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ABSTRACT

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a personality instrument designed for use with individuals, is widely used in today's organizations for many purposes. Frequently in team-building and other organization development applications of type theory, a modal type is identified and comparisons to expected characteristics are made or assumed. There is not conclusive evidence that modal type accurately reports organization characteristics, but in some cases, organizations, have found it useful to think of groups as having a group type and published articles have extended the use of the MBTI to show group type.

Using a survey instrument to compare modal organization type to the employees' view of the organization, this study attempted to move this debate forward by using extensive data from an insurance company. A Chi-Square analysis of the survey data provided evidence that in this study employees' perceptions of the organization were not the same as the organization modal type; employees viewed their departments as different from the modal organization type; and there was evidence that top management type did influence the organization type perceived by the employees.
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When many employees in an organization have taken the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), those types are often condensed into a comprehensive (modal) type sometimes called a group-type or organization-type. This comprehensive view allows the organization to develop certain organization development strategies based on assumed type characteristics. Using the MBTI to increase self-awareness at all levels of an organization, can be a catalyst to developing an effective organization learning process. If the comprehensive type (modal type) is correct, organization development based on these characteristics can be effective. If the modal type does not reflect the actual characteristics used, then incorrect strategies are designed and little learning can take place.

This study was conducted to explore the accuracy of assumptions made about an organization’s characteristics as described by the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). Through analysis of a survey instrument data was generated, to which modal type and perception were compared. The role of upper management in the perceived characteristics of the organization was examined. Analysis of the individual survey questions also provided some insight into where the perceptions of specific organization characteristics vary.
BACKGROUND

Brief Overview of the Theory of Psychological Type

The theory of psychological type, developed by C. G. Jung in the early 1900s, theorizes that human behavior can be characterized by personal preferences for orienting to the environment, absorbing data, and processing information. Jung showed that these preferences are within each individual and, although the preferences can be are influenced by the environment, the actual preference remains intact. Jung described these characteristics as:

*Extroversion or Introversion (E/I):* an orientation to the environment directed either outward or inward.

*Sensing/Intuition (S/N):* the means of bringing in information either through conscious observation or unconscious deduction.

*Thinking or Feeling (T/F):* how we decide things, either objective analysis or subjective values.

Isabel Briggs, developing a similar theory, later adopted Jung’s work, incorporating and expanding it to include one more dimension:
Judging/Perceiving (J/P): an attitude for using the preference of Thinking or Feeling (J), and Sensing or iNtuition (P).

Type preferences are affected by an individual’s energy and aspirations ..., "but the kind of excellence toward which they are (developed) is (actually) determined by these inborn preferences...” (Myers, 1980).

As Briggs proceeded with her work she designed and developed a forced-choice questionnaire to be used in her research to develop a base for verification of Jung’s theory. This instrument was refined and revised over 40-plus years, providing a tool that is used extensively today in private counseling of individuals and, recently, organization development. This instrument, called the Myers Briggs Type Indicator or MBTI, uses a combination of the four dichotomous dimensions of Extroversion/Introversion, Sensing/iNtuition, Thinking/Feeling, or Judging/Perceiving, to produce 16 personality types shown in a “Type Table” as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myers Briggs Type Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The MBTI type table is always arranged the same way and is designed so that, "The columns of the table represent the four ways of accessing information about the world and making decisions about that information" (Hirsch, 1992, p.67).

An individual has one preference over the other for each dimension of Type, such as preferring Extroversion over Introversion, iNtuition over Sensing; and so on. The objective of the MBTI is to identify an individual's basic preferences for each of the four dimensions -- one of the 16 types shown in the type table. The MBTI differs from many other personality instruments in that it: (a) "is designed to apply a theory; therefore, the theory must be understood to understand MBTI; (b) the theory postulates dichotomies; therefore, some of the psychometric properties are unusual; (c) type theory includes a model of development that continues throughout life; and (d) the scales are concerned with basic functions of perception and judgement that enter into almost every behavior; therefore, the scope of practical application is very wide" (Myers & McCaulley 1985, p.243). The dimensions of E/I, S/N, T/F, and J/P are not designed as scales of measurement of traits or behavior, but to reflect a choice between alternatives. The questionnaire contains only forced choice statements to achieve this goal.
Extensive studies of occupations show that similar individual MBTI types choose the same work. These "type-alike" studies reported in the *Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator*, Appendix D "Types of Populations," show a table of occupations empirically attractive to the 16 types. "To create these occupational tables for each of the 16 types, a type table was created for each occupation (studied) from data provided on response sheets scored in the 1970's until 1984" (Myers & McCaulley, *Manual*, p. 243). These tables report types attracted to certain occupations, but don't show whether like-types reflect the actual characteristic type of the organization in which they are working. Similar data has been collected and published in the *MBTI Atlas of Type Tables* (1992, Macdaid, McCaulley, and Kainz).

The Essence of Type Theory: Four Functions

The core of this theory is that everyone uses a combination of four basic mental functions which are Sensing (S), iNtuition (N), Thinking (T), and Feeling (F). These four functions represent an orientation to consciousness and are referred to as orienting functions. The four functions are divided into two categories: Perception and Judgement. Briggs divided *Perceptive* activities into Sensing and iNtuition; and *Judging* activities into Thinking and Feeling.
“The four functions direct (focus) conscious mental activity toward different goals: (a) Sensing (S) seeks the fullest possible experience of what is immediate and real; (b) iNtuition (N) seeks the furthest reaches of the possible and imaginative; (c) Thinking (T) seeks rational order and plan according the impersonal logic; (d) Feeling (F) seeks rational order according to harmony among subjective values” (Myers & McCaulley, 1985, p.13).

Sensing refers to conscious awareness of the present moment as experienced through the senses and includes “acute powers of observation, memory for details, and practicality” (Myers & McCaulley, 1985, p.10). iNtuition refers to unconscious awareness of surrounding information in the form of possibilities, relationships and patterns, and thus surface as insights, hunches, or discovery. iNtuition looks to the future, and is imaginative, abstract, and creative.

Jung described Thinking judgement as the function that links ideas together through logic using analysis, objectivity, critical thinking and time lines. Feeling judgement, on the other hand, weighs values and merits of issues by a more subjective point of reference and is concerned with affect of decisions on people and a concern for human rather than technical needs (Myers & McCaulley, 1992).
The Thinking/Feeling preference is entirely independent of the Sensing/Intuition preference so there are four possible combinations: (a) ST, Sensing plus Thinking; (b) SF, Sensing plus Feeling; (c) NF, Intuition plus Feeling; and (d) NT, Intuition plus Thinking.

"Each combination produces a different kind of personality characterized by the interests, values, needs, habits of mind, and surface traits that naturally result from the combination. Combinations can share certain qualities but each contains a particular preferred way of observing and deciding" (Myers, 1980, p.4).

**Expected Characteristics of the Four Functions**

The four possible functional pairs of ST, SF, NF, and NT, each produces a different kind of personality. Some examples of assumptions that might be made about these function pairs are:

1. Sensing plus Thinking: Interested in facts that can be counted, weighed, touched, measured. Decisions would be by impersonal analysis, step-by-step reasoning from start to finish.
2. Sensing plus Feeling: Decisions are weighed by how much things matter to people. Interested in facts concerning human interests, friendly and sociable.

3. iNTuition plus Feeling: Focus on possibilities, and new projects, new ideas or inspiration. Enthusiastic and insightful, good at communicating the possibilities and values.

4. iNTuition plus Thinking: Focus is on possibilities that are analyzed objectively, subordinating the human element. Logical and ingenious, good problem solvers.

Since the 1970s, the MBTI has been used in organization development. Walck's (1992) review of published research on type and management showed that early studies tested and observed behavior related to organization and management concepts. "Management scientists have been interested in psychological type as a measure of individual psychology because it is nonjudgemental and is related to managerial processes of information processing, and decision making" (Walck, 1992, p.13).
Researchers have used functional pairs in their studies because as the core of Jung’s theory the four-functions identify the critical areas of information and decisions that are linked to characteristics such as problem solving, and decision making styles. A problem with confining studies to the four functions is that one loses a valuable perspective about attitudes that affect the functions. For example ESTP and ISTJ are both STs, but ESTP is “action oriented and resourceful preferring to take the most efficient route” and ISTJ is “thorough and painstaking, careful with detail” (Hirsch & Kummerow, 1987) So, the ST practical orientation to life is expressed differently by ESTP and ISTJ, an important detail not to be dismissed. This study focused primarily on the four functions in the organization being studied.

**Effect of management influence.**

Managers’ preferences compared to the overall organizations’ preferences were also analyzed in this study. It is difficult, if not impossible, to consider the use of type functions in organizations without also considering the influence of executives type preferences on the workforce. The manager’s performance is important as it compares to the overall organization profile, i.e., does it match the overall organization profile? Does it complement the overall organization
profile? If the two (management and the organization) are different, then which preferences are more influential on organization type characteristics.

In early research using the MBTI, researchers matched management concepts to preference scales to link type and management. Walck (1992) organized several research projects dating from 1975 to 1983 into a table showing how functional pairs were linked to managerial and organization behavior such as goal setting, planning, problem solving, and decision making. In one study, for example, "...Mitroff & Kilmann (1975a) hypothesized that if asked to identify their ideal organization, ST’s would prefer impersonally (T) realistic (S) bureaucratic organizations, while NF’s would prefer personally (F) idealistic (N) organic organizations. If a manager were asked to plan, NT managers would gravitate toward long-range (N) strategic (T) planning, while SF managers would plan for day-to-day (S) human relations (F)” (Walck, 1992, p.14). An S would prefer hard data and practical information, in contrast to an N who would prefer openness and theoretical concepts. T’s would prefer to have abstract, strategic information, and an F would prefer creative genius. Walck’s work was used as one of the scales to analyze the organization being studied in this research in the areas of organization structure, problem solving and decision making.
An example of how management influences an organization is in the area of information sharing and communication. Several authors studied in this research project commented on communication skills/style as demonstrating this influence. According to Brock (1990) "...the function pairs most closely relate to communication skills." Mitroff & Kilmann established in 1975 that "...peoples' written communication of their ideal organization relates to their preference for ST, SF, NF, or NT" (Hirsch, 1992, p.64) and they "...conclude that the four function pairs revealed preferences for information and action that would influence how managers would perform in organizations" (Walck, 1992, p.14). Mitroff & Kilmann also noted that performance was related to information geared to their own type, and an awareness of their own and their co-workers preferences.

Type Influence

Management of an organization also is influenced by type characteristics. Walck (1992) reported that "...research has identified type distributions in occupational groups (i.e., managers, executives, general workforce). Researchers have just begun to investigate the effect of type on group dynamics and team formation" (Walck, 1992, p.13).
Mitroff & Kilmann's (1975) studies concluded that the four-function pairs revealed preferences for information and action that would influence how managers would perform in organizations. To perform well, managers were hypothesized to need information geared to their own psychological types, and to be aware of their own and their co-workers preferences" (Walck, 1992, p.14).

McCann, Margerison, & Davies (1989) explored "...why some managerial work teams were successful and others were not -- even when individual abilities of team members (of both) seemed about the same." In researching characteristic differences over seven years, they showed that "...managers of teams can only be successful if they fully understand differences. Only by understanding and managing these differences can teams...link themselves together into a coherent whole" (McCann, Margerison, & Davies, 1989, p.127).

The four key issues managers face are the same issues of behavior defined in Jung's theory: (a) how people prefer to relate to others (E/I); (b) how people prefer to gather and use information (S/N); (c) how people prefer to make decisions (T/F); and (d) how people prefer to organize themselves and others (J/P) (McCann, Margerison, & Davies, 1989, p.127).
McCann, et al, showed how managers' preferences influence all four areas: relationships (Extroverted-Introverted), information (practical-creative), decisions (analytical-beliefs), and organization of work (structured-flexible). They concluded that "...two perquisites for success appear time and time again: (a) high-performance management teams are well-balanced...; and (b) the team must have excellent linking skills" (McCann, Margerison, & Davies, 1988, p.129). This means that there should be some distribution of opposite preferences within the group such as both Introverts and Extroverts, both Sensors and Intuitives, both Thinkers and Feelers, and both Judgers and Perceivers. But, it is not clear how or if these studies on managers can be generalized to overall organization characteristics.

Type and Organizations

Collective effect of individual preferences on an organization.

Organizations are a collection of individuals, and the effect of the collective preferences on organization characteristics was a primary topic of this research. "Jung used the term 'individuation process' for what he saw as the natural means
by which a person becomes his or her own unique self. We individuate through becoming more conscious; that is, dealing with unconscious parts of ourselves and becoming aware of them, owning, them, and integrating them into our overall personality. The result of the process is being more fully ourselves and having choice -- the ability to draw on all the different parts of ourselves at appropriate times and as we wish" (Myers, 1980, p.17). Jung makes it clear that psychological type "...is the structure through which we become conscious and more toward individuation, and, as Myers and Briggs believed, knowledge of type and the development process actually assists in its unfolding by affirming an individual's way of individuation and removing impeding snags" (Myers, 1980, p.17). It is not clear through studies to date how this process works on an organization level, but it is clear that with individuals the exploration, definition and clarification of preferences provides valuable insight into personal development, and potential for growth and change.

In this project an attempt was made to formulate a realistic profile of type characteristics for this organization using the employee survey for organizational input. This profile described the expected characteristics of the assumed modal type of the organization and projected a description of type characteristics beyond
the generic definition of the four separate parts. According to Jung, the combination of the four dimensions produces a more complex and comprehensive reality something like the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. This description shows the expected characteristics of the organization through the separate departments and levels.

**Groups and Type**

Through vertical and horizontal (level to level and department to department) action we can observe the actual type characteristics in action. The departments and levels can be considered to be "groups" performing together and separately in this analysis and it is in this way that consideration is given to group type in this study. This human interaction is the reason an employee survey has been chosen as the medium to compare raw data results. Because overall perceptions and management influence are the two primary areas being explored, employee responses are the only reasonable way to get this feedback.

In organizations, groups of employees reflect the characteristics of the individuals in the group, and these characteristics form the dimensions of the
groups' performance. This is demonstrated in problem solving, decision making, communication, and process capabilities. For instance, if a group has an equal balance of Extroverts and Introverts, the performance will reflect somewhat different behavior, energy, and effectiveness than a group weighted toward one or the other. When a group is informed about its type characteristics, it can be more involved in controlling and monitoring its own behavior. Each group can have different group preferences, however, so a group type would not necessarily show characteristics of the overall organization. This indicates that if a group were predominantly composed of certain type preferences, it might reflect certain characteristics. This study questioned if this was true of small groups (such as a particular department) and would it also be true of large groups (such as a whole organization)?

In a study of work teams as the key unit for learning more effective patterns of organization characteristics, Gould & Sink (1988) found that knowledge of MBTI concepts in small groups of employees does serve as a "...powerful, revealing, and facilitative diagnostic tool." A work team varies in size and function, however, so the scale may not reflect the makeup of the larger organization. Gould & Sink discuss "...major organizational processes" affected
by application of the MBTI as communications, functional role of group members, problem solving and decision making, and leadership and authority.

**Organizational Characteristics**

Company culture relative to MBTI refers to how the work itself, the management, or the overall workforce reflect type characteristics.

An interesting conclusion to McCann, Margerison & Davies (1988) work was that they show that people *behave* differently in different situations, so at work people may learn to behave in a certain way. "...characteristics ...(that were) part of the company culture in the organizations concerned (reflected that) the people had learned (those characteristics) in a way that led to rewards. This had, therefore, become their preferred way of working" (McCann, Margerison, & Davies, 1988, p.128). This indicates the possibility that modal type may be so influenced by management type and company culture that type characteristics do not reflect the modal type at all or only partially.
The reference to company culture as an influence on employee behavior indicates a relationship between the functional characteristics of an organization's employee base with the expectations of behavior and performance of individual employees -- somehow type characteristics influence organizational culture and vice versa.

In a study of bank, utility company, and paper products company, Reynierse (1993, p.21) examining how advancement to successive management is compared to type preference, observed that type distribution in management may be influenced by the company itself. The study questioned whether functional distribution of managers and executives determines types represented in an organization, or whether it is the function of the overall organization business which determines the makeup of employees. This is relevant when looking at the underlying source of an organization's type characteristics. This environmental organization issue is complex, but in the context of this study, only one aspect was explored: the identification and comparison of management/organization modal type (as shown in the base data) to management/organization type characteristics as perceived by the employees.
Recent work on leadership indicates that a leader's personal influence on an organization reflects the influence of "...the leader's personality (on) followers needs and personalites, the organizational culture, and the ever changing environment" (Bargal & Schmid, 1989, p.19). Bargal and Schmid specifically point to Schein's (1985) work on group culture. Schein wrote that "...the founders, or powerful group members impose their assumptions, namely proposed solutions to problems, on the organization's participants, who try them in order to assess whether or not they will be effective in coping with the organization's problems of adaptation. These assumptions are the major part of 'organizational culture..." Schein further defines organizational culture as, "...a pattern of basic assumptions - invented, discovered or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation...taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems" (Bargal & Schmid, 1989, p.9). Although Schein's work was not directly related to type characteristics, it indicates a pattern of direct influence of executives on organizational characteristics.
Purpose and Rationale

The primary questions explored in this study were:

1. Is there agreement within an organization about the organization's type?

2. How does raw data modal type compare to employee descriptions of the organization?

3. If there is a predominant or particular pattern of type at higher levels of management, to what extent does that pattern influence the organization type? Is the organization more like the management type or the raw data modal type?

The terms "characteristic type" and "type characteristic" refer to an expected profile of common assumptions based on an organization or individual MBTI type.
Methodology

Subjects

Base population data.

The base population was a small insurance company with 270 employees.

Random sample.

A 75% sample of the above organization was used for comparison.

The company-provided employee list was used to select the random sample. Starting with the first name on the list, every fourth name was skipped. Fourteen employees in this first group did not show a reported type. A second count was done starting with the first unselected name and every fifth unselected name was added to the sample group. One name on this list did not have a reported type, so the first unselected name was chosen to complete the sample of 75%; a total of 202 employees was chosen to participate.
Data Collection

Data collected by the company on all employees showing their MBTI preference was combined with human resources data showing each employee’s gender, department, and position in the organization. A list of this information was provided by the company and used as the base data for all comparisons.

Data was also collected from a survey given to a random sample of the organization to compare to the base data.

The base data was collected in the organization at the same time the survey was administered to the random sample, reflecting as closely as possible the same employee base.

Demographics.

Tables 1, 2, and 3, show the comprehensive demographics (gender, department, and position) of the base population (first row) and of the random sample (second row).
Gender.

There were 40% males and 60% females in the base population. There were 43% males and 57% females in the sample population.

Departments.

Of the 9 departments shown above, 4 were studied in the analysis of this research: Information Services; Client Services; Claims; and Marketing.
TABLE 3
Demographics by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Executives</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Non-Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positions.

The organization had 4 levels of authority designated as "Officer"; "Executive"; "Manager"; and "Non-Manager." No one from the Officer level responded to the survey; 2 from the Executive group responded and 27 Managers. (Executive surveys were added to the Managers level in order to include their comments and opinions anonymously.) All other employees were categorized under the heading Other or Non Manager.

Table 4 shows that the sample represents the base population exactly.

Table 5 is a comparison of sums of the 4-Functions from base and sample data which were studied in this analysis.
The employees’ understanding of Jungian concepts was not relevant to this research; only the fact that their individual types had been identified and confirmed by them was relevant.
The Survey Instrument

Origin of the survey statements.

The survey instrument was designed by formulating statements for the respondent to choose from based on statements generated by previous researchers.

Formulation of survey instrument and tables used in this research.

Walck's (1992) characteristic descriptions of the four function combinations in organizations with analysis of expected management behavior is attached (Appendix A). Hirsch's (1992) "Summary of Functions Characteristics" in Teambuilding With the MBTI (Appendix C); and Husczo's work on management styles in organizations (Appendix B), were also be incorporated as part of the format for development of the survey, and analysis of base and survey data, providing a more comprehensive description and analysis of type characteristics. Brock's (1990) work, as referenced by Hirsch in Teambuilding With the MBTI, was also used as a reference for the survey and analysis (Appendix D).
Walck's article (1992), "Psychological Type and Management Research: A Review," discussed three principal areas of research on type and management over the last two decades: theory building, predicting performance from type theory, and type distributions in management and business. According to Walck, in an extensive review of over 60 studies, "...research...identified type distributions in occupational groups...(but)...researchers have just begun to investigate the effect of type on group dynamics" (Walck, p.13). The abstract concluded with the statement: "Future research needs to incorporate ethnographic methodologies and to examine the relationship between type, culture, and situational variables (Walck p.13).

Walck's summary of early research (1975-1983) included conclusions regarding function-pair expected responses in: organizing work; problem solving; and decision style. In each category Walck showed the reported differences between ST, SF, NF, and NT. For example, in the category "organizing work," ST prefers a bureaucratic organization structure; SF prefers a matrix structure; NF prefers a familial structure; and NT prefers an open and adaptive structure.
A key summary table from "Psychological Type & Management Research: A Review" is attached as Appendix A.

Huszczo.

Huszczo (1993) provided information about probable function behavior in his research on leadership styles in manufacturing and unionized organizations from 1975 to the present. Huszczo expanded the classifications of Stabilizer, Cooperator, Visionary, and Catalyst managers by combining the work of Williams, Armstrong and Malcolm, *The Negotiable Environment*, (1989) and the McKenzie "Seven S Model of Organizational Excellence" to "...understand how managers of differing types are likely to go about their approach to managing" (*Team Building Manual*, p. 43). For example, Huszczo described the following:

1. **ST:** stabilizers -- systematic, logical, dependable, conservative.
2. **SF:** cooperators -- detailed, familial, compassionate, fair.
3. **NF:** catalysts -- innovative, flexible, democratic, creative, authentic.
4. **NT:** visionaries -- theoretical, rational, complex, logical, competent
Key sections from Huszczo's article, "Looking At Leadership Through the MBTI," are attached as Appendix B.

Hirsch

Hirsch's work with over 2000 individuals and groups in work settings, focused on "...a variety of ways to apply the MBTI to analyze the team, clarify problems, design interventions, heighten team awareness, and help deal with issues like communication, change or leadership" (p. 2). Published in the MBTI Team Building Program, (1992, Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.), Hirsch described expected characteristics as:

1. ST: focus on detail with high value on responsibility.

2. SF: focus on the impact of details on people with high value on personal loyalty.

3. NF: focus on the big picture and its impact on people with high value on making a difference.

4. NT: focus on big picture's logical implications with a high value on competence.
Excerpts from Hirsch’s work on the four-functions, referred to in the Team Building Manual and relevant to this research, are attached as Appendix C.

Brock.

Brock’s (1990) research on selling and influencing demonstrates that the four Functions are the part of psychological type most closely related to communication skills, maintaining that people need to understand their own and others’ ST, SF, NF or NT style. Brock’s “Summary of Functions Characteristics” shows the different ways: (a) established teams behave; (b) teams focus on work; (c) teams establish their hierarchy or structure; and (d) each function might prefer to work.

An excerpt from Brock’s “Summary of Functions Characteristics” is attached as Appendix D.

In addition to being used for analysis, these studies were a basis for formulating questions for the survey administered to the random sample of the organization.
The survey instrument consisted of forced choice statements. A copy of the survey instrument is included as Appendix E.

**Organization of the survey instrument.**

The survey was organized into 15 sections with 4 statements in each section. The sections and statements were based on the studies by Walck, Hirsch, Brock, and Huszczo, as described in the Introduction Section. The respondents' choice reflected a choice for ST, SF, NF, or NT in each section for "overall organization" and the respondent's "department." These were organized as forced-choice with a numerical response for each of the statements -- "1" "2" "3" or "4" -- which corresponded blindly to ST, SF, NF, or NT. A sample of the survey instrument is reproduced as Appendix E.

Each section required the respondent to choose a "most like" answer for each the overall organization and their own department. These views or perceptions were compared to the base data to see if employees view the organization and their department the same as or different from what the base data suggests.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>PREVIOUS STUDIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 9, 10</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Walck, Huszczo, Hirsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Walck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>Walck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 13</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Brock, Hirsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 14</td>
<td>Staff Characteristics</td>
<td>Huszczo, Hirsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Huszczo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 15</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Huszczo, Hirsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Huszczo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Company Seeks</td>
<td>Hirsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Company Avoids</td>
<td>Hirsch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each respondent received a survey packet containing a letter of introduction; instructions; survey instrument; blank page for comments; and demographics questionnaire.

**Return of surveys.**

Surveys provided by researcher were distributed by the company to 198 of the 202 participants selected as the sample and respondents were given 10 days to complete and return the surveys in provided envelopes with researcher's company
logo. As each survey was returned, it was given a control number. This number was placed on each page of that respondent’s packet. 95 surveys were returned (48%).

Procedure

**Analysis of the data.**

A Chi-Square formula was used to process the data by computer using the Selection Ratio Type Table program (SRTT) developed by Center for the Application of Psychological Type (CAPT) specifically for research on Type. The SRTT is a computer program written originally for Isabel Myers during the follow-up of her longitudinal medical sample (1972). Analyses of type data for her research was done in groupings to: (a) test theoretical expectations that certain types have common characteristics; or (b) to obtain groups large enough for statistical analysis. Analyzing data in these type groupings meant that 44 selection ratios and 44 chi-square statistics would have to be computed for each table. Myers did these by hand until the SRTT program was written.
The SRTT compares one type table with another type table. One table is called the *sample* and the table to which it is compared is called the *base population*. The significance number computed by the SRTT refers to the *index* or *ratio* known as the self-selection index and is indicated in the reported findings by the designation "I=" or "Index." The index or ratio can be computed in either of two ways: (a) the ratio of the observed frequency to the expected frequency, or (b) the percentage of the type in the sample divided by the percentage of the type in the base population. In this research the observed frequency ratio was used for computations.

Statistical significance of the SRTT ratios is established through a series of 2x2 chi-square calculations with one degree of freedom. The null hypotheses is tested using the chi-square statistic, or using Fisher's exact probability test. When the index or ratio is greater than 1.00, there are more people in that cell of the table than expected from their numbers in the base population. If the index or ratio is less than 1.00, there are fewer in that cell than expected. "It is important to know that even very small samples have yielded useful data with SRTT's. For example, the Manual (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) discussed SRTT's of data on psychologists by Harold Perry (1975); his sample of only 72 psychologists was
divided into three subgroups, each with significantly different distributions” (McCaulley, 1985, p.46).

Data in this research was organized into a type table and compared to a type table of responses from the survey showing employee perceptions. Using the overall organization type as the base, comparisons were made for significant similarities or differences to the overall organization function type. This was done to indicate how the overall type was represented at each level and in each department of the organization, whether the predominant organization type was more represented in a particular portion of the organization, and whether the employees’ perception of the organization was the same as the base data indicated.

Three questions were studied and all analysis was framed in response to these questions:

1. *Is there agreement within an organization about the organization's type?*

2. *How does raw data modal type compare to employee descriptions of the organization?*
3. If there is a predominant or particular pattern of type at higher levels of management, to what extent does that pattern influence the organization type? Is the organization more like the management type or the raw data modal type?

Comparison of data.

1. MBTI Type of the organization overall and sample population.

2. Employees' Perception of the Organization to overall organization type.

3. MBTI Type of each department to overall organization

4. Employees' Perception of Their Department to overall organization

5. MBTI Type at each organization level (position) to overall organization

6. Influence of Top Management on Overall Organization

7. MBTI Functional Type Distribution (ST, SF, NF, NT)
RESULTS

Base Data Reported Type.

In the general population all types were represented and 4 Types representing 2 specific Functions were found to be predominant: ISTJ, ESTJ, ESFJ, and ISFJ representing the functions of ST and SF.

ISTJ and ESTJ made up 26% of the population with 13% each. ESFJ (14%) and ISFJ (10%) made up 24%. Extraverted and Introverted Sensing, and Judging were predominant in the base data. Sensing/Feeling was higher than Sensing/Thinking by only 1%. There was almost identical distribution of E and I in the organization overall with 49% E and 51% I.

Type Tables of base and sample reported types are shown as Tables 7 and 8 showing the similarities of distribution in the base and sample.
### TABLE 7
**Base and Sample Type Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
<th>INFJ</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTP</th>
<th>ISFP</th>
<th>INFP</th>
<th>INTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESTP</th>
<th>ESFP</th>
<th>ENFP</th>
<th>ENTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESTJ</th>
<th>ESFJ</th>
<th>ENFJ</th>
<th>ENTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8
**Base & Sample 4-Functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Data Reported Type**

In the *sample population* all types were represented and the distribution was almost identical to the general population with the same 4 Types representing 2 specific Function Types (ST and SF) predominant. The overall percentage of Sensing/Feeling in the sample was the same in the base data. iNtuition and
Perceiving were less represented in both the base and sample. There was a more frequent preference for Sensing (69%) over iNtuition (31%), and a similar preference for Feeling (48%) and Thinking (52%) in both base and sample.

Departments.

The distribution of types across the 9 departments is summarized in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Group Type</th>
<th>Base N</th>
<th>Sample n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Services</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample data from 4 departments: Information Systems, Client Services, Claims and Marketing was large enough to use for separate analysis.

Research Questions

Analysis of the data compares the respondents perceptions of the organization (from their answers to the survey statements) to the base data to explore the various possibilities stemming from these questions.

Question 1. Is there agreement within an organization about the organization's type?

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 22 employees have unreported types

Table 10 shows that employees perceive the organization characteristics as different from the base type of ST. The employees perceptions of the
organization indicated a significantly higher perception of iNtuition and Thinking characteristics (I=1.92 p<.01) than the base data, and in contrast, Sensing and Feeling characteristics (I=.60 p<.05) were significantly less than the base data. The analysis also suggested a more frequent preference of Thinking over Feeling (I=1.27 p<.01), and a greater preference of iNtuition over Sensing (I=1.52 p<.05) than would have been expected from the base data.

Table 11 shows the employee perception of the departments also differed from the base data type. The sample indicated SF characteristics were used 37% of the time over ST (28%) and NT (12%), and also perceived NF characteristics (23% of the time) more frequently in the department groups, differing from the base data. The frequency of NF was significant at I=1.69 p<.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>* 270</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 22 employees have unreported types
Question 2: How does raw data modal type compare to employee descriptions of the organization?

Table 12, below, shows that employees perceived departments as more Sensing and Feeling ($I=1.74 \ p<.05$) than they perceived the organization in general. Thinking and Feeling compared in this context showed greater Feeling ($I=1.71 \ p<.001$) in department environments.

<p>| Table 12 |
| Sample Perception of Organization Compared to Sample Perception of Departments |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Organization</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Departments</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 95$

Four departments perspectives.

A comparison of the sample organization type to four departments, and four departments to each other is shown below. This comparison was done to determine if individual departments perceive the organization differently.
TABLE 13
Perception of Organization By Individual Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Sample n</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Marketing*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Claims** n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Information Systems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Client Services **</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 incomplete survey
** 3 incomplete surveys

Table 13 shows the only significant difference in this comparison was the Marketing Department. The Marketing Department viewed the organization as ST (60%) significantly more (I=1.73 p<.05) than both the overall sample (35%) and the other departments who in contrast perceive the organization as significantly more NT (Claims Department NT, I=2.31 p<.01; Information Systems Department NT, I=2.23 p<.05; Client Services Department NT, I=2.26 p<.01).
Table 14 shows the departments perceptions of individual department characteristics compared to the overall sample types.

<p>| Table 14 |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Individual Departments Compared to Sample Type |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Organization</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Marketing</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Claims</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Information Systems</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Client Services</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 incomplete survey
**3 incomplete surveys

Table 14 shows that although the Marketing Department perceives their department as NF (I=2.82 p<.01), the other departments show no significant difference from base type of ST. In addition, the Marketing Department’s perception of their own type characteristics (NF) is different from their own modal type of ESTP (see Table 9, p.45, for Department modal types). The Marketing
Department computations also show a contrast in this department by indicating a higher than expected result for Feeling (I=1.79 p<.01).

**Question 3:** If there is a predominant or particular pattern of type at higher levels of management, to what extent does that pattern influence the organization type? Is the organization more like the management type or the raw data modal type?

In this organization there were essentially three levels of management: (1) Officers; (2) Executives; and (3) Middle-Managers. For this research everyone else was considered a Non-Manager. The following tables analyzed the type characteristics of the management hierarchy compared to the organization overall.

Table 15 comparing the organization type to the three levels of management combined, indicated significantly greater ST characteristics (I=1.40 p<.05). This comparison shows the same function characteristics as the organization base type of ST, but does not provide insight into why the perception of the organization is primarily NT.
Table 15: Comparison of Organization to Combined (3) Levels of Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Population*</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Managers **</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = 270  22 employees had unreported types
** n = 40  1 manager had unreported type

Table 16: Comparison of Base Organization to Top Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Population *</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Officers and Executives **</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = 270  22 employees had unreported types
** n = 12  1 officer had unreported type

Table 16 compares only the officers and executives (n=12) to the base data, indicating greater NT characteristics (I=2.64 \( p<.05 \)). In addition, there was significantly less Feeling (I=.23 \( p<.05 \)) and significantly more Thinking (I=1.72 \( p<.05 \)) in this comparison.
Table 17 indicates significant differences for managers and non-managers, with managers showing significantly greater NT (I=1.68 p<.05), and non-managers significantly greater SF (I=1.08 p<.05). This significance was important in examining the influence of top management on the overall organization.
DISCUSSION

Findings

It appears that there is some evidence that the modal type of the organization, ISTJ, is not perceived by many employees to be the characteristic type of the organization. In the initial comparison of employee perceptions of the organization to the modal type (Table 7), the statistical analysis shows significantly higher perception of NT characteristics ($t=1.92 \ p<.01$).

The NT profile would look for such characteristics as goal oriented; well-thought-out plans; structured; hands-on management; fast paced; long-range vision; results oriented; independent; and focused on solving complex problems.

In contrast the ST organization would have characteristics that reward a steady pace; are task oriented; orderly; good with detail; attention to immediate and practical organization needs; good with detail and managing it; hard working people focused on facts and results.
There are some areas that ST and NT are very much alike and others that are quite different. The difference between the two is Sensing and iNtuition, and in identifying "true type" or "preferred type" a choice is made for one or the other of Sensing over iNtuition or Feeling over Thinking. In other words, if the organization is Sensing it will not also be iNtuitive at the same capacity and vice versa. The rather remarkable issue here is that the modal type is predominantly Sensing with 172 employees reporting that preference and only 75 employees reporting a preference for iNtuition. Nonetheless, the survey did show repeatedly in statistical analysis that the overall perception of the organization is that the preferred characteristic of this function pair is iNtuition and not Sensing.

In addition, Table 7 also shows SF less preferred than would have been indicated from the overall type tables (Tables 4 and 5) where 35% of the organization reported SF preferences. Both Thinking and Feeling would not be preferred at the same level in "true type" because they are polar opposites. If this study allowed looking at whole type (all four type pairs) it would be possible to identify the least-preferred of the four functions, which we can speculate would be iNtuition or Feeling.
In contrast to the employees' perception of the organization, Table 11 shows that ST and SF are more preferred at the department level. Within the parameters of the department, employees are utilizing the Sensing characteristics with both Thinking and Feeling, but with emphasis on Feeling. This emphasis is increased by the perception that departments seem to prefer significantly more NF than would be expected from the modal type. Sensing and Feeling characteristics would be: painstaking and responsible with detail and routine; make effort willingly to serve others; conscious of practical needs of people; using personal influence behind the scenes; having respect for facts; being sensible; and accepting responsibility.

In order to analyze the relationship of the above contrasts, a comparison was done between the employee perception of the organization and the employee perception of departments (Table 12). The tables were run twice, from opposite positions. This provided a more specific view of the contrast between the organization and departments. As noted in Table 12, the view of the organization is sharply contrasted with the view of the departments. The organization shows significantly greater NT (I=2.64 p<.01), while the department view is significantly more SF (I=1.74 p<.05).
It cannot be determined if this causes any tension within departments or within the overall organization but that would be a possibility. It is not unusual, after all, for different departments to define different characteristics as more or less valuable to them. Also, a certain amount of tension can provide energy that can be a positive motivator.

The more compelling analysis in this study was the finding related to influence of upper management on the organization. This would be expected to some degree in any organization, but the survey has allowed some clarity around the characteristics that are different and those that are the same. If more specific questions were asked it might be possible to understand this influence more, not so much to change it and make everything the same, but to strengthen the links between worker and management or between departments and levels. Possibly a survey of this type could begin to address and shed some light on this complexity of organization behavior.

In studying management influence, one comparison (Table 15) grouped all three levels of management: the Officers, the Executives, and the Middle-Managers, to identify that group's relationship to the overall organization. That
analysis revealed the group (n=40) to prefer ST characteristics significantly over SF characteristics. This would have been interesting if employees perceptions of the organization matched the organization type. But they did not.

Another comparison (Table 16) was made to the base organization grouping only Officers and Executives (n=12). This analysis showed significantly greater preference for NT in the top management group (I=2.64 p<.05). Data shows this group's modal type is ENTP. Considering the fact that 12 top management have a group type of NT and a majority of the workforce are ST or S (see Table 9), it is likely that there is a link between organization characteristics and top management influence. It appears that this group provides significant influence over the characteristic type preferences of the organization toward NT.

The application of NT to this organization could have both positive and negative effects. On the plus side the organization is predominantly Thinking so there may be a natural tendency toward characteristics like critical analysis and objective problem solving. Differences between Sensing and iNtuition may, however, cause difficulties. The Sensing Thinking employees would most likely (in theory, at least) be thorough, careful, hard working, systematic, and take
ultimate and personal responsibility for their work. They would not be inclined usually or naturally, to impulse, inspiration, or constantly changing and challenging concepts which would (theoretically) be the preference for NT's. In fact, the NT's may, in spite of the ST penchant for reliability, be impatient with all the detail and (seemingly) endless fact-finding that might tend to slow the pace of daily activities. The tension between fact and inspiration may bog things down.

These two different approaches could provide a thoroughness that in practical terms serves the company well, and challenge employees to practice and learn about type preferences they might not gravitate toward naturally.

Another consideration in this organization is the substantial number of employees who report a Feeling type - specifically the 35% who are SF. For SF's working in an NT environment some adjustment would be in order. The Sensing preference which taps into their detail and fact orientation would be beneficial but may not be fully utilized in this organization. There could be a resistance to and/or sensitivity around the critical, analytical, and inspirational thinking that would be the predominant characteristics of NT type. The practicality they would bring, along with the dependability could provide the counterpoint for the NT
creativity. One danger would be that the SF is seen as a distraction by NT primarily because of the hierarchical advantage of the NT's. In this context the SF sensitivity and focus on value (albeit people) could be dismissed as unimportant or frivolous.

An important result of the analysis of survey questions is that the organization is in general agreement that in three important areas of organization development the perceived preference for both the organization overall and departments individually, was NF. These areas: Values, Skills, and Style are important because they provide the underpinning for how the organization will act and react to the differences implied in this analysis.

Although it does appear that the NT officers and executives are influential in the overall preference characteristics of this organization, it also appears that they, along with employees and other managers prefer and use a more humanistic approach in general expectations of work. This would be apparent in the company's sharing of information, open problem solving, consensus decisions, fairness to and respect for workers.
Additional Findings

Results of survey statements by category.

Table 18 shows a Chi-Square Goodness of Fit analysis (using the SRTT) of the survey indicating employees' perception of the organization, and perception of departments, for the 10 specific characteristics studied.

Characteristics that were questioned in more than one section are combined. (Example: Sections 1, 9, and 10 each questioned the characteristic of organization Structure; results show the combined perception of organization structure.) If results were not significant, nothing is shown in that column of the Table and the assumption is made that the respondents chose the base organization type (ST) as preferred for that section (characteristic).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Sections</th>
<th>Base Type</th>
<th>Perceived Organization Type</th>
<th>Perceived Department Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 9, 10: Structure</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 13:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 14:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 15:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sections 1, 9, 10: Structure:** These sections referred to hierarchy of the organization, the chain-of-command and type of control and authority structure.

Perception of Organization: NT (I=2.59 p<.001). The characteristic structure of the organization was perceived by respondents as significantly NT. This showed that structure of the organization was hierarchical with defined levels of authority, and an expected framework for movement through the
organization. This significance is important because over half of the employees are Sensing and at least one-third of the employees are SF, creating a contrast in the way many individuals prefer to be managed, given information, interact with other departments, and respond to levels of authority.

**Perception of Department:** NF (I=1.75 p<.05). The perceived structure of departments is primarily shared responsibility and teamwork, with an emphasis on values and people. This is also a contrast to the base type of ST.

**Section 2: Problem Solving.** This section attempted to identify characteristics considered important to solving problems such as using: critical thinking; careful attention to facts; regard for human systems; or creativity and challenges.

**Perception of Organization:** NT (I=3.65 p<.001). Employees perceived problem solving as significantly NT, done with critical analysis, in an objective manner, and probably focused on the impact of future business rather than day to day activities. The NT process of solving problems with creative hunches and few facts could present a potential frustration for some Sensors in the workforce.
Perception of Departments: ST (I=1.51 p<.01). The departments significantly prefer Sensing characteristics for bringing facts and details into their problem solving. Problem solving in this way also uses Sensors analytic and logic skills. Use of these characteristics could indicate easier problem solving at the department level for the Sensing employees.

Section 3: Decision Making

This section attempted to identify how decisions were made i.e., with logic, data, and objectivity; a careful process of gathering information; using iNtuition; or top down with authority.

Perception of Organization: ST (I=1.54 p<.01). Decisions are made using facts, details, logic, and critical analysis. The process of making the decision, for ST, would be as important as the decision itself and decisions made in this context would put more emphasis on critical data than impact on people.

Perception of Departments: No statistically significant results.
Sections 4, 13: Focus

This section attempted to identify where the organization places important emphasis, whether on responsibility, loyalty, impact on people, or competency

Perception of Organization: NT (I=2.45 p<.001). The organization prefers to focus on NT characteristics of concepts, theories, inspiration, creativity, and challenge. This might keep the changing market this company is in, in constant view and prevent the organization from becoming stagnant and lost in past-practice. It might be possible, however, that the organization would need to pay careful attention to whether it slows down enough to take advantage of facts and the present moment, available through the ST workforce, to be highly effective.

Perception of Departments: NT (I=1.84 p<.01). The departments and the organization have a similar focus (NT) when it comes to looking at work and planning for the future together. It might be beneficial for departments to use the benefit of careful attention to facts which many employees prefer as individuals. Organization Focus is an example of where the NT influence of upper management may play a key role.
Section 5 and 14: Staff Characteristics

This section attempted to identify where the company places emphasis when recruiting employees, such as rules and regulations, employee development, or new ideas.

Perception of Organization: No statistical significance
Perception of Departments: No statistical significance

Section 6: Values

This section attempted to identify the context in which the company places its value system such as valuing logic, stability, dependability; friendliness, trust, honesty; cooperation, loyalty, authenticity; or innovation, and complexity.

Perception of Organization: NF (I=1.71 p<.05). The organization places an emphasis on and has a high regard for employee interests and well-being, as well as placing value on the business beyond the bottom line. This is somewhat different from the day to day environment directed by a preference for NT. The underlying message here seems to be that the company values people, and the good work the company does, very much.
Perception of Departments: NF (I=2.70 $p<.001$). The departments place emphasis on the importance of employee welfare and the good work people do beyond the analysis of the critical day to day activities.

Section 7 and 15: Skills

This section attempted to identify skills important to the company such as thoroughness, efficiency; interpersonal skills, human resources development; public relations, communication; or logic, efficiency, and planning.

Perception of Organization: NF (I=2.36 $p<.001$). The organization perceives and values the personal insight and sense of responsibility often seen in NF characteristics. The preference for NF also suggests a value on the importance of people-skills to the run the business, most likely used in contact with clients.

Perception of Departments: NF (I=2.59 $p<.001$). Departments also place value on creativity and insight of employees but in the smaller department grouping this could also suggest that departments might need to reward attention to detail and careful consideration of facts as also valuable and necessary.
Section 8: Style

This section attempted to identify how the company might be perceived from the outside -- by persons not connected to the organization such as: fair, dependable, blunt, objective, accountable; compassionate, tolerant, participative, practical; idealistic, dramatic, sociable; or confident, progressive, directive.

Perception of Organization: NF (I=2.82 p<.001). The organization is perceived as compassionate, tolerant, participative, and practical. In contrast to the way it operates inside (as NT) the organization might be perceived from the outside in a different way.

Perception of Departments: NF (I=3.21 p<.001). This is one of the sections of the survey where the organization and departments are perceived the same even though the perception is different than either organization or department type characteristics. One possibility is that the entire workforce is invested in maintaining an image that says "we're here to help you."

Section 11: Seek

This section attempted to identify what kinds of things the company finds
compelling and important as part of the work it does such as graphs, charts, cost schedules, results, problem-solving; documenting skills, documenting needs; communicate in creative ways, innovation, work with diversity; and looking toward the future, debate challenging questions, long-term impact studies of complex problems, or organizational growth.

Perception of Organization: NT (I=1.88 p<.01). The organization seeks characteristic NT qualities such as looking toward the future, studying complex problems and organizational growth.

Perception of Departments: NF (I=2.65 p<.001). Departments seek innovation, diversity of work, creativity, and different ways of communicating which may indicate the departments are self-contained and somewhat independent.

Section 12: Avoid

This section attempted to identify things the organization might avoid routinely such as participating in self-awareness activities, brainstorming, using untried methods; analyzing outcomes of strategic models; working with schedules, documentation; and administrative details, repetitious tasks.
Perception of Organization: Although findings were not statistically significant here, there could be evidence that the organization spends time developing preferences other than the modal preference. If the perceived type of the organization is the one that is most developed (NT) then the modal type preference (ST) could suffer by being dismissed or overlooked as not-as-important.

Perception of Department: NF (I=1.71 p<.05). Departments might prefer to avoid working with schedules, performing accounting, playing politics, and dealing with documentation and paperwork.

Summary of Survey Analysis

The perception of the organization is that in all areas except decision making, iNtuition and specifically iNtuition plus Thinking, are the primary characteristics of this organization.

Looking at modal type can be of benefit to an organization in establishing the framework of employees overall. It may be necessary, however, to find a way to assess the "true type" of the organization before making assumptions or recommendations about type-related characteristics.
Conclusions.

Through this analysis it was shown that:

1. There was no clear agreement within the organization about the organization type. The organization in general agreed the characteristic type was significantly NT, but there were other perceived types as well.

2. There was significant agreement that ISTJ, the base organization type, did not match the perceived organization type NT. This finding was significant for the organization. The department type was, however, more similar to the base organization type.

3. In this organization it appears the top management predominant preference for NT has significant influence on the overall characteristic preferences in this organization.

Recommendations for the company.

Heightened awareness of differences can provide an opportunity for learning. Keep communication open and provide safe occasions for dialogue
around effectiveness of problem solving, decision making, and information sharing. Be cognizant of the benefits of bottom-up participation and responsibility (this can be a challenge in NT organizations if there is a preference for control and decisiveness at the top). Engage others in their responsibility for learning how to get better.

Recommendations for further research.

1. Redesign the survey to be more user friendly and enlarge the focus to include E/I, J/P preferences.

2. Use the survey with a larger company or several small companies for better comparative data.

3. Look for ways to narrow the findings on influence to attempt to identify how, when, why, and where the influence from the top actually touches the employees.
Problems With This Research

1. Some employees were put-off, frustrated, or confused by the wording of the survey statements. Wording of survey statements was matched closely to wording of other researchers work, but it was not “user friendly.” This could have contributed to the low number of survey instruments returned from the total sent out.

2. Although the cover letter over the survey instrument stated this was a masters research project, some employees may have assumed they HAD to fill out the survey because the president of the company “gave employees permission” to participate. This could have sounded to some like a “must do” rather than a “may do.”

3. The demographics page was designed to increase anonymity, but some employees may have been hesitant to participate for fear of being identified.

4. The survey instrument is based on past research on the 4-functions of MBTI so only 4-function findings can be analyzed: S, N, T, F. These
characteristics miss the complete type analysis that would have included E, I, J, P characteristics.

5. Some of the departments were too small to do statistical analysis.

6. The number of Managers responding to the survey was not as large as hoped (27) but statistical findings are reported because it appears to be representative (68%) of the total population of managers (40).

7. None of the Officers responded to the survey and only two of nine Executives responded.

8. The 15 survey sections covered 10 areas of interest so there is very limited depth of understanding about any one area of organization development characteristics (structure, style of management, focus of work, decision making, etc.) The study was designed as an overview and thus used a wide spectrum of focus.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Organization (1)</td>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Matrix, R &amp; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impersonally realistic</td>
<td>impersonally conceptual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>detailed and factual</td>
<td>broad, ill-defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>narrowly economic goals</td>
<td>macro-economic issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (2)</td>
<td>Operational problem-solving</td>
<td>Long-range strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Solving (3)</td>
<td>Real-time operational-technical problem solvers</td>
<td>Future-time strategic-technical problem generators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Effectiveness (4)</td>
<td>Internal Efficiency inventory cost units produced per hour</td>
<td>External Efficiency cost of capital new product development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Style (5)</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of Doing Science (6)</td>
<td>Hard Experimentalist</td>
<td>Abstract Theorizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>NF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Organization (1)</td>
<td>Familial</td>
<td>Organic Adaptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personally realistic</td>
<td>personally idealistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>human qualities of specific people</td>
<td>people and human goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work roles</td>
<td>flexible and adaptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (2)</td>
<td>Day to day human relations</td>
<td>Long-range human goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Solving (3)</td>
<td>Real-time social problem solvers</td>
<td>Future-time strategic-social problem generators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Effectiveness (4)</td>
<td>Internal Effectiveness employee turnover employee commitment</td>
<td>External Effectiveness consumer satisfaction social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Style (5)</td>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>Intuitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of Doing Science (6)</td>
<td>Humanistic Scientist</td>
<td>Intuitive Synthesizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Mitroff & Kilmann (1976); Mitroff (1983)
(2) Mitroff & Kilmann (1975a)
(3) Mitroff et al. (1977)
(4) Kilmann & Herden (1976)
(5) Nutt (1979)
(6) Mitroff & Kilmann (1975b)
APPENDIX B

Huszczo
STABILIZERS = ST(sensing, thinking)

STRATEGY: SYSTEMATIC, DETAILED, PRACTICAL, SENSIBLE, FAIR, SLOW BUT STEADY, PATIENT, HEAVILY DOCUMENTED, FOCUS ON ONE STEP AT A TIME

STRUCTURE: VERY LOGICAL AND ORGANIZED, HIERARCHICAL, BUREAUCRATIC, CENTRALIZED, CLEAR CHANNELS, CHECKS AND BALANCES TO REDUCE RISKS, LEGALISTIC JOB DESCRIPTIONS

SYSTEMS: CLEAR BUSINESS PROCEDURES, ROUTINES, FORMATS FOR REPORTS, SYSTEMATIC DATA GATHERING, FORMULAS FOR DECISIONS, RELIANCE ON HARD DATA AND EXPERIENCE

STYLE: DEPENDABLE, LOGICAL, PATIENT, REALISTIC, FAIR, DETAIL AND FACT ORIENTED, PLAN AND THEN FOLLOW PLAN, FORMAL AND DECISIVE, BLUNT, REINFORCE COMPLIANCE, OBJECTIVE, STRESS ACCOUNTABILITY, BLUNT, MATTER-OF-FACT, IMPERSONAL

STAFF: AWARE OF HEADCOUNT, CATEGORIZE EMPLOYEES, CLEAR SELECTION CRITERIA FOR EACH JOB, HIRE PEOPLE WHO RESPOND TO RULES AND REGULATIONS, EXPECT LOGIC AND STABILITY, ADMIRE COMMON SENSE

SKILLS: ABSORB AND USE DETAILS/FACTS, FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND ACCOUNTING, GOOD AT ROUTINES, BEING THOROUGH, EFFICIENCY IN MEETINGS AND REPORTS

SHARED VALUES: LOGIC, CONSERVATISM, STABILITY, DEPENDABILITY, ORDERLINESS, PRACTICALITY, PUNCTUALITY, FAIRNESS, OBJECTIVITY, COMPETITIVENESS, EFFICIENCY, DON'T ROCK THE BOAT, SECURITY

WEAKNESSES: TREAT STRATEGY AS AN END NOT A MEANS, OVERGUARD AGAINST CATASTROPHES, MISS THE FOREST FROM THE TREES, TOO IMPERSONAL AND MATTER-OF-FACT, RIGID AND LEGALISTIC STRUCTURES MAKE CHANGE DIFFICULT, COMPARTMENTALIZATION LEADS TO OVER-SPECIALIZATION, OVER-RELY ON FORMULAS FOR DECISION MAKING, NIT PICKER, RESIST INNOVATIONS, IMPATIENT WITH COMPLEXITY, FORGET TO STROKE PEOPLE, MAY TAKE STAFF FOR GRANTED, HAS DIFFICULTY DEALING WITH UNCERTAINTY, RIGIDLY ADHERE TO PLANS, MYOPIC
COOPERATORS = SF(sensing, feeling)

STRATEGY: DETAILED, SYSTEMATIC, EMPHASIZE VALUES, SLOW BUT STEADY, DOWN-TO-EARTH, PRESENT ORIENTED, BASED ON VERIFIABLE FACTS AND EXPERIENCES, PERSONAL REACTIONS CONSIDERED

STRUCTURE: FAMILY, CLAN, MANY CHANNELS TO FUNNEL INPUT, EXPECTATIONS MADE CLEAR, CENTRALIZED, DECISION MAKING PROCEDURES MADE CLEAR

SYSTEMS: ROUTINES ESTABLISHED AND FOLLOWED, FORMATS FOR REPORTS USED BUT PERSONAL PERSPECTIVE EXPECTED, VAST INPUT SYSTEM, CAREFUL TO GATHER FACTS, DETAILS, OPINIONS, EXAMPLES, REACTIONS, ETC. THROUGH PEOPLE

STYLE: CAUSE-ORIENTED, CONSIDERATE, COMPASSIONATE, THOROUGH, FAIR, DEPENDABLE, TOLERANT, PARTICIPATIVE, SUPPORTIVE, PRACTICAL, SLOW BUT MAKES SURE ALL HAVE THEIR SAY, LIVE-AND-LET-LIVE, COMPROMISE

STAFF: AWARE OF HEADCOUNT, CONCERNED WHETHER PEOPLE FEEL THEY BELONG, SOCIALIZ/E/MOLD PEOPLE TOWARD COMPANY VALUES, EMPHASIZE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES, FACILITATE INTERACTION BETWEEN STAFF MEMBERS

SKILLS: ABSORB AND USE DETAILS AND FACTS ABOUT PEOPLE, HUMAN RESOURCES/SERVICES/DEVELOPMENT, MARKETING, INTERPERSONAL SKILLS, GOOD AT ROUTINES AND PATCHING UP SYSTEMS

SHARED VALUES: AFFILIATION, FAIRNESS, PROPER BEHAVIOR, TRUST, LOYALTY, HARMONY, PRAGMATISM, THE GOLDEN RULE, ANYONE CAN SUCCEED, TRADITIONS, COOPERATION

WEAKNESSES: TREAT STRATEGY AS AN END NOT A MEANS, OVER-CO ncerned WITH PEOPLE, RESISTANT TO CHANGE, PERPETUATE POSITIONS BEYOND THEIR USEFULNESS, OVERSIMPLIFY PROBLEMS, NIT PICKY, AVOID CONFLICT, NAIVE IN BELIEF THAT ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS WORK HARD, MYOPIC, SOFT-HEARTED, A BUSYBODY, TRYING TO PLEASE EVERYBODY MAY LOOK LIKE PLAYING FAVORITES, NOT COMFORTABLE WITH COMPLEX OR ABSTRACT SITUATIONS, PASSIVE-AGGRESSIVE, RIGHTEOUS, MISS THE FOREST FROM THE TREES
CATALYSTS = NF(intuition, feeling)

STRATEGY: INNOVATIVE, CREATIVE, RISKS FOR VALUES, SELL THEIR STRATEGIES, MULTIPLE BACK-UPS, EMPHASIS ON DEVELOPMENT, EMPHASIS ON RELATIONSHIPS, BASED ON VALUES, ACQUISITION OF RESOURCES, FUTURE ORIENTED, PEOPLE ORIENTED

STRUCTURE: LOOSE, ORGANIC, AD-HOCRACY, FLAT, DECENTRALIZED, GROWTH-ORIENTED JOB DESCRIPTIONS

SYSTEMS: FLEXIBLE, UNSTRUCTURED, PARALLEL ORGANIZATIONS, ALLOW FOR PERSONAL JUDGMENTS AND HUNCHES, USE BRAINSTORMING SESSIONS TO DISCOVER ALTERNATIVES

STYLE: PARTICIPATIVE, DEMOCRATIC, CHARISMATIC, DRAMATIC, IDEALISTIC, ENTHUSIASTIC, GIVE STROKES FREELY, SOCIABLE, PERSONABLE, HIGH ENERGY BURSTS, RESCUERS, EVOLUTIONARY, SMOOTH OVER CONFLICTS, COMPROMISERS, DECISIONS ALWAYS OPEN TO MODIFICATION

STAFF: PUSH DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF POTENTIAL, SELECT PEOPLE WHO FIT IN, FIND THE GOOD IN ALL EMPOWERING

SKILLS: AWARE OF DOMINANT SKILLS AND USE THEM, CUSTOMER SERVICE AND PUBLIC RELATIONS BENT, COMMUNICATION, EMPATHY, ABLE TO SEE BOTH SIDES OF ISSUES

SHARED VALUES: HARMONY, COOPERATION, PEOPLE ARE GOOD AND IMPORTANT, LOYALTY, CREATIVITY, DEVELOPMENT, STIMULATION, VARIETY, AUTONOMY, AUTHENTICITY

WEAKNESSES: HIGH NEED FOR APPROVAL, EMOTIONAL/DRAMATIC, MORALISTIC, OVEREXTENDED, CREATE DEPENDENCIES, AVOID CONFLICT, WORK IN BURSTS, POOR DISCIPLINARIANS, NAIVE, OVEREMPHASIZE ENTHUSIASM, POOR AT DETAILS, TOO MANY DIRECT REPORTS, TOO FLEXIBLE, INCONSISTENT, RE-INVENT THE WHEEL, FOLLOW-THROUGH, OVER TRUSTING, LATE FOR DEADLINES, TOO INFLUENCED BY PERSONAL LIKES/DISLIKES, TRY TO RESCUE LOST SOULS, MAY TALK TOO MUCH
VISIONARIES = NT(intuition, thinking)

STRATEGY: GOAL ORIENTED, INNOVATIVE, USE THEORIES, CALCULATIVE RISK TAKERS, PLAN FORMULATORS NOT EXECUTORS, BIG PICTURE, FUTURE ORIENTED

STRUCTURE: COMPLEX, DECENTRALIZED, MATRIX, TRANSITIONAL, PROVIDE STRUCTURE TO ENCOURAGE PRODUCTIVITY

SYSTEMS: FLEXIBLE FORMAT BUT RATIONAL CONTENT, USE PARALLEL ORGANIZATIONS, RESULTS NOT PROCEDURES, GATHER INFORMATION FAST AND USE IT TO GAIN SENSE OF PROGRESS

STYLE: FEEL ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE, CONFIDENT, PROVIDE MEANING, FREQUENTLY ASK "WHY?", ARCHITECTS OF PROGRESS, IDEA GENERATORS, REVOLUTIONARY, BLUNT, DIRECTIVE, IMPERSONAL

STAFF: NEED/USE EXECUTORS, HIGH EXPECTATIONS, DEMAND COMPETENCY, RESPONSIVE TO NEW IDEAS, IMPERSONAL RELATIONS

SKILLS: R&D, LOGIC, EFFICIENCY, PLANNING

SHARED VALUES: CHANGE, PROFOUND/COMPLEX, COMPETENCY, INNOVATION, NONCONFORMITY, LOGIC, NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT

WEAKNESSES: LOSE INTEREST, MAY FAIL TO FOLLOW-THROUGH, FORGET TO STROKE, NEED MANY STROKES, ELITIST, LOVE/HATE DEADLINES, RESTLESS, ESCALATING STANDARDS, ARGUER, CRITICAL, IMPATIENT OVER REPEAT MISTAKES, HARD TO SHIFT FOCUS, TOO MUCH TIME PLANNING, LEAVE STRUCTURES TOO UNCLEAR, CHANGE FOR THE SAKE OF CHANGE, CONFRONTIVE, IMPATIENT WITH DETAILS/ROUTINES
Missing
### Summary of Functions

#### Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>STs</th>
<th>SFs</th>
<th>NFs</th>
<th>NTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like work that is</td>
<td>Practical Crisp</td>
<td>Social Personal</td>
<td>Idealistic Insightful</td>
<td>Theoretical Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish teams that are</td>
<td>Efficient and data-oriented</td>
<td>Friendly and service-oriented</td>
<td>Creative and growth-oriented</td>
<td>Effective and competition-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish team structure that is</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Fraternal</td>
<td>Collegial</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team focus is</td>
<td>Predictable and stable</td>
<td>Traditional and affiliative</td>
<td>Dynamic and ideological</td>
<td>Achieving and competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek</td>
<td>Permanence Accountability Control</td>
<td>Membership Personal interaction Support</td>
<td>Personal meaning Development Growth</td>
<td>Rationality Opportunity Long-range plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often found in</td>
<td>Military Industry</td>
<td>Service Health care</td>
<td>Arts Communication</td>
<td>Sciences Start-up organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitroff and Kilmann (1975) established that people’s written communication of their ideal organization relates to their preferences for ST, SF, NF, and NT.

Using the MBTI in Organizations, revised edition (Hirsh, 1991), Exercise 13, “Matching Type to Organizational Stories” is excellent for helping assess how well team members understand the differences between the Functions. The exercise demonstrates that when the different Functions write about their “ideal organization,” they reveal different communication styles and patterns.

How one views the world (Perception), either through Sensing or Intuition, and how one organizes those perceptions (Judgment), either through Thinking or Feeling, gives a particular cast to her or his communication. Thus, the Functions Lens is particularly useful when dealing with persuasion and communication. It is also germane to the kind of tasks people seek to do and to avoid.
APPENDIX E

SURVEY
12 November 1994

Dear _____ Employee:

_____ Insurance has agreed to participate in my Masters Research project by selecting a random sample of employees to complete this survey instrument. Your employee number, not your name, was used for selection. All completed surveys will be treated as confidential and anonymous.

In this envelope you will find the following materials:

(1) This Letter.
(2) Instruction Sheet
(3) Survey Instrument
(4) Page for Comments
(5) Demographic Questionnaire

The survey should take 15-20 minutes to complete. An envelope has been provided with each completed survey to assure anonymity. Please do not share your completed survey with any other employee, in order to guard against influencing others who will be participating in this project.

Please complete the survey and demographic information, plus any comments you may have, by January______. Fold the materials and put them in the provided envelope, seal the envelope, and give the sealed envelope to Mary Gravina. Mary will then pass the sealed envelopes on to me for analysis.

It is important that your completed survey be returned to Mary no later than January ____, in order to be included in the analysis.

Please read the instruction sheet carefully before filling in the survey.

Thank you very much for taking the time to participate. A copy of my completed study will be available through Mary this Spring. If you have any questions or concerns please call me at my office: 561-8877.

Sincerely,

Shirley J. Layne

enclosures: Instructions
Survey Instrument
Comments
Demographic Questionnaire
INSTRUCTIONS

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
Fill out the demographic questionnaire and return with your survey instrument.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
The survey instrument is divided into fifteen (15) sections.
Each of the 15 sections has four (4) statements marked "1", "2", "3", "4".

There are two columns for your answer choices - one on the left side of the page and one on the right side of the page.
The column on the left side of the page is marked "_____ Overall Organization."
The column on the right side of the page is marked "My Department."

In the column titled "_____ Overall Organization"
circle one number of the statement in each section that most closely describes this COMPANY from your point of view.
Your response, in other words, is about the company in general.

In the column titled "My Department"
circle one number of the statement in each section that most closely describes your DEPARTMENT from your point of view.
Your response, in other words, is about your department.

NOTE: Your responses for the overall organization and your responses for your department MAY BE DIFFERENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Organization</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>My Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ______ workers meet often, on a regularly scheduled basis, to talk about problems.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ______ workers work on problems on a scheduled basis monthly.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ______ workers work on problems as they occur.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ______ workers create problems to work on.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.
- THERE ARE NO GOOD OR BAD ANSWERS.
- EACH STATEMENT TELLS SOMETHING ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE WAY THE ORGANIZATION WORKS.
- THE STATEMENTS ARE NOT JUDGMENTAL.
- THESE STATEMENTS WILL NOT HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON YOU OR THE COMPANY.

COMMENTS
Please fill out this sheet as you wish and return with all other materials.
SURVEY KEY

TO BE USED FOR ANALYSIS ONLY

Sections 1, 2, 3

All number "1" statements are ST
All number "2" statements are NT
All number "3" statements are SF
All number "4" statements are NF

Sections 4-15

All number "1" statements are ST
All number "2" statements are SF
All number "3" statements are NF
All number "4" statements are NT

The actual survey sent to company employees will say only "Section 1" not "Section 1: Structure". There will be no indicator as to what each Section is trying to look for.

The questions can be mixed up in other configurations if deemed appropriate.
## SURVEY

For each Section, circle ONE number next to the statement which most closely describes the Overall Organization AND Your Department

### SECTION 1: STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>has a carefully designed chain-of-command with non-personal and realistic policies. rewards detail and facts; goals are definite and based on economics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>has a broad, conceptual, and less-defined plan, and uses a matrix-management structure. rewards research and development, and goals focus on broad economic issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>feels like family, is realistic about work roles, and rewards individuals for special qualities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>is flexible, structured around personal ideals, rewards adaptability, and focuses on people and their personal goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 2: PROBLEM SOLVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>At we are expected to work on today's problems, and focus on operations issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>looks to the future and uses a strategic, technical, process that generates problems to solve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>uses social meetings to process today's problems and to solve organizational issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>uses a strategic, social process to focus on the future and generate problems to be solved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 3: DECISION MAKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Decisions at are made in a systematic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Decisions at are made in a speculative way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Decisions at are made with justice and fairness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Decisions at are made intuitively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 4: FOCUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>focuses on details and places a high value on personal responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>focuses on the impact of details on people, with high value on personal loyalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>focuses on the big picture and its impact on people, with high value on making a difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>focuses on the big picture's logical implications for the company, with a high value on competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 5: STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>employees are aware of current headcount, and employees are easily categorized into departments or levels. There is clear selection criteria for each job and people respond to rules and regulations, expect logic and stability, and admire common sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>employees are aware of current headcount, concerned with whether people feel they belong, are kept aware of and respect company values, emphasize training and development opportunities, and facilitate interaction between each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>pushes employee development/use of potential, selects people who fit in and finds good in all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>hires people who get things done, have high expectations, demand competency, and are responsive to new ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 6: VALUES

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>_____ values logic, conservatism, stability, dependability, orderliness, practicality, punctuality, fairness, objectivity, competitiveness, efficiency, security, and people who don't rock the boat.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>_____ values friendliness, fairness, proper behavior, trust, loyalty, harmony, honesty, the golden rule, traditions, cooperation, and believes anyone can succeed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>_____ values harmony, cooperation, loyalty, creativity, development, variety, autonomy, authenticity, and believes people are good and important.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>_____ values change, competency, innovation, nonconformity, logic, need for achievement, and people who are profound and complex.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 7: SKILLS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Skills that count at _____ are the ability to absorb and use details/facts, financial analysis and accounting, ability to follow routines, thoroughness, and efficiency in meetings and reports.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Skills that count at _____ are the ability to use details/facts about people, sensitivity to human resources/services/development, marketing, interpersonal skills, good at routines, and patching up systems.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Skills that count at _____ are customer service and public relations, communication, empathy, ability to see both sides of issues.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Skills that count at _____ are research and development, logic, efficiency, and planning.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 8: STYLE

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>The &quot;_____ style&quot; is dependable, logical, patient, realistic, fair, detail and fact oriented, plan and follow plan, formal and decisive, blunt, forced compliance, objective, accountable, matter-of-fact, non-personal.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>The &quot;_____ style&quot; is considerate, compassionate, thorough, fair, dependable, tolerant, participative, supportive, practical, slow but let all have their say, live-and-let-live, compromise.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>The &quot;_____ style&quot; is democratic, participative, dramatic, idealistic, enthusiastic, gives &quot;strokes&quot;, sociable, personable, rescuers, evolutionary, smooth over conflicts, compromisers, decision always open to modification.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>The &quot;_____ style&quot; is confident, provides meaning, frequently asks &quot;why?&quot;, is progressive, idea generators, revolutionary, blunt, directive, impersonal, feel anything is possible.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 9: STRUCTURE

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>The business structure at _____ is very logical and organized, hierarchical, bureaucratic, centralized, has clear channels, has checks and balances to reduce risks, and prefers &quot;legalistic&quot; job descriptions.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>The business structure at _____ is like a family. There are many channels through which to funnel input, expectations are clear, the structure is centralized, decisions and procedures are made clear.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>The business structure at _____ is pretty open, loose, organic, ad-hoc, there are only a few layers (flat organization), no &quot;hard&quot; departmental boundaries, with growth-oriented job descriptions.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>The business structure at _____ is complex, has no &quot;hard&quot; departmental boundaries, uses a matrix management, and provides enough structure to encourage productivity.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SURVEY CONTINUED

For each Section circle ONE number next to the statement which most closely describes the Overall Organization AND Your Department

#### SECTION 10: STRUCTURE

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- is hierarchical.
- is entrepreneurial.
- is a fraternal.
- is collegial.

#### SECTION 11: SEEK

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- teams usually monitor organization progress using statistics, graphs, and charts; manage costs and schedules; show measurable results; use proven methods to increase productivity; and solve problems immediately.
- teams usually use tried-and-true methods; apply experience to practical jobs; share work equitably; develop charts that document each person's skills or needs; and review plans and materials others have formulated to see what works best.
- teams usually have fun, seek harmony, and are innovative; do work that allows for awareness and growth; communicate in creative ways; try activities that provide insight into things that matter to people; and work with diversity to improve output.
- teams usually position the team for the future; link systems, strategies and models; find opportunities for organizational growth and development; conduct long-term impact studies of complex problems; and debate challenging questions.

#### SECTION 12: AVOID

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- teams usually avoid participating in self-awareness activities; brainstorming with no practical outcome; hypothesizing about the future; using untried methods; and not concentrating on the work at hand.
- teams usually avoid using new/untested procedures; debating the merits of various theories; analyzing and predicting the outcomes of strategic models; criticizing in an open forum especially in relation to team members they know; treating people as interchangeable parts of a machine.
- teams usually avoid working with schedules, and figures; performing control functions like accounting, setting up hierarchies, playing politics; and dealing with documentation and paper work.
- teams usually avoid doing someone else's work; engaging in popularity contests; working with administrative details; performing repetitious tasks; participating in self-awareness activities.

#### SECTION 13: FOCUS

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- is predictable and stable.
- is traditional and close.
- is dynamic and ideological.
- is achieving and competent.
### SECTION 14: STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

1. ____ employees like work that is practical and crisp.
2. ____ employees like work that is social and personal.
3. ____ employees like work that is idealistic and insightful.
4. ____ employees like work that is theoretical and complex.

### SECTION 15: SKILLS

1. ____ teams are efficient and data oriented.
2. ____ teams are friendly and service oriented.
3. ____ teams are creative and growth oriented.
4. ____ teams are effective and competition oriented.
Any comments you wish to make are welcome and will be included whenever possible in the research findings. Please be as specific as possible if you refer to particular statements in the survey. Thank you very much for your time.
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Which Department Do You Work In? Circle One.

1. Information Systems
2. Research & Development
3. Client Services
   a. Underwriting
   b. Customer Service
4. Finance
5. Human Resources
6. Claims
7. Marketing
8. Internal Audit
9. Other (specify) __________

Which of the following categories most closely describes your position? Circle One.

1. Officer
2. Executive
3. Manager
4. Other (specify) __________

Are you........ Circle One.

1. Male
2. Female

What is your 4-letter Myers-Briggs Type? (MBTI) Circle One.
(If you do not remember your 4-letter Myers-Briggs Personality Type, you can call Mary Gravina, who will obtain that information in the company's confidential files.)

1. ISTJ
2. ISTP
3. ESTP
4. ESTJ
5. ISFJ
6. ISFP
7. ESFP
8. ESFJ
9. INFJ
10. INFP
11. ENFP
12. ENFJ
13. INTJ
14. INTP
15. ENTP
16. ENTJ
APPENDIX F

EMPLOYEE COMMENTS FROM SURVEY
EMPLOYEE COMMENTS FROM SURVEY

The following comments written and sent with the survey instruments were edited only to protect identity of the respondents. No departments are named nor are there any other forms of identification. Many comments are about the survey itself.

- It is obvious I am "in the field." Many of my answers for my Department and Company were the same because most of my contact with the company is only with my department. I did not answer #12 because I felt it did not apply at all.

- This survey is being filled out by a marketing field representative of the company. It is very hard to evaluate the overall organization from this perspective, because we are far removed from the day to day operation in the home office or have to make that judgement from correspondence and dealings over the phone and fax. Also, Field Reps, I believe, have a bias point of view. We are the infantry, the foot-soldier so to speak, therefore we have the foot soldier's bias. We have to et our job accomplished within the parameters set forth by the home office. On the other hand the field rep is as close to an independent business person as there is in the company. Because we are "detached" from the home office we must plan our business in the field and make all daily plans and decisions as we see fit. We do no always agree with decisions made in the home office but abide by them accordingly. We are self-motivators and manage a territory and inventory which involves all of the functions of running a business. Clerical, outside sales, accounting, planing, customer service, vehicle maintenance and personal responsibility are all part of the job along with the necessary knowledge of the insurance industry. We do our job in garages, doctors clinics, bakeries, stores, factories and in various other settings as necessary. We are expected to and do put our "best foot forward" (most of the time!) as we are, in the eye of our client, the Insurance Group and are in many cases the only representative that they will see. On the above basis I filled out the questionnaire and tried to give my perception overall organization as I see it from a detached perspective, which may be far from the actual day to day organization of the home office setting.
Not certain my limited comprehension of the statements permitted me to offer a "qualified" response. Also being a field employee limits my degree of insight into the daily mechanics of operations. Thank you.

This company is very service oriented and make the employee feel like part of a big family. The employee is expected to do their job in a professional manner. Since I have been here, I feel I am an important part of the company, and I give my best to that end.

Since I am "in the field" and away from the home office environment, my answers for the overall organization may be inaccurate with home office people. I only get in to home office once a year and that is only for a few days and have very little interaction with home office employees.

I received this questionnaire on 3-3-95 and completed it right away. Since your cover memo asks that it be returned no later than 2-28, I wanted to explain.

Need to react to opportunities and problems faster.

I do not feel that my department is "true to itself”. In my department it is a contest of who you are and who you are liked by - what management. Nothing gets solved due to this.

This covers most statements - next time you do one of these you may want to use more "everyday" language that most people will understand: not everyone has an English degree.

The statements in Section 12, were misleading to me. I was unsure whether work groups usually avoid all items listed or just the first item --could be taken the wrong way, possibly. I tend to be literal when filling these surveys out!!

In section 12, No. 2, the last part of the statement "treating people as interchangeable parts of a machine" is NOT something this company avoids; this part of the statement is not correct but the rest of this statement most
closely describes my opinion in this section. In section 4, none of the statements exactly describes my opinion but I chose No. 1; however, there is no high value on "personal responsibility" more accurately "personal accountability."

- I feel you should have used words most people would know and understand. Also the option of "none of these apply to this company" would have been more appropriate in many questions.

- My department is very "who you are" not "what you do."

- Sentences too long and redundant. Didn't understand all the words, too wordy.

- Selections were difficult in most cases. There were often times more than one selection possible to specific sections for either response.

- If you want to do away with mid manager should do so. No, recreate under different name. However, since management changed to team structure I see people every day taking 1-1/2 hour lunches, leaving on a regular basis 15 minutes early and taking 1/2 hour breaks each and every time. Therefore, structure is needed. People still fear for jobs everyday. Lots of back stabbing goes on.

- Your survey is looking only for one type of answer. There are no choices available should you disagree with management style. It was felt this survey is searching for only positive notes/ideals.

- It is difficult to respond to statement 12 with any hope of being understood because the perception among many on this level is that while executives and some managers say things about being into brainstorming, TQM, and etc., the facts are that those who get ahead do so the same old-fashioned way. Acquiring knowledge, making contacts, and brown-nosing still count for most people if they hope to move up.
This company has always been fair to me. I like the department I’m in because I always have liked working with people. I work with people all day. My manager and supervisor have always been very fair and appreciative of me.

As with most surveys the possible responses to your questions leave a lot of room for interpretation. Very few possible answers represented a complete picture of how our organization really works.