

DO.ITCHANGE™



SHIFT PATTERN INDEX™
— SEE TENSION. UNDERSTAND SHIFT. CREATE CHANGE. —

Case Studies

powered by the Faria-Lequay Shift Pattern Index™

Three teams that were working well, and the composition each could not see from the inside.

These cases illustrate how team-level analysis can reveal capability gaps, concentration risk, and strength overconcentration that individual profiles alone may not surface.

Navigate From Within™

Applied organizational case studies | 2026

ABOUT THESE CASE STUDIES

Applied evidence, presented with appropriate limits

These case studies examine organizational applications of the Faria-Lequay Shift Pattern Index™ and the accompanying Team Shift Analysis. Each case draws on completed individual assessments, aggregated team-pattern data, facilitated interpretation, and organizational actions discussed or taken following the analysis.

Client-identifying details have been removed or generalized where necessary to preserve confidentiality. The first case is an internal application within Soleil Edge Enterprises and is identified by name because the organization elected to use its own instrument on itself.

The cases are presented to illustrate observed team-composition dynamics. They are not intended to establish causal claims, population-level norms, or predictive outcomes. Interpretations describe patterns that were consistent with reported team experience and that informed subsequent leadership decisions.

METHODOLOGICAL PRINCIPLE

The analytical unit is the team, not the individual. The value comes from seeing how individual patterns combine, concentrate, or disappear when people operate together.

What the analysis includes

Individual FLSPi profiles establish each participant's Primary and Secondary Shift Patterns. Team Shift Analysis then examines the combined composition of the group, including representation, absence, concentration, balance across planning and execution functions, and potential handoff or dependency risks.

The result is not a judgment about whether a team is good or bad. It is a structured view of the response capabilities the team naturally carries, and the capabilities it may need to hold deliberately.

WHAT TEAM-LEVEL ANALYSIS CAN REVEAL

Three forms of composition risk

The cases that follow illustrate three analytically distinct conditions. Each can exist inside a capable, productive team and remain difficult to detect through individual assessment alone.

Absence	Concentration	Overconcentration
A needed response capability is not represented in the team composition. The risk is not poor performance by an individual, but work the group has no natural source for.	A capability exists, but depends disproportionately on one person. The team average can look balanced while resilience remains vulnerable to availability and handoff.	A strength is represented so heavily that other necessary capabilities are crowded out. What helped the organization succeed at one stage may become insufficient at another.

These conditions are not defects. They are composition realities. Once visible, leaders can decide what to reinforce through role design, decision practices, team structure, or targeted development.

CORE PRINCIPLE

The purpose of team analysis is not to make people more alike. It is to make the system around them more intentional.

CASE STUDY ONE | INTERNAL APPLICATION

The room where no one said wait

What a founder learned by running the instrument on her own company.

ORGANIZATION	Soleil Edge Enterprises
SECTOR	Change management and organizational development
STRUCTURE	Globally distributed, founder-led organization
PARTICIPANTS	Nine, spanning operations, business development, finance, media, web, and executive leadership
ENGAGEMENT	Faria-Lequay Shift Pattern Index™ completed individually, followed by Team Shift Analysis

Organizational context

In the first months of building the company, hiring followed a familiar early-stage pattern. Roles were filled as needs surfaced, and candidates were assessed for capability, experience, and fit. What was not visible at the time was the composition being created underneath those decisions.

The founder was repeatedly selecting people whose response to change felt familiar: people who could see possibility, build momentum, and move quickly. Because those tendencies aligned with her own, they also read as competence. The team functioned well, but its shared preference for movement made agreement easy to interpret as evidence that an idea had been sufficiently tested.

Presenting situation

Ideas moved quickly from discussion to action. Questions about sequencing, sustainability, and what should be held before moving were less visible in the room. The issue was not open conflict or poor performance. It was the absence of enough natural friction to test momentum before the organization committed to it.

CASE STUDY ONE | TEAM COMPOSITION FINDINGS

An abundant capacity to start, with no natural source of regulation

Nine people produced eighteen pattern positions when each participant's Primary and Secondary Shift Patterns were counted. The distribution was:

Shift Pattern	Primary	Secondary	Positions held
Activator	2	3	5
Harmonizer	2	2	4
Envisioner	3	0	3
Analyzer	2	1	3
Strategizer	0	1	1
Processor	0	1	1
Explorer	0	1	1
Regulator	0	0	0

Interpretation

Four patterns held every primary position in the company: Envisioner, Activator, Analyzer, and Harmonizer. The team could imagine what came next, understand a situation, move toward it, and keep people steady.

Regulator did not appear anywhere, not as a Primary or a Secondary. In a team where Activator was the most represented pattern, the capacity to initiate movement was abundant while the capacity to stabilize it had no natural source. Strategizer and Processor appeared only once each and only in secondary position.

The pattern helped explain why immediate agreement was not a reliable indicator that a proposal had been fully examined. No individual profile was problematic on its own. The risk existed in the way the profiles combined.

Harmonizer representation sits underneath that dynamic. Harmonizer is the work of maintaining cohesion, and cohesion is measured against whatever a group already treats as normal. In a team whose shared default was movement, the responses least likely to be voiced were the ones that would have slowed it. This is a contributing condition rather than the central finding. The composition issue was the concentration of movement capability alongside the absence of regulation, and Harmonizer representation helped that concentration go unexamined.

The absence of pushback did not establish that the decisions were sound. It was consistent with the composition of the room.

CASE STUDY ONE | ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE

From automatic agreement to deliberate friction

Actions taken

The analysis changed how agreement was interpreted. Immediate enthusiasm is now treated as a signal to create a deliberate hold rather than as confirmation that a decision has been sufficiently tested. Before moving, the team asks what should be held, what should be kept, and what should be abandoned.

Analyzer and Strategizer contributions are weighted more deliberately in decision conversations. Responses that slow a decision in order to examine it are no longer treated as lower energy versions of progress. They are recognized as distinct capabilities that the organization needs.

Role scoping also shifted. The hiring question expanded from “What skill are we missing?” to “What response capability is missing from this team?” That distinction matters because regulation, sequencing, and momentum can present very differently in an interview while each may be essential to the work.

Observed value

The most useful outcome was not a single decision. It was the decisions the company stopped making automatically. The organization did not have to wait for a failed initiative to discover that agreement had been functioning as a substitute for friction.

The internal application also created an important credibility test for the instrument itself. The organization that developed the FLSPI was carrying a team-composition blind spot that individual profiles had not revealed. The blind spot became visible only when the company examined itself as a system.

KEY INSIGHT

In this case, hiring in the founder’s image did not produce visible conflict. It produced agreement, which proved harder to recognize as an organizational risk.

CASE STUDY TWO | CONFIDENTIAL CLIENT APPLICATION

The balance that concealed a dependency

A senior leadership team that appeared evenly matched at the aggregate level.

ORGANIZATION	Independent organizational change consultancy
PARTICIPANTS	Three-member senior leadership team
CONTEXT	Established leadership group with significant experience working together
ENGAGEMENT	Faria-Lequay Shift Pattern Index™ followed by facilitated Team Shift Analysis

Identifying characteristics have been generalized to protect client confidentiality.

Presenting situation

The team had a strong track record and no obvious performance problem. When difficult situations arose, the group tended to move through the issue rather than spend extended time unpacking how each leader was experiencing the change.

That approach supported productivity. It also meant difficult conversations could be postponed, concerns could be absorbed rather than raised, and differences in response could be interpreted as personality rather than as different change needs.

CASE STUDY TWO | TEAM COMPOSITION FINDINGS

Aggregate balance did not equal distributed resilience

At the team level, planning capability represented 50.4 percent of combined change energy and execution represented 49.6 percent. On the surface, the profile was unusually balanced.

50.4%

Planning capability

49.6%

Execution capability

Finding 1: New-direction capacity was concentrated

The three executives brought genuinely different profiles. One led with Activator, one held Analyzer and Regulator at equal strength, and one led with Envisioner with Explorer close behind. The aggregate view therefore looked well covered.

The distribution underneath that average told a different story. Envisioner and Explorer capacity was disproportionately concentrated in one executive. When that leader was not available, the team retained its capacity to analyze, move, and stabilize, but its range for generating new direction dropped substantially. The team therefore carried a dependency that the balanced average did not show.

Finding 2: Interpersonal steadiness was stronger than internal processing

Harmonizer was the team's highest-scoring pattern, while Processor was among the lowest. That composition was consistent with the leaders' reported tendency to maintain steadiness while leaving some difficult experiences unarticulated.

A balanced team average can conceal concentration risk when one capability depends too heavily on one person.

CASE STUDY TWO | ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE

Turning a habit into a decision

Actions discussed and adopted

The facilitated debrief translated the combined profile into practical team decisions. The group introduced a more deliberate pause at the beginning of change work, before momentum made re-examination more difficult. Ownership of vision-setting work was made more explicit so that the leader with the strongest Envisioner and Explorer capacity could be deployed intentionally rather than relied on implicitly.

The team also made the naming of what was not working a recurring leadership practice rather than something that depended on an individual choosing to raise a difficult issue. Particular attention was placed on the handoff between planning and execution, where a team with near-equal aggregate strength can still lose continuity.

Observed value

Participants reported that the analysis was consistent with experiences they had recognized informally but had not previously named as a team-composition issue. The organization subsequently discussed broader application of the instrument within its leadership work.

The case illustrates why aggregate balance should not be treated as sufficient evidence of team resilience. A capability can be present in the average and still remain operationally vulnerable if it is concentrated in one person.

KEY INSIGHT

Balance describes the total. Resilience depends on how that total is distributed across people.

Identifying characteristics have been generalized to protect client confidentiality.

CASE STUDY THREE | CONFIDENTIAL CLIENT APPLICATION

When the strengths that built the company became the constraint

A growth-stage retail organization whose founding strengths no longer covered the full demands of scale.

ORGANIZATION	International growth-stage retail organization
PARTICIPANTS	Founding leadership group
CONTEXT	Rapid expansion from founder-led operations to a substantially larger workforce
ENGAGEMENT	Faria-Lequay Shift Pattern Index™ followed by Team Shift Analysis of the founding leadership group

Identifying characteristics have been generalized to protect client confidentiality.

Presenting situation

Growth had been the defining story. The founders identified opportunity early, moved quickly, adapted, experimented, and continued imagining what the company could become.

As the organization expanded, leadership tension and operating instability became more visible. The company had changed in size and complexity, but its operating structure had not matured at the same pace. The leaders knew the organization felt different, yet the leadership approach that had produced rapid growth had previously been a source of success.

CASE STUDY THREE | TEAM COMPOSITION FINDINGS

A pronounced concentration in vision and exploration

Every member of the founding team carried a primary Shift Pattern within Intuition, either Envisioner or Explorer. The concentration was total, and it sat entirely within one of the four modes of response. The group carried substantial capacity for imagining future possibility, spotting opportunity, adapting quickly, experimenting, and opening new direction.

Those were not weaknesses. They were the capabilities that had helped build the company.

What was underrepresented

The leadership composition carried comparatively little regulation and sequencing: stabilizing, establishing operating discipline, ordering priorities, and holding the organization steady long enough for systems and infrastructure to catch up.

The analysis reframed the leadership question. Instead of asking why the founders could no longer operate exactly as they had in the earliest stage of the business, the team considered what capabilities the organization now required around the founding group that had not been necessary when the company was much smaller.

The issue was not too much vision. It was that the organization's next stage required capabilities that vision alone could not supply.

Organizational interpretation

The composition was consistent with a common growth challenge: the strengths that open opportunity can remain valuable while becoming insufficient on their own. The organization needed to complement vision and exploration with greater capacity to regulate growth, sequence priorities, and translate future direction into sustainable execution.

CASE STUDY THREE | ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE

Building around the founders rather than asking them to become different people

Actions taken

Founder scope was differentiated more deliberately so that responsibility could sit where each leader's pattern was best able to carry it rather than being distributed evenly across a group with similar orientations to change.

Regulation and sequencing were named as capabilities the leadership system needed to hold intentionally. Team composition and role definitions were adjusted so that those capabilities were represented rather than assumed to be present.

Leadership also temporarily constrained new growth initiatives while operating systems and infrastructure were strengthened. Through the FLSPI lens, that pause could be considered a strategic response to organizational capacity rather than a retreat from ambition.

Observed value

The founders were able to distinguish between the value of their natural strengths and the limits of relying on those strengths as the organization became more complex. The analysis did not ask the founding team to become different people. It showed what the organization needed to build around them.

KEY INSIGHT

The goal was not to slow the vision. It was to build an organization capable of sustaining it.

Identifying characteristics have been generalized to protect client confidentiality.

ACROSS THE THREE CASES

Different teams. Different risks. One analytical principle.

Each organization was functioning. None of the cases began with a conclusion that the team was fundamentally broken. The value of the team-level analysis came from making a composition issue visible before it had to be learned only through repeated friction, dependency, or operating strain.

Case 1: Absence	Case 2: Concentration	Case 3: Overconcentration
Soleil Edge had no Regulator represented across eighteen Primary and Secondary positions. The response was to create deliberate friction and reconsider capability coverage in hiring and decisions.	A consultancy showed near-perfect planning and execution balance, but new-direction capacity depended disproportionately on one executive. The response was to make ownership and handoffs more intentional.	A growth-stage retailer carried heavy vision and exploration strength while regulation and sequencing were comparatively limited. The response was to build structure around the founders as the organization scaled.

The Faria-Lequay Shift Pattern Index™ identifies how individuals tend to orient to and move through change. Team Shift Analysis examines the system those patterns create together: which change-response capabilities are represented, absent, concentrated, or overconcentrated, and what that composition means for how the team navigates change.

Reactive teams absorb change. Intentional teams move through it.



DO.ITCHANGE™
Method

DO.ITChange™ Method

Dianna Khan, Business Development
d.khan@soleiledge.com
flspi.com