Case study

# What happens when you stop looking at leadership assessments one person at a time?

*How BIOSS Southern Africa turned eight individual leadership profiles into one picture of a leadership team.*

BIOSS Southern Africa

Anonymised case study — August 2026

**Starting point**

## Reading the team as a system

In a recent leadership team project, BIOSS Southern Africa integrated assessment data across eight senior leaders to build a clearer picture of both individual leadership capability and the collective dynamics of the team. Assessment on its own tends to stop at the individual, a report filed and moved past. We wanted to know what happens when you read eight of those reports as one dataset instead.

**The building block**

## Four lenses, one Leadership Signature

We drew together capability, derailment risk, values and emotional intelligence data for each leader, and used it to write a Leadership Signature: how that person creates value, where their future potential may lie, and the tension they need to manage to get there.

- **Capability** MCPA
  Current level of work and future potential, mapped against age on a growth-curve model.
- **Derailer risk** Hogan HDS
  Strengths in moderation that can turn into risks under pressure, when overused.
- **Values and motives** MVPI
  What energises a person, and what they are quietly optimising for.
- **Emotional intelligence** EQ-i 2.0
  Self-awareness, interpersonal skill and stress management, benchmarked against norms.

**Eight signatures**

# The leadership signatures

Not fixed types. Each signature reads current capability against future potential, then names the tension the leader needs to manage to grow into that potential.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| H4 → M5 | Leader A | **The Navigator** — Steers through complexity with strategic clarity and people-centred leadership; the growth edge is trusting their own voice more and softening less. |
| L4 → MH4 | Leader B | **The Engineer** — Scales performance through structured innovation and operational discipline; the risk is building alone when the design needs co-authors. |
| M4 → H4 | Leader C | **The Architect** — Designs enterprise-wide systems and transformation with bold creative vision, but must ensure the blueprints stay anchored to buildable realities. |
| H3 → H4 | Leader D | **The Orchestrator** — Connects systems, resources and enterprise signals to turn complexity into clear commercial choices; the tension is stepping back from personal ownership to lead through others. |
| H3 → M5 | Leader E | **The Catalyst** — Accelerates execution through data and momentum, on the cusp of a major capability shift; the move from doing to directing is imminent. |
| M4 → M5 | Leader F | **The Provocateur** — Disrupts conventions at the intersection of brand, culture and commerce; the discipline challenge is knowing when boldness serves the business and when it serves the ego. |
| L4 → L5 | Leader G | **The Integrator** — Weaves complexity into coherence across systems and people; needs a bigger canvas and sharper strategic dialogue to fully realise their trajectory. |
| H3 → MH4 | Leader H | **The Shaper** — Brings brand, design, people and commercial logic together to shape meaningful growth; the tension is converting creative breadth and collaborative energy into disciplined, independently owned strategic choices. |

Quick reference

## The leadership team at a glance

| Leader | Capability | Transition age | Key watch point |
|---|---|---|---|
| Leader A | H4 → M5 | 58 | Emotional self-awareness and assertiveness |
| Leader B | L4 → MH4 | N/A | Balancing independence with collaboration |
| Leader C | M4 → H4 | N/A | Grounding innovation in operational realities |
| Leader D | H3 → H4 | 44 | Over-ownership and difficulty leading through others |
| Leader E | H3 → M5 | 36 | Shifting from execution to strategic direction |
| Leader F | M4 → M5 | 58 | Managing overconfidence and risk appetite |
| Leader G | L4 → L5 | N/A | Needs broader enterprise and cross-functional exposure |
| Leader H | H3 → MH4 | 46 | Creative overextension and follow-through |

> *The real value emerged when we stepped back and looked across the team.*

Reading the whole team

## What eight reports said together

7/8

### Expect the work to change mid-flight

Treats change in-flight as normal, not a sign the planning failed.

7/8

### Rules are guides, not fences

Nobody defended rule-following as a value in its own right.

7/8

### Gaps energise rather than threaten

Missing information is the interesting part of the problem.

5/8

### Define the horizons, then roam

Scope sketched lightly first, so they can stretch further safely.

**Motivation and friction**

## What drives, and stretches, this team

### Consistently energises them

Developing other people — named by six of the eight leaders as the most rewarding part of the job.

Turning bold ideas into measurable results — the satisfaction of proving out something that looked impossible.

### Consistently drains them

Bureaucracy and short-term calls that cost people — exits, cuts, decisions that hurt teams.

Data without judgement — a preference for informed instinct over rigid process.

### Planning horizons vary by function, not seniority

Execution roles plan in fast 3-month/1-year/5-year cycles; one leader compresses further for turnaround work, another stretches to 1/5/15 years for a longer asset cycle. Calibrate “long-term” per function, not one clock for the whole team.

### Resilience under real personal strain

Multiple leaders delivered major outcomes while navigating serious personal circumstances outside work. This is a team tested outside of work, not just within it.

**Growth is not one direction**

## Different transitions, same team

Some leaders shifting from **executing strategy** to **shaping direction**.

Others moving from **personally owning the work** to **leading through others**.

Others converting **creative and strategic breadth** into **disciplined, owned choices**.

**One level deeper**

## Individual snapshot

The defining trait and the growth focus behind each signature.

| Leader | Capability | Defining trait | Growth focus |
|---|---|---|---|
| Leader A *The Navigator* | H4 → M5 | Moderate Imaginative & Colourful | Emotional self-awareness and assertiveness |
| Leader B *The Engineer* | L4 → MH4 | High Bold, forceful and demanding | Balancing independence with collaboration |
| Leader C *The Architect* | M4 → H4 | High Imaginative, unfocused | Grounding innovation in operational realities |
| Leader D *The Orchestrator* | H3 → H4 | High Leisurely, quietly resists others | Over-ownership; leading through others |
| Leader E *The Catalyst* | H3 → M5 | High Bold/Colourful; high Power, Commerce | Shifting from execution to strategic direction |
| Leader F *The Provocateur* | M4 → M5 | High Bold; high Hedonism, Power | Managing overconfidence and risk appetite |
| Leader G *The Integrator* | L4 → L5 | High Colourful; very high Affiliation | Broader enterprise and cross-functional exposure |
| Leader H *The Shaper* | H3 → MH4 | Moderately Colourful; high Recognition, Power | Creative overextension and follow-through |

**What it added up to**

## A picture of the system, not a stack of reports

The result was a practical picture of the leadership system: who brings what, where the team already has strength, where tension is likely to show up, and what each leader may need next. A richer starting point for leadership development, succession conversations, team assimilation and executive team effectiveness work than any single report on its own.

> *Assessment becomes more valuable when the question shifts from "what does this score mean?" to "what does this tell us about how this leadership team will work together?"*



Next step

# Curious what this looks like for your leadership team?

Get in touch with BIOSS Southern Africa to talk through what an integrated team read could surface for your organisation.