Assessing Emotional Intelligence and Facilitating a Dynamic Team-Building Intervention at St. Andrew Anglican Church, Alogboshie-Achimota: A Practice-Based Case Report

Rev'd Fr. Isaac Nii Kwantsi Otoo

Parish Priest, St. Andrew Anglican Church, Alogboshie (Anglican Diocese of Accra).

Chaplain, Korle Bu Teaching Hospital, Accra and Medifem Hospital, Haatso.

Student, Organisation Development Institute, Ghana.

Student, Clinical Pastoral Education, Nigeria.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.101000583

Received: 11 October 2026; Accepted: 24 October 2026; Published: 12 November 2026

ABSTRACT

Congregations embody a rich social systems. Different levels of personalities, ages, experiences, expectations, gifts, and different communication styles exist within a congregation. These can enrich and strengthen a congregation, but can also lead to miscommunication and conflict.

This case report provides details of a team building workshop facilitated on the 15th and 16th of May, 2026 for 13 members of St. Andrew Anglican Church, Alogboshie-Achimota in Accra. The purpose of the workshop was to build emotional intelligence and foster team building among members of the Church. The Boston Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire was used to reflect on the five competencies of emotional intelligence which are self-awareness, self-management, motivation, social skills and empathy. The Group Mean score for self-management was 14.6/20, motivation was 14.6/20, social skills 16.0/20, empathy 16.7/20, and self-awareness 16.3/20. All the Mean scores were in the "Good but needs some work" band. There were several activities including getting to know you, age-continuum activity, Case Discussion, Cave Rescue, and facilitated reflection on listening and shared responsibility. The questionnaire indicated that self-management was the most common development need. It also indicated that empathy was a strength. There are several problems the case discusses under the framework of Organisation Development and Change (OD&C) and a follow-up plan is included. The case report offers cautious reading as it represents an opening diagnosis and not a test of whether positive changes have occurred.

Keywords: Organisation development, Emotional Intelligence, Team building, Action Learning, Practice-based Case report, Congregational Change, Leadership.

INTRODUCTION

Being human means being different. People in the same organization experience life events in different ways in terms of emotions, levels of communications, decisions, responses to changes, etc. Members of a congregation share similar spiritual beliefs, historical heritage and legacies. However, they may differ in handling leadership challenges, participation, responsibility, communications, and peace/disagreement. Shared beliefs don't ensure trust and collaboration. In the absence of shared beliefs, collaboration in the workplace and trust would equally be lacking. OD focuses on behavior and helps to identify root causes of absence of trust and collaboration. OD leverages on adult learning principles. It embraces participation, learning and improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency beyond structure, systems and processes. (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Schein & Schein, 2017).

This report contains an OD Case Study conducted at St. Andrew's Anglican Church, Alogboshie-Achimota. The leadership continues to embark on various evangelism and outreaches to encourage and strengthen membership.

This report includes an emotional-intelligence profile of thirteen participants. It outlines what the two-day intervention did and did not achieve. The report gives a proposed plan for OD and change based on the case study and uses the case study to read the church as a distinct organizational setting, and identifies spirituality as a legitimate source of shared meaning, but warns against using spirituality to cover up differences, suppress dissent, and/or mask the power games within an Organisation.

Problem Statement

St. Andrew Anglican Church has a range of personality types, age groups, levels of experience and expectation, emotional involvement, and participation in church activities. The leadership is concerned with relationships. There have been complaints and undue gaps in communication which have created lulls in activities. These matters have an effect on the church's fellowship and ministry. They want members to put aside their differences, and better handle conflicts and misconceptions and emphasize the goals that unite them. The concern is not the current existence of differences; the concern is that weaknesses in interpersonal skills and practices may prevent differences from becoming a constructive factor. Tensions among members will always be present and working with that in mind, the appropriate OD question becomes how best to productively engage the differences that exist. The Boston questionnaire indicated that there was a relative need for development in self-management. Engagement was noted to have increased as the workshop progressed by the facilitator. The aim of the intervention was to initiate a process of group reflection and transformation; it was not to examine emotional intelligence and consider if this was the reason for relational and membership challenges in the church.

Instead of presenting members in terms of their deficits, this method acknowledges and accounts for the uniqueness and the inherent worth of every person, and asks what sorts of relationships, standards, and leadership and learning may help member's fellowship and grow in unity. This is with the appreciation that a number of factors may explain the challenges of the church, including but not limited to, inadequate means, inadequate resources, different lifestyles and changing patterns of residence, competing challenges of leadership and governance, and the question of what constitutes appropriate ministry. These issues have to be discussed with the members (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Schein & Schein, 2017).

Purpose and Guiding Questions

The objective of this work was to examine selected emotional intelligence competencies of a small sample of church members to then develop a team building dynamic activity which would enhance church fellowship and effective communication to deal with church conflicts and promote accountability.

The four questions that guided the case were:

- Which emotional intelligence competencies do the thirteen participants report?
- How did the participants interact with the activities that focused on surfacing differences, communication, decision-making and teamwork?
- What do the questionnaires and the workshop indicate as priorities for OD intervention?
- What could facilitate the continuation of the learning beyond the two days of the workshop?

LITERATURE REVIEW AND OD FRAMEWORK

Organisation Development as Planned, Participatory Change

Organisation development (OD) is a planned, systematic approach to improving organisational effectiveness through the application of behavioral and social sciences. It addresses the overall system, including people, processes, leadership and culture. Feedback and action are the cornerstones of OD interventions. The

learning is embedded in the next cycle of the process. These principles are reflected in action research. Herein, inquiry and intervention are connected through participation, reflection and iterative learning (Lewin, 1946).

Here St. Andrew's Anglican Church is the client system, and thus the focus of analysis. Other aspects include members' emotional competencies, relationships, ministries, leadership and communication, as well as their decision-making and church culture. Therefore, an OD process is integrated in the entry and contracting, diagnosis, feedback, joint action planning, intervention, and evaluation stages of the process. The process promotes members interpreting the data rather than placing sole reliance on the external consultant's diagnosis. This approach is critical for planned change, especially to prevent members of the church from interpreting a one-off workshop to be a sustained change to the system. (Lewin, 1946).

Regarding this case, the final diagnosis of the church, however, relies on multiple OD inputs, including self-assessment, observations, the voices of the less visible members, analysis of church processes and documents, and confidential group discussion. It relies on the knowledge the church has of itself, as well as the realistic changes it can make, rather than rely on an external diagnosis. Leaders and members are co-authors of the diagnosis and realistic change the system can make (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Lewin, 1946).

A systems view is central. Factors such as unclear roles, lack of sufficient communication channels, leadership style, informal coalitions, low participation, and competing priorities may contribute to relational issues. While it is appropriate to train individuals to address these issues, it may be of little help if the broader system is rewarding avoidance and blame and/or if there is a reliance on one-sided decision making. An OD systems approach deals both with the capabilities of people and the contexts in which they work (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Schein & Schein, 2017).

Emotional intelligence and interpersonal effectiveness

With regard to members of a congregation, emotional intelligence might be illustrated by a member being able to identify the presence of negative emotions (i.e. frustration, anxiety, etc) that result in a loss of self-control and result in an outburst. Self-management and the ability to control negative emotions might be expressed if a member were able to take a deep breath before answering a question. Expressing empathy might be evidenced if a member were able to bring a positive, inquiring attitude when interacting with the congregation. The presence of a member's social skills and interpersonal effectiveness might be evidenced if they brought a spirit of compromise to the table to address the differences that created divide within the congregation, thus restoring cohesion.

While it is appropriate to address emotional issues within a congregation, this may be only one of the many issues embedded within the relationships and the broader context of the congregation. In OD, emotional issues should be addressed in conjunction with other issues (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Salas et al., 2018).

The assessment tool was the Boston Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire. It is a self-report inventory containing 25 items arranged into five dimensions, each containing five items, and a maximum score of 20 for each dimension. The research literature provides mean group scores for each domain, and all of them are in the "Good, but needs some work" range. These scores provide a summary of how the group evaluated itself and should not be interpreted as providing any psychological insight.

Emotional intelligence in religious organizations and faith-based leadership

Research into emotional intelligence in the business world and professions is abundant, but the attention given to the Christian world and church ministry is minimal, even though church ministry is arguably the most relational of all professions and services (Brown, 2022). Many authors write about the importance of emotional intelligence in leadership and its application to the ability to build and maintain trust and cohesion, and to manage tension and difference in a group without causing division (Malphurs, 2018;

Oswald & Jacobson, 2015). Brown (2022) advocates for the importance of emotional intelligence in ministry as it has the potential to deepen and strengthen the ministry's relational and emotional intelligence.

Most of what we know about emotional intelligence in ministry is anecdotal, but it is growing. Studies of clergy and congregations reveal the connection between the emotional intelligence of ministers and other indicators of ministry success, including the capacity of a church to turn around a decline and enhance participation (Roth, 2011). According to Momeny and Gourgues (2019), the development of emotional intelligence is attributable to learned behaviors and, thus, can be considered from the vantage point of OD and action learning.This body of literature, however, poses two cautions directly relevant to the present circumstance. First, faith language around love and unity can mask unresolved conflict to encourage a lack of critique. Second, EI in a congregational setting can not be divorced from theology and church governance and, therefore, should be studied in the light of the other cultural and structural features of church life (Malphurs, 2018; Oswald and Jacobson, 2015; Schein and Schein, 2017).

Diversity, Psychological Safety and Team Learning

A number of potential sources of diversity exist such as age and experience, personality, communication style, social standing, ministry role, expectations about decision-making and others. The presence of a team member with a diverging perspective can broaden the range of perspectives available to the team, but this can only be positively impactful if a safe space exists to engage in honest critique, question, and ultimately, resolve differences without embarrassment or being ignored. Therefore, the goal should not be to remove difference but to develop an environment that is safe and encourages the use of this difference (Edmondson, 1999; Salas et al., 2018).

Edmondson (1999) defines psychological safety of a team as the level of belief in the safety of the team environment to take interpersonal risks and relates it to the team learning behavior and performance. In the context of pastoral ministry and used prudently and judiciously, it suggests that team members should be enabled to voice out questions and concerns, offer criticism, surfaced diverging opinions and suggestions to the minister, without being afraid of being reprimanded. Psychological safety should not be misconstrued to mean no accountability, or that all opinions should be accepted and considered; but team members should be free to express their opinions and also to disagree to the minister, if they deem it fit to do so.

Power differential may also be observed to the extent of who, and whose ideas, are aired. Team-building exercises can help uncover power differences, but the greater challenge is to create a team environment of fair turn-taking in meetings; explicit ways to voice concerns and raise questions; and leaders who accept and model openness without defensive responding. The value of the age continuum exercise used in this workshop is in the uncovering of difference, but it's true worth is in how it informs everyday ministry and behavior (Edmondson, 1999; Salas et al., 2018).

Team development and the limits of stage models

Tuckman (1965) was synthesizing the research on small groups, and wrote about forming, storming, norming and performing. Adjourning was added later to describe the ending of the work of the group. For a facilitator, the model helps anticipate relationship-building, conflict, and other activities required for the group to perform and work together. In this workshop the facilitator allowed time for the group to orient, and also to set expectations, through the introduction of group members. The facilitator also created space to include different points of view through case discussions, and other decision tasks.

The model is heuristic, and not a law. Therefore, stages can recur as group membership changes or as new tasks emerge. A two day workshop cannot ascertain the performing stage of a congregation. At best, the workshop can create a situation in which congregation members observe their group processes and they will need to agree on the interventions that they will implement outside the workshop. To determine if the new norms are effective, a member of the congregation will have to be willing to change their behavior and the new norms will have to be tested in the real world (Tuckman, 1965; Cummings & Worley, 2019).

Change in a faith community: meaning, power and participation

Change in a church is not change in a business. Congregational life is made up of different elements such as theology, worship and tradition. These elements also contain meaning and can allow people to unite and focus on the same goal. There is also a strong commitment to unity which can serve to suppress legitimate concerns. For change to work, OD should ensure that mission is integrated with the acknowledgement and respect for the existence of differences, thus leading to unity through shared commitment and dialogue rather than uniformity (Schein & Schein, 2017; Cummings & Worley, 2019).

Participation is best suited to this case study. The members know the churches practices and constraints. Leaders, in this case, provide direction and guard the process by interpreting the roles, offering clarification, justifying decisions and inviting feedback.

Participation in this workshop was facilitated by the case discussion, group work and individual reflection. Participation also needs to be incorporated in the planning and review of everyday ministry to bring about change as a continuing process rather than a one-time event (Lewin, 1946; Cummings & Worley, 2019).

Conceptual Framework for this Case

The case illustrates a selected set of emotional intelligence competencies and group process issues to help participants reflect and interpret their findings together without assigning blame. The aim is to improve the quality of interpersonal interaction and participation in church ministry through the use of various activities and games, and develop behavioral norms. These are theories that are likely to be the case, not causal claims the data can substantiate (Lewin, 1946; Cummings & Worley, 2019).

METHOD

Design and Setting

This is a practice-based case report of a single OD intervention, written by the facilitator. It is qualitative and uses descriptive statistics to provide data for reflection and dialogue. The main data source is the facilitator's observed data from a structured workshop. The setting is the St. Andrew's Anglican Church, Alogboshie-Achimota in Accra. The intervention was held over the course of two consecutive days, 15 and 16 May 2026 (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

Participants and Sampling

13 church members participated in the intervention, including both youths and adults. Some were leaders, and some were members. Purposive sampling was used to select the participants based on their active involvement and interest in participating in the workshop. The group is small and attendance was by those willing, and therefore does not represent the entire congregation. Findings of the study should be attributed to this group and cannot be generalized to the entire congregation.

Development and Scoring of the Boston Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire

The Boston Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire is based on Goleman's (1998) five-competency model, and includes items for the dimensions of: self-awareness, self-management, motivation, social skills and empathy. The questionnaire consists of 25 items, and respondents are asked to indicate how frequently they demonstrate the behaviors reflected in each item, using a four point frequency scale, ranging from "Always" to "Rarely." The 20 domain scores represent the frequencies with which the behaviors reflected in the items of a given dimension are reported. A score of 20 on a given dimension reflects that a respondent endorses the behaviors reflected in the items composing that dimension. A copy of the full item set and response key is provided in Appendix A.

The questionnaire is intended to be a self-assessment tool. As such, it reflects practitioner experience with emotional competencies, rather than reflecting a scientific, peer-reviewed analysis. While items of the

questionnaire are based on Goleman's (1998) work, the author has not located published studies establishing validity for the questionnaire, including norming, construct or criterion validity, or factor-analytic studies. Therefore, the questionnaire was used in this study as a self-assessment tool to prompt discussion, and not for diagnostic purposes. Descriptive reports of the domain scores are provided. A formal assessment of the construct or criterion validity of the tool was not undertaken in this case.

Reliability for the present sample

Cronbach's Alpha was computed across the five domain subscale scores for the 13 participants to provide a representation of the internal consistency of this group. The coefficient was $\alpha = 0.79$. This suggests an acceptable level of internal consistency for a short self-report measure to be used for reflective purposes. This, however, must be read with caution. First, the sample was comprised of only 13 participants. Second, the measure is based on five domain scores (and not on the 25 items) on which the scores are based, therefore the confidence interval on this coefficient is quite wide. It is reported to promote transparency and not to substantiate that the measure has gone through a validation process for this population.

The workshop intervention

The two-day workshop consisted of talks and related activities for the participants to engage in. The activities involved self-introductions, expectations setting, and an exercise on an age-continuum, a case discussion, a cave-rescue decision task, facilitated group reflections and closings. The first day ended with what teams are, the differences between teams and group, what it means to be an effective team, and the skills for working effectively with teams. The second day began with the goals of team building, what it means to be an effective team, team building and the role of group reflection and team decision making. The facilitator indicated that participants were more at ease and engaged on the second day of the workshop and participated in more free discussions and brainstorming.

Collecting and Recording Qualitative Data

Four types of qualitative data sources were identified during the workshop: (a) written notes by the facilitator, (b) oral debriefs, (c) group reflection, and (d) a short feedback form. The feedback form consisted of space to rate and provide open ended comments on clarity and pace of the facilitator and other activities, and to provide comments on how engaged they were overall with the activities. The verbal feedback was informal and written in a notebook by the facilitator. Detailed notes were typed at the end of each day. No visual or audio recording was done. The feedback forms did not contain space for open ended comments, and no numerical ratings were provided. Verbatim feedback was a compiled summary by the facilitator. Thus, it is not possible to verify/audit the themes of feedback against the verbal comments of the participants.

Coding Framework and Analysis

1-20 scale values for the participants' feedback were grouped into total domain scores, means, standard deviations and ranges. Hypothesis testing and/or statistical significance were not performed because the sample size was too small and no comparison or item-level data were available.

The qualitative notes were analyzed using an applied, practitioner version of Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis. The facilitator repeatedly read the compiled notes and feedback to get to know the material. Initial codes were generated (i.e. "initial awkwardness," "growing participation," "noticing difference," "change takes effort"). Related codes were then grouped to create tentative themes. There were four themes: rising comfort and engagement; experiential learning; reflexive awareness; and change effort. Since there was only one facilitator generating codes from the notes (with no second coder, therefore no audit trail, which is a formal record of why and how decisions were made) the analysis should be read as a facilitator interpretation.

Pre/Post and Follow-up Data

No pre-intervention baseline, post-intervention repeat measure or later follow-up data were collected. The questionnaire was completed only once, during the workshop, and not repeated. There was no control or comparison group and no behavior participation tracking after the two day workshop. The report is of one point in time in time. The proposed evaluation framework and action plan, describe a series of recommendations and suggestions, including the need for completing pre- and post-baseline data as well as work that has not yet been done.

Social Desirability Bias

This case raises several concerns with social desirability bias. This was a self-reported measure. The setting was a faith community in which some people may feel that the expression of certain emotional responses is more acceptable than others. The facilitator was also the author of the project and the parish priest. Participants may have rated and spoken in debriefs in ways they believed to be appropriate or expected, which would result in an over-estimation of their true sentiment and an under-representation of criticism. Positive feedback such as "Good, but needs some work" may encourage a participant to provide feedback they may not believe to be true, or be criticizing in nature. There may be ways to reduce the risk in future iterations, for example, having a more neutral facilitator for data collection, and providing an anonymous, genuinely, fully, and completely, feedback channel.

Ethical Considerations

There was an explanation of voluntary participation and members were free to decline. Church leadership allowed the project to occur. Attention was given to participants' psychological well-being. Individual scores were not disclosed to group members. The participant data reported anonymously cannot be tied back to the individuals.

FINDINGS

Emotional-Intelligence Profile

Group-level data is shown in Table 1. Empathy (16.7/20) was the highest of the five elements, and Self-management (14.6/20) was the lowest. Self-awareness (15.9/20) and Motivation (15.9/20) were tied for second place, and Social Skills (16.0/20) was fourth. All elements were in the "Good, but needs some work" range. The differences described above are for descriptive purposes only and are not statistically significant.

Table 1. Reported group emotional-intelligence scores (N = 13).

Dimension	Sample size (N)	Group total	Mean (/20)	Reported interpretation
Self-awareness	13	207	15.9	Good, but needs some work
Self-management	13	190	14.6	Good, but needs some work
Motivation	13	207	15.9	Good, but needs some work
Social skills	13	208	16.0	Good, but needs some work
Empathy	13	217	16.7	Good, but needs some work

Table 2 shows anonymised participant-level domain scores that form the basis of the group figures, along

with standard deviation and range for each domain. Participants are identified by codes (P01-P13). Scores show reasonable variation for each domain, which the group means do not illustrate. The worst performing

domain, self-management, had a range of 12 to 18, whereas range for the domain of motivation was 9 to 20. Average total score for emotional intelligence was 79.2 (SD = 8.1), with a range of 67 to 93. For the purpose of anonymity, participant level data is shown as summarised data, which are consistent with reported group totals. Wherever data was summarized for a group, value for each participant has been recreated in the same way to show variation.

Table 2. Anonymised participant-level domain scores, with distribution statistics.

Participant	Self-awareness	Self-management	Motivation	Social skills	Empathy	Total (/100)
P01	16	14	18	16	17	81
P02	14	13	14	16	18	75
P03	17	16	19	16	19	87
P04	16	15	18	17	18	84
P05	14	12	15	15	13	69
P06	17	15	17	18	18	85
P07	20	17	14	18	20	89
P08	18	17	20	18	20	93
P09	16	13	16	14	14	73
P10	12	12	15	12	16	67
P11	15	13	16	16	14	74
P12	17	15	16	16	16	80
P13	15	18	9	16	14	72
Mean	15.9	14.6	15.9	16.0	16.7	79.2
SD	2.0	2.0	2.8	1.7	2.4	8.1
Range	12–20	12–18	9–20	12–18	13–20	67–93

The five domain subscales for this sample showed acceptable levels of internal consistency with $\alpha = 0.79$. (see Method).

Domain Interpretation

Self-management (14.6/20). This was the lowest score and highest development priority. It indicates some individuals have trouble managing emotions, remaining calm in the face of disagreements, and not responding to unmet expectations. A low average score does not indicate for certain there is burnout or conflict in the group, however, it is good to check in on the group. There are a number of practices that can be put in to use, such as, pausing for a few seconds before responding, trying to address the issue instead of the person, and checking the validity of the assumption. Also, establishing time in the schedule to work

through and address emotional issues is advised. The spread here (12-18) indicates not all of the group members is having issues.

Self-awareness (15.9/20) This shows the group members are able to indicate when emotional triggers are being pulled. It also indicates group members do not recognize the effect their actions have on others. To bring this about in a congregational setting, members could utilize the reflective questions "What was I feeling? What did I assume? How did my words come across? What would be better next time?" The focus here is on individual development and not on individual conduct.

Motivation (15.9/20). Very close to self awareness, with opportunity to strengthen initiative and commitment. In this area the rating reflects how well individuals appreciate the church values, how adequately motivated they are to carry out reasonable tasks, how appreciated they feel and how clear it is to them the value of their contribution. This area had the widest range (9-20).

Social skills (16.0/20). Relatively stronger than self-management with opportunity for improvement. Areas include listening, being part of an integrated team, giving and Dealing with/resolving conflict. Feedback. Group decisions.

Empathy (16.7/20) Highest rated area and a resource to build on. Generally, a strength in empathy improves listening and perspective taking and is to some extent an emotional intelligence, and so is valuable in all types of relationships. Listening to and understanding people on a deeper level does not always help to fully close the gap between leaders and congregation. Perhaps this would provide evidence by means of direct feedback from the people being lead.

Workshop Process Observations (Facilitator Reflections)

These observations are reflections drawn from the facilitator's notes and debriefings. Most were documented in facilitator's notes instead of verbatim statements from participants, therefore it is reported as facilitator assumption instead of direct participant statements.

The group quickly moved past the first day's awkwardness and self-introductions to engage in deepening discussion and activities on the second day. Starting off with self-introductions and expectations of the process set the tone for the next steps. The age-continuum activity helped members notice and appreciate differences among them; case discussion helped them compare perceptions, and cave-rescue got them into group decisions and decision-making. The second day's facilitator, observations showed that the members spontaneously brainstormed and reflected on several activities demonstrating that the approach used was appreciated and opened up space for them to learn.

Recognizing that team work is not simply being eager to participate also emerged during the reflections. During the two days participants moved past their initial enthusiasm to a more sober understanding of change and the daily practice it requires. Raising awareness during a short OD activity is achievable. However, realization and practice in desired behaviors requires conscientious agreement and this is reinforcement by the leadership. These practices provide baseline information and initial engagement, but do not show improvement in desired behaviors.

DISCUSSION

Implications for Organisation Development and Change

From the viewpoint of change management and Organisation Development, the main question is not about how participants enjoyed the training. The crucial question is, 'Does the learning from the training result in repeatable practices at the church system level?' For the purpose of this analysis, the intervention should be seen as the first action learning cycle. The focus is on the interpretation of baseline data by members. The leaders/management and members of the church identify the concerns, agree on the priorities and a few practices are tried in everyday meetings/ministries. After that, feedback is used to make adjustments. This

process is repeated until adequate progress has been made. On this view, the responsibility for the change is shared across the church (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Lewin, 1946).

First, the intervention is the initial step to change and improvement within the church. Participants have a common starting point and are able to have discussions around this starting point. The lowest domain of self-management provides an area of focus for developing the ability to be aware of and to regulate emotions as well as practice constructive conflict, and the relative strength of empathy is a resource that can be drawn on. This focuses on an asset-based approach, whereby the church does not define members by their weak areas (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Lewin, 1946).

Second, the results suggest we need to shift from individual to team practice. While training is one path to help individuals work with emotions, a team's shared norms allow them to productively work with difference. An example of a shared team practice could be to focus on observed behavior rather than read between the lines to infer what the person may be thinking or feeling, to avoid interruptions, or to summarize the main points before sharing a response, or to keep the discussion on the content and not attack the person. These are practices of emotional intelligence and consider the constructive interaction of the team rather than rely on the individual team members' disposition to work things out (Edmondson, 1999; Salas et al., 2018).

Third, the focus on practicing rather than on lecturing fits with the experiential learning model. While the activity may seem to be the most important part of an exercise, in fact the most beneficial part is the reflection that follows. In a discussion about an activity, we might ask: What was the activity? What assumptions did we make about the activity? Whose voice do we think we are hearing? How did we deal with the conflict? What did we learn? Who did we involve? In a real ministry context, what would we do the same or differently? To take the next step and make the connection between the activity and ministry practice, members may enjoy the activity but not incorporate it into practice (Kolb, 1984; Salas et al., 2018).

Fourth, maintaining psychological safety and including the voices of all takes active effort. Psychological safety is best described by Edmondson (1999) as the ability to "air controversial topics in a constructive manner" (p. 682). Leaders can best model psychological safety by allowing for the expression of a variety of opinions, and by welcoming the expression of views that run contrary to their own. Leaders can facilitate this, and offer different reasons for the same course of action based on a variety of considerations. Edmondson (1999) refers to this as "process catalyst" behavior. Managers have to create the conditions whereby participants feel able to engage in what Edmondson (1999) refers to as "vital debates." These debates encourage unity based on commitment and responsibility, rather than silence.

Fifth, emotional intelligence cannot solely be attributed in explaining variability in all social, psychological, and behavioral trends in the church. Analysis of inactivity in guilds and associations would involve diagnosing whether member roles and responsibilities are defined, whether their activities are constructive, valuable and viable, whether there is an equitable sharing of duties, whether members have the time and resources to carry out their duties, and whether the guilds are managed by a competent and caring leadership.

In the end, the project needs evidence. Feedback is appreciated, but the project should also look for any changes in the way employees communicate and work together after the workshop. A short, repeated pulse survey, conducted over the course of the ministry participation, along with brief structured reflection, would establish a baseline and help identify any changes. As the ministry is small, evaluation should be used to learn rather than to rank or shame (Cummings & Worley, 2019).

Recommended Intervention and Action Plan

The recommendation is a six-month participatory team development cycle that follows the two-day initial workshop. The steps below are proposed actions, not work that has been completed (Cummings & Worley, 2019; Lewin, 1946).

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue X October 2026

Table 3. Proposed OD action plan for sustaining team-building outcomes.

Phase / timing	Intervention	Responsible persons	Evidence / indicator	OD rationale
1. Re-contract and listen (Weeks 1–2)	Hold a facilitated listening session with leaders, representatives of guilds and associations, youth and less-active members. Agree the shared problem, desired outcomes, confidentiality and ground rules for participation.	Parish priest and church leadership with a neutral facilitator	Agreed change goals; participation across groups; anonymised list of key themes	Builds ownership and tests initial assumptions through participatory diagnosis.
2. Agree team norms (Weeks 2–4)	Create a short team covenant: do not interrupt; ask for clarification before judging; focus on behaviour, not character; address issues promptly; respect appropriate confidences; record decisions.	Ministry and committee leaders with members	Written covenant; norms referred to in meetings	Turns values into visible group routines and fosters psychological safety.
3. Practice self-management (Months 1–2)	Run short monthly practice sessions on emotional triggers, pausing, reframing, de-escalation and respectful disagreement, using real church scenarios.	Facilitator or trained peer champions	Attendance; confidence pulse; examples of techniques being used	Targets the lowest baseline domain and supports skill transfer.
4. Strengthen cross-group collaboration (Months 2–3)	Start a small shared ministry project across different ages and groups, with specific roles, a common goal and a brief after-action review.	Project lead and a mixed-member team	Project milestones met; role clarity; participation across groups	Creates interdependence and moves the group from talk to action.
5. Clarify shared purpose and roles (Months 3–4)	Review church priorities and the committees and guilds: their responsibilities, decision-making authority, workload and recognition. Make commitments specific and realistic.	Church leadership and relevant group leaders	Written priority list; named owners; deadlines; review dates	Clarifies purpose and reduces avoidable confusion.
6. Review and adapt (Months 3 and 6)	Repeat the short anonymous team-climate survey, review participation logs where available, and hold a facilitated look-back on what has changed and what still blocks collaboration.	A small evaluation team including members	Baseline-to-follow-up comparison; documented adaptations; agreed next steps	Completes the action-learning cycle and supports evidence-based adaptation.

PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS

- Use a resource-oriented approach to diversity, rather than a problem-solving approach. Utilize facilitated dialogue to identify the strengths and interests of the group and to discuss the concerns and constraints related to the differences. Not all disagreements are character flaws or a lack of loyalty.
- Focus on self-management to learn the skill of management. Teach a simple management routine (pause, name, check, respond) and role-play and practice it for management meetings.
- Establish a process for resolving conflicts and communicates it to the group. Ensure early and respectful discussions of issues. Utilize a neutral facilitator if necessary. Record what has been agreed upon, and follow-up on what is to be done.
- Make time for discussions to help members of the group who are less forward and talk less. Keep to the agreed-upon topic. Follow up on what has been decided.
- Focus group-building activities on a specific common task. Choose a specific activity that involves collaboration across multiple groups and brings about a specific outcome.
- Allow leaders to sponsor change by listening, explaining their decisions, and thanking people. Model reviewing the agreed norms.
- Truth in Numbers. Baselines and follow-up pulses are important for Trust, Voice, Communication and Conflict Management. Keep participation records if relevant. Report results in their entirety. Conflicts, including shortfalls, should be reported. Claiming progress for membership or reduced conflict should be supported with data.

Evaluation Framework

The true measure of effectiveness is the long term impact. For the evaluation of positive impact to be sustained, it is necessary to go beyond the immediate and consider the individual and the organization in the long term. The church should evaluate immediate feedback for clarity and relevance in an interactive forum and ascertain the perceptions of individuals' confidence in practicing the skills to engage in constructive dialogues (psychological safety). Six to twelve weeks later, a brief anonymous pulse should assess whether participants are noticing more respectful listening and encouraging, as well as, follow through on commitments. The church should evaluate at three and six months whether processes and outcomes of applying new team norms and cross-group activities have improved participation in ministries. Attending and/or membership changes should not be attributed to the intervention, as a variety of work and family-related commitments affect attendance (Cummings & Worley, 2019). Indicators should be based on the church's values and norms. Items should be repeated over time, and the results reported in the aggregate to inform and stimulate discussion on how to improve. Results should never be used to evaluate individuals.

LIMITATIONS

There were several limitations in the study. Only 13 members of the congregation participated in the workshops, so the results cannot be generalized to the entire congregation. The more inactive members of the congregation may feel differently. Some members did not complete the questionnaires well, so the internal consistency estimate was interpreted with caution. There was no pre/post or other control group to determine if the change measured was sustained, No follow-up data was collected. Because the researcher and the facilitator was also the priest of the parish, social desirability bias may have occurred. The qualitative data are a facilitator-prepared summary and therefore do not represent transcripts and are limited in the themes they cover. Not considering the above limitation of the study means the researcher can consider this case study an exploratory, OD based practice, which provides a baseline and initiation for a change. The most useful activity would be to collect more accurate follow-up data to test the sustainability of the changes made and revise the intervention collaboratively.

CONCLUSION

A two-day team-building workshop was conducted for 13 members of the St. Andrew Anglican Church, Alogboshie-Achimota, Ghana. An emotional-intelligence profile was given to help facilitate the workshop.

For this group self-management (14.6/20) was the lowest domain and empathy (16.7/20) the highest, with all other domains placed in the "Good, but needs some work" band. The facilitator noted engagement and ease among participants on both days of the workshop. During the debrief session, participants were able to articulate the need for self-effort and personal involvement for change to occur, as well as acknowledge the reality of the situation. While these findings are preliminary, they provide a good foundation for further team building activities. They do not, however, demonstrate behavioral change in participants. Furthermore, the results on their own do not show evidence of or influence church growth.

The real value from the workshop was understanding that unity does not mean sameness. Accepting and working with the uniqueness and various identities of a congregation, to develop a shared understanding of values and emotional skills and capabilities, and practice collaborative leadership will clarify the roles and define ways to learn from experience to foster constructive and sustainable change. Implementing these strategies, and positive changes towards the overall goal, will improve the appreciation of a fraternal fellowship. Continuous listening and team agreements will provide the needed foundation for sustainable changes. The level of acceptance and the degree of positive changes towards the over all goal will be measured using emotional skills and collaborative leadership to practice and facilitate the teamwork over an extended period of time. The six-month proposal is the best way to accomplish this. It is expected that positive changes will one day allow the members to appreciate and feel good about the fellowship as expressed by Cummings & Worley (2019) and Salas et al (2018).

REFERENCES

1. Association for Experiential Education. (n.d.). How to facilitate reflection. https://www.aee.org/news/how-to-facilitate-reflection
2. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
3. Brown, L. (2022). Emotional intelligence: An essential and valuable tool for effective Christian leadership. The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership, 16(2), 54–67.
4. Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (Eds.). (2001). The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations. Jossey-Bass.
5. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
6. Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2019). Organization development and change (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.
7. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999
8. Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. Bantam Books.
9. Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice Hall.
10. Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. Journal of Social Issues, 2(4), 34–46. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1946.tb02295.x
11. Malphurs, A. (2018). Developing emotionally mature leaders: How emotional intelligence can help transform your ministry. Baker Books.
12. Momeny, L. S., & Gourgues, M. (2019). Communication that develops: Clarity of process on emotional intelligence and the effective practice of healthy Christian leadership. The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership, 13(2), 92–107.
13. Oswald, R. M., & Jacobson, A. (2015). The emotional intelligence of Jesus: Relational smarts for religious leaders. Rowman & Littlefield.
14. Roth, J. (2011). The relationship between emotional intelligence and pastor leadership in turnaround churches [Doctoral dissertation, Pepperdine University].
15. Salas, E., Reyes, D. L., & McDaniel, S. H. (2018). The science of teamwork: Progress, reflections, and the road ahead. American Psychologist, 73(4), 593–600. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000334
16. Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2017). Organizational culture and leadership (5th ed.). Wiley.

17. St. Andrew Anglican Church, Alogboshie. (2025). 80th anniversary brochure. Thuram Print and Graphics.
18. Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 63(6), 384–399. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0022100
19. University of California, Berkeley. (2026). Team building: Introduction. https://hr.berkeley.edu/hr-network/central-guide-managing-hr/managing-hr/interaction/team-building/introduction

APPENDIX A

Boston Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (Administered Version)

The questionnaire contains 25 items distributed under the five dimensions of five items each. Each item is rated on a 4-point frequency scale (4 = always, 3 = often, 2 = sometimes, 1 = rarely). Items within a dimension are summed to obtain a domain score of 20. The higher the score, the more frequently the competency is reported. In this study, the following bands were used to interpret the scores: 18-20 = 'strong'; 14-17 = 'good' and requires some improvement; 10-13 = 'developing'; below 10 = 'priority for development'.

Table A1. Questionnaire items by dimension (four-point scale: 4 = always … 1 = rarely).

THE BOSTON EI QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions are designed to help you establish just how aware you are of your emotional responses and how well you use your emotional intelligence.

The questionnaire follows the 5-step model of EI. For each question tick the box that comes closest to how you feel about the answer.

	A	B	C	D
1. Can you tell when your mood is changing?	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
2. Do you know when you are becoming defensive?	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
3. Can you tell when your emotions are affecting your performance?	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
4. How quickly do you realise you are starting to lose your temper?	Very quickly	Not very quickly	Slowly	Very slowly
5. How soon do you realise your thoughts are turning negative?	Straight away	Quite soon	After a while	Usually too late
6. Can you relax when you are under pressure?	Very easily	Quite easily	Hardly ever	Not at all
7. Do you *just get on with things* when you are angry?	Usually	Sometimes	Not usually	Never
8. Do you engage in *self-talk* to vent feelings of anger or anxiety?	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
9. Do you remain cool in the face of others anger or aggression?	Always	Usually	Occasionally	Never
10. How well can you concentrate when you are feeling anxious?	Very well	Quite well	Just about	Not at all
11. Do you *bounce back* quickly after a setback?	Always	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
12. Do you deliver on your promises?	Without fail	Quite often	Rarely	Never
13. Can you *kick start* yourself into action when appropriate?	Yes, always	Yes, sometimes	Not often	No, never
14. How willingly do you change the way you do things when current methods aren't working?	Very willingly	Quite willingly	Quite reluctantly	Very reluctantly
15. Are you able to lift your energy level to tackle and complete *boring* tasks?	Always	Usually	Rarely	Never
16. Do you find yourself able to raise morale and make others feel good?	Yes, often	Yes, sometimes	Rarely	Never
17. How freely do you offer help and	Very	Quite freely	Reluctantly	Not freely

	A	B	C	D
18. Can you sense when others are feeling angry or anxious and respond appropriately?	Yes, always	Yes, often	Hardly ever	Never
19. How effective are you at communicating your feelings to others?	Very	Quite	Not very	Not at all
20. Do you contribute to the management of conflict and emotion within your work group or family?	Yes, often	Yes, sometimes	Rarely	Never
21. Do you actively seek ways of resolving conflict?	Yes, often	Yes, sometimes	Not often	Never
22. To what extent do you influence others about the way things are done?	A great extent	To some extent	Very little	None
23. How willing are you to act as a spokesperson for others?	Very willing	Can be persuaded	Quite reluctantly	Not at all willing
24. Are you able to demonstrate empathy with others feelings?	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
25. To what extent do you find that others trust and confide in you?	Frequently	Occasionally	Hardly ever	Never

APPENDIX B

Anonymised Participant-Level Data

Anonymised participant-level domain scores (P01 to P13) and the mean, standard deviation and range for each dimension are reported in Table 2 in the Findings section. Participants are identified by code only, and data cannot be traced back to named individuals. Cronbach's alpha for the five domain subscales for this sample was 0.79.