

Data Governance Profile Questionnaire

Scoring Guide

Companion to the "Generic Data Governance Policy Framework" — Preamble: Four Ways to Approach Data Governance

Purpose

The 20-question self-assessment ("What Is Your Data Governance Profile?") helps an organization see, empirically, which of the four governance approaches described in the framework's preamble it naturally leans toward today: Command-and-Control, Formalized, Non-Invasive, or Adaptive. Google Forms does not support this kind of multi-dimensional scoring natively, so results are tallied manually or in a spreadsheet using the key below.

How to Score

- Each of the 20 questions offers four answer options, always in the same order: option A = Command-and-Control, option B = Formalized, option C = Non-Invasive, option D = Adaptive.
- For each respondent, count how many times they selected A, B, C, and D across the 20 questions.
- The letter with the highest count is the respondent's (or the organization's) dominant governance approach. The second-highest count is a useful secondary lean, especially when two counts are close.
- For an organization-wide read, aggregate individual counts across all respondents rather than relying on a single person's answers — governance style often looks different from different vantage points (central team vs. business unit vs. IT).

Worked example

A respondent answers: 7×A, 4×B, 3×C, 6×D. Dominant profile: Command-and-Control (7), with a strong secondary lean toward Adaptive (6). This suggests an organization that currently governs by top-down mandate but is already improvising and adjusting rules in practice — a common combination in fast-growing or newly regulated organizations, and a signal that the mandate is running ahead of the process maturity needed to support it.

Scoring Key

Letter	Approach	What a strong count of this letter suggests
A	Command-and-Control	Governance runs top-down: leadership decides, mandates, and enforces. Fast to stand up, but adoption depends heavily on continued authority backing it.
B	Formalized	Governance runs on comprehensive documentation, defined processes, and measurable compliance — close to DAMA-DMBOK2 or DGI in spirit. Durable and auditable, but can be slow and paperwork-heavy.
C	Non-Invasive	Governance recognizes and formalizes roles people already play, rather than imposing new structures — the Seiner model. Well accepted, low friction, but can lack teeth where no informal practice already exists.
D	Adaptive	Governance evolves iteratively with the organization and its context — aligned with the Agile Data Governance movement. Well suited to fast-changing environments (e.g. AI), but requires discipline to stay consistent.

Result Profiles

Share the relevant narrative with the respondent or the sponsoring team once a dominant (and, where relevant, secondary) profile has been identified.

A — Command-and-Control

You favor centralized, directive governance. Effective in heavily regulated contexts or under strong constraints when starting out, but watch field buy-in — it's this profile's main risk.

B — Formalized

You favor a comprehensive, documented, measurable system. Strong for building a durable, transferable program, but watch the upfront investment and the risk of documentation that doesn't live in the field.

C — Non-Invasive

You favor recognizing existing practice over creating new structures. Fast to deploy and well accepted, but can lack teeth where no practice already exists in a given area.

D — Adaptive

You favor a flexible system that evolves with context. Ideal in a changing environment (AI, fast growth), but requires strong discipline to stay consistent and auditable.

Using the Result

- Treat the result as a description of current practice, not a verdict — none of the four approaches is inherently "better"; the framework's preamble compares them on the same criteria (decision-making, documentation, tooling, culture fit) so the organization can decide deliberately rather than by default.
- Where the dominant and secondary profiles are close, expect a blended reality on the ground — this is normal, and the comparative tables in the preamble can help pinpoint which specific governance activities pull toward which approach.
- Use the result to calibrate the rest of the framework: the level of documentation expected (Section 3), the pace of the adoption roadmap (Section 8), and the degree of tooling investment (Extension Modules) should all follow from the chosen approach rather than be set independently of it.