

Leadership Team Report



HOGAN TEAM ANALYSIS

Team HPI average scores which are close (within one standard deviation) to the average for executive teams can occur in two ways; firstly where most or all individual scores cluster within the average band or alternatively where there is a polarity representing both high and low individual team member percentile scores.

The first situation can result in "group think" a potentially comfortable situation where individual team members styles and approaches are largely similar. The latter type of profile, whilst providing the range of contrasting styles needed for effective team working also includes an increased possibility for interpersonal tension due to the differing styles and approaches.

HPI group average scores for this team were found to be similar to those of other executive teams in five of the seven scales; Adjustment, Ambition, Sociability, Prudence and Inquisitiveness.

With the exception of Ambition these average team scores were generated through a polarity of individual scores.

The implications are that this team, at its best, will have within it the capacity to be creative, generate novel ideas and solutions to problems and to be able take a big picture, strategic view. The range of styles suggests that there is also the potential within the team to balance this creativity with a level headed, practical approach characterised by organization, planning and the attention to detail needed to put their ideas into action.

At its best the team will, overall, appear as calm, resilient and even tempered as most. However there may be a need for the team to make itself more open to feedback.

The team profile suggests that there will be persistence and eagerness to complete tasks. There could, on the other hand, be some unhelpful competition between some members of the team

Overall the team composition indicates that there is a mix of interpersonal styles with some members more expressive and outgoing whilst others prefer a low key, task oriented approach. This can provide an effective mix of listening and participating. There is a high risk that this team may be more blunt, insensitive, harsh and indifferent to feelings than most in its interactions (low average Interpersonal Sensitivity)

In comparison to other executive teams this team is likely to show a much greater desire to stay up to date with technical and business developments (high average Learning Approach). This may, however, lead it to be seen as dogmatic or as "know it alls" by others.

On the Hogan development Survey (HDS) elevated (more than one standard deviation above the executive average) scores were observed in five scales. However only four of these elevated scores were found to place the team in the moderate risk or high risk zone; Skeptical (on the margin of risk), Cautious, Reserved and Leisurely.

HOGAN TEAM ANALYSIS - Continued

These profile scores indicate that when under pressure many in the team will tend to move away from others and manage anxiety by maintaining distance from others.

In particular, on a bad day, this team may become self-doubting, avoid making decisions and may be slower than many to adopt to change due to fears of being criticised. The team may, therefore, be seen by outsiders as unassertive and lacking direction.

More than other executive team members of this team, when under stress, may become sceptical, mistrustful, take criticism personally, be prone to finding fault and become overly involved in office politics. Whilst appearing outwardly co-operative they may procrastinate and express their frustrations in indirect ways. Many team members may react to pressure by withdrawing and preferring to work alone

TEAM DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

Themes such as bluntness, sensitivity and resistance to criticism and a fear of being criticised emerge from this team's profile. On a bad day the team is likely to fragment and withdraw from each other. Feedback and the sharing of opinions in an honest, open and balanced way are unlikely to either take place or alternatively be delivered in a blunt, unsympathetic manner.

This suggests a strong case to explore ways to improve team climate through;

- The development of reflexivity; reflection on objectives and processes .Reflexivity is fundamentally important in ensuring the appropriateness of team processes, task outcomes and team strategies. The more that teams take the time to critically reflect upon their objectives, strategies and processes and then, crucially, to modify them appropriately, the more effective they are likely to be. Many teams in organisations argue that they are too overwhelmed by demands to take the time to reflect regularly upon their objectives, processes and strategies. And yet, there is abundant evidence that doing so leads to far more effective and creative outcomes. For this team we would suggest that structured reflection on process, the way the team works together, resolves conflicts and shares opinions could be highly beneficial.
- Development in the **skills of giving and receiving feedback to create a safe team climate;** Team members are only willing to try out new ideas, and to risk appearing foolish, if they feel safe from ridicule or attack. Teams are more likely to play with new and different ideas if they find that the team provides a sense of safety and support in the expression of those ideas.

The specific behavioural implications for each HDS scale are described below:

Excitable:

Teams with High scores are perceived as intense and energetic, but also mercurial and potentially explosive. They tend to be critical, easily irritated, prone to emotional outbursts, and easily upset with people and projects. These teams tend to develop strong enthusiasms for people, projects, or organizations, and then become disappointed with them. Further, if they become disappointed with people, they may not follow through on commitments, or they may quit in frustration. These teams tend to become annoyed easily, let little things bother them, and change jobs more frequently than other people. They may be hard to work with because they seem moody, hard to please, and do not handle pressure well.

Skeptical:

Teams with High scores are perceived as bright and perceptive, but critical, fault finding and alert for signs of betrayal. They tend to be cynical, easily angered, and mistrustful of others' actions and intentions. These teams are tense, easily upset, and expect to be mistreated. Although they are shrewd and difficult to fool, others may find them hard to work with because they take criticism personally, tend to feel misused, and are prone to retaliate when they feel wronged. High scoring teams are also prone to fault finding and are willing to bend the rules to defend themselves against perceived mistreatment.

Cautious:

Teams with High scores are perceived as shy, self-doubting, conservative, emotional, and unassertive. They tend to avoid making decisions and are slow to adopt new procedures or technology because of the perceived likelihood of failure, criticism, and embarrassment. Although these teams tend to follow company policy carefully, they may be hard to work with because they worry about making mistakes, are indecisive, reluctant to say what they feel and believe, and may give up on difficult assignments.

Leisurely:

Teams with High scores are perceived as overtly cooperative but edgy, mistrustful, and hard to coach. While they seem cooperative on the surface, they express their feelings - especially anger - in indirect ways, will prefer to work according to their own timetable, and may put off tasks they do not see as being personally important. These teams tend to overvalue their independence, feel mistreated and unappreciated when others make demands on them, and covertly question coworkers' competence. Although they can be outwardly pleasant and sociable, others may find them hard to work with because of their procrastination, tardiness, stubbornness, reluctance to be part of a team, and their tendency to ignore constructive criticism and not follow through on commitments.

Bold:

Teams with High scores are perceived as bold, assertive, and energetic. They tend to be confident, aggressive, ambitious, and visionary. These teams may be seen as impulsive, self-promoting, unresponsive to negative feedback, competitive, and demanding. They tend to overestimate their talents and accomplishments, ignore shortcomings, and blame their mistakes on others. Although these teams often make a good first impression, they can be hard to work with because they feel entitled to special treatment, ignore criticism, test the limits, intimidate others - especially subordinates - and have unrealistic career goals. Consequently, they are often unable to foster and develop a sense of loyalty or team work among their associates

Mischievous:

Teams with High scores are perceived as charming, interesting, daring, and fun. They enjoy testing the limits, need variety and excitement, and are very quick to act. While they are usually strategic about their own agendas, they may make some bad decisions because they are motivated by pleasure and oblivious to the concerns of others. Although these teams usually make a favourable first impression, others may find them difficult to work with because they are impulsive, downplay their mistakes and commitments, take ill-advised risks, have no regrets, and do not fully evaluate the consequences of their actions.

Colourful:

Teams with High scores are perceived as quick, fun, and socially skilled. They seek leadership positions, innovate and challenge the system, and are skilled at influencing others. These Teams enjoy multi-tasking but they may have problems with staying organized, strategic decision making, and follow through. They love having a high profile and being recognized for their accomplishments; consequently, they are clever at calling attention to themselves (e.g., making dramatic entrances and exits). While they may be energetic and entertaining, others may find them hard to work with because they tend to be self-promoting, overcommitted, easily angered, and quickly bored.

Imaginative:

Teams with High scores are perceived as unconventional, innovative, and unpredictable. They tend to think and act in ways that are unusual, different, striking, and at times, even odd. These individuals believe that their own opinions matter most, and they take pride in being different and experimental. They are preoccupied, easily bored, distractible, and may lack follow through. They often have trouble getting their ideas adopted because their playfulness, need to show off, and lapses in judgment have compromised their credibility. Although they can be insightful, others may find them hard to work with because they tend to be eccentric, attention seeking, and unaware of how their actions affect others.

HDS Scales	HDS - Moderate Risk (70-90)	HDS – High Risk (90 - 100)
Excitable	0	2
Skeptical	3	1
Cautious	2	3
Reserved	3	1
Leisurely	3	1
Bold	0	0
Mischievous	2	0
Colourful	2	0
Imaginative	0	1
Diligent	1	2
Dutiful	1	0

Table 1 – Number of HDS individual scores for Moderate and High Risk