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Foreword

Building upon the initial and significant findings confirming the high level of validity and reliability of the I. D. System®, and the further research highlighting how it can promote health and well-being in the workplace, I’m pleased to introduce the outcomes of the latest University of Western Sydney project. This latest research explores the extent to which the I.D. System® can impact leadership, team performance and business results.

Many seasoned business leaders, especially those leading major change efforts, know that their organisation’s success is largely predicated on the ability of their people to work together effectively. Until they do, traction is typically stalled; when silos give way to collaboration, the ‘tipping point’ for change and success begins.

As this research shows, client organisations who have used the I.D. System® to help people work together to get the job done have experienced a sustained ability to achieve - and exceed – their business goals and targets.

The UWS team conducted this research during a Global Financial Crisis that presented challenges to both clients and prospective clients, let alone to my own business. In the face of cutbacks and budget cuts, leaders have thought very carefully about the spending of ‘discretionary’ dollars and have been scrupulous about seeking positive returns on investment. Fortunately, I’ve been privileged to work with insightful and visionary clients who have realised that, in the tougher times, it is more critical than ever to maximise the use of available talent (as well as retaining it); drive real and innovative collaboration between individuals and teams; and support the development of creative leadership at all levels. Such clients have continued to engage Link-up Consulting and to use the power of the I.D. System® as part of their strategic approach to not only surviving, but thriving in a tough economy.

As always, we’ve continued to collect testimonials from leaders across the world about how the I.D. System® has made a difference to them at a personal level as well as to their leadership – supporting team members to be at their best and to achieve, and often exceed, expectations. The case studies conducted by USW as part of this research, provide further external validation of how the I.D.™ has made a positive impact in areas such as leadership performance, enabling leaders to make smarter decisions and strategise more effectively around team selection, role allocation, talent management and ways to support collaboration that achieves the desired results.
The data-mining aspects of the research (namely the statistical analysis of I.D.™ across job role, sex and nationality, for example) - and I know this is often the case with on-going research - begs further questions before conclusions can be drawn and remains an area for further exploration. In the meantime, one of the most fascinating aspects of my work over the years, continues to be the witnessing of people - with a wide variety of I.D.s™ - finding greater levels of success and fulfilment across all areas of their lives through uncovering of what they need to be at their best.

Once again, I’d like to thank Dr Anneke Fitzgerald and her research team for their professional and thorough approach and also, many thanks to our clients who agreed to participate in the research.

Paul Burgess

Founder of the I.D. System®
CEO Link-up International
Executive Summary

This is the third in a series of reports on research conducted by the authors in partnership with Link-up International Pty Ltd on the Link-up Instinctive Drives (I.D.) System®. This period of research concentrated on answering questions about a possible relationship between the I.D. System® and leadership practice.

The research employed both statistical analysis of an extensive Link-up database of 15,900 entries to investigate any trends between the demographic characteristics of the respondents and their predominant drive profiles; and intensive qualitative case-study analysis to probe the employment of the I.D. System® in client organizations, reviewing any subsequent changes in organizational communications or performance.

The quantitative analysis of the database found that personnel in upper management had stronger drives to improvise than lower level managers and that clear differences existed between "typical" profiles at the occupational levels of Engineer, Operator and Executive. Slight cultural differences were also found between Northern Europeans, Asians and Anglos.

From the qualitative case study research it was found that utilization of the I.D. System® lead to improved organizational communication, improved team composition and function. The employment of the I.D. System® was also lead to a movement away from a directive leadership to a more productive form.

While there are many implications arising from these results for further research, particularly in the area of positive psychology, present findings indicate that the Instinctive Drives (I.D.) System® provides a unique approach to human resource management that may be utilised to improve organizational communication and innovation. The research also has implications for effective cross-cultural communication for global organizations.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Aim of the Study and Research Questions

The overarching aim of this report is to:

Examine the relationship between the Instinctive Drives (I.D.) System® and leadership.

This is achieved by addressing specific Research Questions determined through discussions between the research partners. These research questions were:

1) What links exist between the I.D. System® and group membership such as occupation, age, gender and other demographic variables?
   a. Are I.D. System® profiles genderised?
   b. Are intensities of I.D. System® profiles affected by age?
   c. When coding the occupational groups, can we detect any significant differences between occupations?
   d. If so, are these related to some cohorts/occupational grouping, related to position within the company?

2) What links exist between the four Instinctive Drives®? Are there any patterns in the demographic data to explain the seemingly strong polarisation of the improvise drive (the frequency of 1, 2, 8 and 9 scores seem much higher than any other drive).
   a. If there is such strong polarisation, how is this affected by intensity of other drives, if at all?

Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies were employed to investigate these research questions.

1.2 Report Outline

The report is structured as follows. Following this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 introduces the present research project by providing a rationale and a brief overview of the current state of knowledge regarding leadership.

Chapter 3 describes the research process embarked upon toward the overarching research aim and objectives. This includes the collection and examination of quantitative survey data, as well as qualitative interview material – both of which were collected from clients of Link-up International.
Chapters 4 and 5 present the findings from this extensive research process. Through quantitative and qualitative representations of the data, the relationship between the I.D. System® and leadership is explicated. This helps to verify the findings through data triangulation (McMurray, Pace, & Scott, 2004).

Finally, Chapter 6 brings the present report to conclusion. It reflects on the research process that was undertaken, summarises key findings, and makes recommendations for practitioners and researchers. Before pursuing the overarching aim and objectives of the study, it is important to first understand key terms – namely, the I.D. System® and leadership. While both are explicated in the subsequent chapter, brief definitions are provided for the sake of clarity.

1.3 What is the I.D. System®?

The I.D. System® is premised on the notion that human beings are driven by four key innate qualities. These include the Instinctive Drive to Verify®, the Instinctive Drive to Authenticate®, the Instinctive Drive to Complete® and the Instinctive Drive to Improvise®. Each constitutes a continuum, polarised by a drive toward the instinct and a drive to avoid the instinct. To identify where an individual is situated on each of the four continua, a 32-item, closed-response survey is used. The resulting four-digit figure provides insight into the natural tendencies and innate capacities of an individual. For a detailed explication of the I.D. System®, please see Burgess (2007).

1.4 What is Leadership?

Leadership refers to the behaviours of certain individuals, usually in the form of motivating or influencing others to work towards certain goals. As discussed in the following chapter though, it is difficult to arrive at a singular definition of what leadership actually is. However, one of the most important aspects of leadership is the potential for improvement, or development of leadership skills. This aspect suggests that external forces, such as the I.D. System®, may have an impact on the effectiveness, or abilities of leaders in an organisational environment.

1.5 Summary

This chapter has articulated the scope of the present study, identifying its overarching aim and objectives. It has also defined the key terms: notably, the I.D. System® and leadership. The stage is now set for the remainder of the report.
2 Review of the Literature

2.1 Leadership

Leadership is a well-researched area in social psychology and organisational behaviour (Northouse, 2004); yet it remains difficult to define and identify leadership and associated behaviours. This is largely due to the continued development of theory and knowledge. The array of definitions available for leadership is by no means a recent issue; Stogdill (1974) suggested that the number of competing definitions of leadership was roughly equal to the number of people who have attempted to define it. The changing nature of the field is also recognised. Following a review of leadership theory, Van Seters and Field (1990) concluded that, while the term, leadership has been part of discourse for over 300 years, empirical research on leadership largely began in the 20th century.

One perspective of leadership adopts an anthropological view; it defines leadership as ‘the interpretation of the pattern of behavioral stimuli associated with a person in an influence position as those stimuli are framed by the organizational context within which the stimuli occur’ (Tosi, 1991, p. 214). This view emphasises the importance of interpretation among followers – that is, how followers interpret the actions of their leader. As such, this view also supports an organisational perspective when examining leadership. This view of leadership is revisited in section 2.1.2, following an examination of the historical foundations of leadership research.

2.1.1 Foundational Studies

The earliest theories of leadership were trait-based, examining the specific characteristics that successful leaders possessed. Stogdill (1974) for instance, suggested that leadership is associated with self-confidence, intelligence, persistence and initiative.

The trait-based approach also influenced the development of profiling tools. For instance, the Revised NEO Personality Index (NEO PI-R) assesses extraversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism (McCrae & Costa, 1989). Trait-based theories of leadership form the origin of leadership studies. Furthermore, they continue to be a popular way to examine leadership among academics and managers alike (Northouse, 2004). However, trait-based understandings of leadership are limited. This is largely because there is no universal set of characteristics that will consistently define an effective leader (Zaccaro, 2007).
Attempts to overcome the limitations of trait-based theories gave rise to situational leadership theory (Vroom & Jago, 1988). This approach suggests that leadership is inherently linked to the context in which it is observed. Situational leadership theory also has its shortcomings. In an examination of three versions of the theory, Thompson and Vecchio (2009) found poor predictive power – more specifically, the different versions had a limited capacity to predict interactions between leader and follower behaviour.

The limitations associated with leadership theories have paved the way for different ways of understanding leadership. For instance, following a review of leadership research, Horner (1997) concluded that studies no longer focus on commanding behaviours, but rather on influencing and supporting behaviours.

### 2.1.2 Contemporary Studies

Recognising the limitations of aligning leadership with particular behaviours (Blass & Ferris, 2007; Zaccaro & Horn, 2003), contemporary research has elaborated previous theories – including the transactional-transformational paradigm (Burns, 1978). This theory proposes that different types of leaders can be identified, not by their traits alone, but by the manner in which they lead and whether their approach is appropriate. This theory recognises that leadership style can be modified according to the needs of the followers and the context.

To develop leadership capacity – particularly in the workplace, Gaufin, Kennedy and Struthers (2010) identify four strategies. These include formal leadership training; encouraging a focus on challenges and opportunities; developing a culture that shares ideas and experience; and ensuring that current leaders are providing good examples.

To ensure the appropriateness (and thus, the value) of these strategies, it is important to understand and accommodate individual needs – both of the leader and the follower (Taormina, 2008). This may be aided through the combination of profiling tools and training.

Profiling tools can help leaders and followers understand their different working styles (Melamed & Jackson, 1995). They can also provide a shared understanding of personal attributes (Emmerling & Goleman, 2005), and in turn, bolster a healthy organisational culture (Schein, 1996). As a complement, training (and similar interventions) can help to align their preferred style with that of others (Mosely, Elliot, Gregson, & Higgins, 2005). One tool with a demonstrated ability to facilitate communication in the workplace is the I.D. System®. This system is described in the following section.
Chapter 3: A Review of the Literature

2.2 Instinctive Drives® System

The I.D. System® is founded on the notion that:

- individuals can be characterised in terms of relatively enduring patterns of thoughts, feelings, and actions;
- that [these patterns] ...can be quantitatively assessed;
- [and] that they show some degree of cross-situational consistency (McCrae & Costa, p. 140).

The system is a means of identifying and assessing the innate attributes of each respondent. These are the natural qualities of the individual and are theorised to be the key to achieving and enjoying peak performance, personal fulfilment and optimum health (Burgess, 2007). However, the developer of the system proposes that it is by understanding the dynamics between the innate attributes of individual team members that team performance can be improved (Burgess, 2003).

The system is premised on the view that human beings are motivated by four key innate qualities. These include the Instinctive Drive to Verify®, the Instinctive Drive to Authenticate®, the Instinctive Drive to Complete® and the Instinctive Drive to Improvise® (see Figure 2.1 for further details). Each constitutes a continuum, polarised by a drive toward the instinct and a drive to avoid the instinct.

According to Burgess (2007), the I.D. System® can help to understand human behaviour by assessing motivation levels. To identify where an individual is situated on a continuum for each of the four drives, a 32-item, closed-response survey is used. A resulting four-digit profile...
number provides insight into the natural tendencies and innate capacities of an individual. While further detail about each of the four drives is provided in the subsequent section, additional information can be sourced from existing literature (Fitzgerald, Dadich, Ferres, & Fitzgerald, 2006; Fitzgerald, Dadich, & Fitzgerald, 2006; Fitzgerald, Ferres, Dadich, & Hamilton, 2005; Fitzgerald, Ferres, Hamilton, & Fitzgerald, 2005).

2.3 Summary
In light of its qualities, does the I.D. System® offer an integrated way of managing leadership; more specifically, can an awareness of individual’s instinctive drive facilitate leadership? Empirical research has not yet examined this area. The void in the existing body of knowledge was the primary impetus for the present study. In order to address the research questions, particularly those that relate to the relationship between leadership and the I.D. System®, a variety of quantitative and qualitative research techniques were used. These are discussed further in the following chapter.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3 Methodology

Following from the review of relevant literature in Chapter 2, this chapter outlines the research process that was employed to achieve the aim of the study. This involved a mixed-method design, incorporating the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. This design provided the comparative data needed to examine the relationship between the I.D. System® and leadership.

3.1 Data Mining

Following clearance from the relevant academic ethics committee, Link-up! Consulting (the organisation which administers the I.D. System®) provided data containing 15,790 entries. After data cleaning procedures and removal of duplicate data, a database of I.D. System® profiles along with demographic information for 9,119 unique respondents was established. These respondents were primarily from organisations in the United States and Australia, and had been collected during consulting work with individuals and organisations over 6 years.

From this database of 9,119 individuals, a variety of statistical procedures were used in order to explore different aspects of the I.D. System®. These procedures included comparisons of means, and correlation tests. However, as different types of data were required for each procedure, and not all participants in the database provided the information needed, the number of participants reported in publications of this data (see section 4.2.1 of this report) range from 3,943 to 7,517.

3.2 Case Studies

A case is simply defined as a group that has a purpose, can identify who is inside and who is outside its boundaries and has patterned work behaviours. In a business context, examples of cases include whole organisations; functional departments (e.g., sales, accounting); and groups within functional departments (e.g., Melbourne Sales, Sydney Sales).

A case can contain sub-cases. For example, a Sydney Sales department could be a sub-case of a national Sales department, which itself would be a sub-case of the larger organisation. The flexibility of case research suits the complexity of business and other forms of organisational research. Case research is a well-accepted form of organisational enquiry (Yin, 1994, 2003) and has been used to explore issues related to organisational values and change (Yin, 2004).
Given the leadership subject focus of this project, interviews and observation of team meetings were planned within several case organisations. This permitted comparisons within and between case organisations.

The four stages of case research are:
- designing the research;
- conducting the research;
- analysing the evidence; and
- developing conclusions, recommendations and implications based on the evidence.

3.2.1 Recruitment
Potential research participants were recruited by personnel from Link-up International who identified organisations that had been actively using the I.D. System® for at least 6 months (See Appendix A). To diversify the perceptions reflected in the research material, attempts were made to recruit organisations from different sectors – namely, the healthcare sector, the financial sector, and the non-government sector. Furthermore, attempts were made to recruit an international firm.

Following manager consent, the researchers contacted the organisation to arrange fieldwork. This included an interview with the manager, interviews with at least three subordinates, and observation of a team meeting.

3.2.2 Research Tools

**Behavioural Checklist**
To examine the relationship between the I.D. System® and leadership, a team meeting of research participants was observed, when feasible before interviews were conducted. The observations provided examples from which to draw on and thus inform the interviews.

To optimise researcher attentiveness and consistency, a checklist was developed to guide the observation of team meetings. The checklist was informed by behaviours associated with each of the four Instinctive Drives® (see Appendix D).

**Semi-Structured Interview**
Complementing the observation of team meetings, a semi-structured, open-ended interview schedule was designed to guide consultation with the research participants. Questions clustered around:
• Understandings of leadership
• Demonstrations of leadership (both before and after employing I.D. System®)
• Team dynamics (both before and after employing I.D. System®)
• Perceptions of the I.D.™ profile
• Perceived relationship between the I.D. System® and:
  o Leadership
  o Workplace communication
  o Team dynamics
  o Career development

Given the interviews were semi-structured, the schedule guided the interactive process, rather than dictated it (see Appendix E). This was consistent with the exploratory rather than explanatory research design.

Pilot Study
To optimise the effectiveness of both the behavioural checklist and the semi-structured interview schedule, a pilot study was conducted with an organisation from the financial sector. Following this, both tools were refined. Specifically, the checklist was revised to facilitate data collection, and the schedule was refined to encourage reflection on self-change – it was anticipated that this would incite discussion about self-awareness and self-governance, and the relationship of these concepts with leadership.

3.2.3 Collection and Analysis of Research Material
The interviews commenced with the presentation and discussion of the information sheet (see Appendix B), and consent form (see Appendix C). This discussion focused on the purpose of the study, the way in which research material would be used, the anonymity of respondents, confidentiality of research material and the opportunity to revoke consent without consequence. Those who continued to express an interest in project participation were invited to sign the consent form.

The interviews, (average duration of sixty minutes), were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim. QSR N-Vivo® software was used to aid detailed coding and analysis of the collected research material, facilitating the interpretation process.

Through the analytic phase of the project, the research material was found to cluster around a number of core themes, as the participants constructed their own meanings of situations through the interview process. Using a reflective, iterative process, theme content was then
interrogated to explore relationships between and within the themes. The process enabled the researchers to engage in a systematic method of analysis, whilst remaining open to alternative explanations for the findings (Creswell, 1998).

It must be acknowledged that observational objectivity is problematic. The perceptions of the research team of the issues under investigation cannot claim exclusive privilege in the representation of those issues. However, to diversify the perceptions reflected in the research material, regular meetings were held to provide the researchers with a forum in which to discuss the research material and their interpretations. These meetings provided important opportunities to create, check and recreate meaning from observations and impressions, constantly reflecting on personal biases. To synthesise these perceptions and develop a degree of consistency, a coding structure was developed (see Appendix F).

### 3.3 Ethical Considerations

Approval to conduct the present project was gained from the university ethics committee (see Appendix G). Given that Link-up International managed the collection of quantitative data, it was difficult for the research team to ensure that participating organisations represented diverse structures and sizes. However, organisations represented in the qualitative phase of the study were carefully considered to ensure the diversity in structure, industry sector, geographical location and size.
4 Research Findings: Data Mining

4.1 Research Participants

As discussed previously, the data mining procedures were carried out utilising a large database of participants that had completed the I.D. System®. Of the 9,119 unique entries in the database, 45.5% were male, 35.5% were female, and 19% had not disclosed their gender. More demographic information is shown in table 4.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Not Entered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age10-19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age20-29</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age30-39</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age40-49</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>2445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age50-59</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age60-69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age70-79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Entered</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3232</td>
<td>4152</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>9119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Findings

The findings of the data mining exercise have been routinely published in conference papers. Included in the following section are the abstracts from these conference papers which outline the procedures taken with the data mining exercise, as well as the results found.

4.2.1 Collection of Conference Abstracts

The following presentations resulting primarily from the quantitative components of this research were made at academic conferences.
Identifying innovators in the workplace


The current global financial crisis has compelled unprecedented levels of organisational change. Such change requires innovation – a capacity to adapt ideas, products or processes for improved practice. The Instinctive Drives System® is a validated and reliable tool that measures four drives believed to influence cognition and behaviour. One of these (improvisation) describes the potential to identify possibility in seemingly impossible situations, and as such, is of particular interest when attempting to understand the capacity for innovation. Responses from a large dataset demonstrate that personnel in upper management had a stronger drive to improvise than lower level managers. This finding suggests that personnel who hold upper management positions might be the vehicles moving teams towards organisational innovation.
Profiling Innate Working Styles to Maximise Employee Productivity: An Exploration and Evaluation of the Instinctive Drives® System


Researchers in the past decade have highlighted the value of positive psychology theories and practices in organisational environments, (Wright, 2003; Luthans and Youssef, 2007). This approach has evolved into the research sub-field of positive organisational behaviour (Wright & Quick, 2009). This paper examines a profiling tool that applies the principles of positive organisational behaviour, with practical and theoretical implications.

The Instinctive Drives (I.D.) System® measures individuals on their propensity to either use, or avoid, four specific drives. The four drives relate to a person’s preferences for: detail or bottom-line answers; practical matters or big-picture thinking; structure or spontaneity; and innovative, pressured work environments, or certainty and predictability (Burgess, 2003).

Some researchers argue that positive organisational behaviour to date does not address the lack of positive research in the field, is not grounded in previous organisational research, and relies too heavily on a single method (Hackman, 2009). Recent research into the I.D. System® addresses all three of these concerns, and shows how this tool effectively incorporates positive organisational behaviour practices into the workplace.

Fitzgerald, Ferres, Hamilton and Fitzgerald (2005) give a comprehensive background of the I.D. System®, and make a conceptual comparison between the I.D. System® and other existing profiling tools, such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk & Hammer (1999). Extending this work, Fitzgerald, Dadich and Fitzgerald (2006) and Chapman (2008) demonstrate how the I.D. System® provides a unique approach to human resource management and improving employee productivity and morale at the same time. The studies cited incorporate a variety of different methodological approaches, and suggest that the I.D. System® demonstrates superior reliability and validity than other profiling tools currently available.

This paper demonstrates how the I.D. System® applies the principles of positive organisational behaviour and warrants further study from this perspective. This research represents not only a valuable opportunity for extending current theory, but also a potential source of improvement for organisations and individuals.
Are there international differences in preferred working styles?


Globalisation is associated with many benefits (Hartungi, 2006; Johnson, 2002; Mouhammed, 2009), which can enhance wellbeing. However, globalisation can be hindered by cross-cultural differences (Morris, et al., 1998). Disparate approaches or preferred working styles can impede effective communication across distinct cultures (Matveev & Nelson, 2004; Sanchez-Burks, et al., 2003). Given the role of globalisation in wellbeing (Helliwell, 2003) and positive psychology, it is important to understand such differences. The aim of this paper is to determine differences in the preferred working styles of employees from different national cultures.

Informed by the work of Hofstede (1983, 1984), the preferred working styles of 7,517 employees were profiled. Participants were employed in nations from three distinct cultures – Anglos (95%), Asians (2.1%), and Northern Europeans (1.5%). Preferred working styles were profiled using the Instinctive Drives System® (I.D.®) – a validated tool that measures four discrete drives said to influence cognition and behaviour (Burgess, 2007); these include the drive to improvise, the drive to complete, the drive to verify, and the drive to authenticate. The results demonstrate that respondents from all three cultures have similar working styles. However, relative to their counterparts, Northern Europeans have higher drives to verify and improvise, yet reduced drives to authenticate and complete. This profile denotes a culture of employees who have a strong penchant for embracing opportunity in seemingly difficult situations; checking and evaluating; attending to emotional feedback from themselves and others; and challenging the status quo.

This research suggests that the cultural divide between Anglos, Asians, and Northern European employees is not pronounced – but rather, respondents from these cultural groups share a tendency to verify and improvise, yet have reduced needs to authenticate and complete. The research also indicates that these similarities might be amplified in employees from Northern Europe. These findings have implications for effective cross-cultural communication, globalisation, and the promotion of wellbeing.
As the ‘engine of change’ (Ahmed, 1998, p. 31), there has been considerable academic interest in innovation and the individual attributes that promote it. This paper verifies Schein’s (1996) hypothesised internal occupational cultures by utilising a new way of identifying and assessing preferred working styles in organisational environments.

The Instinctive Drives System® (I.D.®) is claimed to provide individuals with insight into their needs, talents, and vulnerabilities, as well as strategies for self-development (Burgess, 2007). It is based on a reliable, validated questionnaire that measures four drives said to influence cognition and behaviour (Burgess, 2007). The I.D.® system provides individuals with insight into their needs, talents and vulnerabilities, and strategies to use their ‘innate drives’ to best effect. Research indicates that the system improves understandings of self and team-mates, facilitating positive personal development and increased team effectiveness (Fitzgerald et al., 2005, Fitzgerald et al., 2008). Schein (1996) attributed organisational learning and change failures to inadequate understanding of occupational cultures existing within organisations. He theorised that three broad groups exist in organisations: operators who deliver products and services; executives who focus on financial performance; and engineers (technocrats) who design and monitor the technology supporting an organisation’s operations.

This paper analyses the preferred working styles of 3,943 employees to investigate similarities and differences in operator, engineer and executive groups in relation to the ‘innate drives’ most closely aligned to an innovative culture. This provided an empirical test of Schein’s (1996) employee classifications.

Link-up consulting provided data containing I.D.® profiles and job titles for 8,758 respondents. These profiles are summarised by scores from 1 (avoid) to 9 (use) the drives to verify, authenticate, complete or improvise when approaching work tasks. From this dataset the job titles of 3,943 respondents who had completed the I.D.® system were classified according to Schein’s (1996) three groups of Executives, Engineers and Operators. The means and medians of these respondent groups’ I.D.® profiles were then analysed to determine if significant differences existed in the instinctive drives of the three groups.
Classification of the 3,943 respondents resulted in there being 1294 Executives, 2236 Operators and 413 Engineers. A comparison of means tests for each of the four ID drives resulted in several differences being found. Significant differences between the executive, operator and engineer groups provide support for Schein’s (1996) theory. The most pertinent of these differences suggest that executives are more inclined towards variety and flexibility rather than routine and structure, and that executives were more inclined to prefer innovative, dynamic environments as opposed to operators and engineers who demonstrated a preference for logic and certainty.

The results have application to leading and managing change as they help us to understand the drives that are likely to characterise operator, executive and engineer individuals. Consistent with positive psychology, the I.D.® system may improve the management of change and innovation efforts by supporting individual strengths and tailoring communication to match natural proclivities. Nexus views of organisational culture (Martin, 2001) are presented to extend Schein’s conception of occupational culture.

There are a range of implications arising from this study – for managers and employees in organisations; for practitioners developing strategies to improve workplace performance; and for researchers extending current knowledge of the interaction between individuals preferred working styles and occupational culture.

The trends evident in senior management provide an idea of the types of people currently employed in these positions, which is an ideal prompt for self-reflection for employees at all levels. By knowing the characteristics that appear to be preferred in upper management positions, employees can modify their work behaviour to best fit the role which they aspire to in the organisation.

Practitioners can build upon the findings presented here by examining new ways to develop an innovative climate in the workplace. Researchers can take a number of directions when extending the current study and adding knowledge to the field of research. Firstly, research into innovation can build upon the different levels of openness to innovation observed between different managerial levels and the senior executive level. Secondly, future studies can focus on empirically validating tools such as the I.D. System®. And thirdly, research into organisational culture can examine the effect that the utilization of profiling tools - and their subsequent impact on innovation – have on the culture within organisations.
4.3 Summary

The findings presented in the above papers can be summarised as follows:

- The I.D. System® has strong connections to the field of positive organisational behaviour, and there is great potential for future research of the system in this field of study.
- Individuals in upper management positions generally have a stronger drive to Improvise.
- Clear differences exist between the occupational levels of engineer, operator and executive.
- Cultural differences between Northern Europeans, Asians and Anglos exist, but are not pronounced.

The findings show how the I.D. System® applies the principles of positive organisational behaviour, and present a clear case for further study from this perspective. This future research would be a valuable opportunity for extending current knowledge in the field, and also lead to benefits for both organisations and individuals. In addition, the findings show that upper level managers had a stronger drive to improvise than lower level managers, which suggests that these upper level managers could be the driving force behind innovation in organisational teams.

Further to this, breaking down the database into the managerial levels of engineer, operator and executive highlights the differences between these levels of management. Executives were found to score higher on complete and improvise drives than the other two groups. This finding, similar to the previous, suggests that executives prefer dynamic environments, as opposed to the other two groups, who prefer logic and certainty. Furthermore, the results suggest that respondents from the three cultures of Northern European, Asian and Anglo have mostly similar working styles. However, Northern Europeans do display higher verify and improvise drives, and lower authenticate and complete drives.
5 Research Findings: Case Studies

5.1 Research Participants

Three organisations were recruited for this project, Cisco Systems Inc, LookPrint and CSG|PR. These are all commercial organisations, intending to make a profit from their activities. One team from each organisation was invited to participate in this project. Each team was comprised of one leader and a minimum of three followers. The teams’ composition and the total number of individuals participating in this research project are shown below (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1: Research Participants – Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisco Systems Inc</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LookPrint</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSG</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Summary of Case Organisations

5.2.1 Cisco Systems Incorporated

Founded in 1984, Cisco Systems Inc. is a multi-national ICT company, focussing on networking equipment. With over 70,000 employees and revenues of approximately US$26 billion in 2009 Cisco represents a large and complex organisation with diverse geographical operating units and significant product line diversity (see Appendix H for more detail).

5.2.2 LookPrint

LookPrint Pty Ltd is a small Australian printing company operating out of two locations in Sydney. Lookprint specialises in the digital production of high-volume promotional printed material, such as signs, point-of-sale displays and taxi advertising. With fifty-three employees focussing upon customer satisfaction and loyalty Lookprint shares some leadership challenges with Cisco, and experiences others associated with being a smaller organisation and working in a different industry (see Appendix I for more detail).

5.2.3 CSG|PR

CSG|PR is a Colorado, USA based public relations and corporate communications organisation providing services primarily to clients from financial services, education and consumer product sectors. With two offices in Colorado CSG|PR provides an opportunity to compare leader and follower responses to the I.D. System® in small businesses in
different cultural contexts (Australia and the USA) (see Appendix J for more detail).

5.3 Qualitative Findings on Leadership – Know Thyself, Know Thy Followers and Know Thy Leader

Leaders and team members were interviewed and observed in each of the three case organisations. Differences existed in the time that had passed since the introduction of the I.D. System® to the organisations. At Cisco individuals had received their IDs at the same time during creation of a new team. At CSG/PR the I.D. System had a staggered implementation while at Lookprint individuals received their ID at the time of induction into the company, immediately following recruitment.

The themes emerging from analysis of the qualitative research material echoed the timeless and universal exhortation of the Oracle at Delphi, “Know Thyself.” Individuals’ responses spoke of the value of the I.D. System® in developing self-knowledge in the context of their working and personal lives. However, thematic analysis also revealed that in the context of leadership, the I.D. System® extended self-awareness to valuable, practical knowledge about peers, leaders and followers; hence presentation of the results in the following three sections are titled Know Thyself, Know Thy Followers, and Know Thy Leader.

5.3.1 Know Thyself

In all three cases individuals did not easily recall the exact numbers making up their I.D. System® profile. However they did remember the ‘compelling’ drives in their individual profiles. For example at CSG/PR individuals quickly reported their strong proclivities to use or avoid drives, especially the Improvise and Verify drives. At Cisco the attribution of I.D. System® profiles had been extended to incorporate functional departments; the accounting department was reported to be filled with completers while the sales organisation was viewed as the natural home of the improvisers. At Lookprint a majority reported identifying with their profiles, but some individuals reported that their initial response to their IDs did not correspond with their self-image.

*I was a bit low on improvise ... which I didn’t think I was. I thought I did have the ability to think outside the square, maybe not as much as I thought, and also it’s not really all that important for most of my role.*
However, some participants who did not at first identify with all aspects of their profile, found that upon reflection, they were able to connect the messages from the profile to their own behaviour. This suggests that team members need a certain amount of time to properly understand what their profile means, and managers need to be aware of this when implementing tools such as the I.D. System®.

5.3.2 Know Thy Team and Know Thy Followers

Leaders, (including the Cisco team which was composed of leaders) reported that the I.D. System®:

- Provided the knowledge needed to adjust their communication style to match the needs of individual followers
- Helped them allocate people to roles that matched their IDs, and create “balanced” teams composed of individuals with complementary skills
- Assisted in initiating discussions of team strengths within the group of followers, and developed their understanding and appreciation of individuals’ different strengths
- Move from command and control to more decentralised models of leadership.

These findings are briefly discussed below. The summaries of each case study are also included in Appendices H, I and J.

Leaders Adjusting their Communication Styles

The interviews revealed the I.D. System® helped leaders to retrospectively understand, and also predict group and individual reactions. For example:

I was just impressed that [the team leader] knew that plans are always very important to me and I have a very clear focus of what’s coming up, and she recognized that even more so than I even did at the time.

and

There’s a couple of folks on the team that he tolerates a lot more effectively because he understand their I.D.’s.

Active use of the I.D. System® improved their ability to communicate with followers and accommodate individuals’ differing work patterns.
Leaders Developing Teams

Leaders’ and followers’ comments revealed conscious efforts to balance the composition of teams to enable effective communication and increase team output. Knowledge of the I.D. System® allowed leaders to get the best out of people and facilitate goal attainment, as described by one leader:

*If I’ve got a situation where I really feel like we need a couple of improvisers to come up with good ideas and I want to match them with a completer to make sure we get it done, I’ll tell them, “We have purposely mixed you together, recognising these are the areas you will gravitate toward and you, Mr Completer, we are really counting on you to keep the improvisers on task and make sure we got to an answer”... People respond to that well... because none of the scores have a negative or positive implication. ... it helps me build stronger, more balanced teams and I think that is a really big leadership trait.*

Similarly, at Lookprint the I.D. System® is used in role allocation:

*We are looking at individuals saying “We want to take the business to the next level; these are the sort of roles that we’ve got coming up. Do we have any individuals that we think maybe suited?” And we may actually look down at the IDs and say look, this person might be suitable for that sort of a role ... we use it as a tool, as part of the overall picture.*

The Lookprint leader reported that one result of the introduction of the I.D. System® is increased emphasis on members of the team who may have been previously overlooked. This finding reveals an increased appreciation of individual work proclivities, and is complemented by leaders’ and followers’ reports of improved communication.

Leaders Initiating Discussions of Team Strengths

In one organisation team members’ IDs were openly discussed using the common terminology of ‘using’ and ‘avoiding’ drives to identify individual team members’ working preferences:

*We better know how to work with each other, ... You find the people that really like organisation, there are people that do better when it’s spur of the moment, and help with brain storming things, who’s best at mapping out a plan, who’s best at creating it, and organizing it and finding the key roles for everyone.*

The tool was seen as a way of understanding work preferences and using those preferences or working styles to create sub teams to expedite the completion of projects.
Leaders Changing from Command and Control Leadership Styles

Members of the Lookprint team commented that their relationship with their leader had changed from taking directions to a more supportive one, in which they were asked for their recommendations about decisions and how to organise activities:

I think we’ve all changed. ... he was very much more direction orientated, ‘You need to do this’ ... now it’s more along the lines of, ‘... this is what we need to achieve, what’s the best way to do it? What do you think?’ And then if you go and ask him for ideas, then he’ll say I’m thinking this way, what are you thinking? And then we discuss it.

This incident suggests a move to shared forms of leadership, providing opportunities to leverage individual strengths and demonstrate trust within the team.

5.3.3 Know Thy Leader

Complementing the actions of leaders adjusting their communication style depending upon the audience, team members and leaders used the I.D. System to guide upward communication in the organisation. For instance a leader spoke of using it to guide his interactions with senior staff – that is, upward communication:

It helps me how to interact with senior leaders that I may not have understood very well before.

Similarly, another participant also spoke of using the system to guide communication up the chain of command, reflecting the power relationships present in the organisation:

Do I think he is as thoughtful adapting his leadership style, as in changing his approach based on me and my I.D.? No... It’s probably more incumbent on me to adapt my style to figure [the leader]... out, verses [him]... to figure me out. So, it’s a... tool that I use [to]... say, “Okay, I should have handled this differently.

5.4 Summary

Interviewees reported improved communication, downwards and upwards in their organisations, improved team composition and function and in one case, movement away from a directive leadership model. However, at times interviewees struggled to describe the impact of the I.D. System® in the context of leadership. This may be
partly explained by interviewees’ imprecise definitions, and varying understandings of leadership. While the system’s role in aiding communication was clear, the interviewees were largely unable to make general, explicit comments about its explicit ability to bolster leadership.
Chapter 6: Discussion

The previous section of this report provided the key findings and results from both the quantitative and qualitative research conducted during the course of this project. This section will now discuss these findings, and present the implications, limitations, and possible directions for future research. To begin this section, the findings discussed in the previous chapter will be related back to the research questions presented in Chapter 1.

1) What links exist between the I.D. System® and group membership such as occupation, age, gender and other demographic variables?
   a. Are I.D. System® profiles genderised?
   b. Are intensities of I.D. System® profiles affected by age?
   c. When coding the occupational groups, can we detect any significant differences between occupations?
   d. If so, are these related to some cohorts/occupational grouping, related to position within the company?

The results of the quantitative data mining indicated that there are numerous links between the I.D. System® and various demographic factors. In regards to question 1a), it was found that differences do exist between genders when it comes to I.D. System® drives. Generally speaking, men tended to score higher on the Verify and Authenticate drives, and women scored higher on the complete and improvise drives. However, this finding alone did not provide enough information to warrant being presented as a finding in the publications shown in Chapter 5. Instead, it was the combination of genderised drive patterns and occupation that provided the most interesting and relevant findings.

In regards to question 1b), there was very little to suggest that drive patterns or intensities were affected by age. Most findings suggested quite the opposite, that drives were more likely to remain consistent. However, this finding is based purely on a cross-sectional study, as longitudinal data was not available. To increase the validity of this result, longitudinal data that measures potential changes in drives across a number of years is required.

As shown in the results presented in Chapter 5, there were a number of findings that seemed to indicate differences being present between different occupations, and different occupational positions. Whilst ambiguities in the dataset made it difficult to reliably code different occupations, smaller subsets were able to be reliably coded for occupational positions. In regards to question 1d), it was found that
executives and upper level managers were significantly higher on the improvise drive than lower level managers. This finding leads into the discussion of the second research question.

2) What links exist between the four Instinctive Drives®? Are there any patterns in the demographic data to explain the seemingly strong polarisation of the improvise drive (the frequency of 1, 2, 8 and 9 scores seem much higher than any other drive).
   a. If there is such strong polarisation, how is this affected by intensity of other drives, if at all?

The strong polarisation of the Improvise drive seen in the data could possibly be attributed to the predominance of business-based individuals within the large dataset used for the quantitative component of the study. As senior executives were shown to have significantly higher improvise drive scores, it could be suggested that this drive is considered preferable for employees aiming to succeed in the business world, and this may go some way towards explaining the strong polarisation of this drive. However, besides a negative correlation with the complete drive, there was no apparent link with the intensity of the other drives.

The qualitative component of the research focused primarily on the overarching aim of the project, investigating the link between the I.D. System® and leadership. As the results shown in Chapter 5 suggest, the I.D. System® provides employees with a tool that assists them not only in understanding the way they work best (Know Thyself), but also in understanding their peers (Know Thy Team) and their superiors (Know Thy Leader). This understanding was achieved through improving communication, and allowing for candid dialogue between employees, regardless of position, regarding the ways in which they were naturally inclined to do things.

During the course of the current project, a number of links between the I.D. System® and existing theory were investigated. One theoretical construct which appears particularly applicable to the use of the I.D. System® in leadership settings is the Johari window, developed by Luft & Ingham in the 1950s. The Johari window is a model of interpersonal communications that categorises what individuals and other know about their behaviour, and what they are “blind” to into four quadrants as shown in Figure 6.1.
In much the same way as the Johari window helps to illuminate ‘blind-spots’ – characteristics of an individual which other people see, but are not known to the individual, use of the I.D. System® helped leaders and followers quickly understand each other’s preferred working style, without the extensive interaction and self-disclosure usually required to develop such in-depth inter-personal knowledge. It was also observed to help individuals who are not naturally outgoing explain to others the way that they think.

In addition, the speed with which interviewees recalled their I.D. System® drives with a strong use and avoid rating, compared to the difficulty in remembering moderate or neutral drives has been encountered in all the research interviews conducted by the UWS team. It is suggested that common ID patterns be labelled with a novel, easily remembered name – perhaps using an animal generally accepted to embody key characteristics of the profile. This may assist individuals remember and quickly identify their own compelling drives and those of their peers, followers and leaders.

6.1 Implications

The literature presented in chapter 2 of this report clearly demonstrates that scholars have difficulty defining leadership – or at least difficulty agreeing to one definition. The interviewees in the current study shared this difficulty in identifying what constituted leadership. However, it was shown that the understanding of innate characteristics (as identified by
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**Figure 6.1: Schematic of the Johari Window**
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I.D. System®), and clear communication using knowledge of the natural proclivities of both followers and leaders were considered important “soft” leadership skills.

Whilst the qualitative case studies in this report provide some interesting findings, this research was still descriptive, or exploratory – not explanatory. As this research has identified some factors influencing the interaction between the I.D. System® and leadership, further research can now be conducted. As discussed further in section 6.3, this research could be specifically designed to be explanatory, and would provide many benefits for both Link-Up! and organisations using the I.D. System®.

An important limiting factor of this research is the motivation of individuals to change their behaviour in light of the knowledge revealed by the I.D. System®. Once all employees in the workplace are aware of their profile, it remains difficult to assess what factors lead to individuals changing their behaviour accordingly. In the best case scenario, both the leader and the followers work towards positive change. However, several interviews suggested that sometimes it is only one individual (either the leader or a follower) who works towards implementing change based on the new knowledge of other person’s working styles. The implications of this could be that power is seen as a confounding factor. This could be a result of attitudes in the workplace that suggest the followers should ‘match’ the leader’s profile. Further to this, there is also the possibility of the worst case scenario occurring, that being that neither individual changes their working style. The motivating factors behind this change need to be explored more by further research, as will be shown in section 6.3 of this report. Prior to a discussion of this potential future research though, an evaluation of the limitations of the current study is presented.

### 6.2 Limitations

There are several considerations and limitations that need to be made when interpreting the results presented in the current study. When evaluating the effectiveness of the I.D. System®, respondents are not always aware of the communication roadblocks that they may have avoided when communicating with colleagues. This could lead to respondents not being aware of the actual effect that the I.D. System® has on their communication and subsequent performance. However, the structure and technique of the interviews during the qualitative component of the research was designed to minimise the effect that this limitation would have on the results.

As the I.D. System® demonstrates that people inherently respond to things very differently, the evaluation of the I.D. System® by individuals
with different profiles will have an effect on the results. For example, respondents who have a tendency to avoid verification might influence the dataset through non-response. In the quantitative component of the research, this effect was minimised due to the large number of participants.

The context under which the research was carried out also needs to be considered. During the course of this project, the global financial crisis occurred, and this would have influenced the relationship between Link-Up! and the firms using the I.D. System®. In addition to this, the level of contact between Link-Up! and the firms, and the presence or non-presence of the CEO of Link-Up! during consultations with organisations could have influenced attitudes towards the I.D. System®.

Furthermore, the cases used in the qualitative component of the study were chosen as they had all utilised the I.D. System®, yet the time since the teams had received their profiles differed, and there was also variety in type of interventions used and the intensity of their use. These factors may have influenced not only the team’s familiarity with the I.D. System®, but also their attitudes regarding its value and effectiveness. Whilst these factors could not be controlled by the research team, all efforts were made to account for the effects that such factors made have had on the results observed.

To gain a more in-depth understanding of how the I.D. System®, was being used in teams, it would have been ideal to observe team meetings in all three organisations, however, due to time constraints and availability of employees, this was not possible in all of the three cases used in the qualitative component of the study. Nevertheless, the information received still provided valuable insight into each of the teams’ usage of the I.D. System®, as well as the effect that the implementation of the I.D. System® had on the teams.

Finally, it should be acknowledged that the leaders may have been motivated to justify their use of the system, and they may have altered their behaviour and responses accordingly. In addition to this, social desirability factors may have influenced the responses of some of the participants. For example, participants may have been less likely to talk about negative outcomes if they felt that the researchers were looking for positive responses. To minimise the effect that these factors may have had on the results, the researchers attempted to ask all questions in a neutral manner, and made sure that all participants were well informed of the purpose of the research.
6.3 Future Research

As discussed in the implications section of this report (see section 6.1), the current project highlights a variety of directions that future research could take. This is shown in the list below, and expanded upon in the subsequent paragraphs:

- Investigating the differences found between male and female managers
- Further studies of different profiles observed between individuals from different cultural backgrounds
- Using theories and practices from the field of positive organisational behaviour to analyse and utilise the I.D. System®
- More research to better understand the relationship between insight into innate characteristics and leadership, as well as communication and leadership
- The use of different methodological approaches

The quantitative data mining procedures highlighted the differences between female managers and male managers. This difference warrants further exploration, as findings like this can lead to dramatic results. These results can be highly visible, such as organisations adopting new change management procedures, or less noticeable, such as managers themselves gaining an understanding of the best way to approach certain employees and tasks.

The cultural differences suggested by the data mining also lends itself to further study, particularly given the recent increase in globalisation around the world. Employees and managers are more frequently being put in the position of having to work with colleagues from different countries, and establishing ways to manage the potential difference in innate characteristics between cultures would be highly valuable for managers.

There appears to be a conceptual home for future studies of the I.D. System® in the field of positive organisational behaviour. Researchers in this field advocate the use of interventions that focus on developing the positive attributes of individuals, rather than merely diagnosing the negative attributes.

The qualitative component of the current project drew attention to the links between the use of the I.D. System® and leadership. There is definite value in continuing this line of research, and conducting explanatory studies that reveal exactly how leaders utilise the knowledge gained from the I.D. System®. This research could then also examine the link between how the I.D. System® affects communication within the workplace, and how this then has a related effect on leadership.
Finally, whilst the current project utilises a range of methodological approaches, there is still the potential for a variety of different methods and methodologies that could be applied to studies of the I.D. System®. These could include further quantitative procedures, such as the use of factor analysis to determine differences and similarities between certain groups, as well as qualitative procedures, such as discourse analysis to further examine the possible power relationship determining who is more likely to change their behaviour.
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Appendix A – Recruitment Letter

Dear [INSERT NAME],

Researchers from the University of Western Sydney (UWS) are currently collaborating with Link-up International to examine the way the I.D. System® influences workplace practices. As the leader of an organisation using the I.D. System®, I would like to warmly invite you to be part of this endeavour.

Who is carrying out the study?
The Chief Investigators are Associate Professor Anneke Fitzgerald, Associate Professor Terrence Sloan and Dr Kate Hayes from the Centre for Industry and Innovation Studies (CInIIS) at the University of Western Sydney.

What is the study about?
The purpose is to explore the role and value of the I.D. System® in workplace communication, as well as career development.

What does the study involve?
The study will involve:

1. Participating in a semi-structured interview to discuss the role and value of the I.D. System® in:
   - Workplace communication
   - Team building activities
   - Interpersonal relationships
   - Conflict management
   - Professional integrity and trust
   - Influence and persuasion
   - Personal and professional development
   - Career advancement and
   - Employment exits.
   This interview will be taped for transcription purposes only. Interviews will be conducted with up to three of your colleagues.

2. Allowing a member of the research team to observe selected meetings and discussions within your workplace. The purpose of the observations will be to understand the relationship between the I.D System® and workplace communication. The researcher
will unobtrusively observe these practices at a time of mutual convenience.

**How much time will the study take?**
1. There will be one interview per person, which is expected to take approximately 60 minutes, with possible follow-up contact to clarify responses. The interviews will take place at a time and place that are convenient for you. A minimum of four people will be interviewed from each organisation to compare responses.

2. We will determine with you some appropriate meetings and discussions to observe. This may involve researcher attendance at meetings, when appropriate.

**Will the study benefit me?**
The study may identify links between the I.D.® and team effectiveness. If you are a research participant you will receive a research report, free of charge, which could be useful to you in relation to your leadership, professional development, collegiality and personal wellbeing.

**How is this study being paid for?**
The study is being jointly sponsored by Link-Up International and University of Western Sydney.

**Will anyone else know the results? How will the results be disseminated?**
A report of the study may be submitted for publication in academic journals and papers, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report. Once the study is completed, you will receive aggregated information about the findings of the research from Link-Up International.

**Can I withdraw from the study?**
Participation is entirely voluntary; you are not obliged to be involved and – if you do participate – you can withdraw at any time without giving any reason and without any consequence. Your decision not to participate in the study will have no bearing on your current or future employment and/or relationship with Link-Up International or the University of Western Sydney.

**Can I tell other people about the study?**
Yes – if there are any questions, they may contact one of the Chief Investigators to discuss the research project and obtain an information sheet.

**What if I require further information?**
Associate Professor Anneke Fitzgerald and Dr Ann Dadich are available to answer any questions you may have.
What now?
To confirm your willingness to participate in this study, please click on the following link and hit “send” to send the email to the research team:

HERE

I confirm that I have read the Information letter, and agree to participate in the project and look forward to hearing from you to arrange the required interview.

Alternatively, you can contact Associate Professor Anneke Fitzgerald or Dr Ann Dadich at the Centre for Industry and Innovation Studies (CInIS) at the University of Western Sydney. Their contact details are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Associate Professor Anneke Fitzgerald</th>
<th>Dr Ann Dadich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>+2 4620 3414</td>
<td>+2 9685 9475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:A.Fitzgerald@uws.edu.au">A.Fitzgerald@uws.edu.au</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:A.Dadich@uws.edu.au">A.Dadich@uws.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I trust that you will recognise the potential value of this research opportunity and extend to it your full support. If you have any queries, concerns, or would like further information, please feel free to contact me at any time. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mr Paul Burgess
CEO
Link-up International Pty Ltd
Appendix B – Participant Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet (General)

Locked Bag 1797
Penrith South DC NSW 1797 Australia
www.uws.edu.au/researchservices
Human Research Ethics Committee
Office of Research Services Building
K1, Penrith Campus
Tel +61 2 4736 2835
Fax +61 2 4736 2905

Project Title
The Instinctive Drive® records: Exploring data, presenting results and expanding horizons.

Who is carrying out the study?
Dr Anneke Fitzgerald, Dr Terrence Sloan and Dr Kate Hayes from the Centre for Industry and Innovation Studies (CInIS) at the University of Western Sydney.

You are invited to participate in a study conducted by Dr Anneke Fitzgerald, Associate Professor; Dr Terrence Sloan, Associate Professor; and Dr Kate Hayes, Research Fellow, from the Centre for Industry and Innovation Studies (CInIS) at the University of Western Sydney.

What is the study about?
The purpose is to: 1) Identify relationships between I.D.® profiles and demographic information; and 2) Explore the role of I.D. System® in workplace communication, as well as career development.

What does the study involve?
1. Participating in a semi-structured interview to discuss the role of the I.D. System® in
   a. Workplace communication
   b. Team building activities
   c. Interpersonal relationships
   d. Conflict management
   e. Professional integrity and trust
   f. Influence and persuasion
   g. Personal and professional development
   h. Career advancements
   i. Employment exits
This interview will be taped for transcription purposes only.

2. Allowing a member of the research team to observe common practices within your workplace, like discussions with colleagues and meetings with team members. The purpose of the observations will be to understand the relationship between the I.D System® and workplace communication. The researcher will unobtrusively observe these practices at a time of mutual convenience.

**How much time will the study take?**

1. There will be one interview, which is expected to take approximately 60 minutes, with possible follow-up contact to clarify responses. This interview will take place at a time and place that are convenient for you. A minimum of four people will be interviewed from each organisation to compare responses.

2. A member of the research team will observe workplace practices for several hours on two separate occasions. This may involve researcher attendance at meetings, when appropriate.

**Will the study benefit me?**

People who participate in the study are not expected to directly benefit from their participation. However, participation in the study has the potential to provide a better understanding of the relationship between the I.D. System® and leadership, professional development, workplace communication, collegiality and personal wellbeing.

**Will the study involve any discomfort for me?**

No. Participation in the study is not expected to involve any discomfort for you. However, if any uneasiness is experienced, support services that are available to the general public may be accessed, including Lifeline (131 114) and Mensline Australia (1300 789 978).

**How is this study being paid for?**

The study is being jointly sponsored by Link-Up International and University of Western Sydney.

**Will anyone else know the results? How will the results be disseminated?**

All aspects of the study, including results, will be confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants - except required by law. A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report. You will receive aggregated information about the findings of the research via Link-up International.
Can I withdraw from the study?
Participation is entirely voluntary: you are not obliged to be involved and -if you do participate -you can withdraw at any time without giving any reason and without any consequences. Your decision not to participate in the study will have no bearing on your current or future relationship with the University of Western Sydney or Link-Up International.

Can I tell other people about the study?
Yes, you can tell other people about the study by providing them with the chief investigator’s contact details. They can contact the chief investigator to discuss their participation in the research project and obtain an information sheet.

What if I require further information?
Dr Anneke Fitzgerald and Dr Ann Dadich are available to answer any questions you may have. Their contact details are as follows: Dr Anneke Fitzgerald: Phone: +2 4620 3414, Email: A.Fitzgerald@uws.edu.au Dr Ann Dadich: Phone: +2 9685 9475; Email: A.Dadich@uws.edu.au

What if I have a complaint?
This study has been approved by the University of Western Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee. The Approval number is H6571

If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through the Office of Research Services on Tel 02-4736 0083 Fax 02-4736 0013 or email humanethics@uws.edu.au. Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to sign the Participant Consent Form.
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Participant Consent Form

This is a project specific consent form. It restricts the use of the data collected to the named project by the named investigators.

**Note:** If not all of the text in the row is visible please ‘click your cursor’ anywhere on the page to expand the row. To view guidance on what is required in each section ‘hover your cursor’ over the bold text.

**Project Title:** The Instinctive Drive™ records: Exploring data, presenting results and expanding horizons.

I, .................................., consent to participate in the research project titled, The Instinctive Drive™ records: Exploring data, presenting results and expanding horizons.

I acknowledge that:

I have read the participant information sheet (or where appropriate, ‘have had read to me’) and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher(s).

The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

I consent to the interview, which may be audio-taped, and the observation of workplace practices by a member of research team who will record their observations.

I understand that my involvement is confidential and that the information gained during the study may be published but no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s) now or in the future.

Signed: 

Name: 

Date: 

Human Research Ethics Committee
Office of Research Services
Building K3, Penrith Campus
Tel +61 2 4736 2836 Fax +61 2 4736 2905

University of Western Sydney
### Appendix D – Behavioural Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Instinctive Drive to Verify®</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
<th>Instinctive Drive to Authenticate®</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
<th>Instinctive Drive to Complete®</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excels at Prioritisation</td>
<td>Unable to compromise</td>
<td>Can take action without valid reasons</td>
<td>Uncomfortable when justifying actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strives to develop expertise</td>
<td>Unsatisfied with current progress</td>
<td>Unconditional encouragement</td>
<td>Indiscriminate with time and people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers both sides of a situation</td>
<td>Gets “blocked” by past experience</td>
<td>Willing to overlook past experience</td>
<td>Non-confrontational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughly investigates problems</td>
<td>Gives advice when not needed</td>
<td>Naturally trusting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages answers from others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantly checks details</td>
<td>Needs a valid reason for everything</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can appear superficial due to conciseness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifies with evidence</td>
<td>Overly sceptical of new things</td>
<td>Communicate concisely</td>
<td>Does not pre-empt problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instinctive Drive to Authenticate®

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
<th>Instinctive Drive to Authenticate®</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
<th>Instinctive Drive to Complete®</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always personally involved</td>
<td>Doesn’t read between the lines</td>
<td>Intuitive / reads between the lines</td>
<td>Lack of feedback makes others feel ignored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open, honest and literal communication</td>
<td>Performs only as much as requested</td>
<td>Loyal to feelings and emotions, not words</td>
<td>Doesn’t always disclose personal thoughts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a tactile approach</td>
<td>Can stifle workflow by being too involved</td>
<td>Strive for idealistic outcomes</td>
<td>Appears to ignore reality of situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an ‘anti-waste’ nature</td>
<td>Can be excessive with quality</td>
<td>Able to delegate tasks and leverage time</td>
<td>Can read too much into certain situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal to spoken commitments</td>
<td>Can be blunt and offensive</td>
<td>Exacts at conceptualising and theorising</td>
<td>Contribution can go unnoticed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent between words and actions</td>
<td>Overlooks aesthetics / focusing on basics</td>
<td>Happy to work behind the scenes</td>
<td>Not taken seriously due to use of hyperbole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instinctive Drive to Complete®

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
<th>Instinctive Drive to Complete®</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works towards maintaining harmony</td>
<td>Makes mountains out of molehills</td>
<td>Are interruptible, therefore approachable</td>
<td>Can seem to have a short term memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused on following things to completion</td>
<td>Unnecessarily reminds people of mistakes</td>
<td>Exhibit genuine flexibility</td>
<td>Doesn’t say things the same way twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids taking shortcuts in work</td>
<td>Overly set in their routines and traditions</td>
<td>Acts spontaneously</td>
<td>Repetitious tasks are tackled as one-offs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation and forward planning</td>
<td>Can be laborious with step by step process</td>
<td>Pioneering / working things out as they go</td>
<td>Easily distracted/sidetracked on tangents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen as reliable and dependable</td>
<td>Effort and process oriented, not result</td>
<td>Naturally finds a quick ways to do things</td>
<td>Doesn’t always follow things to completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works systematically</td>
<td>Tries to force things into a structure</td>
<td>Solutions are tailor-made for problems</td>
<td>Doesn’t give enough notice / instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td><strong>Instinctive Drive to Improvise®</strong></td>
<td>Avoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take risks if necessary to find a solution</td>
<td>Commit unnecessarily to tasks and people</td>
<td>Commits only when certain</td>
<td>Can appear negative / only finding problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction always positive. ‘Yes’ to anything</td>
<td>Appear to lack conviction/chang e frequently</td>
<td>Identifies the risks / tries to eliminate them</td>
<td>Often ignores the emotion of a situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strives for simplicity in everything.</td>
<td>Doesn’t always deliver on their promises</td>
<td>Meets obligations even if not enthusiastic</td>
<td>Appear unenthusiastic / no sense of urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes a memorable first impression.</td>
<td>Appears superficial/overly simple solutions</td>
<td>Doesn’t require any self promotion</td>
<td>Miss opportunities by not speaking up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspires others to go beyond comfort zones</td>
<td>Can be inconsiderate/want things done now</td>
<td>Relies on logic rather than emotion / hype</td>
<td>Appear to lack conviction / won’t commit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get enthusiastic/excited very quickly</td>
<td>Appear flighty and prone to error</td>
<td>Unfazed by emotional situations</td>
<td>Reluctant to seize opportunities quickly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL:                                                                 | TOTAL:                                                  |
Appendix E – Interview Schedule

For Leaders
1. Demographics:
   a. Current role
   b. Length of appointment
   c. Education in management and/or leadership

2. Leadership
   a. What is leadership (e.g., the associated behaviours and experience required)?

3. Pre I.D. System®
   a. Prior to knowledge of the I.D. System®, how did you demonstrate leadership?
   b. Example of good leadership and/or poor leadership
   c. Example of the team dynamic i.e., way in which team members interacted

4. Post I.D. System®
   a. Could you tell me what your I.D. System® profile is?
   b. When you reviewed your profile:
      i. What did you identify with?
      ii. What did you not identify with?
      iii. What did you with the information did you not identify with?
   c. Since knowing about the I.D. System®, how has your leadership style changed?
   d. Example of good leadership and/or poor leadership
   e. What’s changed/what was the impact?
   f. How has the I.D. System® influenced:
      i. Your career?
      ii. Your working relationship with colleagues?
      iii. Team dynamics?
      iv. Team effectiveness?

For Subordinates
1. Demographics:
   a. Current role
   b. Length of appointment
   c. Education in management and/or leadership

2. Leadership
   a. What is leadership (e.g., the associated behaviours and experience required)?
3. Pre I.D. System®
   a. Prior to knowledge of the I.D. System®, how did [THE LEADER] demonstrate leadership?
   b. Example of good leadership and/or poor leadership
   c. Example of the team dynamic i.e., way in which team members interacted

4. Post I.D. System®
   a. Could you tell me what your I.D. System® profile is?
   b. When you reviewed your profile:
      i. What did you identify with?
      ii. What did you not identify with?
      iii. What did you with the information did you not identify with?
   c. Since knowing about the I.D. System®, how has [THE LEADER]’s leadership style changed?
   d. Example of good leadership and/or poor leadership
   e. How has the I.D. System® influenced:
      i. [THE LEADER]’s working relationship with you and other colleagues?
      ii. Your expectations of [THE LEADER] or others you work with?
      iii. You as a follower?
      iv. Team dynamics?
      v. Team effectiveness?
Appendix F – Coding Structure

- Background
  - Role
  - Problem
  - Timeframe

- Leadership
  - Pre I.D.
    - Leadership Style
      - Transformational
      - Transactional
    - Good Leadership
    - Poor Leadership
    - Team Dynamics
  - Post I.D.
    - Familiarity with Own I.D. Profile
    - Familiarity with Others I.D. Profile
    - Ability to Identify with Profile
    - Inability to Identify with Profile
    - Leadership Style
      - Transformational
      - Transactional
    - Good Leadership
    - Poor Leadership
    - Team Dynamics
  - Changes
    - I.D. and Career
    - I.D. and Working Relationships
    - I.D. and Expectations of Leader
    - I.D. and Followership
    - I.D. and Team Dynamics

- I.D. System (General)
Appendix G – Ethics Approval Number

UWS Ethics Approval Number: H6571
Appendix H – Cisco Case Study Summary

The company is a large IT-firm based in Silicon Valley, USA, with a worldwide network of over 60,000 employees. Given its size, teams represent an effective way to manage different arms of the organisation and different tasks therein. Teams are thus configured and reconfigured according to the projects at hand.

The company has an extensive history with the I.D. System®, and strong support in the upper echelons of the company. The team reflected in this case study consisted of upper level managers, each of which was responsible for their own teams as well as being a member of the team in question. Four team members were interviewed, including the team leader. These members had worked at Cisco for 18 months to 12 years, and had been involved in the current team for a period of six months to four years. When the team was formed (approximately four years ago), most of the team members received their I.D. System® profile.

According to the participants, the I.D. System® provides an informative window into the self. Their profiles largely ‘represent’ their respective working styles with a high degree of accuracy. Although they could not always recall their profile numerically, they could exemplify their key tendencies through anecdote:

I know my I.D…. high improvise, low complete… I tended to move into a different role every two-and-a-half years because once I got to build a team and had it working correctly, I’d get kind of bored… it was fairly scripted, there was a routine… I called it Groundhog Day. You’d know exactly how it was going to be everyday and there be little variances, but nothing that was that terribly exciting. Never knew why that was not my forte until I understood the I.D. System… I’m not somebody who gravitates toward doing things the same everyday, just making small differences. I actually thrive on the change environment and I like to have new innovative things thrown at me to… try and create something different.

Similarly, the participants were somewhat au fait with their colleagues’ preferred working styles. They were able to apply the language of the I.D. System® to behaviours they had observed. Not only was this possible at an individual level, but also at a departmental level:

The completers tend to swarm around finance and the improvisers tend to swarm around sales, and it makes sense if you think about the way people act in those environments.

Although the I.D. System® was part of organisational discourse, it was not always consciously used by staff to inform collegial interactions. Once they understood what the system represented and its potential, it became part of the implicit culture. For some, this involved using lessons provided by the I.D. System® profiles to shape conversation:

We’re probably a little more ingrained… It’s not like I pull [the profiles]… out… It’s subconscious… I have underneath my desk, underneath my laptop… the…
I.D. just so I can keep in mind when I’m on a call with somebody.

This might partly explain why there were relatively few examples of how the I.D. System® helped to advance career paths or team productivity.

For others, the lessons were revisited post hoc to rationalise and endure others’ reactions. This was particularly the case for the leader:  

I don’t consciously think about the authenticators… but I’m cognisant of when people [are] reacting to things a certain way… I know why they are having those reactions. So it’s more of a post-mortem rather than a pro-active thinking… it helps me understand the reactions I’m getting.

The leader’s tendency to use the I.D. System® in this way was also observed by a subordinate:

There’s a couple of folks on the team that he tolerates a lot more effectively because he understand their I.D.’s.

These excerpts suggest that the I.D. System® is sometimes used as an intellectual pacifier. It is used by some to mollify grievances, if not excuse unsavoury reactions. This however, flouts the ethical principles of Link-up International. The firm attests, ‘the I.D. should not be used as a way of explaining why a person can or can’t do things’.

Following the assembly of a ‘rag tag team’, the I.D. System® was used by one cohort to bolster cohesion and cooperation. The team was assembled to plan and operationalise global sales. The team leader was largely unfamiliar with his staff. In a previous role (within the firm), he had worked with ‘a team that was his… handpicking’ – a team that he was comfortable and could communicate with. However, this was not the case with the current team. He had ‘inherit[ed]… resources… from other parts of the organisation’ – including staff:  

He’s got a mishmash of a team that he’s got to cobble together.

Because the team was configured after participants had received their I.D. System® profile, they could not recount their team before the system was used. They could not portray the team’s dynamics devoid of the influence of the I.D. System®; nor could they describe the leadership style of the team leader.

Following the formation of the new ‘rag tag team’, the I.D. System® was harnessed to help realise its aim. More specifically, the system was used to raise awareness about effective communication strategies. The team leader wanted to ensure that ideas were exchanged clearly and efficiently, with little margin for misunderstanding. This aspiration was pursued through discussion and collaboration with team members:  

[The system] was brought in as a, “Hey, we’re all brand new under this new leader; how do we start working together”… we were actually given the responsibility for kind of figuring out what the team should look like... to be effective going forward.
The participants recognised the role of the I.D. System® in crystallising their team. Familiar with each other’s profile, the system had expedited the forming process. They were not compelled to spend considerable time acquainting themselves with fellow team members:

In the creation of new teams, it has a profound positive affect because when you’re putting people together who haven’t worked together before and their trying to… figure each other out, this gives them a roadmap… It helps them understand how they are going to interact with somebody they don’t know. It removes some of the fear and some of the barriers. It’s not an end-all, but it is a good tool for assimilating new teams and making them more effective more quickly.

Conceivably, such camaraderie would have eventuated devoid of the I.D. System®. Through the course of conversation and debate, team members would have naturally learnt the approaches that optimise communication. Although possible, the depth and breadth of the I.D. System® suggests it may not be probable:

I think there are hidden things in the I.D. that doesn’t come out in… regular life… The I.D. sheds light on so many things that you might not know… [Like] how do you like to work? What’s the best way to work with you?… Those conversations won’t touch the things the I.D. shows.

Such detail was valuable for the leader of this ‘rag tag team’. It helped him to ‘get the best out of people’s strengths and to minimise their weaknesses’. This aligns with his understanding of sound leadership – that is, the facilitation of a process that results in goal attainment, both for the individual and the team. This involves promoting others’ assets and removing obstacles that impede growth.

At times, the process of leadership blurs into management, becoming relatively more forced and controlled. Informed by I.D. System® profiles, the leader configures teams that maximise the likelihood of goal attainment:

If I’ve got a situation where I really feel like we need a couple of improvisers to come up with good ideas and I want to match them with a completer to make sure we get it done, I’ll tell them, “We have purposely mixed you together, recognising these are the areas you will gravitate toward and you, Mr Completer, we are really counting on you to keep the improvisers on task and make sure we got to an answer”… People respond to that well… because none of the scores have a negative or positive implication. Because you’re a high improviser doesn’t necessarily mean that’s a negative or a positive; it depends on how it is applied and the situation… I recognise when projects have failed cause we will throw a bunch of improvisers at something that we shouldn’t have… So… it helps me build stronger, more balanced teams and I think that is a really big leadership trait.
The use of the I.D. System® in this way creates a degree of dissonance. On the one
hand, it can advance individual strengths by placing team members in situations
where their strengths can be utilised. This is suggested by the positive responses
received from staff. Yet on the other hand, the practice contravenes the ethical
principles espoused by Link-up International. According to Link-up International, “a
person should not be judged as being capable or incapable of performing a certain
task, role or behaviour because of their I.D.”. However, the leader appears to make
judgements about whether staff should be enlisted in, if not recruited to particular
roles.

Whether the leader has used the I.D. System® to augment his leadership in other ways
is arguable. He is described as a ‘respectful leader’ who is ‘very good at… laying
things out for people’ and providing clear direction. Yet, this style has largely
remained unchanged:

Has he changed stylistically as a leader? No, I don’t
think so… I guess I can’t say that I’ve seen any sort of
dramatic change in his leadership style.

One change this participant has observed however is the leader’s reduced
obstinacy. Reflecting on the earlier cited ‘aggressive’ takeover of an organisation, he
suggested that the leader’s approach seems relatively more considered and
judicious:

[He] hasn’t tried to do that since… I don’t know
whether there are scars there or… learning more about
himself or his changing his style but, it’s been a lot more
about… “You got to earn the right, and if you’re in the
right, people are going to ask you to take it anyway”…
kind of that, “Proof through good work”… I don’t know
[if] that has changed with the system. But it’s definitely
something I think… [is] a huge sign of his good
leadership.

Similarly, the leader could not identify a causal relationship between the I.D. System®
and enhanced (or altered) leadership. Although he could not readily illustrate the
role of the system in leading his team, he spoke of using it to guide his interactions
with senior staff – that is, upward communication:

It helps me how
to interact with senior leaders that I
may not have understood very well before.

Another participant also spoke of using the system to guide communication up the
chain of command:

Do I think he is as thoughtful as adapting to his
leadership style as in changing his approach based on
me and my I.D.? No… It’s probably more incumbent on
me to adapt my style to figure [the leader]… out, verses
[him]… to figure me out. So, it’s a… tool that I use [to]…
say, “Okay, I should have handled this differently.

The limited appearances of the I.D. System® in the context of leadership might be
partly explained by the imprecise relationship between them. Notwithstanding the
system’s role in aiding communication, the team was largely unclear about its explicit
ability to bolster leadership:

The I.D. isn’t, at its core, about leadership. To me, the
I.D.’s about awareness of yourself... It gives you tools
to... if you’re role is, or your desire is to lead something, how can you best construct a team that’s going to support you in that process.

In summary, the I.D. System® seems to be used primarily for avoiding potential conflicts within teams. Leaders seem to either have their teams I.D. System® profiles memorised or at the very least have all the information readily at hand. This information is often used to inform the way particular team members will be approached about certain issues. Although the I.D. System® is an effective ‘grease’ in this team, lubricating the cogs of communication, it was difficult for the team to recognise its value beyond this.
Appendix I – LookPrint Case Study Summary

Previous experience with profiling tools

The I.D. System® was introduced approx 3-4 years, prior to the interviews, to the company by people from another company. Although the reason for the introduction of the tool was not certain, the interviewees found it to be different to other tools they had been exposed to:

It was with Makers from E-Compass, I think he introduced us to it and introduced us to Paul... We had all staff do the I.D. at that stage. We sort of went off it in the recent years and we've just bought it back up again to light. So I don't think we're utilizing it yet to its full potential at all really. So there's a lot more that we can use it for. My experience with it; I found it quite interesting. It was quite a different... Like we've done quite a few different behaviour based types of questionnaires and things like that, so it was quite a different type of background and program I guess.

Some of the interviews commented that they had been exposed to the I.D. System® during the interview process. Although all of the participants had been exposed to the system at the start of their employment, most did not use the I.D. System® to make significant changes until the phase when the system was being evaluated:

As far as I know, David had all of his managers actually go through the system, but it wasn't something I was very aware of at the time. It isn't something I actually followed up or pursued. It was something I did during the interview process, and it was quite interesting to see the results.

Inability to identify with Profile

Whilst the members of the team indicated that they were able to identify with the majority of the I.D. System® profiles, there were some traits suggested by the profile that did not correspond with their own view of themselves.

It [the I.D. System®] seemed to imply that I get frustrated or something and I don't find that being the case at all... it said that that was one of my real challenges is embracing change, and I guess I don't see myself as having that issue because things change all the time, and I understand that even if I spend 3 hours on something and it has to be completely changed to a new angle it doesn't bother me that much... That kind of surprised me because I don't view change bothering me, I guess at first it may jolt me a little, but I understand it very quickly so it seemed to imply more than I do about it, and that's not really the case.

A common theme between the participants interviewed was that the majority of respondents indicated that they believed they would score more highly on the improvise factor of the I.D. System®:

I was a bit low on improvise, much like this one here, which I didn't think I was. I thought I did have the ability
to think outside the square, maybe not as much as I thought, and also it’s not really all that important for most of my role. As long I have people like [the leader] say to bounce ideas off, which I will then go away and implement.

The reason for this could be twofold. First, there could be an automatic assumption that scoring low on a scale indicates a negative or inadequate profile. Second, being in a design company, employees may feel that the creativity aspect of the improvise scale would be more desirable. However, under closer examination, some of the participants who could not identify at first with some of their profiles found that, upon reflection, they were able to relate the messages from the profile to their own view of themselves:

At first that didn’t seem like something that I really did, but after kind of reading through the profile and how it can apply to daily life, it was definitely true in the sense that I will read body language more than I need to, or that I will remember what someone said and how they said it, and just keep re-hashing it in my mind. At first, that didn’t seem like something that I did, but put that way, it is certainly something that I do.

This suggests that team members need a certain amount of time to properly understand what their profile means, and managers need to be aware of this when implementing tools such as the I.D. System®.

The I.D. System®, Team Dynamics and Working Relationships

Prior to the introduction of the I.D. System®, the team dynamics and working relationships were not as supportive as they were after the introduction of the I.D. System®. The relationship between members changed from taking directions to asking the team for their approach as to the way that things should be conducted as well as the decisions to be made:

I think we’ve all changed. I think prior to that he was very much more direction orientated, so you need to do this, and I think this is what you should do. Whereas now it’s more along the lines of; well, look, this is what we need to achieve, what’s the best way to do it? What do you think? And then if you go and ask him for ideas, then he’ll say I’m thinking this way, what are you thinking? And then we discuss it that way.

It should be noted that the I.D. System® was not the only impetus for the change in working relationships and team dynamics. Other systems changes and procedural changes also assisted in the improved working relationships between team members. However, role allocation between team members improved as a result of the introduction of the I.D. System®:

I’m sure it’s played a part in it; most definitely...We are looking at individuals saying “We want to take the business to the next level; these are the sort of roles that we’ve got coming up. Do we have any individuals that we think maybe suited?” And we may actually look down at the IDs and say look, this person might be suitable for that sort of a role. Then you ask them the
As a result of the introduction of the I.D. System®, there is more of an emphasis on including members of the team who may have been overlooked previously. This has resulted in an environment that is more conducive to change and more open to suggestion. It also assisted team members in understanding the need to speak with different team members in different ways. Some people prefer to analyse all of the details whilst others prefer to just hear the answer and move on:

By the types of questions that I ask...I guess by having the ID is that it's just in front of you. It's black and white, and it just highlights it. So you can think about the conversations that you've had and you can say “Yep, that makes sense now.” That's why the conversation went that way when we were discussing this. So that's, as I said, I don't think we change the way we do things because of it, but it actually just highlights it and it just makes you a bit more aware, so like now if I’m talking to [team member 1], I know that he's very much detailed... Whereas [team member 2], you could a lot more freely I guess, in terms of he doesn’t need facts and figures.

Some of the team members suggested that the I.D. System® could be used to improve team communication and dynamics even more in the future:

- I think it’s still having an effect, but I think you could actually improve it more so. I mean, if you sat in your actual team and everyone had their ID out, and everyone actually understood what it meant, I think they could learn to communicate with each other better because the whole aim is for communication to happen within the team as well and not just from manager to staff.

In addition to showing the potential benefits that the I.D. System® can have for team communication, this also illustrates that the team members were very positive in their adoption of the I.D. System®, as they still felt that the use of the I.D. System® could be increased within the team.

The I.D. System® and Changes

In addition to changes within the team and working relationships, there were changes made to individual approaches to working. The I.D. System® assisted the team members in understanding their natural preference for organising their work regime:

Since that ID what I have done, and I actually started to do a little bit before we took it once I saw that, in my ID I’m more consistent from 10-noon in the morning and from 2-4 in the afternoon I just focus on projects and don’t respond to emails or phone calls, if I get them yes I will take them, but, emails I tend to just do those in another time slot, otherwise I don’t get a lot accomplished because you’re constantly answering things instead of really focusing on a writing project or something that takes more time.
The I.D. System® also assisted the team members in reducing time wastage associated with attempting to locate the best person to ascertain information from. Previously, each member would try to make decisions based upon their own incomplete information, or try to gather the information themselves. As a result of the implementation and use of the I.D. System®, the team became more efficient with their time, and instead of trying to solve every problem themselves, would seek out other team members who could quickly provide answers or information:

I think you definitely can figure it out, but it happens a lot more through trial and error. Whereas having the IDs from day 1, from step 1, we would know exactly who to best pull information from or who to best pull in for a quick idea that we need on the spot, but, not having that information from the start, we would kind of go in circles for a little bit or try to figure who best to involve.

Furthermore, as a result of the implementation of the I.D. System®, the organisation implemented changes to the way role allocation was carried out:

We look at the ID and we might say “Well it’s quite clear here, they’re not innovative, they’re not driven to do that anyway.” So they may not be in the best role possible. Prior to that, I guess it’s more intuition...we found is that the ID tool has actually given us a bit more data. So we thought that, now this actually makes sense.

In summary, the case of LookPrint shows how the I.D. System® has been implemented with a range of positive results. From these findings, managers looking to implement similar tools can take a number of key lessons. First, team members need time to successfully adopt a profiling tool, especially when there is some initial confusion or resistance to the messages in their profiles. Second, tools such as the I.D. System® can be useful to use in combination with other management tools to help with role allocation and improving working relationships. Finally, through the continued use of profiling tools within organisations, team members are able to adjust their working styles to enable more efficient and effective communication.
Appendix J – CSG Case Study Summary

Previous experience with profiling tools

The team at CSG did not seem to have extensive experience with profiling tools, and most team members had difficulty remembering exactly when they completed the I.D. System®:

Can’t remember, I think it was... about 9 months ago or so, maybe closer to a year.

Unlike other cases where the whole team completed the I.D. System® at the same time, it seemed that the team members at CSG had completed the I.D. System® at different times:

I think it was, some people did it before I did it, but I think I did it mid to late August.

This is an important factor to consider, as the dynamics of a team who complete the ID system together would be quite different. The somewhat ambivalent attitude shown in the CSG team towards the ID System could possibly be attributed to the fact that the team had not completed it together, and therefore did not see the profiling tool as a means to assist team development and communication.

ID and Familiarity with own Profile

Most of the respondents could not remember the exact numbers of their I.D. System®. This suggests that the team members were either not familiar with their profile, or had not connected with their profile enough initially and therefore had not committed it to memory:

I don’t remember the exact number, no. I have it saved but I haven’t looked at it since we all went through it and kind of talked about one another...ourselves. I just remember I was neutral in one category which was very unique I guess.

However, although the team was not familiar with the exact number, they were mostly able to remember the direction of their scores on the different scales. This was especially the case for the improvise drive and the verify drive, as all of the team members could identify characteristics associated with the use or avoid categories of improvise and verify:

But I definitely tend to agree, like they are the things that tend to motivate me and the things I enjoy doing as well. So that’s when I find I’m strongest, and I tend to avoid conflict, which is highlighted as well.

This finding was further supported by team members who indicated that it was not the numbers that were important to them. Instead, it was the meaning behind the numbers that meant more in assisting them in their familiarity with their preference for working styles:

It’s not the actual numbers, but the concept behind achieving greater self awareness and being open to saying, “Well maybe I am like that.” It means that I don’t complete on very many things. I know that I’m very innovative or creative. I know that...So what does it mean for me? It means that I’m not a detailed person, I will come up with ideas, but I will turn around and expect
my staff to put those things into place, and yes, I will be the person who will come up with the ideas in most cases.

In fact, the I.D. System® was instrumental in assisting the team members in recognising things about themselves that were important in the working environment but that they did not realise they tended to do:

Well after reading my ID, and kind of learning how to read it and learning what it meant, I definitely realized that in staff meeting or just different meeting that we have, I’m very focused on how people are, like, what their facial expressions are or how they’re reacting to what I’m saying or how they’re reacting to what other people are saying. I pay more attention to that than I thought I ever did.

These findings suggest that even in a team that does not complete the I.D. System® together, and that does not have a great familiarity with the numbers of the I.D. System®, there are still many benefits that can be achieved. As long as team members retain the core messages of their profile, they are able to utilise these in their everyday work environment.

**ID and leadership/style**

The respondents spoke about leadership in the organisational as changing. Although the change was not radical, it was important enough to have some impact on the way that the team leader treated the other team members:

She has always been very conscious of time blocking out – time to do things or not – making sure we have met any deadlines, and that we have plenty of time to brainstorm ideas, and I think a lot of her leadership style has kind of remained consistent, although she with each of us knows works and what doesn’t a little more so. She understands if we have meetings all day, it’s kind of hard for some of us to get started on a major project when we don’t really feel like we have enough time to execute that.

The I.D. System® was used in the team to help team members identify their strengths and weaknesses and to help them recognise their preference for working regimes. One of the team members commented about how they were surprised that their team leader had the foresight to recognise their working styles even when they did not:

Well she’s conscious of our IDs which I find very impressive...We were talking about the news industry and how things do change all the time and it doesn’t, like all of a sudden something will completely change and she commented that that doesn’t really sit well with my ID because I like things to be planned and organized, and at first I was like, “Well, that doesn’t really matter.” Then I got to thinking that I always had a contingency planned, and that reflects greatly on my ID, and I was just impressed that [the team leader] knew that plans are always very important to me and I have a very clear focus of what’s coming up, and she recognized that even more so than I even did at the
time. Also just understanding the concepts of time being able to block out, and just work out time to work uninterrupted.

The team leader used the I.D. System® as a point of discussion between the staff members as well as assisting them in recognising their strengths. The I.D. System® filtered into the organisation because the team leader understood the system and demonstrated to the team members her level of understanding. This assisted with the buy-in of the system:

I think a good example is just how much she’s taken it all to heart, and truly wants to understand what makes each person work and how they work best and how she takes pride in understanding all of that, which I think is a good example of a good leader.

These findings show the importance of the leader driving the use of the I.D. System® within the team. By demonstrating a consistent approach to leading the team through the use of the I.D. System®, the leader was able to foster both loyalty and respect within the team members. This was particularly evident through the team members’ recognition of the leader’s use of the I.D. System® despite the team members themselves not being overly aware of its use.

I.D. Team Dynamics and Working Relationships

There was a strong sense of improved working relationships and team dynamics as a result of the I.D. System® profiling. The tool provided a platform for dialogue where each of the team members could use like terminology to discuss strengths and weaknesses of individual team members. The individual profiles were used as a way of understanding who should work together on certain projects:

I think that it (the I.D. System®) definitely helps and benefits us all. We better know how to work with each other, some people work better on the fly than others, some people like to take more time to think things through, and it really just helps pin point people who have certain characteristics that would be at attack. You find the people that really like organisation, there are people that do better when it’s spur of the moment, and help with brain storming things, who’s best at mapping out a plan, who’s best at creating it, and organizing it and finding the key roles for everyone.

The tool was seen as a way of understanding work preferences and using those preferences or working styles to create sub teams to expedite the completion of projects. In fact, some of the participants commented that the use of the I.D. System® had improved the effectiveness of the team overall:

It definitely helps to better understand each other and better understand how each of us works best. It gives everyone a good understanding of each other which is always good to have, it helps understand personality traits and helps foster good, effective teamwork.

Whilst the I.D. System® did not reveal radical revelations, it did expedite the level of awareness for preferences that the team members had for work processes:
Well because the IDs are always in the back of your mind. Through the course of time we probably would have discovered all that, but knowing how each person works best according to their ID. It just helps put it into better perspective of how each one works.

The respondents spoke about the system being used as a communication tool to improve the completion of not only projects, but to better understand personalities and systems of thinking:

I guess the biggest thing would just be how we communicate with one another, just on a daily basis, just when we’re brainstorming ideas or trying to come up with different project ideas, the way that we listen to other people’s ideas, we definitely listen more indepthly after doing the ID test. Not automatically just shooting something down, but maybe taking it in and reworking it or giving feedback after considering it, because that may work better for someone...there’s definitely a much longer thought process when we’re doing or brainstorming activities.

In summary, the case of CSG shows how profiling tools such as the I.D. System® can have positive outcomes, even when team members have a less than ideal level of engagement with the tool. This is shown through the fact that the team completed the profiling tool at different times, and for the most part were not able to remember the exact numbers of their own profile. Despite this, the team leader’s focus on using the I.D. System® to help manage the team and the working relationships within the team was still evident. The case also illustrates that the core messages of the I.D. System® stayed with the team members, even if their own level of engagement was reduced, and these core messages could still have many positive outcomes.
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