DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 967 EA 022 666

AUTHOR	Mamchur, Carolyn
TITLE	How To Run Productive Meetings.
INSTITUTION	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Va.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-87120-178-X
PUB DATE	91
NOTE	36p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 125 N. West Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-2798 (ASCD Stock No. B9101; $6.95).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cognitive Processes; Cognitive Style; Decision Making; Efficiency; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluative Thinking; Extraversion Introversion; Group Dynamics; Interpersonal Relationship; Intuition; Leaders Guides; *Meetings; *Organizational Communication; Perception; *Personality Traits; *Psychological Characteristics; *Staff Meetings
IDENTIFIERS	*Jung (Carl G)

ABSTRACT

Carl Jung, the Swiss psychologist, developed a way to systematically examine eight basic tendencies toward which different types of people tend to gravitate: introversion or extraversion, sensing or intuition, thinking or feeling, and judging or perceiving. This booklet examines what these tendencies mean and how people with different characteristics often behave in meetings, why "opposites" may quite unintentionally aggravate each other, and how the people who run meetings can make the best use of these tendencies. A set of five statements is presented for each of the four groups of tendencies to allow readers to determine their own tendencies. The possible combinations of the 4 preferences results in 16 possible types. A chart briefly illustrates the uniqueness and commonality of the 16 types and is followed with instructions for using the chart. A discussion of four type interactions, described as the four temperaments, concludes the booklet. (MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328967

How to Run Productive Meetings

Carolyn Mamchur

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Mamchur
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ASCD

EA022666

How to Run Productive Meetings

Carolyn Mamchur

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Alexandria, Virginia

The Author

CAROLYN MAMCHUR is Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C., Canada V5A 1S6.

Copyright © 1991 by Carolyn Mamchur. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system without permission in writing from the author.

ASCD publications present a variety of viewpoints. The views expressed or implied in this publication should not be interpreted as official positions of the Association.

Printed in the United States of America.
Typeset on Xerox TM Ventura Publisher 2.0.
Printed by Automated Graphic Systems

Ronald S. Brandt, *Executive Editor*
Nancy Modrak, *Managing Editor, Books*
Stephanie Kenworthy, *Assistant Manager, Production Services*
Valerie Sprague, *Desktop Specialist*

$6.95
ASCD Stock No.: B9101
ISBN: 0-87120-178-X

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Mamchur, Carolyn Marie, 1943–
How to run productive meetings/Carolyn Mamchur.
p cm.
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 0-87120-178-X (pbk.): $6.95
1. Meetings—Handbooks, manuals, etc. I. Title.
AS6.M346 1991
658.4'56—dc20 90-26797
CIP

How to Run Productive Meetings

A Meeting of Minds 1

Focusing Energy: Introversion and Extraversion 3

Giving and Receiving Information: Sensing and Intuition 8

Making Decisions: Thinking and Feeling 13

Establishing Priorities: Perceiving and Judging 18

Putting It All Together 23

Motivation: A Final Key to Understanding 27

References 30

A Meeting of Minds

The Problem

IT IS FRIDAY AFTERNOON AND A TYPICAL STAFF MEETING IS IN progress at Mountain View High. Another at the local school board. A third at Burnaby Central school district office. The Mountain View principal, the chairman of the school board, and the superintendent all have something in common: They chair important meetings at which decisions have to be made. And they're all a bit worried. Will everyone show up? Will the key players participate? Will some dominate? Will everyone understand? Will they get done in time? Will everyone be involved? Will Wilma Windy go on and on about nothing? The principal, the chairman, and the superintendent are getting headaches. Two wish they could go sailing; one would rather be writing her brief.

At Mountain View High, staff members begin to file into the room, some already grumbling. The meeting starts. Some people talk. Some don't. Some argue. The issue on the table becomes bogged in misunderstanding. The meeting is over. Some leave angry. Some leave bored. Many wish they hadn't come.

What happened?

Misunderstanding is a major cause of meeting foul-ups. A famous example is Nikita Khrushchev's 1962 speech addressing the United Nations in New York. He emphatically told his audience, while pounding a shoe on the podium, that Russia would "bury" the Western capitalist countries. This statement was interpreted as a threat. The cold war convinced most Americans that the Russians meant to bomb the United States. What the phrase, in Russian, actually means is that Khrushchev believed the Soviet system would outlive the capitalist system. The pounding

of the shoe was a more rude than menacing display of Russian emphasis.

We do not need a cold war or a different culture to let misunderstandings lead us astray. The principal of Mountain View High wishes he could speed up things, make everyone understand, run a meeting so that everyone would agree—at least agree enough to come to some solid decisions and then live with them. He certainly would like to call meetings that his staff would want to come to, and that he, too, would find to be more positive. Typically, administrators spend 21 percent of their work day in unscheduled meetings and 17 percent in scheduled meetings. Imagine the stress level when those hours require expending negative energy and the sense of satisfaction when they are productive.

The Solution, In Theory

"Making everyone understand" is often a matter of understanding everyone. No simple task. Carl Jung, the Swiss psychologist, gave the world a very practical psychology whereby ordinary people could understand individual differences in one another. Jung developed a way to systematically examine eight basic tendencies toward which different types of people tend to gravitate: introversion or extraversion, sensing or intuition, thinking or feeling, and judging or perceiving.

In the following chapters, we take a look at what these tendencies mean and see how people with different characteristics often behave in meetings, why "opposites" may quite unintentionally aggravate each other, and how the people who run meetings can make the best use of these tendencies.

Focusing Energy: Introversion and Extraversion

ONE OF THE FIRST TENDENCIES IS THE WAY IN WHICH PEOPLE FOCUS their energies. From studying Freud and Adler, Jung came to the realization that one focused energy outward, the other inward. The inward flowing of energy, so preferred by Adler, Jung called *introversion*. People who direct energy inward tend to be reflective, introspective, and internally motivated. The outward flow of energy Jung called *extraversion*. Extraverts tend to be action-oriented, sociable, and externally motivated, as Freud was.

This orientation helps explain different behaviors that show up in staff meetings. The extravert speaks out in the meeting whenever she feels a need. She is outspoken, relaxed, and feels free to "butt in" whenever she has something to say. She is the person on the social committee who is not at all disturbed by changing the agenda; she reacts to immediate situations and feels content to send out memos instead of giving reports. She wants to take action concerning the situation at hand and make her opinion heard. She is also tuned in to the opinions and needs of others and is influenced by them.

The introvert, on the other hand, withdraws into silence, bothered by the noise and confusion and by the chairman's pushing and wanting to get on with it, thus giving the introvert no time to think before he acts. Even though he has some good ideas and even though the extravert may try to accommodate the introvert and encourage him to share his ideas, the introvert would rather let things be. He will keep his thoughts to himself, observing rather than participating.

The value held by one type varies quite dramatically from the value held by the opposite type. Introverts often, for example, sit smugly judging extraverts who seem to "run off at the mouth" and wonder why these extraverts don't think before they talk.

They do. They just do it *out loud*. The very same process of going over ideas, examining issues, and weighing consequences that the introvert does inside his head, the extravert does outside, in her favored external world.

Determining Your Preference

To determine your own tendency toward extraversion or introversion, complete the section of the Instant Insight Inventory* in Figure 1.

Figure 1
Instant Insight Inventory
Introverted and Extraverted Meeting Styles

For each set of statements, circle either A or B to indicate which statement is most like you.

1A. I answer a question quickly, sometimes without thinking.
B. I like to think about something before I offer an answer or an opinion.

2A. I use trial and error with confidence.
B. I like to deeply understand something before I try it.

3A. I need to find out what others expect of me.
B. I like to do things on my own.

4A. I get full of energy when I am around a lot of people, such as at a party.
B. I get tired when I am around a large group of people, and need to get away often to be by myself and collect my thoughts.

5A. I enjoy a lot of variety and action.
B. I enjoy a quiet place all my own where I can reflect uninterrupted.

If you circled A three or more times, your preference is for extraversion. If you circled B three or more times, your preference is for introversion.

* All excerpts of the Instant Insight Inventory are from C. Mamchur, *Insights* (Toronto: OISE, 1984).

Meeting Styles of Extraverts and Introverts

In dealing with extraverts and introverts in the work place, it helps to consider their different characteristics.

The extravert:

- Likes to think out loud
- Likes to speak up at meetings
- Is capable of spontaneous action
- Derives great pleasure from social occasions and group endeavors
- Likes a wide range of ongoing jobs and activities
- Finds stimulation in unexpected occurrences
- Is comfortable and proficient at off-the-cuff speaking in public
- Tests ideas by sharing them and thereby may be thought insubstantial or inconsistent

The introvert:

- Likes to reflect before speaking
- Often merely listens at meetings and carefully considers what others say
- Rarely reacts on the spur of the moment
- Is often content to work alone or with a trusted few
- Prefers to focus on one or two jobs at a time
- Likes to know ahead of time what is going to happen
- Is best at speaking publicly when well prepared and organized
- Often keeps his ideas to himself and thereby may be underestimated

Strategies for Dealing with Introvert and Extravert Differences in Meetings

The meeting chair can do much to cope with and optimize the differences between extraverts and introverts.

To deal with the extravert:

- Harness her energy in an orderly way by using her on committees or asking her to chair subcommittees.
- Remind her of the rules of order.
- Tactfully remind her that the needs of others and the logical protocol of a meeting require that she share the floor.

• For certain hot issues, draw up a list of speakers with a time limit for each so that the extravert doesn't dominate.

• Suggest that each person write down ideas before speaking to force the extravert to organize before orating.

• Suggest that not everyone is willing to simply "jump in and try it to see if it works."

• Give the extravert "talk time" in situations other than the formal meeting.

• Refrain from expecting the extravert to be on target at the beginning of discussions.

• Refrain from making the extravert feel stupid if she changes her mind during a discussion.

To deal with the introvert:

• Be sure he is comfortable with the group, since he surely won't speak up if he's uncomfortable.

• Ensure that the issue at hand is one the introvert is knowledgeable about or cares about before asking for his contribution.

• Use a perception check—"Mr. Introvert, are you happy with the library decision to let our students have one-half day per week to travel to Mission to compete in sports events?"

• Use wait time—"Does anyone have anything else to add?" and wait at least three seconds for a response.

• Circulate an agenda and any support materials before the meeting and request that people think about the issues and be prepared to share ideas.

• Be aware of the body language with which the introvert may be subtly signalling an urge to speak.

• Use an overt system of signals, like a green/red card for participants to signal the chair when they have or don't have an opinion to express.

Two general strategies may help both groups. The first is simply a rotation of the chairmanship, using an introverted chair at least half the time. The second strategy is a bit more radical. If the topic of the meeting is highly debatable and important, it's worth the effort of having the extraverts meet first, separately, for a general discussion. Invite the introverts, but don't require or expect them to come. Tape the session, and let the introverts view it on their own, when they can "fast forward" any boring

sections. This strategy allows everyone to be involved in a way that best suits how they process and clarify emotion-laden information.

Giving and Receiving Information: Sensing and Intuition

A SECOND IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PEOPLE MADE CLEAR by Jung's system is the way individuals give and receive information and instruction.

One is a *sensing* orientation. The sensing type, paying keen attention to the facts at hand, has a direct line to reality. He is practical, focused on the here and now, and enjoys using skills that bring immediate results. He trusts experience most of all, sticking to the tried and true. His opposite, the *intuitive* type, tends to stress the imagined side of the personality, focusing on what might be, rather than concentrating on what is. She enjoys seeing relationships and possibilities and the theories behind ideas. Often this type has difficulty communicating in the direct and linear fashion that is easily followed by others in a meeting.

It is the sensing type who brings the group to the reality of the present moment in the meeting, reminding everyone of the facts presented in the agenda and of the commonsense approach to the problem at hand. The intuitive is not always appreciative of this commonsense approach, and she's apt to protest with such statements as, "We can't get stuck in the bureaucracy!" "But, you're missing the main point." "What *are* the issues here?"

The intuitive has an innate willingness to move things into the future, to find alternative solutions, and to move from topic to topic. This postponement and "jumping from idea to idea" distresses others who want to deal with one thing at a time. Moreover, she may bring in too many seemingly unrelated issues, like discussing the *way* the

meetings are run. This is just far too nebulous and impromptu for many staff members.

In their frustration, others may ignore the intuitive's very creative notion that the group consider a more flexible way of organizing discussion, and that a new process could affect all decisions, not merely the crucial one at hand.

Determining Your Preference

To determine your tendency toward sensing or intuition, mplete the section of the Instant Insight Inventory Figure 2.

Figure 2
Instant Insight Inventory
Intuitive and Sensing Meeting Styles

For each set of statements, circle either A or B to indicate which statement is most like you.

1A. I enjoy looking at details and seeing proof that things are really as they appear to be.
B. I tend to skim over details and look for hidden meanings in things.

2A. I enjoy checking, inspecting, and reading the fine print to find out all the information I can.
B. I become impatient with routine, repetition, and slow, precise activities.

3A. I enjoy things as they are, recall past events, and learn from the combination of these two in a "commonsense" sort of way.
B. In a flash of insight, I go with my "hunches" on many things.

4A. It would be fairly accurate to describe me as being realistic and practical.
B. It would be fairly accurate to describe me as being imaginative and inventive.

5A. I rarely rely on inspiration to keep me going.
B. I have a lot of bursts of energy, with slack periods in between.

If you circled A three or more times, your preference is for sensing. If you circled B three or more times, your preference is for intuition.

Meeting Styles of Sensing and Intuitive Types

In helping sensing and intuitive types to better understand one another and to make the best use of the strengths of each, it is important to be aware of their different approaches to processing information.

The Sensing Type:

- Likes working with facts and details
- Prefers jobs using traditional methods
- Likes to follow an agenda
- Needs to see and understand practical implications of what's going on
- Likes working with tangible materials
- Wants to know what, where, when, and how
- Trusts experience and tested standard procedures
- Is more concerned with immediate results
- Focuses on specifics
- Is keenly observant
- Has the most realistic, practical view of the present

The intuitive type:

- Scans issues, preferring to work with theories and hypotheses
- Is easily bored with straightforward issues; prefers the complex, the symbolic, and the abstract
- Is able to abandon the agenda
- Needs to see the whole vision
- Likes working with possibilities and ideas
- Needs to understand the crucial issue at stake
- Trusts flashes of insight
- Directs energy toward future possibilities
- Scans the general picture
- Is aware of underlying meanings
- Has clearest vision of the future

As they begin to recognize sensing and intuitive types in meetings, administrators may be surprised to hear both types voice similar complaints: "What's the point?" "What's the bottom line?" "What are you going on and on about?"

The point for the sensing type is often the practical realities involved in the decision. For the intuitive, it's more

often the examination of patterns and relationships behind decisions.

The bottom line for the sensing person is often a dollars and cents concern: "How many students will benefit and at what per-student cost?" The intuitive bottom line is the issue at stake: "Do schools have a responsibility to provide a liberal arts education for every student?"

While sensing types will go on and on about details, intuitives will emphasize all the events and ideas related to what they see to be the issue at stake.

Strategies for Dealing with Sensing and Intuitive Differences in Meetings

To deal with the sensing type:

- Use him to provide facts and details.
- Use him as group secretary.
- Make sure the agenda is clear.
- Discourage the sensing type from inhibiting discussion of theory or philosophy by asking him to be recorder or fact finder.
- Ignore the sensing type who becomes impatient and wants to stick strictly to pragmatic issues.
- Heed the sensing type if the group tends to be getting nowhere on practical matters.

To deal with the intuitive type:

- Allow some time on the agenda for "play" or brainstorming and creative input on any subject that has long-range implications.
- Defer critical judgment of the intuitive's contributions until later.
- Give her plenty of opportunity to contribute various ideas before evaluating them.
- Don't demand that the intuitive provide specific details of implementation.
- Refrain from dismissing her inspirations if they do not have immediate specific support.

A wise chairman should recognize that both types can be excellent team members, each one supplying what the other lacks. The sensing type can provide details, make

keen observations, record and relate back to the group exactly *what* has happened. The intuitive type, on the other hand, can scan what might be coming up, deal with underlying issues, make forecasts, and offer innovative solutions. These projected solutions can then be turned over to the practical, sensing type who examines them to see what can be realistically accomplished in a given time frame. Both types do well in tossing back and forth the ball of practicality and possibility and adding what they can at different stages of development.

Making Decisions: Thinking and Feeling

AT THIS POINT IN THE THEORY, ADMINISTRATORS OFTEN BEGIN TO feel confident that they understand the Jungian system. They see some practical and precise ways to orchestrate this information in order to have better control over what's happening. And then the theory throws them a curve—it deals with the way people make decisions. Because this involves a conflict between logic and values, it is far more difficult to deal with.

The analytical and objective approach to making decisions is called the *thinking* approach. Thinking types tend to stand back and look at situations with a cool head. Most people believe this is the best and the only rational way to make decisions. Thinking types especially believe this.

Jung presents another equally acceptable and rational approach to problem solving: subjectively weighing the values involved. *Feeling* types consider what is right and wrong, good or bad. The effects on how thinkers and feelers behave and on how individuals interact because of these different approaches to making decisions become quite apparent.

This theory explains, for example, why a thinking type can sometimes be so quickly and brutally critical of a feeling type's suggestions at meetings. Criticism is a natural tendency growing out of objective analysis. The thinker does not even hear the feeler's voice shake with hurt emotion as she tries to defend her view that enhancing school spirit is as important to student success as spending time in class listening to lectures, and can be accomplished as well in a drama class as on a football field.

The thinker is faintly aware that the feeling type seems responsive to the feelings and needs of others in meetings, and although he often wishes he had this facilitative skill, he's not sure why she *always* bothers.

The feeling type is so often hurt by the thinker's critical attack on her and his generally brusque manner that she is unaware of his excellent ability to handle difficult situations with logic and expediency.

In any event, the wise chairperson knows better than to expect thinking types to always be cool and rational. Ironically, although thinking types value objective rationality, under stress they can erupt with sudden and harsh emotion. Feeling types, too, under pressure can lose all empathy and become rigid and judgmental. All types, when really stressed, can act on their "opposite" preference. And when they do, they demonstrate the worst aspects of that preference. Jungians refer to this as working in the "shadow" or "inferior" function.

Determining Your Preference

To determine whether you are primarily a thinking type or a feeling type, complete the section of the Instant Insight Inventory in Figure 3.

Figure 3
Instant Insight Inventory
Thinking and Feeling Meeting Styles

For each set of statements, circle either A or B to indicate which statement is most like you.

1A. Much of what I do is ruled by my need for justice.
B. Harmony is one of the most important aspects of my life.

2A. I try to logically analyze all the facts in making a decision.
B. In making a decision, I think of what is best for all the people involved.

3A. I consider fair and honest criticism to be a natural, acceptable part of human relationships.
B. I avoid confrontation and feel very uncomfortable giving or receiving criticism.

4A. I know lots of people who are too soft-hearted and emotional to make good decisions.
B. I have my feelings hurt by people who tend to analyze or make cold statements when understanding is what I am looking for.

5A. It's often difficult for me to freely express my emotions.
B. I find it easy to express my feelings and to understand others' feelings.

If you circled A three or more times, you prefer the thinking approach to decision making. If you circled B three or more times, your preference is for the feeling approach.

Meeting Styles of Thinking and Feeling Types

Although it is more difficult to see, a pattern begins to emerge in the way these types approach decision making.

The thinking type:

- Sometimes chooses to be flexible, as required by the situation
- Can appear unemotional and aloof
- Seeks clarity through logical analysis
- Makes decisions based on objective evidence
- Is task-oriented, then people-concerned
- Believes that fair play is based on rules
- Measures choice against results
- Seeks cause-and-effect relationships
- Needs to keep discussion within the boundaries of his rational system
- Is indifferent to persuasion; allows logic to speak for itself
- Is skeptical
- Values giving objective, constructive criticism
- Enjoys most the technical aspects of a project
- Needs to feel competent

The feeling type:

- May be committed to a tradition
- Often shows warmth and caring or hurt or anger
- Seeks harmony through shared beliefs
- Makes decisions based on personal values and beliefs
- Is people-concerned, then task-oriented
- Believes fair play is based on values
- Measures choice against values

- Seeks to determine personal motives
- Seeks to explore "rightness and wrongness" of issues
- Is motivated and skillful at convincing others of the worth of a project
- Is accepting
- Takes all criticism personally
- Enjoys most the human aspects of a project
- Is susceptible to feeling undervalued

Strategies for Dealing with Thinking and Feeling Differences in Meetings

Knowing these differences, the meeting chair can try to maximize the thinker's wonderful analytical ability and the feeling type's facilitative skills in dealing with people.

To deal with the thinking type:

- Ask her advice on issues needing objective choices.
- Intercede to defuse her critical remarks.
- Use her to steer the meeting back on track when it goes off task.
- Ask for her help with problems that involve logical analysis of facts.
- Use her to explore efficiency and suggest improvements.
- Use her to help design agendas.
- Help her feel competent.
- Give her all the knowledge and information she needs to act rationally.
- Present data and issues in a cause-and-effect fashion.
- Stick to the issues under discussion.
- Be ready to debate.
- Be honest and fair.

To deal with the feeling type:

- Ask his advice on issues related to values.
- Use him to explore others' concerns about a decision or choice.
- Make sure the agenda includes time to explore values.
- Employ him to promote harmony within the group when the mood becomes unfriendly.
- Use him to convince others of the worth of a project.

- Begin debates with points on which there is agreement.
- Stress cooperation.
- Put feeling types in charge of committees that need to be handled with decorum.

Any meeting chair will have to use her own judgment about when to elicit the contributions of the thinking and the feeling types. She may need to first ask the feeling type to clarify the goals of the group, then employ the thinking type to logically analyze how these may or may not be attained. The chair should steer the thinking type away from making direct critical comments about feeling types' contributions.

Establishing Priorities: Perceiving and Judging

ISABEL MYERS, AN AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGIST AND RESEARCHER AND developer of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI*), adapted Jung's system to add a most clarifying dimension to the understanding of individual differences. She added the way in which individuals establish priorities. This dimension has been called a *perceiving* and *judging* interface with the environment.

In the perceiving approach, the person puts a priority on getting as much information as possible. This often sends him on many tangents of discovery. His interests do not always result in completion of tasks, but in an exploration of ideas or facts. The perceiving type hates to be tied down to a schedule or an agenda, wants things "left open," and can put off closure almost indefinitely.

Many chairpersons smile at this description, recognizing such people on their staffs. Many of them also wish they could change the perceiving type's behavior. Interestingly, over 80 percent of administrators in North American school districts who have used the MBTI scored as judging types.

Judging types often mistakenly believe that perceiving types have no plan or schedule in mind when going about their business. This is not the case! What perceiving types have is a *secret* plan, a secret agenda. The reason they don't make it known is that they don't want to be held to it. They want to be free to change it as they go along. This change is neither a selfish seeking of "what's best for me" nor an arbitrary noncommitment. Instead, it's a desire to respond

* The MBTI is a 166-item forced-answer questionnaire designed to determine psychological type. It has a reliability of .86. Available from the Centre for the Application of Psychological Type, Gainesville, Florida.

to each new situation as it occurs, and to adjust plans if necessary.

A helpful way to look at how perceivers and judgers operate is to understand that perceivers need an open door policy to have a joie de vivre, a reason to be alive. Judging types need a structure and plans in order to feel safe.

Judging types, very different from perceiving types, have a strong need to have issues clarified and resolved. This type wants to set the ship on a certain course and steer directly toward it.

Unless a course of action is decided upon, the judging type flounders. "Things ought to be a certain way," and the judging type usually knows what that way is. Having decided on a best way, the judging type organizes, makes plans and schedules, and completes the task at hand.

What this type must remember, however, is that perceiving types do *not* do their best in these "restrictive" arrangements. If the judging type can be logically convinced of the need of a more flexible approach for some people, she can usually fit that notion into her schema.

The administrator applying this system can understand the judging type's need for agendas, closure, and for sticking to the rules; she can also recognize others' needs for flexibility and open discussion. The solution, of course, is not to abandon all formality in pursuit of satisfying the more adaptive mode required by perceiving types. The solution lies in knowing which rules really mandate close adherence, and knowing how to structure flexibility into the overall agenda.

Determining Your Preference

To determine your preference for judging or perceiving, complete the section of the Instant Insight Inventory in Figure 4.

Figure 4
Instant Insight Inventory
Perceiving and Judging Meeting Styles

For each set of statements, circle either A or B to indicate which statement is most like you.

1A. I like to be in control of the events in my life and make them "the way they ought to be."
B. I need to understand thoroughly the events in my life and therefore spend more time than I should in making decisions.

2A. Once I make up my mind, I find it difficult to change it.
B. I put off decision making as long as possible and change my mind often.

3A. I like schedules and some definite order or system to regulate the way I do things.
B. I prefer to live by an easygoing, flexible pattern.

4A. I choose work to come before play when I organize my time and priorities.
B. Meeting deadlines are mad-rush affairs for me because of my "There's plenty of time" attitude.

5A. I most enjoy friends who share my ideals and standards and are true to them.
B. I choose friends who have interests similar to mine and with whom I can share common experiences.

If you circled A three or more times, your preference is for the judging pattern. If you circled B three or more times, you prefer the perceiving pattern.

Meeting Styles of Judging and Perceiving Types

Again, meeting chairs can consider the characteristics of each type in the work place.

The judging type:

- Seeks resolution
- Likes clear-cut problems
- Dislikes ambiguity
- Is well organized
- May make decisions too quickly
- Operates on a schedule
- Desires to enact
- Needs closure
- Is decisive

- Is resistant to change
- Is directive

The perceiving type:

- Seeks information
- Enjoys open-ended questions
- Tolerates ambiguity
- Does not give organization a top priority
- May put off deciding altogether
- Works according to the requirements of the data
- Desires to know
- Sees no need to have all things decided or completed
- Is open, curious, responsive
- Is alert to change
- Is adaptive

Strategies for Dealing with Judging and Perceiving Differences in Meetings

Knowing these differences, meeting chairmen can use the following strategies.

To deal with the judging type:

- Distinguish between issues that must be decided right away and those that can be mulled over or postponed, and encourage judging types to concentrate their decisive impulses on the first category.
- Make sure that the judging type has a good information base on which to decide. Both sensing-perceiving and intuitive-perceiving types are good at gathering information and could be given the responsibility of researching relevant facts and issues for the meeting.
- Prepare a clear agenda to satisfy his need for order and system, but include areas of flexibility in this system.
- Be aware of the judging type's area of expertise and heed his decisions in these areas.
- Remind impatient judging types that they may not be well-informed enough to decide as quickly as they wish in areas outside their expertise.

• Use the judging type's talents to organize the group, help create the agenda, and put the resolutions of the meeting into action.

To deal with the perceiving type:

• Provide her with plenty of advance organizers to give her the chance to gather lots of information.

• Initiate discussion at one meeting and allow time for reflection and investigation before concluding at a later meeting.

• Make sure the agenda tends to those methods of delaying closure that will satisfy the judging and thinking types.

• Present specific time limits to the perceiving type to compel her to prepare for a decision.

• Supply her with lots of information sources—written materials, experts, and discussion periods.

• Start by paying attention to the concerns of the perceivers, who are good at seeing the need for information, and for desiring to understand ramifications; *then* listen to the judging types who will be eager to find a way to closure. These two tendencies need to be balanced.

• Give the perceiver opportunity to explore ideas and value process.

• Create opportunities for spontaneous, unplanned pleasure to be associated with meetings.

Putting It All Together

THE PRECEDING CHAPTERS MAY SOUND AS THOUGH PEOPLE TEND to exhibit one preference only— either extraversion or introversion, sensing or intuition, thinking or feeling, or judging or perceiving. In reality, no one projects just *one* of these aspects of personality. We all behave out of a preference for a combination of these factors, resulting in 16 possible types:

ISTJ	Introverted Sensing Thinking Judging Type
ISFJ	Introverted Sensing Feeling Judging Type
INFJ	Introverted Intuitive Feeling Judging Type
INTJ	Introverted Intuitive Thinking Judging Type
ISTP	Introverted Sensing Thinking Perceiving Type
ISFP	Introverted Sensing Feeling Perceiving Type
INFP	Introverted Intuitive Feeling Perceiving Type
INTP	Introverted Intuitive Thinking Perceiving Type
ESTP	Extraverted Sensing Thinking Perceiving Type
ESFP	Extraverted Sensing Feeling Perceiving Type
ENFP	Extraverted Intuitive Feeling Perceiving Type
ENTP	Extraverted Intuitive Thinking Perceiving Type
ESTJ	Extraverted Sensing Thinking Judging Type
ESFJ	Extraverted Sensing Feeling Judging Type
ENFJ	Extraverted Intuitive Feeling Judging Type
ENTJ	Extraverted Intuitive Thinking Judging Type

Each type has its own unique combination of the four preferences. And each type shares preferences in common with other types. The description in Figure 5 illustrates the uniqueness and commonality of the 16 types.

Figure 5
Brief Description of the 16 Types

ENTJ	ISFP
Intuitive, innovative *organizer;* aggressive, analytic, systematic; more tuned to new ideas and possibilities than to people's feelings.	Observant, loyal *helper;* reflective, realistic, empathetic, patient with details, gentle and retiring; shuns disagreement, enjoys the moment.
ESTJ	**INFP**
Fact-minded, practical *organizer;* aggressive, analytic, systematic; more interested in getting the job done than in people's feelings.	Imaginative, independent *helper;* reflective, inquisitive, empathetic, loyal to ideals; more interested in possibilities than practicalities.
INTP	**ESFJ**
Inquisitive *analyzer;* reflective, independent, curious; more interested in organizing ideas than situations or people.	Practical *harmonizer* and worker with people; sociable, orderly, opinioned; conscientious, realistic, and well tuned to the here and now.
ISTP	**ENFJ**
Practical *analyzer;* values exactness, more interested in organizing data than situations or people; reflective, a cool and curious observer of life.	Imaginative *harmonizer* and worker with people; sociable, expressive, orderly, opinioned, conscientious, curious about new ideas and possibilities.

ESTP	INFJ
Realistic adapter in the world of material things; good natured, tolerant, easygoing; oriented to practical, firsthand experience; highly observant of details.	People-oriented *innovator* of ideas; serious, quietly forceful and persevering; concerned with the common good, with helping others develop.
ESFP	**INTJ**
Realistic adapter in human relationships; friendly and easy with people, highly observant of their feelings and needs; oriented to practical, firsthand experience.	Logical, critical, and decisive *innovator* of ideas; serious, intent, highly independent, concerned with organization; determined and often stubborn.
ISTJ	**ENFP**
Analytical *manager of facts and details*; dependable, decisive, painstaking, and systematic; concerned with systems and organizations, stable and observant.	Warmly enthusiastic *planner of change*; imaginative and individualistic; pursues inspiration with impulsive energy, seeks to understand and inspire others.
ISFJ	**ENTP**
Sympathetic *manager of facts and details*; concerned with others' welfare; dependable, painstaking, and systematic; stable and conservative.	Inventive, analytical *planner of change*; enthusiastic and independent; pursues inspiration with impulsive energy, seeks to understand and inspire others.

Copyright © 1982 by Gordon Lawrence; reprinted with permission.

Using the Chart

Now that you have determined your orientations (extraverted or introverted), your functions (sensing or intuitive; thinking or feeling) and your interface (judging or perceiving), your overall type begins to emerge in a skeletal form—ENTP, ISFP, and so forth.

If you are uncertain about your preferred type, look again at Figure 5. Your "total shadow" or opposite type is listed in the column opposite your own letters. Suppose you think you're an ENFP; your total shadow type is an ISTJ. The ISTJ is found to the left of the ENFP descriptor. E is always opposite I, S is opposite N, T is opposite F, and J is opposite P. The "opposite" of you in this context is called your shadow type. This shadow is what you are *least* like: the way in which you would find it most difficult and energy-consuming to function. This is often a helpful strategy in finally choosing your pattern. If you agree that you are much like the descriptors of your type and very unlike your shadow type, then probably you have accurately determined your type from this short questionnaire. If you disagree with the description in Figure 5, then the descriptors may not be right for you. Psychological type is only a description of *preferences*, it is not the self. You know yourself best and should trust your own judgment.

We each act out of the interaction of the combination of the preferences. Despite the fact that most of us do demonstrate a strong, single preference at various times, the most powerful differences and similarities in psychological patterning come from the interplay of these individual attributes. An extraverted sensing thinking judging type, for example, is very different from an extraverted sensing thinking perceiving type because of the way judging and perceiving affect *all the other* preferences. The sensing function behaves differently because of the perceiving or judging factor. For the perceiving type, sensing is the most trusted function. For the judging type, thinking is the most trusted function.

My intent isn't to show the intricacy of the differences, and the interplay of the preferences, but to show that they exist. A deeper understanding of type allows an even more complex and more effective way of dealing with individual differences.

Motivation: A Final Key to Understanding

OF ALL THE TYPE INTERACTIONS ONE MAY CHOOSE TO EXAMINE, four stand out as essential. These have been described by Keirsey and Bates (1978) as the four temperaments.

The first temperament comes from a combination of Sensing and Judging, often a preference of school administrators. A commonly recognized trait of this combination of sensing and judging (SJ) is a deep sense of *responsibility*. Keirsey calls such people the conservers of society. They honor institutions, traditions, and systems. They are motivated by a deeply rooted feeling of *duty*. This type, in meetings, has a strong need to get things settled, to do the "right" thing for the institution and the people for whom the institution is responsible.

A second temperament, rarely found in school administrators, is that found in the Sensing Perceiving (SP) types. The combination of these two preferences gives the SP person a strong drive to be in on the *process* and to ensure that *flexibility*, *adaptatibility*, and openness are part of the agenda. In meetings this type often demonstrates a strong motivational force that seems opposed to that of the conserving, closure-oriented SJ type. It is essential for both types to realize that the "opposition" is not vindictive or destructive. It is not really personal, except in the sense that it comes from the persons, and moves naturally, instinctively. Recognition of these basic motivational differences is essential if types are to coexist in educational settings.

A third combination of preferences described by Keirsey is the Intuitive Feeling (NF) combination. This type is often called the *enthusiastic innovator* and can be seen as opposing the SJ's need for preservation. NFs are motivated

by a need to be *unique* and to keep their *integrity*. As a result, they are persuasive and creative, full of ideas, and sometimes have fairly extreme or off-beat plans for how the system, the meeting, or the issue could be explored and improved.

A final combination emerges out of the union of Intuition and Thinking (NT). This type seems to present less of a problem to SJ administrators. Working on the basis of *cause* and *effect*, in an *analytical* mode, the NT is motivated by a need for knowledge and competence. *Knowledge* enables people to understand in order to achieve competence and thereby control situations—as opposed to allowing ignorance to control situations and individuals. In meetings, NT persons are insistent on gathering information, clarifying ideas, and working in a *systematic*, *logical*, and competent manner.

Each temperament focuses energy and attention in a different arena:

- conserving for the Sensing Judging type
- processing for the Sensing Perceiving type
- innovating for the Intuitive Feeling type
- knowing for the Intuitive Thinking type

Awareness of these differences in motivation can help any chairperson understand sources of real irritation and natural opposition of purpose among staff members. By examining the differences among the preferences, administrators can discover what a wealth of opportunity is available to them if they can learn to channel all of these various gifts.

In meetings, the surfacing of certain key and opposing characteristics based on any of these traits and their combinations may become a visible source of frustration for any chairperson. Understanding these differences by examining them *one at a time* provides the chairperson with a systematic and effective way to reduce stress, harmonize the group, and maximize the potential gifts each type has to offer.

It is important, too, for those attending meetings to become aware of type differences. By understanding ourselves, we can appreciate the differences in others. With an understanding of differences comes a prizing of aspects

of personality that are foreign to our own natures. Instead of posing a threat, differences provide a complement, an approach often needed but difficult to achieve on our own.

Understanding certainly beats arguing, not listening, getting angry, dissolving into indecision. How many hours have been wasted in nonproductive meetings? Perhaps knowledge of type can reduce that wasted, hapless energy. Perhaps knowledge of type can help the administrator hold meetings people will want to attend because they feel listened to and understood.

References

Keirsey, D., and M. Bates. (1978). *Please Understand Me.* Del Mar, Calif.: Prometheus Nemesis Books.

Lawrence, G. (1982). *People Types & Tiger Stripes* (2nd ed.). Gainesville, Fla.: Center for the Application of Psychological Type.

Leithwood, K. (1986). "The Principal Profile and Planned Educational Change: A Resource Package." Workshop presentation at the Academy of Principals Summer Seminar, Vancouver Island, British Columbia.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development