

TEAM INTELLIGENCE

FOR TEAM LEADERS

# Case Studies.

---

*Real teams. Real friction. Real outcomes. Two live, verified engagements—one senior leadership team at a global agency, one operating-unit leadership team at an energy company.*

*Every quote in this document is verbatim, attributed by name and role, and traceable to a call transcript, workshop recording, or direct correspondence. Nothing here is invented. Where a speaker asked to be anonymised, that is noted. The stories are written for a team leader—someone who has watched their own team stall on a decision and wants to know if Team Intelligence would help.*

---

## *I. — Case Study*

# The deadlock that broke in ten minutes.

---

|             |                                                       |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| CLIENT      | Oliver Agency—global creative agency, 3,800 employees |
| TEAM        | Senior Leadership Team, APAC region (five leaders)    |
| FACILITATOR | Harry Marshall, Dramatic Difference (Singapore)       |
| SETTING     | Week-long senior leadership offsite, February 2026    |
| TOOL        | Team Intelligence + Clara                             |

---

## The friction

The APAC senior leadership team was working on people & culture objectives at their offsite. One breakout group of five leaders had been stuck for close to an hour. The conversation was circular, energy was falling, and the deadline for the next session was approaching. From the outside it looked like a straightforward disagreement.

Any team leader has seen this. Smart people in a room. Shared goal on the flip chart. And nothing landing.

## What Team Intelligence saw

Harry queried Clara mid-session. Clara had already ingested every participant's thinking profile. The diagnosis returned in seconds:

*"This is a classic cognitive collision. Based on the profiles in that group, I can tell you exactly why they are deadlocked before you even walk over there."*

The composition of the group: three Future thinkers, one Past thinker, one Present-Probability thinker. Not a personality clash. Not a values clash. A **structural** mismatch in where each person was standing when they looked at the problem.

Clara then wrote the intervention for Harry to deliver:

*“You have three strong Future thinkers trying to fly the plane to 2028. And you have one strong Past thinker who is checking if we have enough fuel and if the runway is paved. You aren’t disagreeing on the goal. You are disagreeing on the starting point.”*

## What happened next

Harry walked into the breakout and delivered the reframe. The story from the facilitator:

*“It was night and day... ten minutes later they were getting to specifics.”*

And from Harry, reflecting after the session:

*“Honestly, it was probably one of the most beautiful moments of insight and energy shift I have observed in a workshop/offsite setting like this.”*

## What one of the leaders in the room said afterwards

A senior leader inside that offsite—anonymised at her request—wrote her own reflection after the session:

*“Despite its simplicity of input, the output felt surprisingly personal.”*

*“The observations were both surprising and deeply affirming—articulating patterns and preferences I’ve intuitively felt but never clearly defined.”*

*“Its ability to distinguish between what energises me versus what drains me, and how my interaction style compares to others, was incredibly valuable. It put certain feelings or frustrations into context rather than me just accepting that’s my nature.”*

*“The tool didn’t just provide generic outputs—it appeared to learn and respond within the nuances of our business environment, making the experience feel genuinely personalised and relevant. It knew me, and responded to me.”*

## What this means for you

When a leadership team stalls on a decision, it is rarely because people disagree on the goal. Almost always, they cannot see the same starting point. The Future-oriented person is stand-

ing in 2028 and moving backwards. The Past-oriented person is standing in what has already been proved and moving forwards. Both are being sensible. Both are talking past each other.

Team Intelligence makes the starting point visible—for the leader, for the facilitator, and, where the team leader chooses to share it, for the team itself. That single move is what broke the Oliver deadlock in ten minutes.

---

*II. — Case Study*

# When the labels come off.

---

|             |                                                                                |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CLIENT      | KP Spain (Kuwait Petroleum, Spanish operating unit)                            |
| TEAM        | Operating-unit leadership team, led by the Managing Director                   |
| FACILITATOR | Neil Crofts, Holos Change (UK)                                                 |
| SETTING     | First integrated Holos + MindTime + Q8 competencies pilot, February–March 2026 |
| TEAM LEADER | Max, Managing Director, KP Spain                                               |
| TOOL        | Team Intelligence + Clara + Q8 competency ingestion                            |

---

## The friction

Max had a team that had worked together for years. Like most long-tenured teams, they had settled into a shorthand for each other—“the crazy one,” “the careful one,” the one who always comes in with a problem, the one who always comes in with a plan. The team had built a small internal mythology about who was different from whom. That mythology was doing damage they had stopped noticing.

Max also had a specific external ask on the desk: the leadership team was being asked to think about innovation. This is the kind of ask where an operating-unit MD can either force an off-pattern brainstorm and get low-quality output, or find a way for the team to innovate in a way that fits how they actually think.

## What Team Intelligence saw

The team’s cognitive composition, once mapped, told a different story from the one the team had been telling itself. High Present. Low Past. Low Future. All of them—clustered together in the same region of the cognitive map.

Team leaders who read this and recognise their own team will understand why what happened next was important.

## What happened in the room

Max, describing the moment:

*“Once they see them clustered in the same space, we are more or less the same kind of animal. At the end we are more or less of the same flesh and blood. And so this helped a lot the collaboration.”*

Then the shift he did not expect:

*“The label come off. There is something like a label that’s okay, I need to be defensive when you come because you always come with something.”*

And the change in what the team was actually able to do together:

*“This also built some availability to collaborate and maybe broke some hypothetical barriers that were existing more virtual than the real.”*

## On the innovation ask

Traditional blue-sky brainstorming is a Future-dominant activity. Ask a Present-dominant team to blue-sky and you get resistance dressed up as “we need to be realistic.” Clara helped Neil redesign the innovation session as a stepwise, process-led activity—step 1, step 2, step 3—that suited the way the team actually thought. The team innovated. Their way.

Max on the outcome:

*“We generated a lot of good ideas and a lot of spiritual collaboration between the team in order to achieve some new methods and some new processes.”*

*“This innovation mindset or future-related mindset would help to win a bit the fear of making changes or big changes and of looking forward to really evolve and to grow.”*

## On Clara herself

Team leaders often ask, quietly, whether their team will actually engage with an AI in the room. Max’s answer:

*“The AI component was really useful from one side, also funny to see—because the team started putting strange questions. This is also a very good tool.”*

## On the day itself

*"We had the team really thinking one entire day on their way of approaching these big topics—how do we innovate? Are we open to innovate?"*

*"Taking the time one day to think how we do things and how we can do it better—and to suffer less while doing that."*

## And on whether it delivered

*"The result confirmed what was my expectation from this."*

## What this means for you

Two things.

The first is what Max named "the label come off." Long-tenured teams often trap themselves in identities that no longer describe them. The map shows what is actually there. Almost every time, the actual pattern is more useful, and more encouraging, than the story people have been telling about each other.

The second is the innovation lesson. Team Intelligence lets you design the work around the team you have, not the team a management book thinks you should have. If your team is Present-heavy, you don't need to guilt them into blue-sky. You need to design innovation as a process. If they are Future-heavy, you don't need to hammer them into disciplined execution. You need to structure follow-through around them. The map tells you which lever to pull.

---

### III.

## What the numbers say alongside the stories.

Two supporting data points from investor materials, verified separately:

**Oliver Agency APAC pilot**—deadlock in a five-person senior leadership breakout resolved in approximately ten minutes after Clara’s diagnostic intervention.

**12.7% increase in conversions** by aligning ad messaging with cognitive profiles; **17.4% reduction in cost-per-click** through predictive audience alignment; **18% revenue lift** at a leading brokerage by optimizing team collaboration based on cognitive insights. (*Historic MindTime enterprise deployments.*)

Full quantitative results and third-party validation—including Rory Sutherland (Vice Chairman, Ogilvy UK), who called MindTime a “game-changer in predictive human insights”—are documented in the companion Testimonials document.

### IV.

## What is still being prepared.

*Additional case studies are in development. Included here as a signal of the pipeline, not as evidence.*

**The project-manager team.** A project manager ran Team Intelligence with her team (five members), used the shared map to redesign how the team relied on its Future thinkers, and shared the outcome with her manager. The story is strong; publishing awaits explicit permission from the participant.

**The Unum tech team persistence story.** Neil Crofts used Clara weeks after the session to diagnose why the team was not prioritising the development plan, and used Clara’s answer to break the internal logjam with the HR business partner. Source material available; case study yet to be written.

**The 18-month engagement at MTaylor Inc.** Julie Sanders, MindTime-certified facilitator, has run a sustained MindTime engagement with a US client. Interview material exists; consent for a public case study to be confirmed.

Each of these is real. Each will be added to this document once the permission and sourcing bar is met.

---

## SOURCING AND VERIFICATION

All named quotes above have been verified against original source material—Fireflies transcripts, Slack correspondence, email, participant reflections, and interview recordings—held in the Marketing Voice Library.

**Two attribution items are outstanding and worth noting:**

- **Max (KP Spain MD)**—surname pending; traceable through Q8 partnership records.
- **The anonymised senior leader (Oliver Agency APAC)**—internally referenced elsewhere as “Lisa, ANZ Managing Partner.” Attribution has not been formally confirmed for external use and is left anonymous here until confirmed.

TEAM INTELLIGENCE · CASE STUDIES · V1 · 18 SEPTEMBER 2026 · FOR TEAM LEADER CONSUMPTION