlen and Mercer’s 1944 hit song “Accentuate the Positive,” and little did they know that this song would “foreshadow the emergence of appreciative inquiry” (Fitzgerald et al., 2003, p. 5).

Fitzgerald et al. further stated “AI [appreciative inquiry] applications range from strategic planning, team building, human resource practice and diversity initiatives to the transformation of global corporate cultures and social change organizations” (2003, p. 5). There are many traditional approaches to change, such as gap analysis, which are rarely questioned. They focus on “identifying and solving core organizational problems and deficits” (p. 5). “In contrast, AI focuses and builds on what’s working when the organization is at its best” (p. 5). The core philosophy of appreciative inquiry focuses on guiding organizations to identify what they do best and create a preferred future based on what they want more of and less of what they do not want.

The five principles of appreciative inquiry “(constructionist, simultaneity, poetic, anticipatory and positive) come to life through the design of the basic AI process” (Fitzgerald et al., 2003, p. 6):

- “*Defining* the focus of the inquiry. Collaboratively defining the topic(s) for an appreciative inquiry is perhaps the most critical phase of the process” (p. 6).
- “*Discovering* people’s experience of their group, organisation or community at its most vital and alive and clarifying what made those experiences possible” (p. 6).
- “*Dreaming* together to envision a future in which those exceptional experiences form the bases for organizing the future” (p. 6).
- “*Designing* appreciative systems and structures to support the manifestation of the co-created dreams” (p. 6).
- “*Delivering* implementation of those systems and structures by organisation members in an ever-expanding positive-feedback loop for appreciative learning” (p. 6).

Whitney and Schau (1998) noted that “companies around the world are engaged in bold experiments with an innovative process of organization development called appreciative inquiry (AI)” (p. 11). “Appreciative inquiry engages the whole organization in discovering the best of what has been and dreaming about the best of what might be” (p. 11). In their article, Whitney and Schau explained “the 4-D model of appreciative inquiry” (p. 12), which is a “process for positive change” (p. 12). The appreciative inquiry process has four distinct phases: discovery, dream, design, and delivery. Whitney and Schau also discussed the “powerful applications of appreciative inquiry” (p. 17):

The applications of AI are varied, ranging from global organizing, corporate culture change, team building, and leadership development to selection interviewing and performance management. Although organizations benefit when using AI as a vehicle for organization change, comments from participants engaged in AI processes frequently revolve around its tremendous personal application and benefits. (p. 17)

Whitney and Schau ended their article by stating “organizations can no longer afford to operate as if the needs of the business and the needs of the people doing business are at odds” (p. 21). “They must seek out innovative processes, such as AI, that collectively and positively involve people in the design of their own future at work” (p. 21).

Two peer-reviewed studies were found to have a direct link to the topic of this study and are included in this literature review. The first study (Head, 1999) was specifically about using appreciative inquiry with newly formed teams. The second study (Lewis, Passmore, & Cantore, 2008) used appreciative inquiry in the development of a sales team. An additional peer-reviewed appreciative inquiry study (Bechtold, 2011) was examined by the researcher, showed links, and is included in this literature review.

In his dissertation titled *Appreciative Inquiry as a Team-Development Intervention for Newly Formed Heterogeneous Groups*, Head (1999) stated that “creating a positive image of the future allows newly formed heterogeneous groups to develop faster and perform at higher levels than heterogeneous groups that develop in a traditional manner” (p. iii). He conducted his research to “validate the effectiveness of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) versus traditional or no structured intervention” (p. iii).

Head conducted his study through the United States Postal Service in Milwaukee with “eighteen groups of managers and supervisors, with a total of 124 participants” (p. iii). The participants were divided into three groups, one group per intervention “(AI, team-building, and control) and measured on the basis of development (using the Group Style Instrument, a daily diary, and a single-point questionnaire) and performance (using a group output questionnaire and a daily diary)” (p. iii).

Results of Head’s study “suggest that groups receiving appreciative inquiry develop more team-oriented behaviors, perform at a higher level, and have more positive images of future interactions than groups experiencing either team-building or no structured intervention” (p. iii). Furthermore, the results of Head’s study will aid organizations and their teams to “complete tasks at an increasing rate of speed” (p. iv) and to help increase “performance of organizations that are experiencing an increasing level of diversity” (p. iv).

Lewis et al. (2008) discussed the use of AI in the development of a sales team. The team “was one of four area sales teams that covered the UK for Marley Plumbing and Drainage, part of Aliaxis Group” (p. 177). The area sales manager approached the director of human resources in regard to holding a team day. “He wanted to help his sales team change their behavior from

their individual, self-contained my patch sales orientation to a greater team orientation in their selling behavior” (p. 177). The human resources department built a day that “called on a number of essentially constructionist and positive methodologies to meet the needs of the action-oriented pragmatic group” (pp. 177-178).

Although there was initial skepticism in regard to the “value of time away from the road from some experienced salesmen, all participants rated the day as being very productive, fun and useful” (p. 179). The area sales manager reported after six months “that more cross-boundary co-operative behavior was happening in the team. In the period since the meeting we’ve been much stronger as a team. We’re now looking out for each other and taking a wider view of the opportunities we have as a region, as well as individually” (p. 179). The article also noted that shortly after the initial team day, another sales team requested the same event and appreciative inquiry intervention.

In Bechtold’s (2011) study he discussed a case that used appreciative inquiry to improve worker morale at a large oil refinery in the Middle East. A group of young engineers, known as the Red Team, were tasked by the general manager to “re-image the organization” (p. 27). The general manager explained that “he wanted the refinery to be the best place in the company to work, and said that he would measure success by the level of happiness of the 1,600 workers, believing that this would lead to a safer, more productive worker force” (p. 27).

The group of engineers decided to use the “AI approach to solicit input on the inherent strengths and possibilities for the future from the employees themselves, and in so doing, generate the necessary commitment to future changes” (Bechtold, 2011, p. 27). The Red Team developed a strategy on two concepts. First, they needed a simple theme where people could

“connect emotionally” (p. 28). Second, they needed a plan “for improving morale, motivation, and happiness that would gain immediate support and momentum” (p. 28). The team had a series of appreciative inquiry workshops that included “100 employees from each of the refinery work units and organizational levels” (p. 28).

As a result of the appreciative inquiry workshops, “employees are experiencing a stronger sense of belonging and commitment to a better future for the refinery” (Bechtold, 2011, p. 28). One of the best benefits “of the AI approach is the goodwill and commitment that results from the positive affirmation of what gives life to an organization. This attitude continues to spread throughout the organization, as the AI approach becomes further embedded” (p. 28).

In summary, the three studies reported that appreciative inquiry had a positive impact on the newly formed team, the development of a sales team, and the improvement of worker morale. The results of Head’s (1999) study suggested that those teams that participated in an appreciative inquiry workshop promoted healthier team behaviors, had an elevated level of team performance, and created more images of a positive future versus teams with no structured intervention. The results of Lewis et al.’s (2008) study stated that all team members who participated in the appreciative inquiry workshop rated the day as being very positive in nature and that skills learned will be very helpful. After six months, the area sales manager reported that an increased level of cooperation was occurring amongst team members and that the team was much stronger as a group. He also reported that team is now looking out both for each other as well as themselves. The results of Bechtold’s (2011) study stated that as a result

of the appreciative inquiry workshops, staff members feel an increased level of belonging to the refinery as well as a stronger commitment to create a better future for the refinery.

The next section of this literature review explores the gaps in knowledge.

Gaps in Knowledge

This chapter reviewed the literature on team building and, more specifically, drum circles and appreciative inquiry as team-building interventions.

There are few empirical studies on the impact of drum circles in organizational contexts. Snow and D'Amico (2010) have suggested that drum circles have many therapeutic effects, and Bittman et al. (2004) stated that drum circles have aided in reducing burnout and improving mood states. Further research studies need to be conducted on the impact of drum circles on team effectiveness.

Research suggests "that groups receiving appreciative inquiry develop more team-oriented behaviors, perform at a higher level, and have more positive images of future interactions than groups experiencing either team-building or no structured intervention" (Head, 1999, p. iii). From the researcher's point of view, more empirical research on the impact of appreciative inquiry as a team-building intervention would be useful.

The research on team building and team effectiveness showed some type of link to the following aspects of team effectiveness measured in this current study: collaboration, trust, authenticity, communication, creativity, commitment, and interrelatedness. However, the team-building research reviewed for this study did not show a link to recognition, which was one of the eight aspects of team effectiveness measured in this study. The researcher recommends that further research be conducted on team building and recognition as a

measurable aspect of team building and team effectiveness, as this aspect of team effectiveness was adapted for this study from the Team Maturity Survey (Dyer et al., 2007).

Summary

The number of empirical research studies on the impact of drum circles and appreciative inquiry as team-building interventions with newly formed teams in organizational contexts remains small. No studies were located where drum circles were used as the sole team-building intervention or were compared to other typical team-building interventions. One study was located where appreciative inquiry was used as the sole team-building intervention with a newly formed team, and an additional study was located where appreciative inquiry was compared to a typical team-building intervention.

The amount of literature written on team building and team effectiveness is vast, and the researcher selected professional articles that presented thoughts and definitions of team building to give a widespread view of how team building has been **seen** in the workplace over the past several years. Lencioni's (2002) team development model and five peer-reviewed research studies that focused on perceived success of team building by participants, team building with newly formed teams, team-building activities on group climate and cohesion, effects of team-building interventions, and testing the effectiveness of team-building interventions were reviewed.

The literature review highlighted the gaps in knowledge that exist in the writings on drum circles and appreciative Inquiry as team-building interventions. This review also explored the gaps in knowledge that exist in the literature on team building and team effectiveness.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

The following sections discuss the research design, participants, confidentiality, data collection, and data analysis procedures. The researcher conducted a study with two teams from the Boys and Girls Clubs of Long Beach, California using two team-building interventions—drum circles and appreciative inquiry. This chapter captures the essence of the design of the two team-building interventions.

The purpose of conducting this research was to compare the effectiveness of drum circles and appreciative inquiry as team-building interventions. The goal of this research was to assess the effectiveness of drum circles as a team-building invention and, to do so, the researcher compared it with another typical team-building intervention—appreciative inquiry.

IBM SPSS Statistics was the software used for all quantitative analysis. For the purpose of data analysis, the order of the Likert scale was reversed so that Strongly Disagree is at the low end (value = 0) and Strongly Agree is at the high end (value = 4). A statistical level of significance of 95% was used with an alpha of .05.

For comparing means across intervention groups before and after the intervention, the Independent-measures *t*-test was used. The independent *t*-test compares two means, specifically when those means have come from two separate groups (in this case, the team that participated in the drum circle and the team that participated in appreciative inquiry), and calculates whether there is a statistically significant difference in means between the two groups (in this case, either pre-workshop means by question or immediate post-workshop means by question).

For comparing means within an intervention group before and after the intervention, the paired comparison *t*-test was used. The paired-comparison *t*-test compares two means, specifically when those means have come from the same group (in this case, either the team that participated in the drum circle or the team that participated in appreciative inquiry), and calculates whether there is a statistically significant difference between two conditions (in this case, pre-workshop and immediate post-workshop).

For comparing means within an intervention group before and four weeks after the intervention and immediately post-intervention and four weeks after the intervention, the paired comparison *t*-test was used. The paired-comparison *t*-test compares two means, specifically when those means have come from the same group (in this case, either the team that participated in the drum circle or the team that participated in appreciative inquiry), and calculates whether there is a statistically significant difference between two conditions (in this case, pre-workshop and four weeks post-workshop or immediate post-workshop and four weeks post-workshop).

For comparing means across intervention groups four weeks after the intervention, the Independent measures *t*-test was used. The independent measures *t*-test compares two means, specifically when those means have come from two separate groups (in this case, the team that participated in the drum circle and the team that participated in appreciative inquiry) and calculates whether there is a statistically significant difference in means between the two groups (in this case, four-week post-workshop means by question).

Research Design

The researcher was introduced to four notable professionals in the field of drum circles. Through in-depth conversations with all four professionals, the researcher's design began to take shape. Each of the four professionals suggested that the researcher use the "Empowerment Protocol" from the *HealthRHYTHMS* Group Empowerment Drumming Facilitators Training Manual (Bittman et al., 2006) as the drum circle team-building intervention (Appendix A). The researcher worked closely with Christine Stevens, one of the co-authors of the *HealthRHYTHMS* "Empowerment Protocol" (Bittman et al., 2006) on workshop design, and she assisted in obtaining a *HealthRHYTHMS* trained facilitator.

Since the drum circle team-building intervention was facilitated by a trained *HealthRHYTHMS* drum circle facilitator, the researcher chose a professional organization development consultant to direct the appreciative inquiry team-building intervention so that the study results would not be skewed.

This study utilized an action research design of two team-building interventions—drum circles and appreciative inquiry (see Appendices A and B)—along with mixed-methods qualitative and quantitative surveys to collect data pre-workshop, immediate post-workshop, and four weeks post-workshop (see Appendices C, D, and E).

Two established teams of administrators from the Boys and Girls Clubs of Long Beach, California, were participants for this study. These two teams had not participated in a team-building intervention before. Two groups were included in order to not significantly bias the effect of the second intervention by already having the same group participate in the first team-building intervention.

Alex Spurkel, trained *HealthRHYTHMS* drum circle facilitator, directed the drum circle team-building intervention at the Long Beach Boys and Girls Clubs. The site directors were the participants. Spurkel directed the drum circle intervention by utilizing the “Empowerment Protocol” shown in Appendix A (Bittman et al., 2006) where he led the team through an introduction of the program, a wellness exercise, a series of guided drumming activities, another wellness exercise, and the finale.

Lori Heffelfinger, MSOD, facilitated the appreciative inquiry team-building intervention at the Long Beach Boys and Girls Clubs. The legacy site directors were the participants. Heffelfinger directed the appreciative inquiry intervention (see Appendix B) by leading the team through an introduction on what appreciative inquiry is and an appreciative inquiry exercise. The team members created vision boards and possibility statements of team effectiveness of their preferred future around a crafted question on team building. They presented their vision boards and possibility statements to each other, and Heffelfinger provided a closing to the intervention.

During each team-building intervention, the researcher opened the workshop with a brief welcome and description of the workshop, had participants complete a pre-workshop team-building survey, and introduced the facilitator to the group. The researcher was also observing the overall flow, behaviors of the group, and effectiveness of the team-building intervention from his point of view. The researcher did not actively participate in the team-building intervention activity. At the end of each workshop, the researcher provided closing remarks and expressed his gratitude to the participants. He also requested the participants to

complete an immediate post-workshop survey. The researcher announced to both teams that they would be receiving a four-week post-team-building workshop survey.

Participants

Participants for this study consisted of two teams, the site directors and the legacy site directors from the Boys and Girls Clubs of Long Beach, California. The site directors team consisted of 11 participants, and the legacy site directors team consisted of 13 participants; both teams ranged in age, race, ethnicity, and years with the organization. See Table 1 for the participants' demographics.

The site directors were hired specifically to oversee the after-school program, which is in collaboration with the Long Beach Unified School District. The school district subcontracted with the Boys and Girls Clubs of Long Beach to plan, coordinate, and implement after-school programs at five elementary schools, one K-8 grade school, and two middle schools. Total youth served are approximately 900; there are 45 staff and 11 site directors. Each staff employee is given up to 20 Boys and Girls Club members to assist with homework, enrichment, and recreation. The site directors work closely with parents, principals, teachers, and janitorial staff to ensure that each member has a safe, fun, and educational experience.

The 13 legacy site directors are responsible for overseeing the day-to-day operations of a clubhouse that serves youth ages 6 to 18. They oversee the staff responsible for delivering key programs in the areas of education and career development, character and citizenship, healthy and life skills, sports, fitness and recreation, and the arts. Their responsibilities also include the management of grants ranging from \$5,000 to \$60,000 and ensuring the implementation of stated goals and objectives. The staff members at the legacy sites implement these key

programs and are responsible for increasing attendance to meet capacity and attendance goals.

The staff at each site has worked together anywhere from one to four years and, in some cases, has worked at the site up to seven years.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variable Category	Legacy Site Directors (N = 13)			Site Directors (N = 11)		
	n	% of Sample	Mode	n	% of Sample	Mode
Gender			1			1
Male	6	46.2		4	36.4	
Female	7	53.8		7	63.6	
Age			0			0
21-30	9	69.2		7	63.6	
31-40	3	23.1		2	18.2	
41-50	0	0.0		2	18.2	
51-60	0	0.0		0	0	
61+	1	7.7		0	0	
Race/Ethnicity			4			4
Arab	0	0.0		0	0.0	
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	30.8		1	9.1	
Black/African American	1	7.7		1	9.1	
Caucasian/White	1	7.7		1	9.1	
Hispanic	5	38.5		5	45.5	
Latino	1	7.7		1	9.1	
Multiracial	1	7.7		2	18.2	
Years with Organization			0			3
<1 Year	5	38.5		1	9.1	
1-2 Years	3	23.1		1	9.1	
3-4 Years	2	15.4		3	27.3	
5+ Years	3	23.1		6	54.5	
Years with Group			0			0
<1 Year	6	46.2		4	36.4	
1-2 Years	2	15.4		1	9.1	
3-4 Years	3	23.1		4	36.4	
5+ Years	2	15.4		2	18.2	

Note: Automatic rounding of IBM SPSS Statistics software resulted in some percentage totals exceeding 100%.

Confidentiality

The researcher earned a certificate in designing and conducting ethical research. As this study was conducted in a single organization, an Institutional Review Board review was not required. All participant responses were kept confidential. Only aggregate data is reported in the research and in any subsequent dissemination of the results.

All research data was stored securely in the researcher's locked file cabinet during the study and will be kept in this location for six years following the study, after which time all of it will be destroyed. An entire copy of the study will be provided to participants upon request.

Data Collection

This was a mixed-methodology study, where the participants completed pre-, immediate post-, and four-week post-team-building workshop surveys (see Appendices C, D, and E). The four-week post-workshop survey additionally supplemented the study with qualitative data through open-ended questions.

This study measured the following aspects of team effectiveness: collaboration, trust, authenticity, communication, creativity, commitment, interrelatedness, and recognition. Survey items were drawn from established measures, including Tuckman's Group Detector (Tuckman, 2001), the Team Development Survey (Dyer et al., 2007), the Team Maturity Survey (Dyer et al., 2007), and the Team Effectiveness Survey (Goodstein & Pfeiffer, 1985). The researcher decided to use these established measures as these particular surveys provided well-established questions that could easily be adapted to measure the specific elements of team building.

Data Analysis

Data was gathered at three specific points: pre-workshop, immediate post-workshop, and four-week post-workshop for each team-building intervention. The pre- and immediate post-workshop data was gathered to gauge each participant's evaluation of how well the group functions as a team. The four-week post-workshop data also gauged participants' evaluation of how well their group functions as a team but, through open-ended questions, captured their evaluations of how their groups were currently functioning as a team since participating in the team-building interventions.

The following procedures were used to analyze the data. Deductive coding of open-ended question responses was used after the qualitative data had been sorted, aggregated, and analyzed. Paired comparisons were used to compare means between pre-, immediate post-, and four-week post-workshop questionnaires to determine any statistically significant differences; a p value of $<.05$ was used as the level of statistical significance. In a similar study, Stoller, Rose, Lee, Dolgan, and Hoogwerf (2004) used paired comparisons to contrast pre- and post-questionnaire responses to determine the effectiveness of a one-day leadership and team-building retreat for first-year residents. Synthesis of qualitative and quantitative data was used to identify any patterns and/or emerging themes.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of conducting this research was to compare the effectiveness of drum circles and appreciative inquiry as team-building interventions. The goal of this research was to assess the effectiveness of drum circles as a team-building intervention and, to do so, the researcher compared it with another typical team-building intervention—appreciative inquiry.

Participants for this study consisted of two teams; one team consisted of 11 participants, and the other team consisted of 13 participants, ranging in age, race, ethnicity, and years with the organization. Both quantitative and qualitative data was collected pre-, immediate post-, and four weeks post-workshop, analyzed and displayed below.

Quantitative Data Key Findings—Pre- and Immediate Post-Workshop

In an independent samples comparison of intervention mean scores by pre-workshop question, only two of the nine questions showed a statistically significant difference:

Question 6: We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively.

Question 7: People are clearly committed to the group.

Otherwise, it can be inferred that the two groups of participants did not differ significantly in their pre-workshop perceptions of their teams. In an independent samples comparison of intervention mean scores by immediate post-workshop question, none of the nine questions surfaced a statistically significant difference between means. It can be inferred that the two groups of participants did not differ significantly in their immediate post-workshop perceptions of their teams. See Table 2 for the pre- and immediate post-workshop mean and standard deviation of questions by intervention and timing.

Table 2. Mean and Standard Deviation of Questions by Intervention and Timing

Variable	Intervention	N	M ^a	SD	t ^b	p ^b
Q1. We work together well as a group.						
Pre-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	3.18	.751	1.691	.105
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	2.62	.870		
Immediate Post-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	3.55	.522	.028	.978
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	3.54	.660		
Q2. I think we trust one another.						
Pre-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	2.73	.786	1.256	.222
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	2.23	1.092		
Immediate Post-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	3.45	.688	.546	.591
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	3.31	.630		
Q3. People are willing to take risks and try new things to make the group better.						
Pre-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	2.64	.505	1.391	.178
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	2.31	.630		
Immediate Post-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	3.27	.467	.433	.669
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	3.15	.801		
Q4. People are willing to be themselves with each other.						
Pre-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	2.55	.522	.692	.496
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	2.31	1.032		
Immediate Post-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	3.00	.775	-.823	.419
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	3.23	.599		

Table 2 (Continued)

Variable	Intervention	N	M ^a	SD	t ^b	p ^b
Q5. Members are not afraid of being open and frank in their discussions.						
Pre-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	2.82	.874	1.647	.114
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	2.15	1.068		
Immediate Post-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	2.82	.405	-1.676	.108
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	3.23	.725		
Q6. We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively.						
Pre-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	3.09	.701	2.133	.044
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	2.31	1.032		
Immediate Post-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	3.18	.405	-1.075	.294
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	3.46	.776		
Q7. People are clearly committed to the group.						
Pre-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	3.09	.701	2.336	.029
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	2.38	.768		
Immediate Post-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	3.27	.647	-.421	.678
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	3.38	.650		
Q8. People know how their work contributes to the goals of the group.						
Pre-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	2.64	.809	.061	.952
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	2.62	.870		
Immediate Post-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	3.45	.522	-.028	.978
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	3.46	.660		

Table 2 (Continued)

Variable	Intervention	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i> ^a	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> ^b	<i>p</i> ^b
Q9. Members are recognized within the group for their contributions.						
Pre-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	2.27	1.009	1.080	.292
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	1.77	1.235		
Immediate Post-Workshop	Drum Circle	11	3.18	.405	-.447	.659
	Appreciative Inquiry	13	3.31	.855		

Independent sample *t*-test.

^a 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree.

^b Equal variances assumed.

Appreciative inquiry intervention. Within the appreciative inquiry team-building intervention, each paired comparison of means by each survey question differed at a statistically significant level. In other words, on average, participants' agreement with each stated question differed significantly (i.e., increased) between the pre- and immediate post-workshop survey. See Table 3 for the responses regarding perceptions of the team pre- and immediately post-appreciative inquiry team-building workshop.

Drum circle intervention. Within the drum circle team-building intervention, four of the nine paired comparison of means differed at a statistically significant level. In other words, on average, participants' agreement with four questions differed significantly (i.e., increased) between the pre- and immediate post-workshop survey. See Table 4 for the responses regarding team perceptions pre- and immediately post-drum circle team-building workshop.

**Table 3. Responses Regarding Perceptions of Team Pre- and Immediate Post-Workshop—
Appreciative Inquiry**

Question	Pre M^a	Delta (SD)	P
Q1. We work together well as a group.	2.62	-.923 (1.038)	.008
Q2. I think we trust one another.	2.23	-1.077 (.760)	.000
Q3. People are willing to take risks and try new things to make the group better.	2.31	.846 (.689)	.001
Q4. People are willing to be themselves with each other.	2.31	-.923 (1.115)	.011
Q5. Members are not afraid of being open and frank in their discussions.	2.15	-1.077 (1.382)	.016
Q6. We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively.	2.31	-1.154 (1.144)	.003
Q7. People are clearly committed to the group.	2.38	-1.000 (.913)	.002
Q8. People know how their work contributes to the goals of the group.	2.62	-.846 (.899)	.005
Q9. Members are recognized within the group for their contributions.	1.77	-1.538 (1.198)	.001

Paired *t*-test.

^a 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree

Pre = immediately prior to the intervention.

**Table 4. Responses Regarding Perceptions of Team Pre- and Immediate Post-Workshop—
Drum Circle**

Question	Pre M^a	Delta (SD)	P
Q1. We work together well as a group.	3.18	-.364 (.809)	.167
Q2. I think we trust one another.	2.73	-.727 (.786)	.012
Q3. People are willing to take risks and try new things to make the group better.	2.64	-.636 (.674)	.011
Q4. People are willing to be themselves with each other.	2.55	-.455 (.688)	.053
Q5. Members are not afraid of being open and frank in their discussions.	2.82	.000 (1.000)	1.000
Q6. We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively.	3.09	-.091 (.701)	.676
Q7. People are clearly committed to the group.	3.09	-.182 (.405)	.167
Q8. People know how their work contributes to the goals of the group.	2.64	-.818 (.751)	.005
Q9. Members are recognized within the group for their contributions.	2.27	-.909 (1.221)	.033

Paired t -test.

^a 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree.

Pre = immediately prior to the intervention.

Qualitative Data Key Findings—Pre- and Immediate Post-Workshop

Pre- and immediate post-workshop qualitative data was collected from both teams during the team-building workshops via an index card. Participants filled out Side A of the index card pre-workshop, answering the following question: What are the three most important outcomes you want to receive out of today's team-building workshop? Participants then filled out Side B of the index card immediately post-workshop, answering the following question:

Please advise your comments as to whether your three outcomes were met and, if so, how?

The data consisted of information contained in participants' answers to the two questions on the index card.

The qualitative data was coded and analyzed for each workshop intervention, and the results are reported in Tables 5 to 13. Summaries of key qualitative findings for both the appreciative inquiry and drum circle workshops, which present the major themes, are presented in the tables as well as participant comments for each theme for each workshop. As shown, for the appreciative inquiry team-building workshop, the top three unique themes are open communication, group versus individual, and new strategy which are more cognitive in nature where for the drum circle team-building workshop, the top four unique themes are listening, sense of team, fun, and creativity which are more sensory or kinesthetic in nature. See Table 14 for qualitative analysis codes.

Table 5. Summary of Key Qualitative Findings—Appreciative Inquiry

Theme	Findings
Theme 1: Open Communication	Communicating ideas open and freely
Theme 2: Group versus Individual	The distinction of group versus individual
Theme 3: New Strategy	Learning new information and strategies from the workshop and each other

Table 6. Appreciative Inquiry Theme 1: Open Communication

Theme
Open Communication
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “All outcomes were met because we were able to share ideas that were in turn valued by our teammates. . . .” • “Yes, [build strong] communication was met with my group by us sharing our comments to our topics.” • “We all were able to talk freely.” • “Yes, we all worked well as a team by bringing all ideas together.” • “Yes . . . we were all able to listen to one another’s ideas and contributed to the task.” • “We are all on the same page, with same goals so we all can work on communicating better.” • “Everyone was on equal standing, no matter their positions, and all ideas were listened to.” • “We all had to collaborate and had to hear each other’s opinion.” • “[The specific way the activity best strengthened my relationship with team members was] getting to speak with the team members about what makes a great group.” • “[The specific way the activity most enhanced my ability to be a better team member was to encourage] me to put my ideas out there.”

Bold indicates four-week post-workshop comments. The other comments are immediately post-workshop.

Table 7. Appreciative Inquiry Theme 2: Group versus Individual

Theme
Group versus Individual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “. . . I have a better understanding of the group as opposed to the individual.” • “Yes, all 3 [ability to be able to clearly and effectively communicate with one another, able to learn more about the staff at the site and how we together handle situations, create a greater sense of unity] were met. . . . We were able to come together and fulfill a goal as individuals and as a group.”

The comments are immediately post-workshop.

Table 8. Appreciative Inquiry Theme 3: New Strategy

Theme
New Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Important and updated team strategies.” • “New information I can use to better my program area.” • “Lessons I can apply outside of the club.” • “Yes, I learned new techniques and ideas from my fellow co-workers.” • “Gave insight on how to make the 3 outcomes possible.” • “. . . different strategies to accomplishing goals was met.”

The comments are immediately post-workshop.

Table 9. Summary of Key Qualitative Findings—Drum Circle

Theme	Findings
Theme 1: Listening	Understanding the importance of listening
Theme 2: Sense of Team	The sense of being and operating as a team
Theme 3: Fun	Having fun together as a team
Theme 4: Creativity	Creating something, being able to be creative

Table 10. Drum Circle Theme 1: Listening

Theme
Listening
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “It showed that it’s good to listen and that everyone bring[s] something new. It’s good to communicate & listen to be able to repeat and respond back.” • “Communication—Not only speaking, but listening and taking in what others say.” • “Communication is about listening as well.” • “Yes we learn to communicate through beats, beats turned into hearing & listening to understand one another.” • “It is very important for us to listen as well as to speak clear[ly] in order to communicate well with our team.” • “[The activity] allowed us to hear and listen to each other.” • “[The activity] showed me that we can trust each other as a team by listen[ing] and follow[ing] with attention each one of our moves.” • “Eye contact [and] listening [were the non-verbal cues that led me to believe the activity was effectively building the team].” • “Eye contact was key & listening [were the non-verbal cues that led me to believe the activity was effectively building the team].” • “Observing, listening, creativity, follow-ups [were the non-verbal cues that led me to believe the activity was effectively building the team].”

Bold indicates four-week post-workshop comments. The other comments are immediately post-workshop.

Table 11. Drum Circle Theme 2: Sense of Team

Theme
Sense of Team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “During the drum circle we felt like a team.” • “[The outcomes of group bonds through fun and group feels more at home with one another] were [met].” • “Everyone had input and felt like [a team].” • “We all participate[d] following each other until we got the same rhythm and then with our own rhythm we made a song out of all of us.” • “[The activity] helped us move all together.” • “We saw that it's important to be on the same page. We work better as a group and being well synchronized.” • “[The specific way the activity most enhanced my ability to be a better team member was to show us] that we are a team.”

Bold indicates four-week post-workshop comments. The other comments are immediately post-workshop.

Table 12. Drum Circle Theme 3: Fun

Theme
Fun
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Everyone worked together and had fun doing it.” • “[The outcomes of group bonds through fun and group feels more at home with one another] were [met].” • “We had fun and boosted our ability to work with one another.” • “This was a fun activity. Always learn new things every day.” • “I was able to enjoy without thinking about the stress that comes along with the job and just absorb the fun moment.” • “I was able to see [the team members] outside of the work environment and enjoy and share a moment of laughter.” • “It was good to see everyone have fun.” • “[The activity] was fun, kept me active and better communication.” • “[The activity] was fun. We worked as a team. Everyone played an important role.” • “[The top moments that resonated with me during the activity were that] we have fun together. We appreciate each other. We collaborate[d] and worked as a team.” • “Everyone laughed, had fun and let their guards down in order to participate.” • “Everyone was smiling.” • “People enjoyed [the activity] and spoke highly of the event after the activity was over.”

Bold indicates four-week post-workshop comments. The other comments are immediately post-workshop.

Table 13. Drum Circle Theme 4: Creativity

Theme
Creativity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “We [built] . . . trust, worked together, and brought in creativity towards the same goal.” • “[The top moment that resonated with me during the activity was] the music we created knowing that most of us did not have previous music experience.” • “The main [top moment that resonated with me during the activity] was coming up with a beat that represents our name. We had to be creative on that part.” • “[The top moment that resonated with me during the activity was] making our name into a song. The longer drum circles. The passing of the apples.” • “[The top moments that resonated with me during the activity were] 1. Copy and Repeat. 2. When they allowed us to create our own rhythm. 3. The moment we incorporated other instruments.” • “The top moment that resonated with me during the activity was] the activity where I would create a beat, and had to choose another member using eye contact to copy the beat.” • “Observing, listening, creativity, follow-ups [were the non-verbal cues that led me to believe the activity was effectively building the team].” • “[The non-verbal cue that led me to believe the activity was effectively building the team was] seeing all the members fully engaged using the materials that we were able to use to come up with some beats and being creative with it.”

Bold indicates four-week post-workshop comments.

Table 14. Qualitative Analysis Codes

Intervention	Code	Description
Drum Circle	LISTEN	Not only communicating well but understanding the importance of listening
	SENSTEAM	Sense of team
	FUN	Having fun together as a team
	CREAT	Creating, being able to be creative
	ONEGOAL	Sharing the same goal
	TRUST	Building trust as a team
	RELBLD	Relationship building and bonding within team
	TEAMWRK	Working with one another as a team
	COMMSKL	Building communication skills
	GENVAL	Received general value from experience and, in two cases, showed gratitude
Appreciative Inquiry	OPNCOMM	Communicating ideas openly and freely
	GRPVIND	Group versus individual
	NEWSTRAT	Learning new information and strategies from the workshop and each other
	ONEGOAL	Sharing the same goal
	TRUST	Building trust as a team
	RELBLD	Relationship building and bonding within team
	TEAMWRK	Working with one another as a team
	COMMSKL	Building communication skills
	GENVAL	Received general value from experience

Bold indicates unique theme to the specific intervention

Qualitative Data Key Findings—Four Weeks Post-Workshop

Four-week post-workshop qualitative data was collected from the two teams through five open-ended questions that were included on the four-week post-workshop survey. The following five open-ended questions were asked of each participant:

1. In what specific ways did the activity most effectively build the team, if at all?
2. In what specific ways did the activity best strengthen your relationship with team members, if at all?
3. In what specific ways did the activity most enhance your ability to be a better team member, if at all?
4. What were the top three moments that resonated with you during the activity and why?
5. What non-verbal cues, if any, led you to believe the activity was effectively building the team?

The data consisted of information contained in participants' answers to the five open-ended questions.

The four-week post-workshop qualitative data was coded and analyzed for each workshop intervention, and the results are reported in Tables 6 to 8 for the appreciative inquiry workshop and Tables 10 to 13 for the drum circle workshop.

Quantitative Data Key Findings—Four Weeks Post-Workshop

In an independent samples comparison of intervention mean scores by four-week post-workshop question, none of the nine questions surfaced a statistically significant difference between means. It can be inferred that the two groups of participants did not differ significantly in their four-week post-workshop perceptions of their teams. This can be

contrasted with the key findings from pre-workshop independent samples where two of the nine questions showed a statistically significant difference. Those two questions were Question 6: We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively and Question 7: People are clearly committed to the group. The four-week post-workshop survey was distributed electronically, and only 9 of the 13 participants from the appreciative inquiry workshop ended up completing the four-week post-workshop survey where 11 of the 11 participants from the drum circle workshop completed the four-week post-workshop survey. See Table 15 for the four-week post-workshop mean and standard deviation of questions by intervention.

Appreciative inquiry workshop. Within the appreciative inquiry workshop, one of the nine paired comparison of means by each survey question differed at a statistically significant level between pre-workshop and four weeks post-workshop. That was Question 4: People are willing to be themselves with each other. In other words, on average, participants' agreement with the stated question differed significantly, in this case, increased, between the pre-workshop ($M = 3.22, SE = .278$) and four-week post-workshop ($M = 2.44, SE = .377$) surveys. This difference was significant $t(8) = -2.401, p = .043$. This is the one sustained statistically significant increase in perception from pre-workshop to four weeks post-workshop across both interventions.

Three of the nine paired comparison of means by each survey question differed at a statistically significant level between immediate post-workshop and four weeks post-workshop:

Question 6: We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively.

Question 7: People are clearly committed to the group.

Question 9: Members are recognized within the group for their contributions.

Table 15. Mean and Standard Deviation of Questions by Intervention—Four Weeks Post-Workshop

Variable	Intervention	N	M ^a	SD	t ^b	p ^b
Q1. We work together well as a group.	Drum Circle	11	3.09	.831	-.326	.748
	Appreciative Inquiry	9	3.22	.972		
Q2. I think we trust one another.	Drum Circle	11	2.91	.831	-.239	.814
	Appreciative Inquiry	9	3.00	.866		
Q3. People are willing to take risks and try new things to make the group better.	Drum Circle	11	3.18	.874	1.050	.308
	Appreciative Inquiry	9	2.78	.833		
Q4. People are willing to be themselves with each other.	Drum Circle	11	3.00	.775	-.617	.545
	Appreciative Inquiry	9	3.22	.833		
Q5. Members are not afraid of being open and frank in their discussions.	Drum Circle	11	2.82	.982	-.164	.871
	Appreciative Inquiry	9	2.89	.928		
Q6. We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively.	Drum Circle	11	3.36	.809	1.300	.210
	Appreciative Inquiry	9	2.78	1.202		
Q7. People are clearly committed to the group.	Drum Circle	11	3.09	.944	.452	.657
	Appreciative Inquiry	9	2.89	1.054		
Q8. People know how their work contributes to the goals of the group.	Drum Circle	11	3.00	1.000	-1.112	.281
	Appreciative Inquiry	9	3.44	.726		
Q9. Members are recognized within the group for their contributions.	Drum Circle	11	2.55	1.036	-.298	.769
	Appreciative Inquiry	9	2.67	.707		

Independent sample *t*-test.

^a 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree.

^b Equal variances assumed.

In other words, on average, participants' agreement with the stated questions differed significantly (in this case, decreased) between immediately following the workshop and four weeks post-workshop. It should be noted that there were only nine appreciative inquiry participants who completed the four-week post-workshop survey. See Table 3 for the responses regarding perceptions of teams pre-workshop and immediately post-workshop for the appreciative inquiry team-building workshop. See Table 16 for the responses regarding perceptions of team four weeks post-workshop for the appreciative inquiry team-building workshop.

Drum circle workshop. Within the drum circle workshop, none of the nine paired comparison of means differed at a statistically significant level between pre-workshop and four weeks post-workshop. In other words, on average, participants' agreement with the stated questions did not differ significantly between the pre- and four-week post-workshop surveys. Additionally, none of the nine paired comparison of means differed at a statistically significant level between the immediate post-workshop and four-week post-workshop surveys. In other words, on average, participants' agreement with the stated questions did not differ significantly between the immediate post-workshop and four-week post-workshop surveys. See Table 17 for the responses regarding perceptions of the team four weeks post-workshop.

**Table 16. Responses Regarding Perceptions of Team Four Weeks Post-Workshop—
Appreciative Inquiry**

Question	Pre M^a	Post M^a	Timeframe	Delta (SD)	P
Q1. We work together well as a group.	2.62	3.54	Pre-4Wk Post	-.444 (1.014)	.225
			Post-4Wk Post	.333 (.866)	.282
Q2. I think we trust one another.	2.23	3.31	Pre-4Wk Post	-.667 (1.118)	.111
			Post-4Wk Post	.444 (.726)	.104
Q3. People are willing to take risks and try new things to make the group better.	2.31	3.15	Pre-4Wk Post	-.556 (.882)	.095
			Post-4Wk Post	.444 (1.130)	.272
Q4. People are willing to be themselves with each other.	2.31	3.23	Pre-4Wk Post	-.778 (.972)	.043
			Post-4Wk Post	.222 (.833)	.447
Q5. Members are not afraid of being open and frank in their discussions.	2.15	3.23	Pre-4Wk Post	-.778 (1.481)	.154
			Post-4Wk Post	.556 (1.014)	.139
Q6. We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively.	2.31	3.46	Pre-4Wk Post	-.333 (1.414)	.500
			Post-4Wk Post	.667 (.707)	.022
Q7. People are clearly committed to the group.	2.38	3.38	Pre-4Wk Post	-.556 (1.236)	.214
			Post-4Wk Post	.667 (.707)	.022
Q8. People know how their work contributes to the goals of the group.	2.62	3.46	Pre-4Wk Post	-.556 (1.130)	.179
			Post-4Wk Post	.111 (.928)	.729
Q9. Members are recognized within the group for their contributions.	1.77	3.31	Pre-4Wk Post	-.889 (1.364)	.086
			Post-4Wk Post	.889 (.333)	.000

Paired t -test.

^a 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree.

Pre = immediately prior to the intervention. Post = immediately following the intervention. 4Wk Post = four weeks following the intervention.

Table 17. Responses Regarding Perceptions of Team Four Weeks Post-Workshop—Drum Circle

Question	Pre M^a	Post M^a	Timeframe	Delta (SD)	P
Q1. We work together well as a group.	3.18	3.55	Pre-4Wk Post	.091 (.944)	.756
			Post-4Wk Post	.455 (.820)	.096
Q2. I think we trust one another.	2.73	3.45	Pre-4Wk Post	-.182 (1.079)	.588
			Post-4Wk Post	.545 (.820)	.052
Q3. People are willing to take risks and try new things to make the group better.	2.64	3.27	Pre-4Wk Post	-.545 (.934)	.082
			Post-4Wk Post	.091 (.944)	.756
Q4. People are willing to be themselves with each other.	2.55	3.00	Pre-4Wk Post	-.455 (1.036)	.176
			Post-4Wk Post	.000 (1.183)	1.000
Q5. Members are not afraid of being open and frank in their discussions.	2.82	2.82	Pre-4Wk Post	.000 (1.549)	1.000
			Post-4Wk Post	.000 (1.095)	1.000
Q6. We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively.	3.09	3.18	Pre-4Wk Post	-.273 (1.009)	.391
			Post-4Wk Post	-.182 (.751)	.441
Q7. People are clearly committed to the group.	3.09	3.27	Pre-4Wk Post	.000 (1.342)	1.000
			Post-4Wk Post	.182 (1.328)	.659
Q8. People know how their work contributes to the goals of the group.	2.64	3.45	Pre-4Wk Post	-.364 (1.120)	.307
			Post-4Wk Post	.455 (.934)	.138
Q9. Members are recognized within the group for their contributions.	2.27	3.18	Pre-4Wk Post	-.273 (1.009)	.391
			Post-4Wk Post	.636 (1.286)	.132

Paired *t*-test.

^a 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree.

Pre = immediately prior to the intervention. Post = immediately following the intervention. 4Wk Post = four weeks following the intervention.

Summary

This chapter presented the findings of this study. The first two sections described the results of the pre- and immediate post-workshop quantitative and qualitative data collected. Quantitative data was collected via a nine-question Likert-scale survey, while qualitative data was collected via an index card both pre- and immediate post-workshop through two open-ended questions. Sample size for this study was two teams, one consisting of 11 participants and the other of 13 participants. One hundred percent of the participants from both teams completed the surveys. See Table 18 for a summary of key responses to the questionnaire immediately post-workshop by intervention.

Table 18. Key Responses to Questionnaire Immediately Post-Workshop by Intervention

	Drum Circle		Appreciative Inquiry	
	Outcome	N	Outcome	N
Most often-cited desired outcomes of workshop	Teamwork	8 (72.7%)	Communication	6 (46.2%)
	Communication	6 (54.5%)	Trust	6 (46.2%)
	Trust	4 (36.4%)	Strategies to achieve goals	4 (30.8%)
			Teamwork	3 (23.1%)
Believed outcome of trust was:				
Met	3 (27.3%)		3 (23.1%)	
Not Met	1 (9.1%)		1 (7.7%)	
Percent that met at least one of their desired outcomes	11 (100%)		9 (69.2%)	

The next two sections described the results of the four-week post-workshop quantitative and qualitative data collected. Quantitative data was collected via a nine-question Likert-scale survey, with qualitative data collected through five open-ended questions. A total

of 20 of the 24 participants from both teams responded to the four-week post-workshop survey.

Chapter 5 will draw conclusions from the study, make recommendations, discuss limitations of the study, and offer suggestions for further research.

Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This research study was an exploration of the effectiveness of drum circles and appreciative inquiry as team-building interventions, using two newly formed teams from the Boys and Girls Clubs of Long Beach, California. The purpose of conducting this research was to compare the effectiveness of drum circles and appreciative inquiry as team-building interventions.

The remainder of this chapter is divided into six sections. The first section presents a discussion of the conclusions and recommendations for organization development practitioners derived from the research study. In the second section, the limitations of this study are identified. The third, fourth, and fifth sections discuss the implications of this study, implications for future practice, and suggestions for future research possibilities. The chapter concludes with a short summary.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Organization Development Practitioners

A review of the research data and an examination of the study's key findings led to the drawing of the following conclusions. Conclusions were drawn from the data from the pre- and immediate post-workshop surveys as well as the data from the four-week post-workshop survey. They are described in detail in the following sections.

Pre- and immediate post-workshop surveys. When comparing the two interventions side by side, the quantitative key finding from the pre-workshop survey was that only two of the nine questions—Question 6: We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively and Question 7: People are clearly committed to the group—showed a statistically significant difference. Otherwise, it can be inferred that the two groups of participants did not differ

significantly in their pre-workshop perceptions of their teams. The quantitative key finding from the immediate post-workshop survey was that none of the nine questions surfaced a statistically significant difference between means, implying that the two groups of participants did not differ significantly in their immediate post-workshop perceptions of their teams. It can be suggested from the preliminary evidence of this study that drum circles and appreciative inquiry can be used as short team-building interventions with new teams.

Four-week post-workshop survey. Comparison of intervention mean scores by four-week post-workshop findings suggests that the two groups of participants did not differ significantly in the four-week post-workshop perceptions of their teams as none of the nine questions surfaced a statistically significant difference between means. This can be contrasted with the pre-workshop independent sample findings where two of the nine questions showed a statistically significant difference: Question 6: We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively and Question 7: People are clearly committed to the group.

Drum circle workshop. The most often cited outcomes that participants wanted from the drum circle workshop, as indicated in the pre- and immediate post-workshop surveys, were teamwork and communication. These exact same most often cited outcomes presented themselves in the data from the four-week post-workshop survey, along with trust. Teamwork, communication, and trust were also three of the four most cited desired outcomes by participants from the appreciative inquiry team-building workshop.

Three themes emerged from the qualitative key findings from the pre- and immediate post-drum circle workshop survey: listening, sense of team, and fun. Additional themes of creativity, trust, and communication skills, along with the three pre- and immediate post-

workshop themes, emerged in the four-week post-workshop data. From the results of this study, all three of the most cited desired outcomes were met. All four studies reviewed for this research showed results indicating that recreational music-making in the form of drum circles has a positive impact in organizational contexts. The findings from this study support these already established results.

Appreciative inquiry workshop. The most often cited outcomes that participants wanted to receive from the appreciative inquiry workshop, as indicated on the pre- and immediate post-workshop surveys, were communication, trust, strategies, and teamwork. These exact same most often cited desired outcomes presented themselves in the data from the four-week post-workshop survey. Teamwork, communication, and trust were also the three most cited desired outcomes by participants from the drum circle team-building workshop.

Three themes emerged from the qualitative key findings from the pre- and immediate post-appreciative inquiry workshop survey. They were open communication, group versus individual, and new strategies. These same three themes along with sharing the same goal and teamwork presented themselves in the four-week post-workshop data. As seen from the results of this study, three of the four most cited desired outcomes were met. These findings are in support of the results of the appreciative inquiry studies reviewed for this research project.

Limitations of this Study

This study had five possible limitations. First, the researcher had a very short period of time for the team-building interventions. Second, the researcher did not know how much of what happened was a result of any interventions at all—for example, the researcher could not

contrast the impact of the interventions with natural changes in team reports on the outcomes measured. This would have required a control group. Third, the researcher did not know the impact of the interventions on the participants' effectiveness as reported by more bottom-line results, as all the data was self-reported. Fourth, only 9 of 13 appreciative inquiry participants completed the four-week post-workshop survey. Fifth, the study could have benefited from an additional two weeks post-workshop before the later survey was administered, giving the teams more time to function as teams post-workshop.

Implications of the Study

As stated in chapter 4, the top three unique themes from the appreciative inquiry workshop—open communication, group versus individual, and new strategy—are more cognitive in nature whereas for the drum circle team-building workshop, the top four unique themes—listening, sense of team, fun, and creativity—are more sensory or kinesthetic in nature. Both appreciative inquiry and drum circles workshops offer interactive platforms where participants on both the individual and group levels have fun while participating, feeling engaged and challenged.

Furthermore, both interventions allow participants to communicate, not only verbally, but through the expressions of the creative arts. These methods also allow participants to be creative in a safe environment as well as feel committed to their group through non-traditional platforms.

Implications for Practice

It can be suggested from this study that both drum circles and appreciative inquiry could be considered as valuable team-building interventions for those who want to focus their team

building in the areas of teamwork, communication, and trust. If a team wanted to do a team-building workshop that concentrated on listening and creativity, the study indicated that using drum circles as a team-building intervention was more effective than using an appreciative inquiry approach.

This most likely occurred because listening and creativity are natural elements that go hand in hand when creating music at both the experienced and inexperienced levels. As there are many ways to create music both individually and as a group, drum circles offer a unique and non-threatening method for groups to be in a safe, fun, and explorative environment. For those groups that want to focus on team building, drum circles offer an environment of creating “a resonant and complex way of exploring some of the central themes associated with organizational dynamics and teamwork” (Moore & Ryan, 2006, pp. 435-436). One of the elements of drum circles that bring out listening and creativity is cross-listening to each other so that the group stays at the same tempo, creating and building rhythms with each other. Additionally, a group can create and build rhythms around communication styles, what does trust look like within a team, and what does interrelatedness look like within a team.

If a team wanted to administer a team-building workshop that concentrated in the areas of strategy and group versus individual, it can be suggested from this study that appreciative inquiry could be considered as a more appropriate team-building intervention versus drum circles.

Suggestions for Further Research

A future research recommendation would be to do a combined drum circle and appreciative inquiry team-building workshop, measuring the same eight areas of team

effectiveness measured in this study. By doing this combined study and measuring the same eight areas of team effectiveness, it would be interesting to compare and contrast how the two studies were alike, how the two studies were different, the results, and the overall impact the two studies had on the team-building process.

An additional area of research would be to do the exact same drum circles as a team-building intervention study where the two teams would be assigned homework assignments post-workshop, before taking the four- to six- week post-workshop survey, where the participants would be asked to practice gained insights from their given workshop and to look for opportunities for “growth and team-building” (Bittman et al., 2003, p. 12). By adding in the extra step of homework assignments to practice gained insights and to look for opportunities for “growth and team-building,” it would be interesting to see the impact and change of both the quantitative and the qualitative results.

Summary

This chapter presented a summary of the research findings, conclusions drawn from the research, and recommendations made to organization development practitioners. Limitations of the study, implications for practice, and suggestions for future research also were provided.

References

References

- Bascombert Kelm, J. (2005). *Appreciative living: The principles of appreciative inquiry in personal life*. Wake Forest, NC: Venet Publishers.
- Bechtold, M. (2011). Improving worker morale through the use of appreciative inquiry. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 43*(1), 25-30.
- Bittman, B., Bruhn, K., Stevens, C., Westengard, J., & Umbach, P. (2003). Recreational music-making: A cost effective group interdisciplinary strategy for reducing burnout and improving mood states in long-term care workers. *Advances, 19*(3-4), 4-15.
- Bittman, B., Snyder, C., Bruhn, K., Liebfreid, F., Stevens, C., Westengard, J., & Umbach, P. (2004). Recreational music-making: An integrative group intervention for reducing burnout and improving mood states in first year associate degree nursing students: Insights and economic impacts. *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship, 1*(12), 1-26.
- Bittman, B., Stevens, C., & Bruhn, K. (2006). *HealthRHYTHMS group empowerment drumming facilitators training manual*. Valencia, CA: Remo, Inc.
- Bonebright, D. A. (2009). 40 years of storming: A historical review of Tuckman's model of small group development. *Human Resources Development International, 13*(1), 111-120.
- Dyer, G. W., Dyer, Jr., G. W., & Dyer, H. J. (2007). *Team building: Proven strategies for improving team performance* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fitzgerald, P. S., Murrell, L. K., & Miller, G. M. (2003). Appreciative inquiry: Accentuating the positive. *Business Strategy Review, 14*(1), 5-7.
- Goodstein, L. D., & Pfeiffer, J. W. (Eds.). (1985). Team Effectiveness Survey. *The 1985 Annual: Developing Human Resources*. San Diego, CA: University Associates.
- Head, R. (1999). *Appreciative inquiry as a team-development intervention for newly formed heterogeneous groups*. (Doctoral dissertation, Benedictine University). Retrieved from UMI Dissertations Publishing (UMI #9947140).
- Hull, A. (2006). *Drum circle facilitation: Building community through rhythm*. Santa Cruz, CA: Village Music Circles.
- Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). The discipline of teams. *Harvard Business Review, 111-120*.
- Kriek, H. S., & Venter, P. (2009). The perceived success of teambuilding interventions in South African organisations. *South African Business Review, 13*(1), 112-128.

- Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lewis, S., Passmore, J., & Cantore, S. (2008). Using appreciative inquiry in sales team development. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 40(4), 175-180.
- Martinez, F. C. (2002). Appreciative inquiry as an organizational development tool. *Performance Improvement*, 41(8), 34-39.
- McInnes Miller, M., Kimball, G. T., Korinek, A., Shumway, T. S., & Arredondo, R. (2003). Enhancing teams in the workplace: A new model of team-building. *Employee Assistance Quarterly*, 19(2), 35-50.
- Moore, S., & Ryan, A. (2006). Learning to play the drum: An experiential exercise for management students. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 43(4), 435-444.
- Munns, K. M. (1995). *The effects of team-building interventions*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin—Madison). Retrieved from UMI Dissertations Publishing (UMI #9536805).
- Murray, R. A. (2013). *Testing the effectiveness of team building interventions in community group exercise settings*. (Master's thesis, Wilfrid Laurier University). Retrieved from Business Premier Data Base Dissertations and Theses.
- Pollitt, D. (2012). Oddfellows employees hit the right notes: Music-making forms basis of successful team-building event. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 20(7), 26-28.
- Rohlander, G. D. (1999). Effective team building. The well-rounded IE, *IIE Solutions*, 22-23.
- Sandor, K. M., Copeland, D., & Robinson, S. (1998). Team-building interventions for interdisciplinary teams: A case study for a pediatric client. *Rehabilitation Nursing*, 23(6), 290-294.
- Senecal, J., Loughead, M. T., & Bloom, A. G. (2008). A season-long team-building intervention: Examining the effect of team goal setting on cohesion. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 30, 186-199.
- Snow, S., & D'Amico, M. (2010). The drum circle project: A qualitative study with at-risk youth in a school setting. *Canadian Journal of Music Therapy*, 16(1), 12-39.
- Stapleton, S. (1998). Team-building: Making collaborative practice work. *Journal of Nurse-Midwife*, 43(1), 12-18.
- Stevens, C. (2007). *Rhythm salam—drum circles in Iraq*. Retrieved from www.ubdrumcircles.com/article_iraqi.html

- Stevens, C. (2012). *Music medicine: The science and spirit of healing yourself with sound*. Boulder, CO: Sounds True.
- Stoller, K. J., Rose, M., Lee, R., Dolgan, C., & Hoogwerf, B. (2004). Teambuilding and leadership training in an internal medicine residency training program. *Innovations in Education and Clinical Practice, 19*, 692-697.
- Stroud, S. M. (2006). *The effects of team building activities on group climate and cohesion*. (Master's thesis, University of North Carolina at Greensboro). Retrieved from UMI Dissertations Publishing (UMI #1434152).
- Swanson, W. J. (1997). Building a successful team through collaboration. *Nursing Management, 28*(5), 71-73.
- Tuckman, B. W. (2001). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Group Facilitation: A Research and Applications Journal, 3*, 66-81.
- Whitney, D., & Schau, C. (1998). Appreciative inquiry: An innovative process for organization change. *Employment Relations Today, 25*(1), 11-21.

Appendix A: *HealthRHYTHMS* Drum Circle Team-Building Workshop Protocol

Note. Reproduced from *HealthRHYTHMS Group Empowerment Drumming Facilitators Training Manual* by B. Bittman, C. Stevens, and K. Bruhn, 2006, Valencia, CA: Remo, Inc., chapter 5, pp. 55-65. Copyright 2006 by Remo, Inc. Reproduced with permission of Remo, Inc.

Empowerment Protocol

HealthRHYTHMS Group Empowerment Drumming Facilitator Training Manual – ©2006
Written By Barry Bittman, MD; Christine Stevens, MT–BC, MSW, MA; and Karl Bruhn

Empowerment Protocol

This is our plan for facilitating the most effective, powerful, meaningful, successful, outstanding, incredible, life-changing, unforgettable and extraordinary drum circle. (We're serious!)

Protocol Building Blocks

These are the components utilized in the PNI study according to Bittman, et. al. Innovations* serving as extensions of the original protocol were utilized in the Employee Burnout & Mood States study.

With a solid foundation already established, it's now time to explore the key elements that build our drum circle in the order they are presented and experienced by a group.

*Components added since the publication of the composite protocol are noted accordingly on the following pages.

Building Blocks

- Introducing the Program
- Wellness Exercise*
- Breaking the Ice
- The ABCs of Drumming
- Rhythmic Naming
- Entrainment Building
- Inspirational Beats*
- Guided Imagery Drumming
- Wellness Exercise*
- The Finale

*Denotes additions to original protocol

Important Considerations

During Each Building Block of the Protocol

- Always establish the context & purpose.
- Discuss the relevance of the activity!

Introducing the Program

1-3 Minutes

- Encourage an open mind & an open heart – this is an opportunity for growth.
- Provide a credible background – review the health benefits of group drumming.
- Remove any barriers to musical expression – dispel myths about having talent and rhythm.
- Ensure a sense of comfort.

Wellness Exercise*

3-5 Minutes

- This is the best time to harmonize mind, body and spirit.
- Using a relaxing soundscape, focus on breathing and imagery along with gentle exercises that promote enhanced range of motion, relaxation and heightened attentiveness.

Breaking the Ice

5–10 Minutes

- Enabling the group to feel at ease.
- Shaker Pass – An Apple a Day
- Everyone is invited to hold an apple shaker in their LEFT hand which is maintained in steady position.
- Using the RIGHT hand to pick up the shaker, demonstrate, smile and say, “take and pass.”
- Gradually increase the tempo until everyone drops the shakers and laughs hysterically.
- Healing metaphor – The circle is a complete circuit of giving and receiving!

Alternate Ice Breaker: Shaker Share – Movers and Shakers Unite

- The facilitator begins a simple rhythm on a drum. Everyone is invited to follow with their shakers and encouraged to make up their own part and motion.
- Progressively make the motion bigger!
- One person is selected for the whole group to copy. Return to “play-your own-rhythm” & repeat.
- Healing metaphor – In order to lead you must follow.

Alternate Ice Breaker: The Wave – Advancing the Beat

- Like the ever-popular “WAVE” at stadiums, we pass the beat around the circle, taking turns and progressively exploring more sounds.
- Then we do it in reverse and listen to the new song.
- HINT – to deepen this experience, create sound vignettes around a “theme.”
- Healing metaphor – Add your creative element to the universal symphony.

The ABCs of Drumming

5 Minutes

- A – Anything goes!
- B – Believe you can!
- C – Cut to the chase!
- Healing metaphor – Only kidding – it’s almost as simple as bouncing a ball!
- Tip the drum off the floor. Bounce your hand on the drum.
- Don’t bend wrist – bend from elbow. Experiment with bass, tone, etc.
- Healing metaphor – The drum extends your inner rhythm.

Rhythmic Naming

5-10 Minutes – Anyone Can Play the Rhythm of Their Name

- Demonstrate the technique with your own name first.
- Each person plays their name.
- The group echoes it back as played.
- Allow the name rhythm to groove, then bring it to a coordinated closing.
- Healing metaphor – A successful journey begins with one deliberate step.

Entrainment Building

10 minutes – Discovering How to Settle in and Let it Happen

- Part I: Start with a foundational rhythm.
- Ask participants to copy your beat.
- Facilitate dynamic changes to the end.
- Part II: Ask participants to close their eyes and follow a new and slightly more complex rhythm.
- Reflect upon heightened entrainment.
- Healing metaphor – Community is achieved naturally by listening, sharing, expressing and releasing.

Entrainment Building: Extension

5-10 Minutes – Inspiring Them to Create the Groove

- After demonstrating progressive layering of each voice, empower a group member to start the next rhythm.
- Have another person match them to support their part. Layer in the rest of the group.
- Proceed with the group's musical contour along an evolving path.
- Healing metaphor – Transfer of leadership occurs one beat at a time.

Inspirational Beats*

10-15 Minutes – Drumming Responses for Individuals Facing the Challenges of Chronic Illness (these questions should be carefully adapted to meet the needs of your group)

- What do you want to say about the disease?
- What do you want to say to your support person?
- What do you want to say to others facing the illness?
- What do you want to say to your Higher Power?
- Healing metaphor – The unspoken need not be left unexpressed.

... [Guided Imagery Drumming section in the original protocol was not used by Alex Spurkel, facilitator of the drum circle team-building workshop in this research, so it is not reproduced here.]

Wellness Exercise

3 Minutes

- Repeat the original Wellness Exercise.
- Ask the group to comment on ease of performance as well as any emotional/physical changes noted in comparison to the initial Wellness Exercise.

The Finale

3 Minutes – “The Beginning”

- Remember . . . the closing is important.
- Create an ambience of reflection and expression.
- Ask each person to describe verbally or rhythmically what the drum circle meant for them.
- Healing metaphor – Know your collective sound lives on in your soul.

Suggestions For Your Growth

- As you develop your skills and your intuition as a facilitator, you will create a rhythmic repertoire of what works best for you.
- Consider including pre-recorded or live music, rhythms, chants and your own unique guided imagery experiences.
- This is just the beginning — the spring board for creating your own ripple of ideas.
- Healing metaphor — Your groups will teach you.

Appendix B: Appreciative Inquiry Vision Board and Possibility Statement Workshop Design

An Appreciative Welcome

- Welcome by Jason Stubbers
- Have group Pre-Teambuilding Workshop Survey and Side A of Index Card
- Jason Stubbers to introduce facilitator Lori Heffelfinger, MSOD
- Brief overview on What is Appreciative Inquiry?
- Appreciative Inquiry Exercise
 - Vision Board and Possibility Statement
- Presentations
- Closing

What is Appreciative Inquiry?

- “A process for engaging people in building the kinds of families, communities, organizations and world they want to live in.
- A practical daily philosophy, that can guide your work with families, communities, and organizations based on the realization that what we learn from what works and gives life is more effective and sustainable than what we learn from breakdowns and pathologies.
- Appreciate: To value or admire highly; To perceive those things that give life (health, vitality, excellence) to living systems. To increase in value.
- Inquire: To search into, investigate, to seek for information by questioning. It is the creation of meaning through a process of exploration and discovery.” (Watkins and Kelly, 2011)

Appreciative Inquiry Exercise: Vision Board and Possibility Statement

Discovery

In your groups have each person take a moment to describe an experience of being on an effective team. You have 10 minutes to complete this exercise.

Question

- **If this team could be the best team you ever worked on in your career/life – what would you all be doing, feeling, saying, accomplishing, etc. over the next two years.**
- Pick a scribe in each of the groups to record all ideas around team-effectiveness on a piece of flipchart paper. You have 20 minutes to complete this portion of the exercise.

Dream State

Create Shared Images of a Preferred Future

- Building on the ideas that emerged through these conversations, each team will create both a visual image and a written statement (possibility statement).

What is a Possibility Statement?

- Exciting
- Provocative – they stretch and challenge
- A realistic stretch
- Desired (they represent our highest hopes)
- Describe what is wanted in positive terms
- Are written in the present tense, as if they are already happening

“Remember: a possibility statement is not a marketing slogan. It is a rich description of the learning community you will create.” (Watkins and Kelly, 2011)

Example Possibility Statements

“Our House Grief Support Center is the most respected and recognized provider of grief support, education, resources and hope. We are unique in serving people as young as four all across the lifespan. The devotion and compassion of volunteers, staff, board members and donors create a community of stakeholders enabling us to create a space where people can share grief and find hope.” (Our House Grief Support Center, 2013)

“Walking into our facilities you can feel the energy.

- a) We build upon each other’s strengths.
- b) We respond to the unpredictable with balance and passion.
- c) We nurture each other with challenge and understanding.
- d) We step out of defined roles to pursue the extraordinary.
- e) We seek places never imagined possible.

We build for the future while living in the present and being grounded in the past” (Watkins and Kelly, 2011)

Creating Our Preferred Future

Using your brainstorming list your group created:

- Create a visual image on flipchart paper
- On another piece of flipchart paper create a possibility statement

Presentation of Our Preferred Future

- Presentations of Vision Boards and Possibility Statements
- Final Thoughts

Closing

- Closing by Jason Stubbers
- Have group complete Post Team-Building Workshop Survey and Side B of Index Card

Appendix C: Pre-Team-Building Workshop Survey

Pre-Team-Building Workshop Survey Boys and Girls Club of Long Beach

Please take the next 5 to 7 minutes to answer all the below questions. On questions with five-point answer scale choose the point which best represents how well your group functions as a team. Don't think too much about your answer but go with your first instinct.

Once you have completed the questions, please turn in the survey to Jason Stubbers and he will hand you an index card. Then take 2 to 3 minutes to answer the question on Side A of the index card and place it face down underneath your seat. Further instructions will be given about the index card at the end of the workshop.

Name: (First name only): _____

Gender: Male
Female

Age: 21-30
31-40
41-50
61+

Race/Ethnicity: Arab
Asian/Pacific Islander
Black/African American
Caucasian/White
Hispanic
Latino
Multiracial
Other _____

Years with organization: Less than one year
1 to 2 years
3 to 4 years
5 or more years

Years as member of group Less than one year
1 to 2 years
3 to 4 years
5 or more years

1. We work together well as a group.

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

Comments: _____

2. I think we trust one another.

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

Comments: _____

3. People are willing to take risks and try new things to make the group better.

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

Comments: _____

4. People are willing to be themselves with each other

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

Comments: _____

5. Members are not afraid of being open and frank in their discussions.

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

Comments: _____

6. We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively.

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

Comments: _____

7. People are clearly committed to the group.

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

Comments: _____

8. People know how their work contributes to the goals of the group.

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

Comments: _____

9. Members are recognized within the group for their contributions.

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

Comments: _____

Appendix D: Immediate Post-Team-Building Workshop Survey

Post-Team-Building Workshop Survey Boys and Girls Club of Long Beach

Please take the next 5 to 7 minutes to answer all the below questions. On questions with five-point answer scale choose the point which best represents how well your group functions as a team. Don't think too much about your answer but go with your first instinct.

Once you have completed the questions, please turn in the survey to Jason Stubbers and he will hand you an index card. Then take 2 to 3 minutes to answer the question on Side A of the index card and place it face down underneath your seat. Further instructions will be given about the index card at the end of the workshop.

Name: (First name only): _____

Gender: Male
Female

Age: 21-30
31-40
41-50
61+

Race/Ethnicity: Arab
Asian/Pacific Islander
Black/African American
Caucasian/White
Hispanic
Latino
Multiracial
Other _____

Years with organization: Less than one year
1 to 2 years
3 to 4 years
5 or more years

Years as member of group Less than one year
1 to 2 years
3 to 4 years
5 or more years

1. We work together well as a group.

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

Comments: _____

2. I think we trust one another.

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

Comments: _____

3. People are willing to take risks and try new things to make the group better.

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

Comments: _____

4. People are willing to be themselves with each other

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

Comments: _____

5. Members are not afraid of being open and frank in their discussions.

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

Comments: _____

6. We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively.

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

Comments: _____

7. People are clearly committed to the group.

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

Comments: _____

8. People know how their work contributes to the goals of the group.

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

Comments: _____

9. Members are recognized within the group for their contributions.

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

Comments: _____

Appendix E: Four-Week Post-Team-Building Workshop Survey

Post-Four-Week Team-Building Workshop Survey Boys and Girls Club of Long Beach

Please take the next 5 to 7 minutes to answer all the below questions. On questions with five-point answer scale choose the point which best represents how well your group functions as a team. Don't think too much about your answer but go with your first instinct.

Once you have completed the questions, please turn in the survey to Jason Stubbers and he will hand you an index card. Then take 2 to 3 minutes to answer the question on Side A of the index card and place it face down underneath your seat. Further instructions will be given about the index card at the end of the workshop.

Name: (First name only): _____

Gender: Male
Female

Age: 21-30
31-40
41-50
61+

Race/Ethnicity: Arab
Asian/Pacific Islander
Black/African American
Caucasian/White
Hispanic
Latino
Multiracial
Other _____

Years with organization: Less than one year
1 to 2 years
3 to 4 years
5 or more years

Years as member of group Less than one year
1 to 2 years
3 to 4 years
5 or more years

1. We work together well as a group.

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

Comments: _____

2. I think we trust one another.

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

Comments: _____

3. People are willing to take risks and try new things to make the group better.

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

Comments: _____

4. People are willing to be themselves with each other

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

Comments: _____

5. Members are not afraid of being open and frank in their discussions.

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

Comments: _____

6. We tend to approach our issues and projects creatively.

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

Comments: _____

7. People are clearly committed to the group.

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

Comments: _____

8. People know how their work contributes to the goals of the group.

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

Comments: _____

9. Members are recognized within the group for their contributions.

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

Comments: _____

Open-Ended Survey Question:

1. In what specific ways did the activity most effectively build the team, if at all?
2. In what specific ways did the activity best strengthen your relationship with team members, if at all?
3. In what specific ways did the activity most enhance your ability to be a better team member, if at all?
4. What were the top three moments that resonated with you during the activity and why?
5. What non-verbal cues, if any, led you to believe the activity was effectively building the team?