Global HR and Training Function Change Project

Academy28

Your *human behaviour* pattern *experts*



Example of a Change Group Analysis

Introduction

Although a fictitious scenario, the following is based on the actual type preferences of 120 HR and Training Professionals who participated in an online training survey in August 2008. As such, they could represent a global HR and Training function that is about to implement a major change initiative.

How can an analysis of type preferences – and likely type behaviours of a whole unit – illuminate a change project?

The HR and Training Function's Type World

One hundred and twenty members of a global HR and Training function used the Your Preferences for Change package to determine their own preferences for change.

The overall type distribution of the entire function was as follows, described in terms of the 16 Your Preferences labels (equivalent MBTI® labels provided for additional reference):

Planner 9 ISTJ	Nurturer 3 ISFJ	Protector 6 INFJ	Director 5 INTJ
Realist 1 ISTP	Composer 1 ISFP	Idealist 5 INFP	Forward Thinker 7 INTP
Adventurer 1 ESTP	Enthusiast 5 ESFP	Inspirer 21 ENFP	Innovator 5 ENTP
Organiser 12 ESTJ	Helper 15 ESFJ	Mentor 14 ENFJ	Leader 10 ENTJ

16 types distributed across 120 professionals

Key Findings

A consultant experienced in analysing Your Preferences results met with the change management team for this project and made the following important observations about the group's needs. These needs can be looked at in two different ways: what the majority of the group need, and what are the weaker behaviours that require some development:

What We Need		**What's Weaker**	
Interaction (70%)	• We want to talk about the changes. • We want information and communication. • What's physically changing around us?	Reflection (30%)	• I need time to think about this. • Don't ask me to tell you what I'm thinking immediately. • Give me written information that I can read in my own time.
A plan in place for the projected changes (62%)	• Timelines, milestones, and structures. • Participation in organisation and planning. • Stepping stones along the way, so as to get a sense of completion.	Letting the changes evolve (38%)	• Open-ended plans. • Spontaneity and flexibility. • To be resourceful in how to support the change.

Academy28

Key Findings [continued]

What We Need		What's Weaker	
To imagine what the future will be like after change (60%)	• The chance to do it our way. • To know how this fits into the bigger, long-term picture. • A chance to participate in the process. • The opportunity to influence change by having our insights taken into account.	The detail of what is actually changing (40%)	• Specific information (who, where, how, when, what?). • Short-term timescales. • Specific information about how changes will affect the ways things are currently done. • Specific experience, knowledge and expertise to be taken into account and used to inform and improve.
The concerns of people to be addressed (59%)	• To know how the changes will affect both individuals and me, personally. • Encouragement and support. • To see how values and personal priorities will be affected and honoured.	Creating structures for change (41%)	• Addressing the reasons and rationale behind the changes. • Being critical and giving feedback. • Developing new systems. • Ensuring objective fairness and equality in the implementation of changes.

Strengths

The consultant was able to use the Type Preferences data to describe the group's strengths:

- exploring ideas for the future
- keeping people happy
- sustaining a vision of achievement
- asking others for feedback
- considering how the change affects ideas, and how ideas can influence the change

Blind Spots

Based on the make-up of the group, the consultant pointed out some potential blind spots:

- the plan of action might neglect logical principles, and might not be checked back against previous experience of what has worked before
- the group might not have a clear idea of the solution for which they are aiming
- little, if any, time would be spent on checking ideas and plans for action against current reality
- the change plans could become too abstract, conceptual, and long-term
- there would be a preference for radical and long-term change over incremental change

With only 7% of the group having a preference for thoughtful frameworks to underpin the actions, the consultant also pointed out that there were very few team members who would:

- give focus to the project
- link the activities to the vision
- provide the criteria for success, not just targets to achieve
- establish new processes for new products and directions
- provide solid foundations for sustainable approaches

Conclusions

In summing up these results, the consultant advised the change management team that they needed to be aware of the need for:

- improving their reflection and logical frameworks for change
- seeking out voices of experience and current reality
- ensuring they are aware of their client preferences, given this group's preference for subjectivity
- recognising their blind spots, and asking for (and listening to) the minority voices in the group
- flexing their approach to fill the gaps