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Welcome to

Better Teams Through Type

A training course for Executive Hall Councils
based on the Myers-Briggs™ Type Indicator

All material © 1997 Jeremy Dwyer. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and MBTI are trademarks of Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
"Turn, turn, turn, to everything there is a season...." And to every type there is a time. The purpose of this course is to teach you about how people interact with the world so you can better understand both yourself and others. And to show you the benefits of your traits, and encourage you to develop them.

"I find classification into types particularly helpful when I am called on to explain parents to children or husbands to wives and visa-versa. It is also helpful in understanding one's own prejudices."

Carl Jung
Collected Works, Vol 18
Why You Should Run This Course

When business people are asked what skills are most important in business, and especially management, they often answer “ability to communicate with other employees.” Successful communication though, takes more than mastery of English and knowing a few things about active listening. Effective communication requires the ability to understand, and appreciate, how the other person thinks. If people don’t understand their differences they will communicate in different ways and the efficiency and cohesion of your organization will suffer.

Type theory, upon which this course is based, attempts to describe personalities so that people can come to understand, and appreciate, the perspectives their coworkers bring to activities. It is not a miracle cure, but if taken to heart the training can reduce conflicts, produce better rounded ideas and reduce the time spent trying to make oneself understood.

I invite you to explore these benefits and many others, I hope you enjoy the journey.

Specific Objectives of Course
1. Participants will learn the 4 axis of type and common traits associated with them.
2. Participants will acquire skill in guessing peoples type.
3. Participants will learn about personality types other than their own and come to understand these as valid.
4. Participants will acquire skill in adapting their communication to other peoples types.
5. Participants will learn that working with people of other types is desirable.
6. Participants will have fun.
General Notes

The course is meant to be run with executive hall council groups of 4-8 people. Between three and six exec-councils can be run at a time in a large seminar although having more than 15 people in a session makes an open discussion unwieldy.

If possible, schedule the seminar to break over a lunch somewhere after step 7. If the participants take this opportunity to talk about type in unstructured conversation they will teach themselves and come back with new questions and perspectives.

Remember that the goals of the seminar are for people to learn about type and learn how they can use it to avoid/solve conflict. The goal is not to finish all the material. If people start an open discussion on type and are learning better than they would by the prepared material then encourage the discussion.

This training is useless if it isn’t internalized and used. People learn best if they’ve come freely, if they’re entertained and most importantly, if they see how the material connects to them. The activities encourage people to see how the material relates to them but I don’t know your participants as well as you do. If you have an activity that would motivate your people more, use it.

Pick a comfortable, informal room for the session. Have comfy chairs or couches -- as long as participants will stay awake. Participants must be able to move their chairs to circle into their small groups.

Provide refreshments before the seminar starts. Coffee, tea and donuts are good. Juice for the morning.

Always Refer to the Myers-Briggs as “the MBTI”, “the Indicator” or “Myers-Briggs”. Never call it “the test”, it is not a test.

Most of the pages in this course are meant to be handouts. They will be especially helpful to people as reference material after they have gone home. They are formatted with a half inch gutter for binding, you may want to center them on the page when you make copies.

After the description of types someone may say that Feelers sound hysterical or Thinkers sound like robots. This is true only for extreme types. Someone who is a way out Feeler, with no Thinking ability, will be hysterical and a way out Thinker, with no Feeling ability will be a robot. But people like that are very rare. Most people use a mix of both, but are better at one.

The older versions of the MBTI used an “x” preference to indicate that the preference was very close and could easily switch if the test were taken again. Recent versions have eliminated the “x” category and even on a perfectly even split have a tie-breaker procedure to force a dichotomy of type.
Step-by-Step

Note: Rather than page numbers the pages in this course are marked by step number.

Before the Seminar
1. All participants should take the MBTI if possible. They should answer the questions with their “shoes-off self”, when they are not stressed or tired. In other words, not “what do you do” but “what would you prefer to do if no one were watching.”
2. Participants should NOT share their type with other group members.
3. Have all participants read the memo entitled “sharing your type, pro’s and con’s.”

During the Seminar
Take a five to ten minute break every hour.
1. If participants do not know each other provide name-tags and have an introduction time.
2. Have the audience brainstorm reasons they are interested in this training. Write answers on a flip-chart and leave up for people to look back at. Sample answers are in the Appendix. (15 minutes)
3. Give everyone a copy of the What Type Theory Is/What Type Theory Is Not sheet (or make it into a poster) and go through each item with the audience. (10 minutes)
4. Discuss whether the group is going to share their types and make a decision. The disadvantages of sharing are outlined in the “sharing your type” memo. The advantage of sharing is that you can encourage people to think of the types not as abstracts, “this is how I should speak to a perceiver”, but as concretes, “this is how I should speak to Joe.” This will give them more personal stake in the learning and they will learn better.
5. Do one of the following with the axis of type sheets. You may want to take a vote. Remember that extroverts may prefer hearing things to reading them. (45 minutes)
   a) If you are well versed in the types you can offer your own explanations of each and, or,
   b) Read some or all of each sheet out-loud and, or,
   c) Give people time to read sheets individually.
6. Encourage people to adjust their type if they feel the indicator measured them wrong. Many people switch at least one axis.
7. Have people talk briefly about how their type does not fit them. (skip if not sharing types.) The purpose is to discourage stereotyping by type.
8. Activity #1: Mini-cases.
9. Remember to take breaks every hour, the next activity is a long one.
10. Activity #2: Determine the type. (20-30 minutes per person)
11. Tell participants to start using what they know now! To adapt their communication style to the type of their listener. At the end they will have the opportunity to share how they did so.
12. Activity #3: Secondary traits. (5-10 minutes per person)
13. Do one of the following with the working in teams material.
   a) If you have personal experience with team work and types talk about it, and, or,
   b) Read some or all of the sheets out loud (then give participants copies) and, or,
   c) Give people time to read the sheets individually.
14. Have group brainstorm why types need other types. Write answers on a flip-chart.
15. Hand out “We don’t need them... Oh, yes you do” sheet.
16. Hand out the memos about dealing with opposite types. Give everyone all memos, knowing how their opposites were told to treat them may be helpful for some people. You can cover it now, or participants can read it later.
17. Present type and conflict resolution handout as you presented the working in teams material in step 12.
18. Activity #4: Case Studies.
19. Have you taken a break lately?
20. Activity #5: Create a Case
21. Have volunteers share instances during this workshop when they adapted their communication to their listeners type. (Don’t force people to share as this is likely to offend introverts.)
22. Tell participants to explain the four axis of types to a friend and guess the friend’s type sometime in the next two days. (Optional: if group meets regularly the results of this can be discussed at the next meeting.)
Memorandum

To: Seminar Participants

Subject: Sharing your type, pros and cons

The Myers-Briggs is a tool for understanding your personality and the personality of those around you. Unfortunately, like all tools, it can be used badly. This memo details some possible negative uses of the Myers-Briggs so you can guard against falling into any of these pitfalls. And also to help you decide if you want to share your type results. If results are not shared then it becomes harder for people to box you, but it also becomes harder for people to adapt their communication to you. Regarding the Myers-Briggs and other indicators, remember that what people think they are is probably more accurate than what the indicator says they are.

• Despite being told otherwise some people insist on using the Myers-Briggs as a box. “Oh, you’re an ISTJ, I know how you think.” The indicator is like a movie preview — it gives you a good idea of what will happen, but there will still be a lot of surprises.

• Some people forget that the Myers-Briggs shows preferences, not abilities/inabilities. Comments like “You’re no good at analyzing plans, you’re an I” or “you couldn’t understand how they felt, you’re a T” deny the fact that people can have well developed secondary preferences.

• Some people forget that all types are needed and think their type is best. A counselor at Western tells of a case where a person was pushed out of their RA position because they were an introverted-thinker and the staff thought only extroverted-feelers could be RA’s.

Some people wrongly judge their opposite types by their own underdeveloped type. For example, a thinker may underrate feelers judgement because they naturally assume everyones feeling is like their own. In fact, the thinkers feeling is underdeveloped and a very poor judge of a feelers highly tuned ability to judge people situations.
### What Type Theory Is

- Indicator
- Measure of preferences
- Tendencies
- Classification of some personality traits

### What Type Theory is Not

- Test
- Measure of Absolutes
- Competencies
- Explanation of all personality traits
- An infringement on self-determination

**Type Theory, general description** - Type theory was developed by Carl Jung to describe the personalities of normal people. It was taken up by Isabel Myers and her mother who developed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The MBTI has become the most popular of several measures of type theory. It is such a popular method that Myers-Briggs has become synonymous with type theory.

**Indicator/Test** - The Myers-Briggs and other type indicators measure preferences. They are not tests with right and wrong answers. They are not even tests with better and worse answers. Every type is equally valid and useful. No indicator is perfect. If after taking this course you believe the indicator scored you wrong you are likely right.

**Measure of preferences/Measure of Absolutes** - Like any tool, type theory can be used to harm if used incorrectly. Using type theory incorrectly is using it as an absolute and saying things like “a Thinker will always...” or “Only an Extrovert would be good at...” These are as invalid than saying “all men are...” or “only a Hispanic would...”

**Tendencies/Competencies** - The score received on a preference from the Myers-Briggs or another indicator indicates how much one favors that preference compared to its opposite. It is NOT a measure of how good one is at using a preference. Everyone uses both sides of a type and some people are excellent with even their less preferred type. Just as people can use both hands but usually prefer one, and just like hands people are usually better with the type they prefer. THE MBTI MEASURES WHAT PEOPLE PREFER, NOT WHAT THEY ARE CAPABLE OF, do not limit yourself or others because of type.

**Classification of some personality traits/Explanation of all personality traits** - Type theory can be used to explain many aspects of personality, but there are far more it does not explain. It does not indicate intelligence, ability to love, work ethic, friendliness, devotion to a task, and so forth.

**An infringement on self-determination** - The MBTI does not tell you what you will be or do. It only gives names to things you have already chosen to be yourself and lists tendencies. Not all of these tendencies are true of every person of every type. Type theory is not meant to tell you how you or others should act, but to give insight into how people will probably act.
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THE FOUR TYPE AXIS

Introvert -- Extrovert
Sensing -- Intuitive (the axis of perception)
Thinking -- Sensing (the axis of judgment)
Judging -- Perceiving

Where Your Energy is Focused (Introvert -- Extrovert)

The I/E preference indicates where you prefer to direct your energy. Extroverts are focused on the tangible world. Introverts are focused on their thoughts. The extrovert is the person who gives many half-formed suggestions to solve a hard problem until they hit on one that sounds good to them. The introvert meanwhile sits quietly until they have thought all the way through a solution before giving a suggestion.

While extroverts tend to be better public speakers, since they like it more and thus have probably had more practice, you have to be careful not to over generalize this. Many introverts have trained themselves to be excellent public speakers.

Extroverts are good front line generals: rallying the troops, organizing the individuals and always jumping in to get things started. Introverts make good back room tacticians: surrounded by just a few close friends they think the battle plans through in detail before even mentioning them to the extrovert general running around outside.

INTROVERT (I)
Do best work inside head
Focused on inner world of ideas
Like to organize ideas (economics, law)
Reserved & cautious. Expect new things to be complex.
Difficult to get to know, often shy. More comfortable with ideas than people.
Drained by large groups and hesitate to make comments in them, especially a group they do not know well.
Careful with details (especially IS types)
Have no trouble working a lifetime on a single thing if it’s something in which they are interested.

EXTROVERT (E)
Do best work by talking it out
Focused on outer world of people and things
Like to organize people & environment
Relaxed and confident, ready to plunge into new situations, expecting them to be shallow.
Easy to get to know, accessible, social. Enjoy being around people.
Invigorated by large groups.
Faster at tasks, dislikes complications. (especially ES types)
Often impatient with long slow jobs.
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INTROVERT

Interested in the idea behind the job.

Think things out before starting a job or speaking.

EXTROVERT

Interested in the results of their job.

Speak or do first and make adjustments as they go along.
Your Method of Becoming Aware (the Perceiving axis)

The S/N axis measures how people prefer to gather and use information. Sensing people are “down to earth.” They prefer information they can see, touch, taste and smell. Although many S’s are very good with abstracts it is not their ‘native’ language. Intuitives are “head in the clouds” people. They are interested in things that cannot be seen or felt, they like possibilities and abstracts, things that exist only inside of words.

There is also a distinct difference in how the types use information. Sensors prefer to use their information to go step by step through established procedures. They like to cook by recipes. Intuitives prefer taking the information they have and giving it to the subconscious which returns the end product. From the outside it looks like the Intuitive skipped all the intervening steps, in fact the steps were performed, but very quickly in the subconscious. Intuitives like to cook with “a bit of this, and a pinch of that.”

Sensors make good statisticians and lab technicians. Intuitives make good artists and theoreticians.

**SENSING (S)**
Interested in actualities (what is or was)

Trusts that which comes through the five senses. Less comfortable with words

Like established routine (esp. SJ)

Prefer to live in present, in what is. Aware of, and focused on, the outside world.

Don’t care what the big picture is or what the final product will be, as long as they have step by step instructions.

Like facts and figures and tend to be very good with them

Work steadily with realistic idea of how long it will take (esp. IS)

“If its not broken, don’t fix it.”

Dislike problems that do not have established procedures.

Enjoy using an already known skill more than learning a new one.

**INTUITIVE (N)**
Interested in possibilities (what could be)

Aware of and focused on thoughts. Rejoices in words, symbols and metaphors.

In order to understand possibilities may ask so many questions that S’s are annoyed

Finds routines boring and unfulfilling. Prefers using hunches and leaps of intuition.

Prefer to live in the future, in what might be. Like to dream of possibilities.

Some want to see the big picture before they start. Others are happy to figure it out as they go along.

Too concerned with possibilities to worry about detailed facts and figures

Work in bursts of enthusiastic energy with periods of slack in between (esp. EN)

“If its not broken, improve it anyway.”

Like solving new situations. Like to infer things.

Enjoy learning a new skill more than using it.
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SENSING (S)

Impatient with complicated situations (esp. ES)

Not often inspired and rarely trust it when they are

INTUITIVE (N)

Interested and patient with complicated situations (esp. IN)

Follow their inspirations, good and bad. Focused on intuitions.
Your Method of Making Decisions (the Judging axis)

The Thinking/Feeling axis is a measure of which method you prefer to use to make decisions. Put another way, what kind of evidence most sways your decision making. Thinkers prefer the application of consistent rules, they make good trial judges. Feeling people prefer to look at how their actions affect people, regardless of how logical they are. They make good social workers, clergy and resident advisors.

Thinking is highly valued in today’s world, perhaps over valued. Businesses especially value the thinking type. Family life, friendships and all other personal relationships value the feeling type. This makes it clear why it is important that while you should prefer one style, you should also develop your opposite. A person with only thinking will be dysfunctional in relationships, a person with only feeling will not go far in the business world.

Since thinking is so valued it hardly needs any more support and little explanation. Thinkers however may need some help to understand the value of feeling. Isabel Briggs says it this way in Gifts Differing, “To thinkers the idea of evaluating by means of feeling sounds flighty, unreliable, and uncontrolled, but thinkers are no judge of feeling. They naturally judge all feeling by their own, and theirs is relatively undeveloped and unreliable. When feeling is well developed, it is a stable instrument for discriminating the worth of personal values.”

It is important to note that the thinking preference is not the same as ‘ability to think.’ Feeling types score as well as thinkers on standardized tests and often do very well in fields such as scientific research. It is also important to remember that thinking and feeling are both only as good as the information that goes into them and the person using them. One unknown feeler expressed his distrust of thinking without good information when he said “Logic is an organized way of going wrong with confidence” (Briggs).

T/F is the only preference that shows any sex difference. About 60% of men are thinkers and 40% feelers, and among women about 60% are feelers with about 40% thinkers.

**THINKING (T)**  
Like giving and receiving critical analysis  
Logical and impersonal. Focused on “consistent, logical”  
Best at organizing facts and ideas  
Value concise presentations, with no information which is not essential. Often brief and businesslike

**FEELING (F)**  
Take criticisms personally  
Personal & subjective values of things. Focused on “pleasing, displeasing, supporting, threatening.”  
Best at dealing with people and relationships  
Find it difficult to be brief and businesslike. Like to include information T’s do not consider relevant. More interested in the people involved than in the issues discussed.
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THINKING

Tend to not talk about things unless they relate to the current situation, often consider personal issues as not relating.

The “Let’s get to our first issue” people

Best with the impersonal. Analytical, dispassionate, but can become defensive if their competency is questioned.

Value logic and impartiality.

More concerned with truth than tact.

Likely to question the conclusions of others and disagree openly.

Do not show emotion readily and often uncomfortable dealing with emotion.

Base decisions on impartial ‘facts’ of the case.

Can fiercely debate the value of ideas without it affecting the relationship.

Desire to be understood.

Subject their conclusions to stringent logical rules but once a belief has passed these rules they assume they are right.

Good at writing dispassionate proposals to people who only want facts.

FEELING

Believe all issues relate to situation because all issues are relevant to the people’s relationship. Will therefore share things like “today at the office”.

The “Let’s get to know each other” people

Tender-hearted, tactful, sympathetic, inclined to take things personally and become defensive at critical suggestions.

Value sentiment and a personal approach.

Find very tactful ways of saying things which may lead to shading the truth.

Dislike telling people unpleasant things, avoid confrontation. Therefore will often keep quiet about disagreements.

Show emotion more easily and have more easily hurt feelings than thinkers. Thrive on praise and thanks -- even for paid jobs.

Base their decisions largely on how they think others will feel about the decision.

Hate to be divided, even temporarily, from people close to them. Chilled by antagonism.

Desire sympathy and appreciation. Want others to at least acknowledge the value of their feelings.

Good at selling ideas to people because they are aware of what that person wants and feels. (hardest sells are to thinkers)

Make gifts of time and energy. Often too many. Some have trouble saying no to people who need help.
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Making Decisions versus Making Perceptions

The J/P preference is an indicator of whether you are more perceiving (either sensing or intuitive) or judging (either thinking or feeling) in your attitude to life. People who are perceiving oriented prefer to remain flexible, not close off any options and “stop and smell the roses.” People who are judging oriented prefer to make decisions as soon as possible and follow through on those decisions without alteration.

It is impossible for anyone to use both preferences. Whenever you gather information you are perceiving, whenever you use that information to make a decision you are judging. Like all the others, the J/P axis measures favorites, not entireties.

Finally it is important to remember that judging does not mean judgmental! Any of the types can be judgmental.

**JUDGING**

Prefers ordered lives with lists and schedules

May decide things too quickly. Like to have choices made.

Like closure in jobs

Does best work spread over time, usually finish early.

Want to regulate and control life. Structured, organized, want things settled.

“Let’s get started”

Want only the essentials needed to begin work (especially ISJ)

May dislike interrupting the project they are on for a more urgent one.

**PERCEIVING**

Prefer lived lives. Spontaneity over planning

May have trouble making decisions. Like to leave all options open.

Like excitement in jobs. May quickly become bored with jobs which don’t provide enough variation or change

Does their best work the night before under pressure. Prefer to let little things pile up then deal with the disaster area. (esp. NP’s)

Dislike schedules.

“Let’s take some more time to examine the situation.”

Dislike being told there is only one right way to do something. (esp. NP’s)

Want to know all about a new job. (especially INP)

May have trouble staying focused on one project. May start too many projects at once.
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Activity #1, part 1
Conversation Mini-cases

Part one and two of activity one can be given all at once if participants read material themselves or used as audience participation if the leader goes over material by section. Cases are marked by preference. Use as many or few as you feel are needed.

Case 1 (E/I):
Q: If Bellingham were flooding what would an E prefer to do? An I?
A: I: organize plans for evacuations, sandbagging and resource allocation. E: Get their hands dirty and rouse gangs of people into starting a sandbag line.
Q: Is one of these better than the other?

Case 2 (N/S):
Q: Two people are having an informal discussion of child-raising practices. Ann is quoting figures from studies she has read and talking about what could be done in theory. Doug is referring to families he has known and does not like Ann’s ideas because they are too far-out. Neither thinks the other’s evidence is very valid. What is wrong?
A: Ann is probably an ‘N’, the world of abstract thought and second hand information appeals to her. Doug is probably as ‘S’, the only evidence that’s valid for him is what he (or another) has personally seen.

Case 3 (T/F):
Q: Tom is a secretary and his boss Joan thanks him for doing the jobs she asks him to -- things like running copies and typing letters. Tom thinks “I don’t know why she’s thanking me, I’m only doing my job.” What type is each?
A: Tom is most likely a T and Joan is probably an F.

Case 4 (T/F):
Q: Is it Ok for a person to steal bread to feed their starving family? How would a major T answer? How would a major F answer?
A: A major T would probably say that if stealing is wrong, then it is wrong in any situation. A major F would most likely say that since it was to feed their starving family the stealing could be excused.

Case 5 (P/J):
Q: Grant is unsure what he wants to do with his life and every time he sees his friend Tom he has a new plan. “What are you doing with the rest of your life this week?” has become a common joke between them. Tom cannot understand why Grant does not just make a decision and stick with it. What are their types?
A: Grant is probably a P, Tom is a likely a J.
Activity #1, part 2
Conversation Mini-cases

These work well as role-plays:
What type is each person acting like? (“Answers” at end.)

Situation 1:
Joan: “I think we should do a dance as a fund-raiser! We could invite professors to try
to get the students there.”
Ted: (sits quietly.)
Joan: “So, I don’t think we could have alcohol, because then we’d have to have a liquor license and that would be hard to get. But we have the money in our budget and...hey! We could make it a 70’s dance. (pauses) Ummm... You’re not saying anything. What part don’t you like?”
Ted: I like it just fine, I just wanted to think the idea through before I said anything.

Situation 2:
Tom: Here’s the procedure for the job laid out in a nice routine.
Daryl: Hmmm... It seems a bit slow, I wonder how it could be improved.
Tom: It works. OK.
Daryl: But last week Nancy said we should try to improve the efficiency of all the jobs.
Tom: That was Jessica, not Nancy.
Daryl: Fine. Management person. The important part is that we’re supposed to be working toward efficiency and I think I can make this more efficient.
Tom: The important thing is to get work done. If you can make it more efficient go ahead, but whatever you come up with needs to be a procedure.

Situation 3:
Linda: Neat story! I would reword this paragraph to make it fit in better, the transition is choppy.
Greg: Why are you always criticizing my work?

Situation 4:
Alexis: It’s ten after, where is he? Oh there he is, finally.
Danny: Hi Alexis. It’s a beautiful day, let’s go jogging instead and swim tomorrow.
Alexis: We can go jogging tomorrow, we decided to go swimming today.
Danny: Oh, come on. Live life before you die!
Alexis: (reluctantly) Fine, we’ll go jogging.

Analysis of Situations
Analysis of #1: Joan is acting extroverted, Ted is acting introverted.
Analysis of #2: Tom is acting sensory and Daryl is acting intuitive
Analysis of #3: Linda is probably a thinker, Greg is probably a feeler.
Analysis of #4: Alexis is using her judging (scheduling) side, Danny is using his perceiving.
Objective: Learn (rather than just read or hear) the four axis of type and some of the traits that go with each one.

Note: If people decided not to share types (step 4) then do the sample person for this exercise and skip the rest. If you have volunteers share keep in mind that it will create peer pressure on those who do not want to share and ostracize them.

Instructions:
1. Starting with yourself and going in a circle the group will try to guess everyone’s type. (Or start with the sample below and have the group try to guess its type)
2. The person being guessed will give 8-12 clues as to their type.
   a) Two to three clues from each category which should be mixed up between categories. (e.g., do not give all your E/I clues, then all your J/P clues...)
   b) Don’t make it too easy on people! Feel free to include occasional traits which do not match your dominate type as long as they are true of you. For example, if you are an introvert who enjoys running meetings use that.
   c) Situations (real or hypothetical) are great.
3. After each clue is given the group decides what type it indicates.
4. After all clues are given the group discusses the persons type until they come to a consensus. If they are incorrect have the person being guessed provide more clues or have the group ask hypothetical situation questions.
5. When a persons type has been correctly determined they should put on the type name-tag they made earlier and the focus moves on to the next person.

Sample person. Answers on next page:
1. I prefer to work alone.
2. I often don’t understand why people get so upset when I make suggestions on their plans.
3. When doing a new procedure I keep thinking of ways to improve it.
4. My days are ordered and scheduled, I carry a planner.
5. Meetings should be brief and business like. Personal things should take place outside of meetings.
6. Philosophy, with all its premises, conclusions and logical fallacies is very fun for me.
7. I have a few good friends and not many sort-of friends.
8. My ideal camping trip is to get in the car and go to the peninsula. Knowing that we’ll be gone for three days but not knowing where we’re going, when we’ll get there, or what we’ll do there.
9. I like running meetings.
10. I don’t like closing off my options.
11. I think a lot about possibilities
12. When I have a gut belief about something I try to justify it with logic.
13. In conversation I switch topics rapidly and in a manner that seems random to some people.
The person who made up the clues for Activity 1 is an INTX (X means no clear preference)

1. I
2. T
3. N
4. J
5. T
6. T
7. I
8. P
9. E
10. P
11. N
12. T or N
13. N
Activity #3: Secondary Traits

Purpose: To give people a better understanding of people with types opposite theirs. And to further ingrain knowledge of the axis into people.

Instructions:
1. Each person takes one or two of their less used preferences and explains how having that as a most used preference would affect them. Other group members should offer further suggestions on the effect of the change.
2. If the group is full of people who are not self-conscious a make-it-up-as-you-go-along role-play would be a good way to do this exercise.

Example for an INTX
"I suppose that if I were an F rather than a T I’d be nicer to people. Right now I’m polite but don’t worry much about how other people feel. If I were an F and saw that one of the group was having a bad day I’d be more likely to ask what was wrong and try to make it better, unless of course I thought they didn’t want to be asked. Right now, as a T, I’m likely to try to ignore the problem and hope it goes away. And I might talk to my housemates more. I’ve never been the type to ask, ‘How was your day?’ or talk about mine, as an F I might be.”

“It would take me a lot longer to run a meeting since I’d be trying to give people emotional support instead of just getting through. And I’d want praise and thanks for things that right now I consider ‘just part of the job.’ I would stop debating! Debate is division and I might take it personally when people tore into my ideas. And of course I wouldn’t want to hurt anyone by criticizing their ideas in a debate.”

“The most important thing I suppose is that I would be a much more people oriented person.”
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Working in Teams

Any one type will have an incomplete view of the situation. Only by combining with an opposite type will a full view be obtained.

Groups of the same type will get along better and make decisions faster but these decisions will lack the benefit of differing viewpoints and so are more likely to be flawed.

Groups of different types may experience personality conflict and will take longer to reach decisions but the decisions will usually be superior because of the differing viewpoints that went into them.

This is important enough to say again. If you want to make good decisions you need a rounded group. So if your group is missing types you should either find outsider advisors who can supply that type, or make a special effort to use their less used preferences to fill in the gap. This could take the form of discussing “what would an F think of this plan?”

Expect leadership roles to shift since different tasks require different abilities.

To reduce conflict appreciate and make use of your team members types will reduce conflict and increase decision quality.

Extroverts may dominate discussion and decision making unless they make a special effort to include introverts. Introverts need to make an effort to speak up.

To make a good decision the group needs to take facts into account (sensing), think of possibilities and future directions (intuitive), make sure there are no logical failings (thinking) and see that the decision is acceptable to the people it affects (feeling).

A warning: Type is an indicator of preference. People do not always act their type and should not be expected to. Well-developed individuals can use both types effectively although they will still have a preference. Therefore, just because someone clearly prefers thinking, do not assume they have undeveloped feeling. In addition, when people are tired and stressed they usually switch to their less developed preferences. Using type to put people in boxes of what they can/should/will do will create conflict.
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Notice the problem with the golden rule in the case of types? (Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.) A thinker who treats others as thinkers because that’s how they want to be treated will not get anywhere. Use the platinum rule instead:

*Treat others as they would like to be treated*

Use your knowledge of type to guess how they would like to be treated.
We Don’t Need Them... Oh, Yes you do....

Sensors need Intuitives:
to look into the future
to create new things
to keep an overview
to search for possibilities
to avoid oversimplification
for their ability to work in the future tense
for when bursts of energy are required

Intuitives need Sensors

to be focused on the now
to work with routines
to remember details
to work with here and now realities
to simplify tasks
for their fine grasp of reality
for when working steadily is required

Feelers need Thinkers:
to be logical in an impersonal manner
for organizing facts, ideas and situations
for questioning the logic of ideas so they improve
to persuade with logic
to change what needs it
to analyze the situation

to be concerned with truth and task

Thinkers need Feelers:
to bring the “human factor” into decisions
to build relationships
for questioning the people-impacts of ideas so they improve
to persuade with people skills
to be a peacemaker
to realize what the people involved think, feel and want
to be concerned with harmony and team

Extroverts need Introverts
to do “think it out before hand” testing
to stand back and consider
to focus on ideas
to be careful with details
to do long jobs (that they are interested in)

Introverts need Extroverts
to do “trial and error” testing
to jump in and get started
to focus on the outside world
to work fast

Perceivers need Judgers
to finish tasks quickly
to schedule
to end issues
to get started even when not much is known
to schedule projects and finish each step on time

Judgers need Perceivers
to gather enough information
to deal with the unexpected
to keep options open
to learn enough to know the big picture
to work well under heavy pressure
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To: Introverts  
Subject: Working with Extroverts

Remember that extroverts like to talk and may be uncomfortable with silences. If one of them is too intrusive find a gentle way to say you need some time to yourself. You’ll need to be assertive in conversation, especially in groups, because extroverts may assume that if you have something to say you’ll break in. (the exception is extrovert-feelers who may value harmony more than talking and will therefore seek everyone’s input.)

To: Extroverts  
Subject: Working with Introverts

Remember that introverts don’t like to talk as much as you do -- don’t expect them to. And while some introverts are happy to listen for long periods of time, others would prefer you to stop and be still for a while. You may be uncomfortable with silence, but the introvert is probably not.

If an introvert doesn’t respond immediately it doesn’t mean they are asleep or dislike your idea. They are probably just thinking. Remember that the material you process while you’re speaking, introverts process internally and silently. Allow them their silence without hurrying them or supplying thoughts.
To: Thinkers  
Subject: Working with Feelers

Remember that Feelers often take criticisms personally and dislike division between themselves and others. You should learn when a critical comment (including constructive criticism) is important to make and when you should just let it go. If they haven’t asked for your opinion they’re likely not looking for it. A suggestion for improvement can be taken that its not good enough already, so be careful if you’re trying to be helpful.

When you do decide to suggest or criticize, use a little sympathy and appreciation and don’t speak as if you have a lock on the truth. Talk about the points on which you agree before the points on which you disagree. Consider the difference between the following statements (and even if you don’t see much difference remember that a Feeler, and many Thinkers, will see a large one).

“I think you’re wrong because…”
“I can see how you’d feel that way but I think you’re probably wrong because….”

“John deserved to be thrown out.”
“Tough on John to be thrown out, but I think he deserved it.”

Supervisor to employee: “Change this section into a list and number them”
“The introduction is great. Please change this later section into a list and number them.”

“OK. Your next job is…” (from supervisor to employee)
“Thank you for doing this for me. Your next job is…”

This isn’t a suggestion to be fake or deceptive. In most cases you’ll be able to think of an honest complement or a bit of sympathy. A little sympathy and appreciation will win you big points when dealing with Feeling types.

The opposite side of criticism is praise. Many Feelers need more of it than you do. You need to tell them when you appreciate what they’ve done, or when you agree with them (this is especially against the nature of Introverted-Thinkers).

When presenting an idea to Feelers remember they’ll tend to judge all Thinking by their own underdeveloped Thinking. Use your Feeling (secondary function) to examine how your idea will make people feel and use it as part of your proposal. If you develop the habit of “feeling” for others reactions, then using that information as part of your logical decision, you’ll find your plans are better rounded and more acceptable to others.

Finally, if a Feeler (especially an Extroverted-Feeler) is presenting something to you, accept that they’ll probably take longer than you would and include information you wouldn’t. Be patient.
Step 16

To: Feelers
Subject: Working with Thinkers

Remember that Thinkers naturally tend to assume all Feeling is as undeveloped as their own. So if you can switch over to Thinking long enough to organize a logical argument for what seems obvious to you, you'll find Thinkers much more receptive to your ideas. Also keep in mind that Thinkers like things stated clearly and with only the necessary details. Avoid rambling and repeating yourself, especially when you're talking to an Introverted-Thinker who may prefer to think quietly to themselves.

Remain aware that a Thinker isn't meaning to attack you personally when they suggest changes to your ideas -- they do the same thing to their ideas. And speaking of hurt feelings remember that Thinkers still have emotions. They tend to take it especially badly if you reject one of their ideas without giving them logical reasons for it.

Thinkers reason from cause to effect and will usually appreciate the input of Feeling if it is presented as a cause, that will lead to an effect, and which they can put into their framework of logical decisions. Consider the difference between the following statements.

"Because giving a bonus is the right thing to do." (although "right" may be obvious to you, many Thinkers will respond "why is it right?")

"Because giving a bonus will make your employees happy and they'll work harder." (this the Thinker will understand very well because you have explained why it is "right" in a manner they understand.)

Alternately you could build a logical framework of ethics which showed that giving bonuses was "right". The "just because it IS!" may be what you're feeling but a thinker needs more analytical proof.
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To: Sensors
Subject: Working with Intuitives

When presenting an idea remember that intuitives are most interested in the main point. Have details ready but keep them in reserve. Try to excite the intuitive with the vision and possibilities of the idea, then provide details if they are asked for. If you’re offering a solution to a problem, show the intuitive your plan before you get them worked up about the problem. If they start on the problem they’ll be leaping to their own solutions before you have a chance to present yours.

Remember that an intuitives special skill is skipping to the end. Don’t be surprised if they’re often a step or seven ahead of your presentation. If they see where the idea is going don’t bore them with details -- skip to the end.

The intuitive who’s presenting an idea to you may seem to have ignored important facts, and may well have, but don’t dismiss the plan because of it. State the relevant facts as things to be considered, rather than a refutation, and most intuitives will happily work them into the plan.

To: Intuitives
Subject: Working with Sensors

If you want a sensor to accept an idea you need to present it in detailed form. Be realistic and avoid a “head in the clouds” accusation. Show the sensor that you’ve thought out the details and you’ve organized the facts to back up your idea.

A sensor doesn’t want to wait till the middle of your presentation before figuring out its purpose, they want to know before you start. So prove there is a problem before you offer a solution.

You may like listening to people jump from topic to topic but your sensing listener doesn’t. Stay on one subject until it is finished, then make the beginning of the next a clear beginning. Something like “you’re probably wondering how much this will cost” or “and now on to cost” works well. Don’t go overboard, “I just finished talking about the timeline, and now I’ll talk about cost.” sounds like you’re in a public speaking class.

Your sensing listener also likes to have thoughts finished -- the phrase “well, you can see where this is going, so I’ll go on to my next topic...” is infuriating to a sensor. Follow through to the end of an idea.
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Type and Conflict Resolution

1) View the conflict not as me-them, but as a partnership trying to create a solution.

2) Focus on what you can do to solve the conflict, not what the other person isn’t doing.

3) Try to guess the type of your partner and adjust accordingly.
   Remember that peoples type often flips when they are tired or stressed.
   **Intuitive-Sensing** - is one of you focused on the present and the other the future?
   Are you both working from the same type of information? (e.g. is the intuitive disregarding fact and the sensor disregarding possibility)
   **Feeling-Thinking** - are you basing your decisions on the same criterion? Are you being emotionally supportive enough of feelers? Are you being concise and logical enough for thinkers?

4) Decide what your goals are and how to help the other person understand them.
   If you don’t know what you want you’ll probably never get it. If a feeler can’t explain their goals logically a thinker will have trouble understanding. And if a thinker can’t use an emotional-relational appeal the feeler may not understand why they care so much.

5) Find out the other persons goals and together figure out what the conflict is actually about.
   **Is it content or relational?** Content disagreements are ideas or plans that conflict. Relational disagreement is a conflict over the relationship of the people. For example, a person who won’t back down may be saying “my opinion counts as much as yours” and not be concerned with the content level of the argument.
   **Are your goals actually compatible?** Sometimes when they talk about it people realize their goals aren’t incompatible. Maybe each person is attached to a certain aspect of their plans and the aspects can be combined as in step 7.

6) Honestly appreciate and understand the other persons goals by looking at it from their type.
   If you appreciate and understand their goals you’ll work more efficiently at finding a solution that satisfies both them and you.

7) Try to find a solution that satisfies everyone’s goals.
   This isn’t a compromise which involves both partners giving something up. It’s finding a plan that solves all the goals of both partners. Finding such a plan can be difficult and time-consuming (but worth it) and other times it’s easy. For example, the cold-logic goals of a thinker and the warm-relational goals of a feeler are often easy to solve in a single plan. You won’t always succeed at filling all the goals but you’ll both come out farther ahead, and much happier, than if you hadn’t tried.
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Activity #4: Case Studies

Purpose: Provide participants hands on experience with using types to solve conflicts.

Instructions:
1. As a group solve the following case study. It is not necessary to come to a consensus, instead, explore many possibilities. There is no right or wrong answer.
2. Remember the comment that learning application of type theory was more important than doing all the exercises? This is a good exercise to drop and have people discuss how they can adapt their communication to each other. Or, if the group has been having a conflict have them solve it using types.

The Iguana Hall Case

This case in an actual occurrence from a Hall Council I served on several years ago.

Hall meetings at Iguana hall last about an hour each. Around 20 people out of 120 residents come to each one and it tends to be the same people every time. The meeting has a friendly, relaxed air which is encouraged (and partly created) by its president. The president, Jon, doesn’t rush through things, throws in personal comments and anecdotes and takes any opportunity to compliment individuals. Everyone who wants a chance to speak is given one, and can speak as long as they want, the gavel is never used. People talk at length about programs that just occurred, reciting who came and what they did. The council has the feel of a group of friends getting together for a chat. When the meeting ends some people stay around to talk, others make a mad dash for their rooms, eager to turn to other tasks.

Other people, who come to council rarely, say that what feels like a group of friends on the inside feels like an exclusive clique from the outside. Some people say that if hall council wasn’t so long they would come. The VP, Sally, is one of these. She thinks the meetings should be shorter, more structured and more business-like. During an executive meeting the disagreement between her and Jon comes into the open.

Options:
1. Discuss solutions to the case as if you were an impartial third party.
2. Pretend you are the hall council in question and come to a resolution which satisfies everyone. Adapt your communication to the type of the person to whom you are speaking.
3. Pretend you are the hall council in question but on the F/T and J/P axis pretend to the type opposite what you are. (to “walk a mile in their shoes.”) Make a new name-card so everyone can remember what types people are playing. Again, adapt your communication to the type of the person you’re addressing.
Activity #5: Create a Case

Purpose: Teach types by having participants use them. Provide more hands on experience with solving cases.

Instructions:
1. As a group, create a case study in which types can be used to solve a problem. If there are other groups trade with them and solve their case. Otherwise solve your own if you haven’t already done so.
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APPENDIX A

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is not included with this course because it is copyrighted material. Paper versions of Jungian type indicators are available in the book *Please Understand Me* by David Keirsey and Marilyn Bates or from Western’s Career Center. For those with WWW access auto-scoring versions are available at the following addresses. Since the web changes so rapidly these links may or may not be active but they worked as of January 8, 1997.

**Keirsey Bates Versions**

http://www.keirsey.com

Homepage by David Keirsey. Includes Keirsey-Bates version and additional information on Jungian types. (This version does not self-score)

http://sunsite.unc.edu/iembin

http://sunsite.unc.edu/personality/keirsey.htm

**Other Versions**

http://mousetrap.ams.vt.edu/~plymale/mb/

126 question version, the original source of this material is unknown.
APPENDIX B

Reasons to be interested in training:
1. Reduce conflicts
2. Increase teamwork
3. Create better rounded ideas
4. Find strengths in others you didn’t know existed
5. Understand yourself better