



---

# Working Paper Proceedings

---

**15<sup>th</sup> Engineering Project Organization Conference**  
with  
**5<sup>th</sup> International Megaprojects Workshop**  
Stanford Sierra Camp, California  
June 5-7, 2017

---

## **Five Types of People in Communal Development Projects in Construction Sector**

**Marika Latvala, Aalto University, Finland**

**Vishal Singh, Aalto University, Finland**

### **Proceedings Editors**

Ashwin Mahalingam, IIT Madras, Tripp Shealy, Virginia Tech, and Nuno Gil, University of Manchester



© Copyright belongs to the authors. All rights reserved. Please contact authors for citation details.

# PRODUCTIVE COMBINATION OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF PEOPLE IN COLLECTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Latvala Marika<sup>1</sup> and Vishal Singh<sup>2</sup>

## ABSTRACT

While there is a need to develop practices for the whole industry, individual Finnish construction companies seem to have lot to do just to get their daily business going with practices they have now. They seem not to have enough resources to do everything, and there is need to be more productive and effective in every project, including collective development projects that aim to bring about a collective change in practices. Such projects may also be driven by non-profit organizations or industry associations. This paper is part of a larger study that aims to understand who should be part of the collective development projects to make them more productive, and what kind of support structures are needed for making the change happen.

Based on the findings, five types of participants were identified earlier: 1) Opinionated Speakers, 2) Emphatic Leaders, 3) Active Respondents, 4) Passive Respondents and 5) Listeners. Therefore, building on this classification of participant types, this paper aims to identify the combination of participant types that would make the workshops more productive and reach a consensus in the results.

Content analysis of recorded video data suggests that to be productive there is need for emphatic leaders who give other participants possibilities to tell their opinion and ideas, but also make sure that the work gets done. If there is an opinionated speaker who dominates the room, there is need for a strong emphatic leader. There is also the need for one or more active respondents so that there will be balanced discussions, productive working, and results based on consensus are useful.

## KEYWORDS

Productivity, self-management, group composition, type, leadership

## INTRODUCTION

The construction business needs to be productive to be able to keep the daily business going and the end-users happy. At the same time, there is need for collective change in the industry's practices. There is a general belief that companies have a lot to do without adequate resources. Hence, both public and private companies in the construction and real estate network need to prioritize their participation in different projects including collective development projects that aim to collectively develop the whole industry and its practices. We term those projects as 'collective development projects' that are aimed at finding ways to bring about a collective change about the ways of working or other similar aspects of the participating organizations, and are

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD Student, School of Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland [marika.latvala@aalto.fi](mailto:marika.latvala@aalto.fi)

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, School of Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland, [vishal.singh@aalto.fi](mailto:vishal.singh@aalto.fi)

not owned or driven by only one of the participants. The term ‘project’ here refers to any collectively agreed goal with an established start and finish dates, set of objectives, timelines, and delivery targets the participants collectively aim to achieve, and this does not necessarily mean a construction project.

As a member of an industry consortium or being part of a wider community, the companies cannot just concentrate on developing their own business and leave all collective development projects, because there is an obligation to contribute to these projects where the unique expertise of the companies may be required. However, because such collective development projects are “no-one’s business, but everybody’s business”, and because the developed practices need to become useful for everybody in the network, there is a need for the non-profit organizations to facilitate collective development projects. Facilitators and owners of such projects need to consider what makes these projects more effective and why both public and private companies from construction and real estate field should choose their projects. Facilitators need to consider how to make the project group productive and result-oriented, such that companies choose these projects over other projects, and get the desired outcome. Furthermore, based on the project, companies may choose different people to represent them. Therefore, the question is “What kind of group is productive in such collective development projects?”

This paper aims to understand: who should be part of the collective development projects? What kind of support structures are needed for making the change happen? And, how to form productive groups by using the typology of the participants. Therefore, before we could start forming productive groups, we studied what types of people were participating in the collective development projects (Latvala and Singh, 2017). Analyzing participants’ behavior using attribute-codes such as leads, listens, fills the room, shares and explains, etc, we were able to cluster all participants into five different types: 1) opinionated speakers, 2) emphatic leaders, 3) active respondents, 4) passive respondents, and 5) listeners. These types are more than just personality types, since the same person can behave differently depending on the situation or the leader (Latvala and Singh, 2017).

In this paper we use the same research data from one project C1 including altogether 5 different workshops as we used to find the types. This project is from one organization, Organization R, which is a Finnish association for Real estate owners and developers. Development project used in this paper took place in fall 2015 and spring 2016.

This article has six sections. The first three are introduction, background and methodology including data gathering. The last three sections include the results and analysis, a discussion, and conclusions.

## **BACKGROUND**

Organization R’s collective development projects typically aim to change practices and behavior or ways of working of all network’s organizations, but Organization R cannot do it alone and everybody from the network cannot be part of all ongoing innovation work. Therefore, there is need for smaller development group and participants in these projects can be seen as a leading group of change-agents or pioneers, who can initiate the change in the whole network. Since there are no nominated leaders in Organization R’s development projects, and facilitator do not specifically tell participants how the group should act, these groups can also be seen

as self-managed teams. Furthermore, personality also affects team performance. One of the goals of Organization R is knowledge sharing between member companies so that they can innovate together, which cannot be done by one company alone.

There is very limited research on these aspects in the Finnish construction industry, especially on collective development projects. Nonetheless, several studies have investigated what kind of coalitions need to be to make change happen (Kotter, 1995, 1996), how does distributed leadership affect teamwork (Carson et al. 2007), how people and personalities have an effect on group effectiveness and teamwork (Campion et al., 1993, 1996) and what balanced discussion means for productivity (du Chatenier et al., 2009).

According to Kotter (1995, 1996), this kind of group can be called leading coalition. The leading coalition needs those who have the power within their organization, or the network in our case, and those who have the expertise from the relevant field. Leading coalition needs also have credibility and leadership. (Kotter, 1995, 1996). According to Kotter and Rathgeber (2009), coalition needs to have among other things leadership skills, trust, and communication skills. Also Stoker et al. (2001) suggest that to be able to perform effectively, self-managing teams need to have leadership.

Self-managing teams, like the teams found in the studied case, can have more than one leader (Latvala and Singh, 2017). When there is more than one leader in the group, leadership is shared or distributed (Buharist et al., 2008). As noted by Carson et al. (2007), shared leadership has positive effect on team performance. It evolves with external support like coaching and setting up common goals, as well as by mutual encouragement by team members when they see each other's contribution. In addition, Kets De Vries (1999) suggests that when groups are informal and with distributed leadership, and there is still the need for effective team work, then there is need to have the possibilities for open dialogue and the members of the group need to support each other.

There are four influential factors in team productivity, which can be combined based on personality types. These four are leadership, communication, cohesion and heterogeneity. For example, lack of communication is always bad for teamwork, and ineffective leadership can destroy the work. An effective team is a combination of different personality types. For example, there should be extroverts, who are normally the leaders, but too many extroverts in the same group can be harmful for the result (Bradley and Herbert, 1997). Also Kichuk et al., 1997 have identified the big five personality factors: conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness and openness to experience. All these have impact on successful team performance. For example, extraversion has more positive effect on successful team performance, and successful teams have more agreeableness than unsuccessful teams.

Based on du Chatenier et al. (2009), these groups can also be called open innovation teams. Such teams need to be balanced to be able to perform successfully. For example, power distribution between team members affects team performance. Strong individual agendas can have negative impact on the team's success (du Chatenier et al., 2009).

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **RESEARCH METHODS AND DESIGN**

The research has been done using qualitative methods, which are justified since the research involves people and social phenomenon that is affected by subjectivity of the social actors (Bryman and Bell, 2011). When doing qualitative research, Silverman (2000) identifies five methods of gathering information: interviews, audiotapes, videotapes, texts and ethnographies. For the part of the research reported in this paper, data from the workshops is collected using videocameras, audiorecorders, and hand-written notes based on observations.

The research reported in this paper is designed as case study research, as part of a bigger multiple-case study. As Bryman and Bell (2015) suggest, multiple-case study can show what is unique and what is common for all cases. In our context, each of Organization R's case is a unique project, and each project has more than one workshop that provides opportunity to collect data, make observations, and validate them.

Organization R has several ongoing collective development projects, which are based on ideas of co-creation: taking a real life problem like 'how to measure performance of knowledge worker and how to create collective measurements for that', gathering stakeholders together to solve it, and use the results to change something (Ramaswamy and Gouillart, 2010). All the Organization R's projects have different problem, but the process is the same. Project usually includes two seminars, which are open to everybody interested in the topic. Each project includes 3-5 workshops for the invited participants only. Duration of a typical project is 3-6 months. Workshops are held 3-4 weeks apart. 2-3 persons from Organization R's crew facilitate each project. They collect participants for the project based on participants' expertise, position in the network, the profile of the company, but not considering the type or personality of the participants. The facilitator does all the planning of the workshops and formation of the groups. The lead author of this paper was part of the facilitation crew.

The PhD research includes observations from several different collective development projects. This paper focusses on project C1, while the observations from other projects are yet to be analysed in detail.

This paper aims to address the following question and hypothesis:

- Q: What is the productive group composition based on the combination of the identified participant types?
- H: A productive group has at least one leader and one or more active respondents to support balanced discussion and the group reaches consensus of the results.

Content analysis in this paper is done using transcriptions from the videos. Analyses has done for six different videos of group work. Each video is around 1.5 hours. The various aspects of group work reviewed in section 2 including leadership, strong own agendas, interaction, encouragement and support, balanced dialog and agreeableness have been used to analyse team productivity.

At this stage of the research, preliminary observations from other projects C2 and C3 are used to validate the observations made in project C1. Later on the results will

be validated to ensure their reliability by using other projects from other organizations and observations made by colleagues.

### **EMPIRICAL SETTINGS**

Case C1 had five workshops, and observations were made in all these even though transcriptions are available from only three of these workshops. The opening workshop did not have videotaping. Workshop 1 had one circulating camera, but the quality of audio was too poor to make transcriptions. Workshop 2 had one circulating camera and two fixed cameras. Workshops 3 and 4 had one circulating camera, two tape-recorders and two fixed cameras. Observations from opening workshop and workshop 1 gave preliminary indicators on how people behave in certain groups and situations.

The smaller discussion groups in these workshops were formed using the following basic rules: all members of a group, if possible, should be from different organizations and different working profiles, such as consultant, contractor, owner and researcher. The group members should come from companies that are different such as pioneering companies, beginners/ emerging companies and something in between. Also, preliminary rules based on personality and leadership skills were used to form groups, but these rules were refined during C1 and will be validated later. There were 5-7 groups in each of the workshops, with 4-6 members in each group.

At the beginning of each workshop, the facilitator directed the work and set the common goals. The facilitator was available for external support to each of the groups during the work, if necessary. Since results of the workshops are based on group notes, printed forms were used to collect answers for the problem in hand. In the workshop 2, there was only individual forms, no group form. Workshops 3 and 4 had both individual as well as group forms.

### **RESULTS AND ANALYSIS**

Sample transcriptions are shown in this section to show good and bad cases of the group work based on aspects reviewed in section 2. Since there are cases from different workshops, and in each workshop there are different groups, cases have been identified by workshop and group number.

In workshop two, group 2 had all five types of people: 1) opinionated speakers, 2) emphatic leaders, 3) active respondents, 4) passive respondents, and 5) listeners. This group was an example of having one extrovert and no strong leader. It had one opinionated speaker (type 1), who filled the room and took the lead from time to time. The emphatic leader (type 2) tried to start the discussion and took the lead, but was not strong enough to prevent opinionated speaker (type 1) from dominating the session. The opinionated speaker (type 1) made leadership ineffective, and emphatic leader (type 2) behaved more like active respondent (type 3). Eventually, the result of the first part of the workshop was a monolog by opinionated speaker (type 1):

*Opinionated speaker: "This was mainly my monolog now..."*

*Active respondent: "How about if you tell to others your story..."*

*Opinionated speaker: "...so I will tell how it is in my company..."*

The second part of the discussion continued like the first part, and the emphatic leader (type 2) was not able to give the group summary:

*Emphatic leader:* “Since I am not able to repeat all we discussed, I will tell my own thoughts.”

In workshop two, group 1 had one emphatic leader (type 2), one active respondent (type 3), two passive respondents (type 4) and one listener (type 5). This group was an example of encouragement and supportive leadership. Their discussion was more balanced and emphatic leader (type 2) encouraged others to talk:

*Emphatic leader to Passive respondents:* “You haven’t said anything yet.”

Group 1’s results were more consensus-driven than group 2:

*Active respondent:* “We started by challenging the subject... We also thought...”

In workshop 3, group 1 had one emphatic leader (type 2) and three active respondents (type 3a, 3b, 3c). This group was an example of good leadership, distributed leadership and balanced discussion. Emphatic leader (type 2) took the lead, made decisions, and made sure that the work got done:

*Emphatic leader:* “Should we write here...”

*Active respondents (Type 3c):* “I can take notes...”

*Emphatic leader:* “Then you have that...”

The discussion was balanced, giving everyone the opportunity to participate, and there were high levels of agreement:

*Emphatic leader:* “You could write...”

*Active respondents (Type 3a):* “I think...”

*Emphatic leader:* “Yes, yes...”

*Active respondents (Type 3c):* Ways to work...”

*Emphatic leader:* “Put that there...”

*Active respondents (Type 3b):* “One thing could be...”

When emphatic leader (type 2) left the group, leadership became more shared:

*Active respondents (Type 3c):* “What comes to your mind...”

*Active respondents (Type 3b):* “That question is hard...”

*Active respondents (Type 3a):* “I would see it like this...”

...

*Active respondents (Type 3c):* “I think we got it all.”

In workshop 3, group 2 had two opinionated speakers (type 1a, 1b), one active respondent (type 3), one passive respondent (type 4) and one listener (type 5). This group was an example of having too many extroverts with strong own agenda and no strong leadership. Type 1a tried to lead and be like emphatic leader (type 2), but had too many own ideas to promote, which was not supported by most of the group.

Passive respondent (type 4) tried to change the way of working and bring the focus back to the task, and become like emphatic leader (type 2). Type 1b also had strong personal agenda.

*Opinionated speakers (Type 1a): "I think we don't have time to do both."*

*Passive respondent: "Should we think..."*

*Opinionated speakers (Type 1a): "Now I am leading you on..."*

*Opinionated speakers (Type 1b): "I thought about value for client..."*

*Opinionated speakers (Type 1a): "Should we take two from here and two from here..."*

Group 2 did not nominate any specific individual to take notes. The group could not decide how to proceed even though the facilitator tried to support their work. The final result was that group 2 could not get the work done:

*Opinionated speakers (Type 1a): "We weren't able to finish the task, but I'll improvise."*

In workshop 4, group 1 had one opinionated speaker (type 1), one emphatic leader (type 2) and two active respondents (type 3). This group was an example of strong leadership over opinionated speaker. Though opinionated speaker (type 1) had strong own agenda, emphatic leader (type 2) was strong enough leader to get work done with the help of others:

*Emphatic leader: "Should we start from the top..."*

*Active respondents (Type 3a): "We can try..."*

*Opinionated speakers: "I would like to have client satisfaction."*

...

*Opinionated speakers: "Can we put client first..."*

*Emphatic leader: "Yes, write that down... and put under that..."*

*Active respondents (Type 3a): "What under a client..."*

....

*Opinionated speakers: "Client, productivity..."*

*Emphatic leader: "I agree, but the basic question is..."*

## **QUALITATIVE OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION**

There are similarities between our findings and the findings from the previous studies on team formation. For example, Kotter (1995) found the need for leadership and Bradley and Herbert (1997) found that personality affects teamwork. The primary difference in our research is the basis of identifying the typology. We not only classify personality types based on participatory actions and behaviour, but we also concentrate on leadership and active communication aspects.

As observed in the results, participants are ready to share and analyse different situations to reach the common goal. Facilitator's support during the group work and printed group forms also have impact on results. Group 1 in workshop 3 is a good example when not nominating someone to take notes has a negative impact. Group 1 is also a good example about the importance of facilitator's support. They managed get at least one decision made even though they could not reach a consensus. Also,

results from workshop 2 demonstrate that the facilitator needs to make sure that there is a group form, and someone is nominated to take notes. Without a form and a nominated secretary, the reporting of results is more about what one person remembers from the discussions or knows about the subject.

The results also show that the work will get done productively if there is an emphatic leader (type 2). For example, group 2 in workshop 3 had balanced discussion and the group members arrived at consensual results. The group leader made others comfortable and willing to talk and share their views. This leader also led the discussion, made decisions if necessary, made sure everybody was heard, and ensured that eventually the work was done. In this kind of a group, there was no need for external support, other than the group form. Group 2 in workshop 2 provided a good example of the leader encouraging others. Group 2 in workshop 3 is a good example of positive impact of shared leadership, because the work was accomplished even after the type 2 leader left.

Group 1 in workshop 3 is an example of a non-desirable situation, and group 1 in workshop 4 is a good example of the situation when there is need for strong leader, who sees the bigger picture without filling the room with strong personal agenda. Strong leadership was found to be especially required when there is one or more opinionated speaker (type 1). Group 1 in workshop 3 also shows that having active (type 3) and passive respondents (type 4) in the group without leadership is not enough to break the dominating influence of the opinionated speakers. Too many extroverts in one group have negative impact on the group work. Leaders need help from active respondents to facilitate effective knowledge sharing and refinement of the results, as seen in group 2 in workshop 3. Active respondents can also assist emphatic leaders in managing opinionated speakers, as seen in group 1 in workshop 4.

The results and analysis of situations mentioned above provide good examples of productive groups: 1) Group 1 in workshop 2, 2) Group 2 in workshop 3, and 3) Group 1 in workshop 4. This validates our hypothesis that for a group to be productive there is the need for an emphatic leader as well as one or more active respondents. Additionally, if there are opinionated speakers in the group, there is need for a strong leader who can balance the group interaction with the help of active respondents.

However, further questions remain. How do we activate the passive respondents or listeners? How do we ensure that all the participants get something out of the collective work? How do we ensure that everybody is committed to the targeted change? That is, even if we know the types of participants in a collective development project, and even if we know how to form the desirable group, there is still the need for support structures and mechanisms to ensure that the collective development projects deliver the intended outcomes and bring about the desired change. Affect-based trust (Cheung et al. 2016) could be one of these mechanisms and good direction to continue our study.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

This paper investigates group dynamics in collective development projects within real estate and construction sector in Finland. The limitations of the study are, that case study is based within one organization's development project even the study includes observations from multiple videotaped workshops, and is done from one perspective only.

This paper is aimed at finding good group composition for productive group work and workshop. The analyses is based on qualitative analysis of the transcriptions from different situations in different workshops. Findings prove the hypothesis that the productive group should have at least one emphatic leader and one or more active respondents. The best example of productive group is Group 2 in workshop 3, which has good emphatic leader and balanced discussion between her and active respondents and the worst example is Group 1 in workshop 3, which has too many opinionated speakers, but no strong emphatic leader. Preliminary observations from other development projects within the case organization validate the results.

## REFERENCES

- Bradley, J., Hebert, F. (1997). The effect of personality type on team performance. *Journal of Management*, 16(5), 337-353.
- Bryman, A., Bell, E. (2015). *Business research methods*. 4rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 389-605.
- Buhanist, P., Kostamo, T., Kallio, K., Talja, H. (2008). Hajautunut johtajuus keskijohdon näkökulmasta. *Työelämän Tutkimuspäivät 2008*, Tampere, 1-11.
- Campion, M., Papper, E., Medsker, G. (1996). Relations between work team characteristics and effectiveness: a replication and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 429-452.
- Campion, M., Medsker, G., Higgs, A.C. (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: implications for designing effective work groups. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(4), 823-850.
- Carson, J., Tesluk, P., Marrone, J. (2007). Shared Leadership in Teams: An Investigation of Antecedent Conditions and Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1217-1234.
- Cheung, S., Gong, Y., Wang, M., Zhou, L., Shi, J. (2016). When and how does functional diversity influence team innovation? The mediating role of knowledge sharing and the moderation role of affect-based trust in a team. *Human relations*, 69(7), 1507-1531.
- du Chatenier, E., Verstegen, J., Biemans, H., Mulder, M., Omta, O. (2009). The Challenge of Collaborative Knowledge Creation in Open Innovation Teams. *Human Resources Development Review*, 8(3), 350-381.
- Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (1999). High-performance teams: Lessons from the pygmies. *Organizational Dynamics*, winter, 66-77.
- Kichuk, S., Wiesner, W. (1997). The Big Five personality factors and team performance: implications for selecting successful product design teams. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 14, 195-221.
- Kotter, J.P. (1996) *Muutos vaatii johtajuutta*. Rastor, 49-53.
- Kotter J.P. (1995). Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail by J.P. Kotter, *Harvard Business Review*, 73(2), 59-67.
- Kotter, J.P., Rathgeber, H. (2009). *Jäävuoremme sulaa, Muutos ja menestyminen kaikissa olosuhteissa*. Porvoo: WSOY, 125-127.
- Latvala, M., Singh V. (2017), Types of people in communal development projects in construction sector: Are they effective together? *ICED 2017 – 21<sup>st</sup> International Conference on Engineering Design 2017* (accepted).
- Ramaswamy, V., Guillard, F. (2010). Building the Co-Creative Enterprise. *Harvard Business Review*, 10, 100-109.

Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing Qualitative Research: A practical Handbook*. London: Sage, 1-316.

Stoker, J., Looise, J., Fisscher, O., de Jong, R. (2001). Leadership and innovation: relations between leadership, individual characteristics and functioning of R&D team. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(7), 1141-1151.

# DESIRABLE COMBINATION OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF PEOPLE IN COMMUNAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Latvala Marika<sup>1</sup> and Vishal Singh<sup>2</sup>

## ABSTRACT

In the construction business a number of trends associated with digitalization, collaboration models, and lean theories are beginning to emerge, opening new opportunities. While there is a need to develop the whole industry, most companies seem to have lot to do just to get their business going. Following the same trends, there is need to be more effective in communal development projects as well. Communal development projects are those projects that aim to bring about a communal/collective change, and a non-profit organization or industry association may be driving such projects. This paper is part of a larger study that aims to understand who should be part of the communal development projects to make them more effective, and what kind of support structures are needed for making the change happen.

Based on earlier findings in this research, the participants in these projects and related workshops were classified into five types: 1) Opinionated speakers, 2) Emphatic leaders, 3) Active respondents, 4) Passive respondents and 5) Listeners. Therefore, this paper aims to identify the desirable combination of participant types that would make the workshops more effective, and results more useful for the participants.

Analysis of collected data suggests that to be effective there is need for emphatic leaders who give other participants possibilities to tell their opinion and ideas, but also make sure that the work gets done. If there is an opinionated speaker who fills the room, there is need for a strong emphatic leader. There is also the need for one or more active respondents so that there can be balanced discussions, effective working, and results based on consensus.

## KEYWORDS

Effectiveness, self-management, group composition, type, leadership

## INTRODUCTION

The construction business needs to be effective to be able to keep the business going and the costs low for the end-users. Creating value for end-users has become more important than it used to be. Renewed emphasis on lean theories are not the only motivation to be effective, but companies seem to have a lot to do and develop without adequate resources. Hence, companies need to prioritize their participation. Money or lack of it is a good way to prioritize, and so are the government decisions,

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD Student, School of Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland [marika.latvala@aalto.fi](mailto:marika.latvala@aalto.fi)

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, School of Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland, [vishal.singh@aalto.fi](mailto:vishal.singh@aalto.fi)

but the easiest way is to leave those projects that the company cannot benefit from. However, the companies cannot just leave all communal development projects, because there is an obligation to contribute to projects that aim for collective development of the industry, and the unique expertise of the companies may be required. That is, “even if the communal development project is no-one’s business, it is everybody’s business”. Hence, companies mostly try choose those projects that support their business and where the results are useful for them. Facilitators and owners of such projects need to consider what makes their project more effective and why companies should choose their project. Facilitators need to consider how to make the project group effective and result-oriented, such that participants choose these projects over other projects, and get the desired outcome. Furthermore, based on the project, companies may choose different people to represent them. Therefore, the question is “What kind of group is desirable?”

Findings presented in this paper are part of an ongoing PhD research, which aims to understand who should be part of the communal development projects and what kind of support structures are needed for making the change happen. There is very limited research on these aspects in the Finnish construction industry, especially on communal development projects. Nonetheless, several studies have investigated how people and personalities have an effect on group effectiveness and teamwork (Campion et al., 1993, 1996). Therefore, before we could start forming desirable groups, we studied what types of people were participating in the communal development projects (Latvala and Singh, 2017). Analyzing participants’ behavior using attribute-codes such as leads, listens, fills the room, shares and explains, etc, we were able to cluster all participants into five different types: 1) opinionated speakers, 2) emphatic leaders, 3) active respondents, 4) passive respondents, and 5) listeners. These types are more than just personality types, since the same person can behave differently depending on the situation or the leader (Latvala and Singh, 2017). Following this typology, this paper investigates how to form effective groups by using these five types of participants.

We use the same research data from three different projects including altogether 10 different workshops as we used to find the types. These projects are from one organization, Organization R, which is a Finnish association for real estate owners and developers. Development projects used in this research took place in fall 2015 and spring 2016.

The rest of this article is organized in five sections. The next two sections explain the background and methodology, including the data gathering process. The last three sections include the results and analysis, a discussion, and conclusions.

## **BACKGROUND**

Organization R’s communal development projects typically aim to change the behavior or ways of working of its member organizations. Participants in these projects can be seen as a group of change-agents, who can initiate the change in the whole network. According to Kotter (1995, 1996), to make organizational change happen, there is a need for leading coalition. Leading coalition needs those who have the power within their organization, or the network in our case, and those who have the expertise from the relevant field. Leading coalition also needs to have credibility and leadership. (Kotter, 1995, 1996). According to Kotter and Rathgeber (2009),

coalition needs to have among other things leadership skills, trust, and communication skills.

One of the goals of Organization R is knowledge sharing between member companies so that they can innovate together, which cannot be done by one company alone. Based on du Chatenier et al. (2009), these can be called open innovation teams. Such teams need to be balanced to be able to perform successfully. For example, power distribution between team members affects team performance. Strong individual agendas can have negative impact on the team's success (du Chatenier et al., 2009).

Since there are no nominated leaders in Organization R's development projects, and facilitator do not specifically tell participants how the group should act, these groups can also be seen as self-managed teams. According to Stoker et al. (2001), to be able to perform effectively, self-managing teams need to have leadership. Self-managing teams, like the teams found in the studied case, can have more than one leader (Latvala and Singh, 2017). When there is more than one leader in the group, leadership is shared or distributed. It includes more interaction than one nominated leader model (Buhanist et al., 2008). As noted by Carson et al. (2007), shared leadership has positive effect on team performance. It evolves with external support like coaching and setting up common goals, as well as by mutual encouragement by team members when they see each other's contribution. In addition, De Vries (1999) suggests that when groups are informal and with distributed leadership, and there is still the need for effective team work, then there is need to have the possibilities for open dialogue and the members of the group need to support each other.

Furthermore, personality also affects team performance. There are four influential factors in team productivity, which can be combined based on personality types. These four are leadership, communication, cohesion and heterogeneity. For example, lack of communication is always bad for teamwork, and ineffective leadership can destroy the work. An effective team is a combination of different personality types. For example, there should be extroverts, who are normally the leaders, but too many extroverts in the same group can be harmful for the result (Bradley and Herbert, 1997).

Kichuk et al. (1997) have identified the big five personality factors: conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness and openness to experience. All these have impact on successful team performance. For example, extraversion has a positive effect on team performance, and successful teams have more agreeableness than unsuccessful teams.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **RESEARCH METHODS AND DESIGN**

This research uses qualitative methods, which is justified because the research involves people and social phenomenon (Bryman and Bell, 2011). When doing qualitative research, Silverman (2000) identifies five methods of gathering information: interviews, audiotapes, videotapes, texts and ethnographies. For the research reported in this paper, data from the workshops is collected using videotapes, audiotapes, and hand-written notes based on the observations during the workshops.

The research reported in this paper is designed as case study research, as part of a bigger multiple-case study. As Bryman and Bell (2015) suggest, multiple-case study

can show what is unique and what is common across all the cases. In our context, each of Organization R's case is a unique project, and each project has more than one workshop that provides opportunity to collect data, make observations, and validate them.

Organization R has several ongoing communal development projects, which are based on ideas of co-creation: taking a real life problem like 'how to measure knowledge work', gathering stakeholders together to solve it, and use the results to change something (Ramaswamy and Gouillart, 2010). All projects have a different problem, but the process is the same. Each project includes two seminars, which are open to everybody interested in the topic. Each project also includes 3-5 workshops, but only for the invited participants. Duration of a typical project is 3-6 months. 2-3 people from Organization R's crew facilitate each project. They collect participants for the project based on participants' expertise, position in the network, the profile of the company, but not considering the type or personality of the participants. The facilitator does all the planning of the workshops and formation of the groups. The lead author of this paper was part of the facilitation crew.

The research reported in this paper includes observation from three different communal development projects C1, C2 and C3. This paper mainly focusses on project C1, while the observations from projects C2 and C3 are yet to be analysed in detail. This paper aims to address the following question and hypothesis:

- Q: What is the desirable group composition based on the combination of the identified participant types?
- H: A desirable group for effective workshops has at least one leader and one or more active respondents.

Analysis in this research is done using transcriptions of the different situations. The various aspects of group work reviewed in Section 2 including self-management, participation, goal interdependence, and communication (Campion et al., 1993, 1996) have been used to analyse team effectiveness.

At this stage of the research, preliminary observations from C2 and C3 are used to validate the observations made in project C1. The results will be validated later to ensure their reliability by using other projects from other organizations and observations made by colleagues.

#### **EMPIRICAL SETTINGS**

Case C1 had five workshops, and observations were made in all these workshops. However, transcriptions are available from only three workshops. The opening workshop did not have videotaping. Workshop 1 had one circulating camera, but the quality of audio was too poor to make transcriptions. Workshop 2 had one circulating camera and two fixed cameras. Workshops 3 and 4 had one circulating camera, two tape-recorders and two fixed cameras. Observations from opening workshop and workshop 1 gave preliminary indicators on how people behave in certain groups and situations.

The smaller discussion groups in these workshops were formed using the following basic rules: all members of a group, if possible, should be from different organizations and with different working profiles, such as consultant, contractor, owner and researcher. The group members should come from companies that are different such as pioneering companies, beginners/ emerging companies, and

something in between. There were 5-7 groups in each of the workshops, with 4-6 members in each group. Groups were different in each workshop, so that wider knowledge sharing was possible.

At the beginning of each workshop, the facilitator directed the work and set the common goals. The facilitator was available for external support to each of the groups during the work, if necessary. Printed forms were also used to collect answers for the problems discussed. In the workshop 2, there was only individual forms, no group form. Workshops 3 and 4 had both individual as well as group forms.

## **RESULTS AND ANALYSIS**

In workshop 2, group 2 had all five types of people. It had one type 1 person, who filled the room and took the lead from time to time. The type 2 person tried to start the discussion and took the lead, but was not strong enough to prevent type 1 from dominating the session. The type 1 person made leadership ineffective, and type 2 person behaved more like type 3. Eventually, the result of the first part of the workshop was a monolog by type 1:

*Type 1: "This was mainly my monolog now..."*

*Type 3: "How about if you tell to others your story..."*

*Type 1: "...so I will tell how it is in my company..."*

The second part of the discussion continued like the first part, and the type 2 person was not able to give the group summary:

*Type 2: "Since I am not able to repeat all we discussed, I will tell my own thoughts."*

Group 1 in workshop 2 had one type 2 person, one type 3, two type 4, and one type 5 person. Their discussion was more balanced and type 2 encouraged others to talk:

*Type 2 to type 4: "You haven't said anything yet."*

Group 1's results were more consensus-driven than group 2:

*Type 3: "We started by challenging the subject... We also thought..."*

In workshop 3, group 1 had one type 2, and three type 3 people (3a, 3b, 3c). Type 2 took the lead, made decisions, and made sure that the work got done:

*Type 2: "Should we write here..."*

*Type 3c: "I can take notes..."*

*Type 2: "Then you have that..."*

The discussion was balanced, giving everyone the opportunity to participate, and there were high levels of agreement:

*Type 2: "You could write..."*

Type 3a: *"I think..."*  
Type 2: *"Yes, yes..."*  
Type 3c: *Ways to work..."*  
Type 2: *"Put that there..."*  
Type 3b: *"One thing could be..."*

When type 2 left the group, leadership became more shared:

Type 3c: *"What comes to your mind..."*  
Type 3b: *"That question is hard..."*  
Type 3a: *"I would see it like this..."*  
...  
Type 3c: *"I think we got it all."*

Group 2 in workshop 3 had two type 1, one type 3, one type 4, and one type 5 person. Type 1a tried to lead and be like type 2, but had too many own ideas to promote, which was not supported by most of the group. Type 4 tried to change the way of working and bring the focus back to the task, and become like type 2. Type 1b also had strong personal agenda.

Type 1a: *"I think we don't have time to do both."*  
Type 4: *"Should we think..."*  
Type 1a: *"Now I am leading you on..."*  
Type 1b: *"I thought about value for client..."*  
Type 1a: *"Should we take two from here and two from here..."*

Group 2 did not nominate any specific individual to take notes. The group could not decide how to proceed even though the facilitator tried to support their work. The final result was that group 2 could not get the work done:

Type 1a: *"We weren't able to finish the task, but I'll improvise."*

In workshop 4, group 1 had one type 1, one type 2, and two type 3 persons. Though type 1 had strong own agenda, type 2 was strong enough leader to get work done with the help of others:

Type 2: *"Should we start from the top..."*  
Type 3a: *"We can try..."*  
Type 1: *"I would like to have client satisfaction."*  
...  
Type 1: *"Can we put client first..."*  
Type 2: *"Yes, write that down... and put under that..."*  
Type 3a: *"What under a client..."*  
....  
Type 1: *"Client, productivity..."*  
Type 2: *"I agree, but the basic question is..."*

## **QUALITATIVE OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION**

There are similarities between our findings and the findings from the previous studies on team formation. For example, Kotter (1995) found the need for leadership and Bradley and Herbert (1997) found that personality affects teamwork. The primary difference in our research is the basis of identifying the typology. We not only classify personality types based on participatory actions and behaviour, but we also concentrate on leadership and active communication aspects.

As observed in the results, participants are ready to share and analyse different situations to reach the common goal. Facilitator's support during the group work and printed group forms also have impact on results. Group 1 in workshop 3 is a good example when not nominating someone to take notes has a negative impact. Group 1 is also a good example about the importance of facilitator's support. They managed to get at least one decision made even though they could not reach a consensus. Also, results from workshop 2 demonstrate that the facilitator needs to make sure that there is a group form, and someone is nominated to take notes. Without a form and a nominated secretary, the reporting of results is more about what one person remembers from the discussions or knows about the subject.

The results also show that the work will get done effectively if there is an emphatic leader (type 2). For example, group 2 in workshop 3 had balanced discussion and the group members arrived at consensual results. The group leader made others comfortable and willing to talk and share their views. This leader also led the discussion, made decisions if necessary, made sure everybody was heard, and ensured that eventually the work was done. In this kind of a group, there was no need for external support, other than the group form. Group 2 in workshop 2 provided a good example of the leader encouraging others. Group 2 in workshop 3 is a good example of positive impact of shared leadership, because the work was accomplished even after the type 2 leader left.

Group 1 in workshop 3 is an example of a non-desirable situation, and group 1 in workshop 4 is a good example of the situation when there is need for strong leader, who sees the bigger picture without filling the room with strong personal agenda. Strong leadership was found to be especially required when there is one or more opinionated speaker (type 1). Group 1 in workshop 3 also shows that having active (type 3) and passive respondents (type 4) in the group without leadership is not enough to break the dominating influence of the opinionated speakers. Too many extroverts in one group have negative impact on the group work. Leaders need help from active respondents to facilitate effective knowledge sharing and refinement of the results, as seen in group 2 in workshop 3. Active respondents can also assist emphatic leaders in managing opinionated speakers, as seen in group 1 in workshop 4.

The results and analysis of situations mentioned above provide good examples of desirable groups: 1) Group 1 in workshop 2, 2) Group 2 in workshop 3, and 3) Group 1 in workshop 4. This validates our hypothesis that for a group to be effective there is the need for an emphatic leader as well as one or more active respondents. Additionally, if there are opinionated speakers in the group, there is need for a strong leader who can balance the group interaction with the help of active respondents.

However, further questions remain. How do we activate the passive respondents or listeners? How do we ensure that all the participants get something out of the collective work? How do we ensure that everybody is committed to the targeted

change? That is, even if we know the types of participants in a collective development project, and even if we know how to form the desirable group, there is still the need for support structures and mechanisms to ensure that the communal development projects deliver the intended outcomes and bring about the desired change. Affect-based trust (Cheung et al. 2016) could be one of these mechanisms and good direction to continue our study.

## CONCLUSIONS

This paper investigates group dynamics in communal development projects within real estate and construction sector in Finland. The case studies are based within one organization's development projects, and include observations from multiple videotaped workshops. This paper is aimed at finding desirable group composition for effective group work and workshop. The findings are based on qualitative analysis of the transcriptions from different situations. Findings prove the hypothesis that the desirable group should have at least one emphatic leader and one or more active respondents. Preliminary observations from other development projects within the case organization validate the results.

## REFERENCES

- Bradley, J., Hebert, F. (1997). The effect of personality type on team performance. *Journal of Management*, 16(5), 337-353.
- Bryman, A., Bell, E. (2015). *Business research methods*. 4rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 389-605.
- Buhanist, P., Kostamo, T., Kallio, K., Talja, H. (2008). Hajautunut johtajuus keskijohdon näkökulmasta. *Työelämän Tutkimuspäivät 2008*, Tampere, 1-11.
- Campion, M., Papper, E., Medsker, G. (1996). Relations between work team characteristics and effectiveness: a replication and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 429-452.
- Campion, M., Medsker, G., Higgs, A.C. (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: implications for designing effective work groups. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(4), 823-850.
- Carson, J., Tesluk, P., Marrone, J. (2007). Shared Leadership in Teams: An Investigation of Antecedent Conditions and Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1217-1234.
- Cheung, S., Gong, Y., Wang, M., Zhou, L., Shi, J. (2016). When and how does functional diversity influence team innovation? The mediating role of knowledge sharing and the moderation role of affect-based trust in a team. *Human relations*, 69(7), 1507-1531.
- du Chatenier, E., Versteegen, J., Biemans, H., Mulder, M., Omta, O. (2009). The Challenge of Collaborative Knowledge Creation in Open Innovation Teams. *Human Resources Development Review*, 8(3), 350-381.
- Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (1999). High-performance teams: Lessons from the pygmies. *Organizational Dynamics*, winter, 66-77.
- Kichuk, S., Wiesner, W. (1997). The Big Five personality factors and team performance: implications for selecting successful product design teams. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 14, 195-221.
- Kotter, J.P. (1996) *Muutos vaatii johtajuutta*. Rastor, 49-53.

- Kotter J.P. (1995). Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail by J.P. Kotter, *Harvard Business Review*, 73(2), 59-67.
- Kotter, J.P., Rathgeber, H. (2009). *Jäävuoremme sulaa, Muutos ja menestyminen kaikissa olosuhteissa*. Porvoo: WSOY, 125-127.
- Latvala, M., Singh V. (2017), Types of people in communal development projects in construction sector: Are they effective together? *ICED 2017 – 21<sup>st</sup> International Conference on Engineering Design 2017* (accepted).
- Ramaswamy, V., Gouillart, F. (2010). Building the Co-Creative Enterprise. *Harvard Business Review*, 10, 100-109.
- Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing Qualitative Research: A practical Handbook*. London: Sage, 1-316.
- Stoker, J., Looise, J., Fisscher, O., de Jong, R. (2001). Leadership and innovation: relations between leadership, individual characteristics and functioning of R&D team. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(7), 1141-1151.