CHAPTER 2: Review of Related Literature

1.   HISTORY LEADING UP TO THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR

Carl Gustav Jung (1971) is the famous Swiss psychologist who wrote the book

Psychological Types. The original version is from 1921. Independently of Jung,

Katharine Cook Briggs and her daughter Isabel Briggs (later Isabel Briggs-Myers) were

also interested in the differences of behaviors people displayed. Katharine Briggs took

notes on index cards for years, noting the differences among people's actions in

situations, yet consistent within one's own actions. Then she attended a lecture by Jung.

When she heard his ideas about personality differences in people, she exclaimed, "this is

it" and threw away all her notes (Lawrence, 1992, article by Myers, p.2.6)!

Jung later encouraged her to start again and continue the studies. Briggs and

Myers "had been interested in Jung's theory for about 16 years when the Second World

War took many men from the industrial workforce into the services and brought many

women out of their normal activities to replace them" (Myers & Myers, 1995, p. xiii).

The two women thought that knowledge of one's own personality could help individuals

to select an appropriate job. "They searched in vain for a test of some indicator of a

person's Jungian preferences and finally decided to create one of their own. The result

was to become the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI) personality inventory" (Myers

& Myers, 1995, p. xiii).

Some interesting history to note is that neither of these women had an advanced

degree at the time, they were not formally trained in psychology, statistics or test

construction, and this was the 1940's. The academic community did not take them

seriously; however, they continued their work anyway (Myers & Myers, 1995, p. xiii).

Jung, being a psychologist, was generally focused on people who had severe psychological problems and "he was primarily concerned with the unsuccessful or unbalanced development of type he found in people who were ineffective, unhappy, and seeking professional help. He was not particularly interested in the aspects of psychological type displayed by ordinary healthy people" (Myers & Myers, 1995, p. xii). Conversely, Briggs and Myers were interested in helping "ordinary, healthy, normal people understand that it is all right to be unique individuals, often quite unlike those around them, and that many, if not most, of the differences, problems, and misunderstanding they may have experienced with others can be explained in terms of the perfectly normal, but different, choices in the way people take in and process information" (Myers & Myers, 1995, p. xii).

Jung wrote in German and targeted an audience of psychologists. "Even the English translation of <u>Psychological Types</u> makes heavy reading" (Myers & Myers, 1995, xii). Briggs and Myers, however, wanted to bring this understanding of types to the general population, in understandable language, so people could apply this to normal everyday people and problems.

Isabel Briggs Myers, although not formally educated in statistics or test construction, had several factors in her favor that led to the creation of the MBTI® indicator. First, her father was a research physicist and the Director of the bureau of Standards in Washington. "So I grew up thinking the greatest fun in the world was to find out something that nobody knew yet, and maybe you could dig it out" (Lawrence, 1992, speech by Myers, p. 2.5). Second, she married (55 years until her death) a man that was opposite her on three of the four preferences, providing a "domestic typology lab in my

daily life" (Lawrence, 1992, speech by Myers, p. 2.5). Third, her mother, Katherine Briggs, had worked out a type theory of her own ("contemplative types", "spontaneous types", "executive types", and "sociable types"). After seeing Jung's psychological types, Katherine Briggs set out to master type theory as Jung had expressed it. She went further making the J/P (Judging / Perceiving) preference clear, which he had not done. So, "Katherine transmitted type to her husband and her daughter, Isabel, who transmitted it to her husband and children, who are still quite active today in the type community" (Lawrence, 1992, speech by Myers, p. 2.6). Fourth, Isabel had "apprenticed herself to someone who was a qualified expert in the techniques and tools she needed…Edward N. Hay… and from him she learned what she needed to know about test construction, scoring, validation, and statistics" (Myers & Myers, 1995, p. xiii). "Isabel devoted the entire second half of her life to interpreting and adapting Jung's theory" (Myers & Myers, 1995, p. xii).

"Fifty years later, a surprisingly large number of people have experienced, or at least have heard about, the MBTI. Over two and one-half million people took the MBTI in 1994" (Myers & Myers, 1995, p. xiv). Originally the MBTI was primarily used for one-on-one counseling, now the indicator has been widely applied to organization development, business management, education, training, career counseling and teambuilding.

As teams, teamwork, and teambuilding have become a major focus of the past 50 years, we now move to some team research to set the context of the pathway toward the wide acceptance of a tool such as the MBTI.

2.   TEAMS AND TEAMWORK

"According to the <u>Wall Street Journal</u>, the first work team ever formed in an organization was established in Filene's department store in Boston in 1898" (Cameron and Whetton, 1998, p. 421). Many companies have attributed their improvements in performance directly to the institution of teams in the workplace (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991). "Literally thousands of studies have been conducted on groups and teams and their impact on various performance outcomes" (Cameron and Whetton, 1998, p. 422). The following three studies offer insights that lead to the use of tools for teambuilding.

The Wisdom of Teams

Katzenbach and Smith (1993) talked with hundreds of people from more than 50 different teams, in 30 companies for their research. They wanted to explore teams in a broad organizational context. They claim it is "obvious that teams outperform individuals" but the reason they wrote the book, <u>The Wisdom of Teams</u>, is because "it is not so obvious how top management can best exploit that advantage" (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993, prologue, p. I). Throughout the book they provide numerous examples from the teams interviewed, giving insight to building teams for high performance results. Katzenbach & Smith offer specific recommendations and ideas for balancing all the aspects of creating teams, a few of which they included are: communications, work responsibilities, skills and egos.

In their article, "The Discipline of Teams" (1993), Katzenbach and Smith state "The essence of a team is common commitment." They define a team as: "a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose,

set of performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable" (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993 article, p. 112). There are sets of questions in Appendix A, which offer a "commonly assumed answer" as well as a "Wisdom of Teams" answer. One question is "What do you do about members who are not compatible personalities? The "commonly assumed answer" is "Counsel them or put them through a teambuilding session. If that doesn't work, replace them immediately" (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993, p. 274). The "Wisdom of Teams" answer is:

> Give them the chance and time to work it out in a performance context. This requires openly acknowledging the problem, which often can be done through counseling, facilitation, or team building. But don't stop there. Insist on the team using specific work products and performance gains as the best vehicle for getting seemingly incompatible personalities to work together effectively. When this is done, people may not "like" one another any better, but they do respect each other and their mutual ability to perform (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993, p. 275).

The Team Report is utilized as a teambuilding (and counseling) tool, which offers feedback and ideas for the team. The idea of linking specific performance gains to the action taken to aid cohesiveness in a group, is also evidenced in the Team Report with the Action Plan that follows the conflict and problem solving sections.

"A team that outperforms all other like teams… is identifiable by its results and by the individual members' commitment to one another, a commitment that transcends the team situation" (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993, p. 283).

Katzenbach and Smith hold a similar view as Larson and LaFasto (next section), that a prevailing element leading to success is the focus on a "purpose" for the team to work toward. "The best teams invest a tremendous amount of time and effort exploring, shaping, and agreeing on a purpose that belongs to them both collectively and individually" (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993, p. 113).

Characteristics of Effective Teams

Larson and LaFasto (1989) conducted a three-year study of quite a diverse range of teams. Some of the teams included: "the McDonald's Chicken McNugget team, the space shuttle Challenger investigation team, the crew of the USS Kitty Hawk, executive management teams, cardiac surgery teams, mountain climbing teams, epidemiology teams from the Centers for Disease Control, and the 1966 Notre Dame championship football team" (Larson and LaFasto, 1989, p. 7).

The central research question began as simply: "What are the secrets of successful teams" (Larson and LaFasto, 1989, p. 7)? They were interested in human functions and communications in a collaborative effort. The original intent was "to develop a system to

1) monitor the degree to which a team is functioning effectively and,

2) provide feedback which helps that team improve its own effectiveness"

(Larson and LaFasto, 1989, p. 11). The MBTI® Team Report has a similar purpose to Larson and LaFasto's second intention: to help teams improve their effectiveness. The methodology for their study was interviews, all of which they both attended.

What happened along the way as Larson and LaFasto constructed the measures for their feedback tool, was that through the process of isolating and defining the criteria for analyzing a team, they discovered the following three items:

"1. We encountered unusual consistency in the features of effective teams, across

a wide variety of teams

2. The criteria, which emerged from our research, seemed to us so basic, so face-

valid, that we became excited about the possibility of actually

understanding the significant factors that describe and explain teams and

teamwork

3. We found ourselves talking with team members and leaders who *knew* the

answers to the questions we were asking. Questions we hadn't even

sufficient knowledge to formulate" (Larson and LaFasto, 1989, p. 12).

Thus, they realized the potential in summarizing their knowledge (not just as the

research and the measuring tools, but as a book from which teams can learn).

From the result of several years of data collection, Larson and LaFasto found

eight characteristics that explained how and why effective teams develop. They are:

* A clear and elevating goal

* A results-driven structure

* Competent team members

* Unified commitment

* A collaborative climate

* Standards of excellence

* External support and recognition

* Principled leadership

Given that Larson and LaFasto have researched and defined these as "effectiveness"

characteristics, the fifth characteristic listed "a collaborative climate," can be related to a

similar area that the MBTI® Team Report aims to enhance. The "Team Similarity Index" (Hammer, 1994, pp. 4-5) provides information to help team members understand communication preferences to increase communication effectiveness with each other. Larson and LaFasto devote an entire Chapter (6) to this subject, collaborative climate. They found that trust is a key to 'working well together'. Larson and LaFasto reported "Our content analysis of the data indicates that trust is produced in a climate that includes four elements: (1) honesty – integrity, no lies, no exaggerations; (2) openness – a willingness to share, and a receptivity to information, perceptions, ideas; (3) consistency – predictable behavior and responses; and (4) respect – treating people with dignity and fairness" (Larson and LaFasto, 1989, p. 85). Trust in the group is increased with understanding of each other's differing thoughts, actions, and processes.

The MBTI® Team Report aims to increase the collaborative climate by helping people not just to get along better, but to gain a deeper understanding of one another's ways of perceiving information, of operating in the world, and of making decisions.

Self Directed Teams

Wellins, Byham, and Wilson (1991) conducted research through a national survey of over 500 organizations that are now using self-directed teams. They also conducted interviews with twenty-eight organizations, which included dozens of site visits and a number of focus groups. In addition, they performed an extensive literature search, reviewing more than 100 separate articles and books. Finally, they have also assisted companies in their work experience with the shifting to work teams (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991, p. xvii).

There were four questions researched:

"1. What are self-directed work teams, and how are they different from traditional

    teams?

2. How can we tell if self-directed work teams will work in our organization?

3. How do we go about starting self-directed work teams?

4. How can we keep our existing self-directed work teams going?"

(Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991, p. xvi).

For the survey part of the research, they used two surveys to collect the data. "A 'Team Survey' was aimed at people who were directly involved with team activities, such as team members, team leaders, supervisors, and consultants. The 'Executive Survey,' a shorter and more succinct version of the Team Survey, was targeted at senior-level managers" (Wellins et al., 1991, p. 237).

One main finding that relates to the current study is that many teams need some training in order to work together more effectively as a group. "After all, people do not automatically possess these skills; past work environments may have reinforced habits contrary to those that are needed for successful teamwork. This is not a motivation problem; rather, people don't automatically know how to solve problems as a group, reach consensus decisions, or make presentations of ideas. Until their skills improve to the point where they feel comfortable, they will avoid performing these tasks at all costs" (Wellins et al., 1991, p. 164). Wellins et al, report three types of skills in need of training: job skills, team/interactive skills and quality/action skills. The team/interactive skills relate to the need for and use of tools such as the MBTI® Team Report for increased understanding of the way others operate (communicate, make decisions). Specifically, Wellins et al, offer a list of core sets of skills for the team/interaction skills. They are:

listening and feedback, one-to-one communication, handling conflict, influencing others, training job skills, team skills (such as group process skills, participating in meetings, and developing roles and responsibilities), and working in teams (stages of development and factors for team success) (Wellins et al., 1991, p. 169). The communication and group process skills are exactly the areas in which the Team Report aims to offer help to teams. Given the research studies mentioned in Chapter 1, indicating continued growth in teams, especially self-directed teams (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993) the activities to increase team cohesion are imperative.

3.   RELATED TOOLS FOR TEAMBUILDING

Organizational Character Index

Studies of similar tools to the MBTI® Team Report lend further understanding to variables tested and methods used for this research. One example is the "Organizational Character Index" created by William Bridges. "Everyone knows that organizations differ in their size, structure, and purpose, but they also differ in *character*…An organization's character is like the grain in a piece of wood. There is no such thing as good or bad grain, but some kinds of grain can take great pressure, other kinds can…" (Bridges, 1992, p. 1). Bridges worked with people who were encountering organizational changes and subsequently potential career changes. In his work, he used the Myers Briggs Type Indicator® and started to notice that organizations behave much like individuals. He experimented with this notion and created a tool called the "Organizational Character Index®" (OCI). The OCI assesses an organization's "type" the way the MBTI assesses the individuals. There are 36 questions on the questionnaire and a four-letter "type" results. In his book, The Character of Organizations, Bridges discusses the sixteen types

of organizational character (Bridges, 1192, Ch. 3). This information could be potentially very useful for team members who received an MBTI® Team Report. They could further their own understanding of not only how the team operates, but compare that to the organization as a whole. However, Bridges tool hasn't been supported by reliability or validity studies as of yet.

A tool such as Bridges' that analyzes the entire organization is similar to the idea behind the researched tool: the MBTI® Team Report. Interesting to note here, is that Allen Hammer (author of the Team Report), was the editor to Bridges book – which just happens to be two years prior to the publication of the Team Report. This begs the question, did review of the organization analysis tool lead to the creation of a tool for teams (a logical group – larger than an individual and smaller than an organization).

We move now to a discussion of a few of the many validity studies that have been performed on the MBTI.

4.   THE MBTI®

The MBTI Manual (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) reported numerous studies in determining reliability and validity of the instrument. "In summary, test retest reliability coefficients range between .60 (youngest age group) to .91 (most adult groups), and internal consistency coefficients range between .77 to .90, with frequent lower coefficients for the judgment (thinking or feeling) scale, which is also the shortest scale. Validity studies provide correlations with other instruments, behaviors, and selected criteria" (Fleenor & Pearman, 1996, p. 3). The following are five of the validity studies that relate to the research conducted for this thesis.

VALIDITY STUDIES – PERCEIVED ACCURACY BY SUBJECTS

Perceived accuracy of the 16 Type descriptions

"A criticism that is sometimes made, often by people unfamiliar or only superficially familiar with the MBTI, is that the type descriptions are in effect horoscopes—vague, mostly pleasant sounding material that almost anyone might feel could apply to himself…" (Carskadon and Cook, 1982, p. 89). This criticism was first tested by Carskadon in 1975 when he administered the MBTI (Form F) to 129 college students at Mississippi State University and one week later had them return to rank order and rate 5 (4 letter type) one page descriptions of the type for accuracy. The 5 descriptions were the following: 'the description of their actual measured type; the type obtained if the weakest of their four preferences was reversed; the type obtained if their preferences on E-I and J-P were reversed; the type obtained if their preferences on S-N and T-F were reversed; and the type if their preferences on all four scales were reversed" (Carskadon and Cook, 1982, p. 89).

Carskadon hypothesized that the subject would give higher ranks and ratings to their actual type descriptions or the descriptions having their closest scales reversed than they would give to the other three descriptions (Carskadon, 1982, p. 87). The results concluded that over 66% ranked highest their actual measured type and the closest scale reversed, and only 4% picked the complete opposite type. Reversing the functions (S-N and T-F) had a significantly greater effect on perceived accuracy ($p < .001$) than reversing the attitudes (E-I and J-P). "Overall the results were highly supportive of the hypothesis as well as the validity of the type characterizations as perceived by the individuals to whom they were given" (Carskadon, 1982, p. 88).

The above study (Carskadon, 1975) was replicated by Carskadon and Cook in 1982, again with recipients that were unfamiliar with type. One hundred and eighteen (118) psychology students at Mississippi State University took the MBTI (Form G) and eight weeks later the "subjects were given a packet of four randomly ordered one page type descriptions adapted from Introduction to Type (1976)" (Carskadon and Cook, 1982, p. 90). The four descriptions were the same as in the above (Carskadon, 1975) study, with the deletion of the type obtained if the weakest of their four preferences was reversed. "The subjects were asked to rank order the four descriptions in terms of their accuracy in describing them, and to rate the accuracy of each description individually on a four point scale (4 = very true for me, 3 = mostly true for me, 2 = partly true for me, and 1 = not very true at all for me)" (Carskadon and Cook, 1982, p. 90). Additionally, 28 of the students were given the MBTI five weeks after the original MBTI administration (and three weeks prior to ranking and rating these descriptions) for the purpose of test-retest reliability.

The hypothesis was that the subjects would rank as first choice their measured type and that they would rate this same one higher in accuracy than the others. Also based on the previous Carskadon research (1975), they hypothesized that reversing the S-N and T-F preferences would have a greater effect on rated accuracy than reversing the E-I and J-P preferences.

Results were significant and the hypothesis was strongly supported. Out of all the subjects, 50% ranked the measured type first, while less than 10% ranked their measured type last. "…Over five times as many subjects gave the highest possible rating to their correct type description as to the one with all scales reversed, while well over four times

as many subjects gave the lowest possible rating to the description with all scales reversed as did to the correct description… Overall, the correct type description was perceived as most accurate, followed, in order, by that with preferences on E-I and J-P reversed, preferences on S-N and T-F reversed, and preferences on all scales reversed" (Carskadon and Cook, 1982, pp. 91, 92). These results refuted the idea that type descriptions other than one's own might be equally appealing if given to persons taking the MBTI. Although the validity is supported here, further research is needed such as replication of this research with different investigators and different populations.

Validity of the 16 types – Myers and Keirsey

McCarley and Carskadon (1987) investigated the "relative validity of the individual descriptors found in the complete type descriptions of the two major type theorists" – referring to Myers (1976) and Keirsey (1978). Previously (and above), studies were done on the perceived accuracy of individual descriptors found in the 16 type descriptions of Myers (Carskadon, 1982, Carskadon & Cook, 1982). This study adds in the descriptions by Keirsey of the 16 types.

The main research question for this study was "not which theorist is right or wrong, or better or worse, overall, but rather which type description *elements* contributed by each theorist are the most useful" (McCarley & Carskadon, 1987, p. 9). The descriptors were measured by having individual students, 609 introductory psychology students at Mississippi State University take one of the 16 questionnaires that were created. The questionnaires were "extracted from Myers' 16 type descriptions appearing in Introduction to Type (Myers, 1980) and from Keirsey's 16 type descriptions appearing in Please Understand Me (Keirsey & Bates, 1978). These descriptors were then combined

in 16 questionnaires, one for each of the 16 types" (McCarley & Carskadon, 1987). Each of the students took the MBTI instrument. Previous to receiving their MBTI results and approximately six weeks later, the students filled out the questionnaire that matched their measured type on the MBTI.

The main findings were the following "preliminary conclusions: 1. Significant variability in the perceived accuracy of different individual type descriptors. 2. Both Myers and Keirsey contribute relatively high rated descriptors and relatively low rated descriptors. The 'winners' and 'losers' occur among the individual type descriptors rather than between the two type theorists. 3. Most type descriptors do not seem to be greatly different in perceived accuracy among men and women of those types. 4. Most descriptors of most types were rated fairly high in accuracy, although not as high as wished. The only exceptions were the ISTP descriptors that were frequently rated low in accuracy. 5. Even though the ratings were fairly high, the type descriptions could probably be made more accurate by modifying them to reflect more empirical data" (McCauley and Carskadon, 1987, pp. 9,10).

These studies would benefit from more replication. One suggestion was to use adult subjects instead of students. Another idea is to study the eight single-letter preferences (Myers) or the two-letter temperaments (SP, SJ, NJ, NT) of Keirsey's rather than the 16 types which is what this study investigated.

Perceived accuracy of the 16 Type descriptions

Ruhl and Rodgers (1988) then replicated the study done by McCarley and Carskadon (1986) by investigating the perceived accuracy of the 16 type descriptions of Myers (1976) and Keirsey (1978). The research questions were a little different: (1)

Given the descriptive statements from both Myers and Keirsey, which are most accurate? (2) When the accurate statements are compared, does Myers or Keirsey have the best overall perceived accuracy? (3) Are the type descriptions stereotyped against types of any given dimension?

The variable of type descriptors was measured by the use of two instruments: The Myers Briggs Type Indicator (to obtain the subject's type) and the McCarley and Carskadon's questionnaire (1986) which consists of specific descriptors drawn as equally as possible from each theorist's descriptions. The 145 subjects fell into different sample sizes (*n*) for each of the sixteen types. Using a four (4) point rating scale (4 = very true, 3 = mostly true, 2 = mostly untrue, 1 = very untrue) the means of perceived accuracy of type descriptions rank ordered the types.

The main finding was that the rank order of perceived validity of each descriptor within each type's questionnaire confirmed the results of McCarley and Carskadon's (1986) study almost exactly. Each type fell into nearly the same rank-order from those perceived as most valid to those perceived as least valid. There is one area that differed from the original study. In comparing each dichotomous preference, the T (Thinking) versus F (Feeling) is the only one that emerged with a significant difference. The T types mean was 2.9, significantly lower than the feeling types' mean of 3.1 (1988). This T-F discrepancy could be due to a slightly more inaccurate description in the T items as opposed to the F items, or, this difference could simply reflect a tendency for T's to be more critical than F's (part of the definition of T types – Myers, 1976).

The Ruhl and Rodgers (1988) study replicated the McCarley and Carskadon (1986) study. The Carskadon and Cook (1982) study replicated the original Carskadon

study (1975). Each study varies a bit in the research questions asked or hypothesis and the results received. However, they are similar in that each investigated the validity of the sixteen types as perceived by the subjects. Given the results were similar in all four studies (evidence was found that there are 16 types that view themselves differently in various ways) the findings gain strength in the impact due to the other studies.

The relation of these studies to the current thesis is that the subjects' perception is the data collected and analyzed. The "perceived accuracy of the type descriptions" for the MBTI is similar to this study where "the perceived accuracy of the team type descriptions" for the MBTI® Team Report is the data.

Perceived differences of 16 types (self report and observed)

This next study also investigates the 16 types using the perceptions of the individual as data. However, it also uses observations from others as a comparison and most notably obtained a much larger sample size than the previous studies. This study won the 1995 Isabel Briggs Myers Memorial Award for outstanding research.

Fleenor and Pearman (1995) studied the differences in observed and self-reported qualities of psychological types. Exactly 2398 managers and leaders were the subjects of this study: roughly 150 per type with the exception of 149 for two of the types.

The hypothesis of this research was the same as predicted by type theory – that in a large sample, the 16 types described themselves differently, as do observers of each of the 16 types. An analysis of variance was done using the instruments: California Psychological Inventory (CPI, Gough, 1987) and the Leadership Style Inventory (LSI, Bailey, 1991). For the self-rating, the MBTI type was used as an independent variable

and 20 CPI scales were used as dependent variables. All the analyses were significant at p < .0001.

The ANOVA revealed significant differences among the types as expected. For the observer rating analysis, their peers and direct reports rated the managers using the LSI. The MBTI was the independent variable and five LSI reports for each of the 150 managers per type (149 for two) supplied the dependent variable scales. An ANOVA was completed and found the same results: significant differences among the types. There are over 60 pages of statistical reports and more information detailing results.

The study helps confirm type dynamics as a working model of human differences. "As predicted by type theory as measured by the MBTI, qualities of the 16 types were confirmed" (Fleenor and Pearman, 1995, p. 3).

Next we move to a discussion of a few related MBTI tools that are available and widely used by consultants and trainers for teams.

5. MBTI® TEAM BUILDING TOOLS

Using the MBTI in Organizations

Using the MBTI in Organizations (1991) is a resource guide created for workshop leaders to use for presentations in organizations. It is a three-ring notebook containing nine tabbed sections beginning with the first one titled "Using the MBTI." Included in this tab are guidelines about "preparing thoroughly, adhering to ethical guidelines and maintaining confidentiality" (Hirsh, 1991, pp. 2-5). "Introducing the MBTI" is the second tab. This section offers strategies for the trainer to increase communication during the training. Additionally, it outlines benefits to the organization from learning the MBTI® types (pp. 7-13). "Preparing for the Workshop" is the next tab, which includes

such topics as scoring the MBTI, materials needed and ethics (pp. 15-23). The next two tabs are the actual workshops: "The Introductory MBTI Workshops" (pp. 25-62) and "Special Workshop Applications" (pp. 63-109). These include detailed formats and exercises to consider and utilize. The "Special Workshop Applications" ventures into management development, team building and career development applications. "Additional Resources" (pp. 111-116), "Common Questions" (pp. 117-123) and "References" (pp. 125-136) are the next three tabs and are self-explanatory. The last tab is helpful for workshop leaders to save time and is titled: "Reproducible Masters" (pp. RM1-RM75).

This resource guide contains years of materials created by the author throughout her experiences in working with organizations. Next, we will move to another tool she created for workshop leaders that is specifically for team building.

MBTI Team Building Program

Another publication by Hirsh is the MBTI® Team Building Program (1992). There is a "Leaders Resource Guide" and a "Team Member's Guide" that make up the program. The leaders guide is a three-ring notebook. Hirsh created this program after 15 years of working with "hundreds of teams and literally thousand of team members across this country and abroad, I have seen its power demonstrated over and over" (Hirsh, 1992, p. 1). Hirsh applied the MBTI in a variety of ways in her work: "to analyze the team, clarify the problem, design interventions, heighten team awareness, and help the team to deal with issues like communication, change, or leadership" (Hirsh, 1992, p. 2). This guide was created for people who are preparing for and conducting team-building sessions.

Part 1 of the Leaders guide includes an introduction, which provides the team builder with guidelines and describes the use of the MBTI with teams. It includes characteristics of effective teams (a very similar list to Larson and LaFasto earlier) and effective team builders, as well as, cautions and considerations (pp. 1-9). Part 2 is called "Starting the Process" and details how to prepare for the team building session through problem definition, contracting with the client, and collecting data through interviews and MBTI® results (pp. 11-26). Part 3 is planning the team building session, which includes sample agendas, how to prepare the five MBTI® Lenses (Team Type, Functions, Quadrants, Temperaments, and Dynamics) and how to establish ground rules (pp. 27 – 46). Part 4 is the Team Type Lens, which supplies information on Team Type, predictions of the team, team frustrations and how to introduce this Lens to the team (pp. 47-62). Part 5 is the Functions Lens and provides information on Functions, communication styles, and task preferences, as well as introducing the Lens and team activities (pp. 63-72). Part 6 is the Quadrants Lens, which offers information on work environment and organizational change (pp. 73-84). Part 7 is the Temperament Lens supplying information on organizational culture and work roles, ways to talk to the team about the Lens, and activities to use in the session (pp. 85-98). Part 8 is the dynamic Lens which describes the theory of balance related to type Dynamics, provides information on stress and the inferior function, and concludes with team activities (pp. 99-110). In addition, there are resources for each Lens offered and reproducible masters for the team builder.

Introduction to Type and Teams

The *Introduction to Type® Series* includes a publication by Sandra Krebs Hirsh (1992) called <u>Introduction to Type and Teams</u>. This booklet is intended for the workshop participant, as opposed to the team leader. "The purpose of Introduction to Type and Teams is to help you understand your Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® results and the relationship of those results to your contributions and effectiveness as a team member" (Hirsh, 1992, p. 1). The booklet offers insight into an individual's own leadership style, influence on teammates, contributions to team functioning and how to maximize their personal effectiveness to enhance team productivity. Hirsh begins with a page (p. 3) that summarizes the four continuums for natural preferences: focusing your energy, gathering information, making decisions, and living a certain way (same information as in basic Introduction to Type booklet). Then there is a section describing how the MBTI can benefit teams and an overall discussion of "Descriptions of Team Member Types" (Hirsh, 1992, p. 7). For each Type® there is an individual page which contains information on the following topics. How that type might lead, things they do that might irritate team members, how they might influence team members, things they contribute to the team, how they can maximize their effectiveness and what they are irritated by in other team members (pp. 10-25).

These three tools are examples of a few of the many resources that trainers have available to help them in teambuilding with groups. The MBTI® Team Report is simply another tool to utilize with teams in an effort to increase team members understanding and communication with one another.

6. THE MBTI® TEAM REPORT

As previously mentioned, there are no published studies to date on the MBTI®

Team Report. The intent with this research is to submit the results to the publication:

Journal of Psychological Type, the official Journal of the Association for Psychological

Type.