
Chapter 7: Choosing the Right People

Introduction

The intention of this book is to prepare its readers for the challenges of the next-generation network in the broadest context. Some of these challenges are technical: it is quite important to understand what the next generation network actually is, even if there are specialists ‘out there’ who understand the various layers in the greatest detail. Other challenges relate to business models and marketing strategies, topics which were discussed in preceding chapters, and to which we return in the final part of the book. But people are also part of the next-generation network, not only with regard to identifying the right roles in the future organisation, and finding the right people to inhabit them, but also with regard to understanding how to define the roles and select the people to accomplish the next-generation network *transformation* itself.

Managers should be surprised at how much is now known about classifying personality and intelligence. An enormous amount of research has been carried out about the attributes required to successfully accomplish various roles which has yielded a high degree of consensus. Yet many decision makers are completely unaware of the frameworks and tools at their disposal, preferring to subcontract to HR or to consultants. This chapter should serve as a wake-up call, to give you, the reader, a background in understanding personal differences, helping to deal effectively with different kinds of people, and choosing the right individuals for the right tasks. It may even help your own career, and perhaps provide you with greater insight into how you are likely to be perceived by other people, in work and out of it.

Individual personality and intelligence matters!

How many times have we railed against senior management when they allow a talented person to leave or be transferred, forcing the appointment of a mediocre person to an important position. ‘They think people are interchangeable’, we complain, ‘just components to be picked up and slotted into place’.

The monopoly carrier of the past was indeed, on the face of it, populated by an army of faceless clerks and technicians. But even the modest deregulation of the 1990s was sufficient to drive competition, forcing the removal of layers of these employees, and encouraging the recruitment of bright people with flair. New disciplines (at least to carriers) such as marketing were finally recognised as important, and were staffed with talent. The better *vendors* had always known this of course.

When Nortel decided that the Internet was real, in the late 1990s, it undertook a 'right-angled turn'. Managers were put through a three-day personal re-evaluation workshop. We were sent to a pleasant hotel by the seaside (out of season, though!) and given batteries of psychometric tests. We were conducted through videotaped role-playing and were counselled on career options. The extremely competent consultants and the relatively small team-size allowed a very personal style of guidance and the result was perhaps the most impressive workshop I have ever attended. Many people, myself included, left with new thoughts about ourselves, our aspirations and what we ought to be doing to actively develop our careers. That was precisely the intention of course.

Nortel had to cancel this exercise prematurely - the cost was exorbitant - but the basic premise was spot-on. People *are* a factor in the corporate success vs. failure equation, and there exist perfectly good tools which can be used both to classify and develop people as regards to their career options, and to steer them towards the most appropriate roles.

Pre-Nortel I had been used to Dilbert-style managers: concrete, administratively-minded individuals obsessed with the minutiae of cost-control and routine. In Nortel I found completely different management styles.

The leader of my division was called Alicia. Highly-intelligent, Alicia was also quiet, self-effacing and almost completely non-directive in her management style. She would chair meetings in an almost feline fashion, asking everyone to contribute, making sure that no-one was left out, and letting consensus emerge from the collective discussion. I found the style both transformationally refreshing and completely bewildering: here was a leader who, apparently, did not lead! I had not yet heard of the 'servant leader' concept.

Alicia was outstandingly successful as the leader of a Professional Services consultancy group. On the strength of it, she was promoted to lead a development team. Here her style was less successful. Finally, Nortel seemed at a loss to know what to do with her, and she entered that shadowy world where you do senior odd-jobs: speaking at conferences, representing the company at B-list events, which are the anteroom of the way out. Alicia is now successful, but not with Nortel.

Mark was the opposite. Brought in to fast-track the introduction of a new carrier product, Mark was a maverick who broke the rules. He was smart and completely task focused. Based in Ottawa, he would think nothing of calling people at home in the evening (his afternoon) and instructing them to produce

something there and then. Week-ends and holidays meant nothing to him, particularly as he had staff he could delegate to. We grew to dread his calls.

Mark achieved his mission and was duly decorated by senior management. He moved on to oppress another bunch of staff to the relief of those of us for whom the nightmare had just ended. In the end, he made just too many enemies and is currently running businesses a long way from Europe.

Piers, by contrast, cared about his people. He knew most of his large staff by name, and did not forget birthdays. His meetings were long and detailed, and covered many, many issues. He had plans for reform, but they were hazy, and somehow the big changes never came. Despite a high workload and attention to detail, there was a larger-scale sense of drift and that classic feeling of rearrangement of deckchairs on the Titanic.

We recognise all these people, and more besides. They were all talented individuals who had come up through the Darwinian process of management selection. Were they the right people for those particular jobs? We need a language to discuss this in a standardised and objective way.

Types of People

When we were living in Virginia, I once attended Catholic Mass with my wife. The priest, addressing the large congregation, introduced the featured speaker, a Jesuit priest, thus: *'We are fortunate today to have Father Michael Smith SJ to talk to us. Sounds a bit like Myers-Briggs doesn't it?'* (laughter). Fairfax County's professional congregation knew all about Myers-Briggs, because it was the personality assessment they had all taken at work. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator™ (MBTI) is the most popular psychometric test in the world.

Isabel Myers and her mother, Katherine Cook Briggs developed their theories during the second world war. Their initial self-assessment test was based on concepts of psychological type developed originally by the Swiss psychologist Carl Jung, but Myers refined and extended the concepts, orienting the approach towards 'normal people' rather than the clinically-referred individuals whom Jung had theorised about. The Myers-Briggs approach was developed outside the academic community, at that time mired in the morass of behaviourism. This separation continued, even as Myers-Briggs took the global corporate community by storm. More about this in the appendix below.

The Myers-Briggs approach to personality differences is deceptively easy to state. Individuals taking the self-assessment inventory answer questions which produce scores on four dimensions as follows.

1. Extraverted or Introverted?

Is 'hell at a party' not being able to get in? Or being there? Extraverts take their energy from socialising with other people and feel under-energised when alone. Introverts need time alone, and socialising makes them weary. Most people recognise themselves on one side or the other of this divide. This is the **E-I** scale.

2. Sense-impressions or intuition?

Some people deal with the world in a concrete pragmatic way, others grasp situations through a framework of concepts, values or ideals. In the former category are many sports people, administrators, policemen; in the later category intellectuals, conceptual artists, campaigners for a cause. This is the **S-N** scale.

3. Thinking or Feeling?

Another poor choice of words from the founders. We all know people who are coldly focused on the logic of the situation (Mark, for example, above), who will do what is logical, and take the interpersonal consequences. This applies as much to the logically-focused intellectual as to the results-focused executive and mission-oriented special forces soldier. On the other hand, there are those, like Piers above, who put personal relationships first, who are motivated by sustaining the cohesion of the group, making their opponent a friend, or who are driven by a moral imperative to care.

The former score highly on the 'Thinking' side - sometimes the **T** is read as 'tough-minded'; the latter score highly on the Feeling side, although feeling is not so much raw emotion as a genuine warmth, empathy and an orientation to human values and solidarity. This is the **T-F** scale. And by the way, men's scores tend to be skewed to **T** and women's to **F**, although as a corrective, we have all met women who are probably from Mars, and men who have real warmth and are natural hosts, entertainers or diplomats.

4. Judging or Perceiving

This dimension is the staple of so many comedies, as well as real life dilemmas. One half of the partnership likes everything planned and organised in advance, the other hates lists, loves freedom and just wants to live life as it comes - 'something will always turn up'. This is the **J-P** scale. The highly-

organised folk who want to put a grid over life score strongly **J**, while those who are transactionally in dialogue with events score highly **P**.

Putting it all together

Having completed the Myers-Briggs self-assessment questionnaires, your score will position you on each of the four axes, combining to give a single, four letter code. The author, for instance, scores **INTP**.

- **I** = Introverted (rather than extraverted)
- **N** = iNtuitive (conceptual rather than concrete)
- **T** = Thinking (logical rather than values-driven)
- **P** = Perceiving (understand /persuade rather than dominate).

This is a typical profile for a researcher, architect, scientist or strategist.

ISTJ Inspector	ISFJ Protector	INFJ Counsellor	INTJ Mastermind
ISTP Crafter	ISFP Composer	INFP Healer	INTP Architect
ESTP Promoter	ESFP Performer	ENFP Champion	ENTP Inventor
ESTJ Supervisor	ESFJ Provider	ENFJ Teacher	ENTJ Fieldmarshal

Figure 1. The Sixteen Types

If you enter **INTP** (or any other Myers-Briggs type) into your favourite search engine, a number of profiles will come up. Many assume you know more about Jungian thinking than described here. In figure 1, I list the 16 Myers-Briggs types, on the scheme suggested in the original book by Isabel Myers

Briggs[1]. Beneath the four letter code, I have included the descriptive word David Keirsey [2] suggests for roles of this type. So in the top left hand corner, we see the dominant type in the police and military, the **ISTJ**: Introverted (not too showy) + Sensing (concrete rather than abstract) + Thinking (tough-minded, duty-oriented) + Judging (authoritarian rather than permissive). David Keirsey calls this kind of person an INSPECTOR.

I want to emphasise that the theory behind the MBTI is a lot deeper than I have described. For example, the four axes are not really in the same category. The **S-N** and **T-F** axes are fundamental, and the **E-I** and **J-P** dimensions modify their dominance and orientation. And there is sometimes a facile identification of sometimes-desirable traits such as *conscientiousness* with a single MBTI dimension such as 'more **J** than **P**'. Thankfully people are not so simple, and the overall personality type is not a simple additive combination of the separate letters. To probe further, [3], [1] and [4] are useful reading - in that order. If you are interested in knowing your own type, [2] has a sample questionnaire, which suffices for a rough idea. For more sophisticated insights, a standardised psychometric test set given by a qualified practitioner is necessary.

The Jungian tradition underlying the Myers-Briggs approach appear to some people to presuppose a kind of functional architecture for personality. Not everyone wants to go that way, and David Keirsey for instance took the four Myers-Briggs dimensions and the sixteen types but interpreted them differently. Best known for his book *'Please Understand Me II'*, [2], Keirsey reviewed the history of personality assessment, arguing that there are fundamentally *four* human temperaments, a view going back to antiquity. Keirsey renamed the four temperaments and identified them with Myers-Briggs dimensions as in table 1.

Guardian (SJ)	Artisan (SP)
Idealist (NF)	Rational (NT)

Table 1: The Four Keirsey Temperaments

- **Guardians** are **SJs**, concrete and institutionally oriented.
- **Artisans** are **SPs**, concrete and individual-action oriented.
- **Idealists** are **NFs**, conceptual and value-driven.
- **Rationals** are **NTs**, conceptual and logic-driven.

The popularity of Keirsey's views arises from the obvious fact that most people are fairly easily seen to fit into one of these four categories, and that it is easy to make finer-grained distinctions if necessary using the full sixteen types, which are embedded within Keirsey's approach (table 2).

Guardian	ISTJ	ESTJ	ISFJ	ESFJ
Artisan	ISTP	ESTP	ISFP	ESFP
Idealist	INFP	ENFP	INFJ	ENFJ
Rational	INTJ	ENTJ	INTP	ENTP

Table 2. The Keirsey temperaments and Myers-Briggs types

In [2], Keirsey provides distinctive profiles for the four temperaments, as well as the finer-grained types within them, which seem to many people to be both insightful and to have strong predictive powers in both inter-personal and career contexts.

So given that Myers-Briggs' **SJs** are Keirsey's **Guardians**, the priest would have been more accurate in saying '*it sounds a bit like David Keirsey, doesn't it*' (confusion in the congregation). In fact the Catholic Church is remarkably keen on personality profiling, especially the Jesuits (the *Society of Jesus* or in Latin, *Societas Jesu* - SJ), and the Jesuits are widely seen as a **Rational** (NT) Order, not **Guardian**.

Personality Assessment in Practice

There are plenty of personality assessment tests, but the classification schemes can be used without them. Most of us think we can judge people pretty accurately once we know them a little. Personality type is a fundamentally *empirical* framework for organising those judgements, and it is perfectly possible to make a judgement about someone's type by observation. Once we have the right category, we can think more clearly about that individual's personal style (which translates to strengths and weaknesses in a corporate context). That, after all, is the purpose of personality assessment and psychometric testing in the first place. Needless to say, we should base definitive management decisions on formal testing rather than impressions - the error-rate is far lower.

Both Alicia and Mark were Rationals, although Alicia was an introverted, perceiving Rational - **INTP**, while Mark was an extraverted, judging Rational - **ENTJ**. Piers was a Guardian, an extraverted and friendly **ESFJ**.

By reading type descriptions in the books cited in this chapter, or by entering a four letter Myers-Briggs designator, such as **ENTJ**, into a search engine, it is possible to refine your understanding of how different kinds of people are likely to operate, and what the differences are. Sales people have found this particularly valuable. It is unfortunately very easy to fall into the trap of interacting with other people within your own preferred typological style.

- If you are a **Rational**, you will tend to embark upon a long and logically-detailed explanation almost as soon as you open your mouth - lecture or problem-solving mode.
- If you are a **Guardian**, you will tend to address the pleasantries to break the ice before getting down to business, and then focus on the immediate details.
- If you are an **Artisan**, you will be more focused on the immediacies - less social overhead and no abstractions.
- If you are an **Idealist**, ethics and values will always be lying beneath what is said.

I recall meeting recently with a client, who was the technical director of a large company. We were facilitating his involvement with another of our clients. The purpose of my meeting was to understand better his company's approach to Voice over IP. Having found the premises and his office, I assumed he was a technologist (typically a **Rational**) and, after a few preliminaries, launched right in.

Me: "Are you just SIP-based or do you also do H.323?"

Client: "No, that's not it".

Me: "I mean, do you have some kind of architecture diagram I could look at?"

Client: "Look, I don't think so"

At this point, I noticed that the client was looking very defensive, with his arms drawn across his body. He seemed uncomfortable. I blundered on for a few more technical questions until the client lost patience.

Client: "Could you explain why you are here?"

Well, I thought I had covered that in my first couple of sentences, but now I get it. This guy is *not* a **Rational**, he's a **Guardian**. He doesn't do 'straight into technical', we have to get acquainted first and set the scene before doing business. So I reverse up, explain the background, explain my role, ask him about his history and establish some context and common ground. Finally, after ten minutes or so, the client loosens up, and begins to take me - in his own way - around the topics he has decided I should know about.

Rather than just hitting our conversational partner with our preferred style, we are more successful if we adopt the preferred style of the person we are talking to, or at least adjust to it. And that depends upon identifying their type. Most people with some degree of empathy have the ability to instinctively adjust their style to the people they're dealing with, but not everyone in business is naturally either diplomatic or empathic, and type theory is there to help.

Applying temperament or type theory in an informal setting is useful and will repay the time taken to learn it. The other main use is in more formal personnel selection. It is usually possible to identify the type characteristics of a role, either by the nature of the role, or by examining the types of the people who are conspicuously successful in it. It is not always the case, of course, that one role = one type. For example, a classic police/military pairing is the Guardian with the Artisan. The Guardian is orthodox, and does it by the book; the Artisan is a maverick who does what it takes, paying lip service to the rules where necessary. Choose your favourite film. Each style work best in some situations.

Isabel Myers profiled a sample of urban police with the following results ([1] *ibid*, p. 50).

- Guardian 56%
- Artisan 24%
- Idealist 8%
- Rational 12%

Against general population figures, (roughly 38% Guardian/Artisan, 12% Rational/Idealist - [5]) this proportion is significantly skewed towards Guardian. But even so, there were apparently ways of being a police officer - hopefully successful - which could exploit Idealist and Rational temperaments.

As we saw in the examples above, there is not one, interchangeable job called being a line manager. Some departments need strong, task-oriented leadership, some need leaders who care. Sometimes change needs

to be accomplished without taking prisoners; sometimes a department, damaged by endless change and uncertainty, needs to be recreated as an effective team. Type awareness, both in defining role characteristics and in assessing candidates for roles, is a tool which is available, highly useful and it seems perverse to ignore it.

If line management is the glue which keeps an organisation together and provides the recurrent revenues, then it is projects and programmes which are the mechanism of change. How does anything get changed in an organisation? You have to establish a project. And of course, a standard cliché in business is how often projects fail. There are many standard lists of why projects fail: lack of defined methodology, lack of clarity on project objectives, continual change in requirements, lack of empowerment for project leaders, and so on.

For strategic change, we prefer to talk about programmes. A programme is large, will significantly change the organisation, is more likely to be transformative than sustaining, and will spawn a number of projects under its umbrella. Programmes come with some well-defined roles at the top, and the correct mapping of people to roles is another mission-critical differentiator between successful, and unsuccessful programmes.

Roles, People and Successful Programmes

We need to say more about the difference between programmes which are sustaining, and programmes which are transformational. A sustaining programme is one which accomplishes something which has already been accomplished many times before. The organisation understands most, or all aspects of the process and the desired result. These kinds of programmes need only *effective* management to secure success. The diverse customers of the programme will shout if anything goes wrong, and the programme manager will make the necessary adjustments and conduct fine tuning. Sustaining programmes can be carried out by 'average people executing good processes'.

Transformational programmes, by contrast, are designed to bring about a new outcome which the organisation may not, at the outset, fully understand. A transformational programme needs *active direction* as well as *effective execution*. To bring about anything really new, you really do need good people. The *effective execution* calls for a high-calibre programme manager and the *active direction* calls for a high-calibre technical architect and business-process architect. We will now discuss these roles in more details.

Technical Architect

The architecture of a solution is the definition of its components, the relationships between them and the overall integrity of the design and implementation which makes it fit for purpose. In car terms, it's what makes a Rolls-Royce or a Porsche an excellent car, rather than something which ended up with a racing car engine, a tractor chassis and the body of a bus.

Since both suppliers and customers of a programme normally represent special interests and partial points of view, and as specific requirements are always changing, the natural fate of any programme, even if well-conceived at the start, is divergence. If this is left uncorrected, the end-point of a programme comprises a lot of good work in detail which fails to cohere overall and is unusable, poorly integrated or unaffordable. In a word, a failure.

The technical architect is the design authority for the programme. He has the last word on - and has to approve - what is done and what is not done. He is the person who is accountable for the overall design and implementation, and the person who should be able to explain the whole content of the programme to any audience. He fights entropy.

In a big programme, the technical architect can have a team of specialist architects/ designers under him. In a small programme, perhaps only one or two, or the architect may have technical skills allowing him to manage all technical aspects of the programme himself.

Normally, the technical architect reports (for programme purposes) to the programme manager. This is because the organisation normally wants the programme carried out *effectively* in terms of functionality, time and budget, for which the programme manager is accountable. The technical architect's function is an 'interior' one - to keep the content of the programme coherent and on-track. Rarely, the organisation doesn't really know what it wants, and the technical architect is plugged into the ongoing business discussion and serves to lead and guide the path of the project technically as the business mission evolves. In this case, the programme manager works for the technical architect as his 'enforcer' and executive officer. We see this in the military too, sometimes.

The technical architect is not just a stereotypical back-office technical guy. He is responsible for the ongoing 'fitness-for-purpose' of the content of the programme and will find himself dealing with every type of customer of the programme, all of whom will have vital needs which serve to pull the programme off-track.

- External customers with new service requirements.
- Internal operations people with process concerns.
- Suppliers pushing their own solutions.
- Marketing people with new product ideas.
- IT people who need to know what they are managing/interfaces to.
- Owners of legacy equipment who need to know how to interface to the new systems.
- Management who need to know what they're getting, and why.
- And finally endless change requests from each of the above which have to be assessed and approved or turned down.

The technical architect has a number of deliverables - architecture documents, design documents, implementation documents, interfaces specifications, test specifications, roadmaps. The *products* which the system enables are someone else's responsibility, but the technical architect has to specify exactly what the new system will do, and how it can be made to do it.

Business Process Architect

What images go through one's mind when one thinks of business process engineering (BPE)? Most likely a montage of process flowcharts, ineffectual workshops, high-priced consultants and a business fad which has come and gone. You would be safe to conclude that it is difficult [6].

Increasingly IT departments have been picking up BPE as a core competence. After all, those processes embedded within automation are already in their jurisdiction. But unlike processes encapsulated in legacy computer programs, processes embodied in people's current roles cannot simply be turned off. People matter, whether their fate is to be laid-off or to be retrained. And in the inevitable absence of all useful process documentation, they are often the only source of knowledge as to what actually happens now, a vital input to the process of systems analysis which is the first phase of effective BPE.

The target solution which the transformational programme has been set up to achieve will be a composite of new IT systems, new technology platforms and new human roles and processes, working at the edge into an existing legacy environment. The business process architect is responsible for developing effective new process models and winning their acceptance by all parties through to final implementation. The skills include:

- Analytical abilities - rapidly getting up to speed on the existing processes through interviews, observation and document analysis. Understanding the potential of the new systems and technologies. Being able to model the old and new processes, and charting a route between them.
- Technical depth - understanding exactly what the IT systems and technology platforms can do, how they can be used, and contributing to their usability .
- People/political competence - acquiring information, managing workshops, eliciting support, facilitating problem-solving with the staff involved with both the old and new processes, demonstrating empathy while maintaining the integrity of the overall mission.
- Systems/integrative talent - integrating a wealth of different kinds of hard and soft data into a coherent, executable plan and holding the vision.

It may be thought that this diversity of skills is too much for any one individual, and they do tend to pull in different directions, but skilled practitioners do exist. They are part systems analyst and part agent of change. Their deliverables include process models, user-interface specifications, user acceptance test models, and they have a sizeable input into the overall design of the automation systems. They will also contribute to the design of the future organisation, work closely with HR people, and take a lead in pilot implementations and making the organisational change happen.

Programme Manager

The programme manager is responsible for bringing the programme to a successful conclusion. The task is mostly about effective leadership. Knowing how to bring about change, who to speak to, how to exert pressure and break through roadblocks. When to use charm and when to use threats. The ideal programme manager is tough, resourceful and can improvise. They have an instinctive feel for how far they can push people out of their comfort zones to achieve mission objectives.

Project managers, by contrast, tend to have more of an administrative bent and tend to be detail people. This is the domain of the Gant charts, the ticking off of boxes, the detailed measurements of progress against plan, and the endless reminders, cajoling and checks. Good project managers are methodical, detailed and conscientious. A programme manager needs project managers to do his leg work, and to act as his eyes and ears as he steers and coaxes the programme to success.

The Programme Manager marshals his assistants. The technical and business process architects have already been mentioned, and there will also be finance people managing the budget, commercial people

managing vendor negotiations, and any other specialists needed for particular tasks, for example HR if there is a broad people dimension, facilities if buildings and leases have to be addressed.

The programme manager has borrowed power. Although as an individual he reports to someone, for the purposes of the programme, he is responsible to the executive sponsoring the programme, and borrows that executive's power to get things done. For transformational programmes to succeed, it is imperative that the programme reports at a senior level. In many cases, anything under the CEO or COO is not good enough.

Type Requirements for Programme Roles

Using Keirse's temperament categories, we can draw up a transformational programme role correspondence as shown in table 3.

Role	Temperament
Technical Architect	Rational
Business Process Architect	Rational
Programme Manager	Artisan/Guardian
Project Manager	Guardian/Artisan

Table 3. Programme roles and individual temperaments

The technical architect and the business process architect roles are not necessarily type-identical. The business process architect would benefit from being more extraverted and less judgemental, as judgemental often comes across as abrasive and arrogant. In Myers-Briggs terms the optimal role definition is probably an affable ENTP who can *listen*. The technical architect role, by contrast, probably works with any flavour of Rational. Why not an Idealist for business process architect? Idealists are people-oriented and driven by moral values; business transformational programmes by contrast are focused on task and mission accomplishment, where sometimes people's feelings, and even their livelihoods, get damaged. The programme needs to prioritise not *inter-personal harmony*, but *effective human resource management*: they are not quite the same thing.

The Programme Manager role has a focus on the effective use of institutions and people, areas where task-oriented Guardians and Artisans excel. If the project requires forcing through, then the Artisan style of task-focused power can be more successful. If it requires extensive use of formal institutional power, then a Guardian can be very effective. Subordinate project management functions favour Guardian types to the extent that they require routine conscientiousness over unconventional problem-resolution skills.

It is important to recall that this discussion is indicative, not mechanical. Almost all types can be successful under certain kinds of circumstances and with appropriate support. But selecting people for roles ought not to be an arbitrary process, and the conceptual framework discussed here is best-in-class for assessing both role needs and personnel suitability. The next chapter gives an example of the impact of personality type on programme success.

High Performance People?

Every large organisation I have worked in has had a programme for 'High-Performance People'. There is some kind of evaluation process, by which the HPPs (sometimes pronounced 'hypers'!) are identified and logged. Their careers are then meant to be managed separately, putting them on a fast-track to senior positions later. I think it is fair to say that every such programme I have ever seen has failed, and after an initial burst of enthusiasm, the scheme falls in abeyance.

- No-one knows what to do with the HPPs.
- There is a reorganisation and the HPP programme gets lost.
- People advance their protégés, and ignore the HPP database.
- HPPs are valuable to their current managers and are not let go.
- HPP database information is inaccessible, too limited, inadequate or incomprehensible.
- The whole scheme is loathed by the majority of non-HPPs, including many managers.

People are understandably cynical about such programmes, but the underlying need to identify, develop and use talent is undeniable. Since people are corporate resources, there is really little excuse for line managers not understanding the concepts of personality type (one reason for this chapter). Personality/IQ assessment of staff needs to be generalised. After all, if job candidates can routinely take a battery of IQ and psychometric tests, there is no reason why staff, who have already been employed, should not be able to do likewise to the advantage of themselves for career development, and of their managers for resource development and allocation.

On this basis, skills and talent management would be part of every line manager's day job, rather than being hived off to a separate programme. All that needs to be added is a regular upward submission through the management line of top performers who are candidates for development. Without the structural separation between HPPs and everyone else, morale and team cohesion also improves.

Summary

In this chapter we have taken a look at individual differences in personality characteristics and described various frameworks and terms for capturing distinctions *explicitly* which we already know *intuitively*. I have argued for more intensive use of psychometric testing to create a more accurate and objective basis for optimal staff allocation and career development.

I have devoted a large amount of space to personality testing and not much to intelligence testing. Any psychometric testing suite will include both kinds of assessment. It has been known for decades that the ability to function at higher executive levels directly correlates with measured IQ, but that effectiveness in-place is then determined by the nature of the role and the personality characteristics of the individual concerned. Raw aggression can only get you so far before the executive coach is called in! I am an advocate of intelligence testing in business personnel assessment because IQ is a robust predictor of potential performance, other attributes being equal.

We looked in some detail at the challenges of transformation *programmes*, and the roles and skills needed to make them successful. In the next chapter, we take a look at a case where these concepts will prove valuable in understanding what actually happened.

In North America, I would say that the concepts of this chapter are well-understood in most leading companies, and that those companies achieve competitive advantage through their use. Outside of North America, understanding and take-up is considerably more patchy, and I would urge managers to be proactive in bringing these ideas into their daily work.

Appendix: The scientific take on personality classification

This appendix is for those who wish to know more about how the scientific community thinks about personality differences, and why the Myers-Briggs approach is not at all the end of the story. It can be skipped without any breaks in continuity.

While most corporate HR staff and many therapists and counsellors routinely use the Myers-Briggs and Keirsey assessments, the academic community analyses personality in terms of the 'Five-Factor Model' (FFM) [7] comprising the traits of: Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism; sometimes recalled through the mnemonic of **OCEAN**. This is well described by Pierce and Jane Howard [8], who run one of the few consultancies using the FFM in a business context with clients.

The FFM dimensions arose from the following approach. Personality is important in human relationships, so we are likely to have a rich vocabulary of significant personality terms - this is called the lexical hypothesis. Large numbers of personality words were therefore culled from dictionaries, and people were asked to describe other people using these terms. Then a technique known as factor analysis [9] was used to group terms which seemed to correlate with each other, and therefore might mean the same thing. After much number-crunching and discussion, it seemed that personality terms seemed to cluster predominantly around five largely-orthogonal major axes: these constitute the Five-Factor Model. Naturally, there is much debate about personality concepts which don't seem to fit the model - honesty? - but a consensus seems to have developed.

Note that unlike Myers-Briggs and Keirsey, there are *no types*. The five axes constitute a kind of five-dimensional personality space, and an individual taking an FFM personality assessment ends up with an aggregated score along each dimension, a personality vector in this space. In practice, each trait is further subdivided into six sub-traits which are also chosen to minimise cross-correlation - the resulting raw personality vector has 30 components. The significance of this collection of numbers can be hard to understand - the typological analysis, once the letter codes are understood, seems easier to work with, which is probably why it is more popular in a corporate or clinical context. People who have used the FFM with clients have scored the assessment in terms of High, Median or Low along each of the five main dimensions. This is a little more manageable, but you end up with $3^5 = 243$ possible outcomes, rather than 16 types.

Academics don't like the Jungian apparatus of dominant, auxiliary, tertiary and inferior functions and their attitudes, and they don't like the apparently bimodal character of the type attributes - where you are forced to choose between alternatives: **E** or **I**, **S** or **N**, **T** or **F**, **J** or **P**. In the Five-Factor Model, populations are assumed to distribute normally along the five axes. Since both approaches are agnostic about the underlying neurological architecture of personality, the differences in neurological structure and function which underlie observable personality differences, and are not situated within an evolutionary paradigm, this is clearly an area where future research has the potential to transform current thinking. I

am inclined to appreciate the insights afforded by the Jungian approach, without thinking of it at all as the last word - a kind of psychological analogue to Aristotelian or Newtonian mechanics.

In fact it is possible to compare the Myers-Briggs (and by extension, the Keirseyan) approaches and the Five-Factor Model. The Wikipedia article on 'MBTI' quotes a study of 119 undergraduates who were given both the Myers-Briggs assessments and an FFM personality inventory and the results compared to look for correlations (figure 2).

	Extraversion	Openness	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Emotional Stability
E-I	65%	6%	-37%	-15%	31%
S-N	12%	-56%	34%	37%	6%
T-F	19%	-25%	-21%	9%	7%
J-P	18%	-15%	10%	55%	8%

Figure 2. Correlation between FFM traits and Myers-Briggs dimensions

Any correlation over 50% can be considered significant, so what this is saying is that:

- Extraversion (FFM) seems to be extraversion (E) on the E-I dimension
- Openness (to experience) is similar to iNtuition on the S-N dimension
- Agreeableness seems to be a composite in the Myers-Briggs view: you are perceived to be more agreeable if you are somewhat introverted (I), somewhat concrete rather than abstract (S) and to a lesser extent, somewhat Feeling rather than Thinking (F). Perhaps there is more than one way to be agreeable! However, other FFM theorists have simply identified the Myers-Briggs F function with Agreeableness ([7] p. 56).
- Conscientiousness correlates with J on the J-P dimension
- Neuroticism (alert, anxious, worried) and its inverse, Emotional Stability (calm, relaxed, stable) does not seem to be captured in the Myers-Briggs approach,

The Myers-Briggs testing found in corporate life is focused more on 'cool', 'top-level' psychological functions than on the overall psychological integration of these with deeper emotional drives.

Interestingly, it was the latter which was the focus of Jung's mainstream work in analytic psychology. In a business context, low-neuroticism, sometimes described as high emotional stability, is usually a required personality attribute (except, perhaps, for some of the most senior managers!).

There is a mathematical way of thinking about this. Consider the totality of a person's personality to be represented as a vector **P** in some high-dimensional space as yet not completely understood. Then both Myers-Briggs and the Five-Factor Model are representations (sets of basis vectors, but not complete sets) onto which **P** can be projected. Some of the axes line up (*Extraversion* with **E-I**, *Openness* with **N-S**) while others are linear combinations (*Agreeableness* might be a linear combination of **E-I**, **S-N**, **T-F**). The extra Five-Factor Model dimension of *Emotional Stability* is orthogonal to the Myers-Briggs set of bases. On this view, fights between the FFM and Myers-Briggs are arguments about the utility of different representations, not about the fundamentals, since they are related by linear transformations.

Recent work in Evolutionary Psychology suggests that the Five-Factor Model axes should be rotated in personality space to align better with evolutionary-significant traits. In this view, the two orthogonal axes of 'Extraversion -- Agreeableness' should be rotated to 'Dominance -- Nurturing'. Expected gender differences then appear ([10] p. 210). Anthony Stevens and John Price suggest in [11] that human beings rank along two orthogonal dimensions: dominance (rule by fear) and social attractiveness (rule by attraction/admiration). They note that most people prefer to operate in institutions governed by the second model, which is normative in most business and social environments (cf. the perennial search for the 'team player'). The criteria for high-ranking on the social admiration axis can be varied: athletic skill, intelligence, personal effectiveness, a genial personal style, moral courage. Of course, rule by fear on the first axis is not by any means unknown in business!

Incidentally, as a reader of this, you are most likely to be a **Rational**. Failing that, I expect some **Guardians** as readers, looking to properly prepare themselves for the next-generation network: **Guardians** are often interested in technical matters and tend to be conscientious in reading everything relevant. You are unlikely to be an **Idealist**, not only because there are so few in telecoms, media and technology, but also because their people orientation tends to steer them away from books like this. And finally, **Artisans** do not read this kind of book, ever (apologies if you are the exception - someone probably made you do it?)

References

- [1]. Briggs Myers, I., and Myers, P., *Gifts Differing: Understanding Personality Type*, Davies-Black Publishing, 1995.
- [2]. Keirse, D., *Please Understand me II.*, Prometheus Nemesis Book Company, 1998.
- [3]. Kroeger, O., and Thuesen, J. M., *Type Talk*, Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, 1989.
- [4]. Thomson, L., *Personality Type : An Owner's Manual*, Shambhala Publications Inc., 1998.
- [5]. Wideman, R. M., Project teamwork, personality profiles and the population at large, *Proc. of the 29th Annual Project Management Institute Seminar/Symposium "Tides of Change"*, Long Beach, California, USA, 1998, (updated presentation, April, 2002),
<http://www.maxwideman.com/papers/profiles/observations.htm>.
- [6]. Harmon, P., *Business Process Change*, Morgan Kaufmann, 2003.
- [7]. McCrae, R. R., and Costa, P. T., *Personality in Adulthood - A Five-Factor Theory Perspective*, 2nd Ed., The Guilford Press, 2003.
- [8]. Howard, P. J. and Howard, J. M., *An Introduction to the Five-Factor Model of Personality*, Center for Applied Cognitive Studies, 2004. <http://www.centacs.com/quickstart.htm>.
- [9]. Kim, J. O., and Mueller, C. W., *Introduction to Factor Analysis*, Sage Publications, 1979.
- [10]. MacDonald, K., Personality, Evolution and Development, in *Evolutionary Perspectives on Human Development*, 2nd Edition. Burgess, R. L. and MacDonald, K., Eds., Sage Publications, 2005, chap. 8.
- [11]. Stevens, A., and Price, J., *Evolutionary Psychiatry: a new beginning*, 2nd Ed., Brunner-Routledge, 2000.