

Temperament Talk of “Managers Chosen as Leaders” in a Family Owned Corporation: From Descriptors to Dialogue

Anna Carol Lampe, Rockhurst University

A workshop built on temperament theory will not solve the financial woes of a company. Nevertheless, a workshop designed and based solely on temperament theory or research can diminish its outcomes. If an organization wants to change its current ways of believing, knowing, and doing, replicating the workshop’s impersonal dialogue process can help facilitate the change. At Celebration, Inc. dialogue proved to be more powerful than descriptors especially when embedded in workshop content.

Celebration, Inc. is a privately held American corporation that helps people celebrate every day and special occasions. The manufacturing company produces more than 12,000,000 million products a day in 20 major product lines and distributes them in nearly 100 countries. Consumers buy its products in more than 40,000 different stores including stores that carry the name Celebrate!, drug stores, superstores, and grocery stores.

Celebrations, Inc. had failed to meet several of its financial targets. The CEO decided that the company needed a new management team and brought in the Management Succession team of the Human Resource Division (HR) to facilitate the selection. This team believed that senior management had chosen the current management team based solely on performance and likeability and that a preponderance of the same personality temperament had contributed to groupthink, one-dimensional decision-making, and an unbalanced organizational leadership culture.

Research indicated that high performing organizations had cultures that included all four temperaments (Demarest, 1995) and as many different personality types as possible. This time the Management Succession team deliberately ensured a more balanced team of personality temperaments. It identified 218 “managers chosen as leaders” who the members believed would do a superior job of leading the company through significant marketplace and organizational changes. These high performing individuals represented nearly all 16 personality types (see Table 1). In less than two months, the Management Succession team had completed its assignment, and the Learning and Development team began to prepare the straw man for the workshop content that would ready the new management team.

Table 1: Type Representation in “Managers Chosen As Leaders” vs. CPP Sample vs. Keirsey Base Population Sample

ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ
Study: 16.0%	Study: 3.0%	Study: 5.0%	Study: 6.0%
CPP: 17.0%	CPP: 3.4%	CPP: 1.9%	CPP: 10.0%
Base: 11.6%	Base: 13.8%	Base: 1.5%	Base: 2.1%
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP
Study: 4.0%	Study: 1.0%	Study: 6.9%	Study: 6.0%
CPP: 3.4%	CPP: 1.2%	CPP: 2.7%	CPP: 6.6%
Base: 5.4%	Base: 8.8%	Base: 4.4%	Base: 3.3%
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP
Study: 3.0%	Study: 0.1%	Study: 7.0%	Study: 7.0%
CPP: 3.2%	CPP: 1.4%	CPP: 5.1%	CPP: 8.1%
Base: 4.3%	Base: 8.5%	Base: 8.1%	Base: 3.2%
ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ
Study: 15.0%	Study: 6.0%	Study: 4.0%	Study: 11.0%
CPP: 15.8%	CPP: 3.6%	CPP: 3.4%	CPP: 13.1%
Base: 8.7%	Base: 12.3%	Base: 2.5%	Base: 1.8%

Sources: Business Research Manager; Schaubhut, N. & Thompson, R. 2008. MBTI type tables for occupations. Mountain View, CA: CPP; Keirsey, D. & Bates, M. 1978. Please understand me: Character and temperament types (3rd Ed.). Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Books.

On a Monday morning, several members of the Human Resource Division sat around a table to hear the Learning and Development (L&D) team's vision of the workshop content. Celebration, Inc. had invested heavily in the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®), and all of HR agreed that each of the four workshops would be comprised of people who shared the same temperament (Keirsey, 1978). The L&D team members, who had administered and interpreted the MBTI® sessions to over 2500 employees, were adamant they could develop content specific to each workshop simply by referencing the materials they used in their type and temperament workshops (Myers and McCaulley, 1992; Demarest, 1995; Hirsch and Kummerow, 1998), coupled with additional research and literature of consultants and theorists (Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Garden, 1988; Barr and Barr, 1989; Montgomery, 1989, 1990, 1993; Isachsen and Berens, 1995; Keirsey, 1998; Bridges, 2000; Engler, 2003; Michael 2003) that lined their library shelves. The Organizational Development team members, part of the Human Resource Division who also sat at the table, were not so convinced. They did not believe that the literature and descriptors could adequately take into account either Celebrations' culture or the personal experiences of the members of the new management team. After a great deal of discussion, the meeting ended with agreement from the L&D team members to take a step back, ask the Celebrations' Business Research Division to conduct some qualitative research, and validate whether the way the new leaders "talked" about change and leadership mirrored that of the descriptors in the research and literature that the team intended to use.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Managers and Leaders

Most scholars and researchers agree that managers and leaders are different. According to Alan Murray (2010), "The manager's job is to plan, organize, and coordinate. The leader's job is to inspire and motivate." Lee Barr and Norma Barr (1989) differentiated leadership from management this way: "Management affects work; leadership affect people." Warren Bennis (1989) composed a list of the differences: "The manager administers; the leader innovates. The manager is a copy; the leader is an original. The manager maintains; the leader develops." Richard Pascale (1990) defined the differences this way: "Managers think incrementally, whilst leaders think radically. Managers do things right, while leaders do the right things."

For the purpose of this research, the author used the words "managers" and "leaders" interchangeably. The CEO of Celebrations, Inc. made this determination when in a meeting he verbalized that the Human Resource Division had chosen "managers who already or would assume the top leadership positions in the company."

Type and Temperament

Scholars and organizational theorists have advanced countless theories of leadership. Two of the theories used to understand leadership are those of type and temperament. They allow others to understand leaders, leaders to understand others, and leaders to understand themselves. Whereas much research has documented how type and temperament differ among leaders (Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Barr and Barr, 1989; Keirsey, 1998; Montgomery, 1989, 1990, 1993; Keirsey and Choiniere, 1992; Stavrou et al., 2005; Grant et al., 2011), little research exists as to how leaders "talk" about what they do and how they do it.

Sorting and classifying people according to their temperaments began thousands of years ago. A great many classificatory schemes for temperament based on human behavior have surfaced throughout history, dating back to such men as Hippocrates, Plato, and Aristotle. One of the earliest methods of sorting and classifying was a theory devised by Hippocrates. Based on his own observations and logic, Hippocrates suggested that the four bodily fluids were at the root of all health and personality (Jones, 1931). Nearly 1700 years later, the German philosopher Immanuel Kant popularized these ideas by organizing the constructs along the two axes of feelings and activity (Engler, 2003).

During the 1800s, the psychologist Wilhelm Wundt (Blumenthal, 2001) proposed that the four temperaments fell along the axes of changeability and emotionality. The philosopher, Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, introduced his famous distinction between the Apollonian (rational) element in human nature and the Dionysian (passionate) element (Nietzsche et al., 1872). Another philosopher, Erich Adickes (1907), divided man into four worldviews: dogmatic, agnostic, traditional, and innovative.

Carl G. Jung, a Swiss psychiatrist, introduced the theory of psychological type in the 1920s. Jung discussed the various aspects of consciousness and the attitudes that the mind might take toward the world in his book, *Psychological Types* (Jung and Baynes, 1921). Shortly after the publication of the book, Ernst Kretschmer (1925) identified abnormal behaviors by temperaments: hyperesthetic, anesthetic, melancholic and hypomanic. Three years later, Eduard Spränger (1928) identified six human values that set apart people: religious, theoretic, economic, social, political, and artistic.

Katharine Briggs and Isabel Myers, mother and daughter, both astute observers of human behavior, put to practical use the preferences from Carl Jung's typological theories. During the 1940s, they developed and published their instrument, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®) that identified 16 personality types (Saunders, 1995). Since then, the MBTI® has evolved and been perfected through continued test research (Myers and McCaulley, 1992; Schaubhut and Thompson, 2008).

Inspired by the work of Kretschmer and Spränger, the modern psychologist, David Keirsey also noted the consistent tendency of human behavior to sort itself. Keirsey combined Kretschmer's temperament hypothesis with Jung's behavior description and Nietzsche's Greek typology and identified four patterns: Sensing Perceiver (SP), Sensing Judger (SJ), Intuitive Thinker (NT), and Intuitive Feeler (NF) (Keirsey and Bates, 1978). Keirsey mapped patterns to the existing Myers-Briggs system and labeled the four basic temperaments as the Artisan, the Guardian, the Rational, and the Idealist (Keirsey and Bates, 1978). Later, Demarest (1995) further associated these temperaments with models of management: the scientific management model (SJ), the contingency model (SP), the social man model (NF), and the strategic management model (NT). These four temperaments were not simply arbitrary collections of characteristics but the interaction of the two basic dimensions of human behavior: communication and action, i.e., what people said and did.

Type literature contains substantial research on how type preferences may be relevant to human behavior and activities, such as career choice (Daub et al., 2000), job satisfaction (Garden, 1988), and organizational development (Fleenor et al., 1998; Hirsch and Kummerow, 1998). In reviewing research on the use of the MBTI® in management and leadership, Walck (1996) found attempts to predict managers' behaviors from type. Rousch and Atwater (1992) used the MBTI® to understand transformational and transactional leadership behaviors. Stavrou et al., (2005) proposed a theoretical temperament framework for an exploration of the relationship among organizational culture, leader personality, and the success of hereditary transitions in family businesses. Most recently, Grant et al., (2011) discussed theoretical and practical implications for leadership and proactivity.

A substantial body of leadership research also examined the associations between dimensions of the MBTI® and leadership indices. McCaulley (1990) examined several comprehensive MBTI® databases containing scores from more than 92,000 subjects, ranging from college students to managers from all organizational levels in numerous industries. Zaccaro (2001) used the tables from McCaulley to compare successful executives with a sample of middle and lower-level managers and unsuccessful executives.

Organizational Culture

Few concepts in organizational theory have as many different and competing definitions as does "organizational culture." In exploring culture, Selznick (1957) moved below the conscious level of organizations to capture a deeper, more powerful force in everyday life. Meyerson (1991) noted that culture was "the code word for the subjective side of organizational life," and its study represented an "ontological rebellion against the dominant scientific paradigm."

Although the term "corporate culture" was initially the popular term used in the press (Jordan, 1994), the term "organizational culture" settled into consulting and academia to describe a tool used in studying

organizations. “Organizational culture” became popular in both anthropology and management in the early 80s when Pascale and Athos (1981) published a book stating that Japan’s economic success was due largely to its very strong “corporate cultures.” Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Peters and Waterman (1982) published books that advocated a strong “corporate culture” as the key to corporate success. The “organizational culture” literature followed many paths and has since “concentrated on defining the concept; prescribing methods of study, diagnosis, and measurement; discussing the possibility of culture change and often prescribing change methods; and recommending methods to evaluate the extent and success of change” (Lewis, 1996). Finally, William Bridges (2000) argued that organizations differ in character just as much as individuals do. Using the framework of MBTI® and its personality types, Bridges believed an organization’s character shaped how managers made decisions, received ideas, and treated employees; how the organization accepted or rejected change; and how such factors affected company performance.

Research Methods

A Celebrations, Inc. Business Research Manager conducted all the research, analyzed the data, reported the results, and made recommendations. She used multiple data sources including focus groups (Merton and Kendall, 1946; Calori and Sarnin, 1991); interviews (Ouchi and Johnson, 1974; Merriam, 1988; Bogdan and Biklen, 1992); and conversations (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984). According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), using multiple data sources was advantageous because it allowed the researcher to deepen her understanding and provided the material that contributed to credible interpretation (Eisner, 1991).

Survey Instrument

All of the “managers chosen as leaders” had taken the MBTI® instrument, designed by Katharine Briggs and Isabel Myers and the most widely used personality assessment in the world (Schaubhut and Thompson, 2008). Briggs and Myers applied Carl Jung’s theory of psychological type and developed a psychometric questionnaire that measured psychological preferences in how people perceived the world and made decisions. “The essence of the theory is that much seemingly random variation in behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent” (Myers and McCaulley, 1992). Their theory suggested that people have opposite ways of:

- gaining energy: extraversion (E) or introversion (I)
- gathering information: sensing (S) or intuition (N)
- coming to a conclusion about that information: thinking (T) or feeling (F), and
- dealing with the world: judging (J) or perceiving (P)

Based on the results of the MBTI® (see Table 1) above, the Business Research Manager further separated the participants by Keirsey’s temperaments (see Table 2). His framework narrowed the 16 types into four temperaments. Myers-Briggs’ type and Keirsey’s temperament had two completely different theoretical bases; however, the same words used to describe type and temperament made for a common language (Keirsey & Bates, 1978).

Table 2: Temperament Representation in “Managers Chosen as Leaders” vs. Leaders in a CPP Sample of Leaders vs. Keirsey’s Base Population Sample

Temperament	% in Study	% CPP Sample	% Keirsey
SJ	39	42	45
SP	8	15	40
NF	23	15	10
NT	30	28	5
Total	100%	100%	100%

Sources: Research Manager; Schaubhut, N. & Thompson, R. 2008. MBTI type tables for occupations. Mountain View, CA: CPP; Keirsey, D. & Bates, M. 1978. Please understand me: Character and temperament types (3rd Ed.). Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Books.

Data Collection

The Business Research Manager conducted eight 60-minute focus groups with 64 participants: two groups of eight each of NT, NF, SJ, and SP temperaments; eight one-on-one interviews that included two each of NT, NF, SJ, and SP temperaments; and 12 formal and 8 informal conversations with participants from the workshop. To ensure the validity of their temperaments, the Business Research Manager ensured all participants had clear or very clear preference scores based on the recommendation of Michael's research (Michael, 2003). She used the same statements for all research methods: describe your style of leadership; describe how your leadership style can effect change; and describe how the organizational culture may help or hinder you to lead.

Analysis

In focus groups, conversations, and interviews segregated by temperaments, the 84 "managers chosen as leaders" talked openly and honestly about their perspectives, thoughts, and feelings about leadership, change, and the culture in which they led. These temperament groups included participants who represented the scientific management model (SJ), the contingency model (SP), the social man model (NF), and the strategic management model (NT) (Demarest, 1995). According to Bridges (2000), Celebrations, Inc. represented the scientific management model (SJ), and according to the corporate MBTI® databases, nearly 60% of the people on the old management team had this temperament, as well.

Men like Frederick Taylor and Henry Gantt defined the scientific management model (SJ) and developed approaches to management based on scientific analysis (Demarest, 1995). They did not accept the belief that management skills were unique gifts acquired as an accident of birth and felt that people could learn management skills. The literature descriptors for this temperament included "efficiency," a "one best way," and "continuously looking for a better way of doing the job" (Table 3). Thirty nine percent of the "managers chosen as leaders" possessed the scientific management (SJ) temperament.

These "managers chosen as leaders" talked about the "systems and structures inherent in the company's business model" and how it was much easier to "run business as usual" than try to change it. They talked about "larger-than-life systems," and how they doubted "whether leaders have the ability to change very complex systems that have been in place for over half a century." They talked about their frustration with "complex systems, policies, procedures, and practices" that perpetuated themselves and the business and the systems that made "risk-taking or innovation next to impossible."

One woman talked about the irony of being "chosen as a leader" since she felt some of her peers saw her as "part of the problem" and "probably standing in the way of change." In addition, although these leaders said, "many things need to be changed," some managers expressed fear of being set up for failure. Another manager said, "Unless the company is willing to blow up some of the systems and start from scratch, no amount of traditional tweaking is going to impact the way we currently do business. The systems that were the benchmark for innovation in the 60s are the dinosaurs that are standing on top of our feet today." These managers supported the corporation's "desire to change" and one man was "not sure that the people at the very top have any idea of what kind of change really needs to take place."

Leaders like Ken Blanchard and Peter Drucker defined the contingency model (SP) (Demarest, 1995). They believed that managers needed to be flexible in their management style, to analyze each new situation, and to come to a decision based on the facts presented rather than on some all-inclusive theoretical model of management. The literature descriptors for this temperament included "flexibility," "quick handling of the unexpected," "risk-taking," and "being quick to see 'what is' and 'what is needed next'" (Table 3). Only 8% of the "managers chosen as leaders" had the contingency model (SP) of temperament, and according to the corporate data bases, keeping any employee with this temperament at the company was difficult.

Although fewer in numbers, these animated and energized leaders talked about leadership and change somewhat differently than the SJ temperament group. One woman talked about being "excited for the first time in a long time." More than one leader said that "leaving the company for another" was always top of mind because Celebrations was "boring" and "nothing exciting ever happens." Like the SJ temperament,

the SP temperament also felt that the company was “committed to doing the same things day in and day out” and that even if a leader had a great idea, it would go “unheard and unnoticed.” They talked about “the great ideas” that they “brought before senior leadership” only to be “shot down” because the ideas were not “aligned with how we do things around here.”

Table 3: Leadership & Management Temperament Descriptors

Temperament	SJ	SP	NF	NT
Organizational Focus	Hierarchy; continuously looking for a better way of doing the job.	Immediate needs	Growth	Vision
Leadership Skills	Logistics, facilitation, operations-oriented	Tactics, performance opportunity-oriented	Diplomacy, relationship-oriented	Strategy, design, strategy-oriented
Competencies	Supervise, provide, inspect, find facts	Promote, perform, tryout, compose	Teach, reveal, divine, predict, interpret	Marshall, invent, design, hypothesize
Contributions Acknowledged	Timely output;	Quick handling of the unexpected	Something personal	Strategies & analysis
Assets	Best organized, the most grounded in reality, & the most realistic.	Meet immediate situational needs, respond quickly, handle emergencies well	Sensitive to people & their time; give people all the time they need; use time for finding the purpose	Think of time as conceptual, impersonal
Liabilities	Rigid about schedules, hooked on responsibility, and cannot relax. Only follow standard operating procedures, overlook interpersonal issues.	Scatter their effort, change direction often, act as if there's always tomorrow	Can't say no, feel guilty if don't give others time, neglect own needs, spend time with people first, & task later, struggle with deadlines	Feel no need to act after thinking through something, devoted to intellectual work with no play, have no time for others' priorities,
Values	Efficiency: One best way. Caution, accuracy, hard work, producing & maintaining life, preserving & keeping, regulating, avoiding harm, economy of energy & time, usefulness, comfort	Flexibility: Risk-taking, experiencing & perceiving, altering form, respond to impulses, sensuous, self enjoyment, immediate feelings, beauty, expressing an experience, freedom of action	Potential: Autonomy, harmony & cooperation, Seeking highest value, unity, beyond the senses, ethics & morality, deep personal meaning, identity, interpreting, & values	Competency: Intelligence, concepts & ideas, theories, logic, objective knowledge & truth, consistency in thought, solve the problem, general principles, studying
Setting Direction	Able to recall & synthesize data & past experiences to provide base on which to build future	Generate options that will benefit individuals; be quick to see “what is” and what's needed next	Create idealistic goals; brainstorm multiple visions & paths for realizing them.	Decide what they want & advocate for it; able to quickly weigh alternative & articulate pros & cons
	Define clear roles & deadlines so that others know what to do and by when, track progress to motivate engagement.	Have a friendly, outgoing style & an optimistic outlook; create rapport & inspire followers; values input from others	Inspire others toward a vision; appreciates others & includes their input; spends time understanding values & needs of employees	Possess competence & confidence; can attract others who want to be seen as winners; effective at gaining political support for plans.

These “managers chosen as leaders” emphasized “how boring” it was to come to work and how there was “nothing to lead” because the company ran by itself. Another leader said many of her “friends left the company after only a couple of years because “they were so bored.” She was “sorry to see them leave because they were smart and had a lot to contribute to helping the company meet its financial goals.”

Overall, these leaders said they were “excited” about “the possibility of real change” and were “anxious to get things going.” They were confident that they could “make an immediate impact” if given a chance. They believed they brought “a sense of excitement and real energy to the company” that could be exponentially greater “if given something worthwhile to change.” One manager reflected on a time he was most excited about coming to work, “A ‘special project’ provided my team an opportunity to try new and different ways of testing products in the marketplace.” He ended by saying, “Those assignments are rare.”

Leaders like Elton Mayo, who carried out the Hawthorne studies, and Abraham Maslow, creator of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, defined the social man model (NF) (Demarest, 1995). They believed that employees had needs and aspirations that extended beyond the workplace and that these needs were an

integral part of the management process. The literature descriptors for this temperament included “deep personal meaning,” “sensitive to people and their time,” and “harmony and cooperation” (See Table 3). About 23% of the “managers chosen as leaders” possessed this temperament.

“Managers chosen as leaders” with the social man temperament (NF) talked about “leading through caring and sharing.” They talked about the “wonderful caring products” they designed, manufactured, and sold to consumers and talked about the products as if they possessed more human characteristics than inanimate ones. They talked about the “caring and sharing” that were “embedded in the culture” and that played out in different “rituals and traditions celebrated in the company.” They believed that their style of leading was critical for the future success of the company because it supported employees who created the products that helped consumers share their feelings and sentiments. According to them, their leadership style, like the products they created, “represented the goodness in human beings.”

These leaders also used the word “nice” in the context of their “caring and sharing” style of leadership. When one manager said, “Being nice and getting along with others has always been requirements of employment,” everyone else nodded their heads. One 35-year manager said, “The founder always hired people who he believed were walking greeting cards.”

When asked if anything in the culture impeded the ability to lead, one leader said that the same “niceness” that made the company a good place to work also “made it easy for those in power to create systems which exploited and oppressed some leaders and not others.” Others agreed that this lack of open and honest feedback “fostered a culture in which leaders continued in their ways of doing things the same old way.”

Whereas these leaders’ temperament reflected the culture of “niceness,” the culture frustrated them because it did not allow them to “question or talk about what was really going on” and may have contributed to the failure to meet the company’s financial goals. These leaders hungered for “honest communication and authenticity.” Because they did not believe they had permission to discuss certain subjects, they used “large amounts of unproductive energy trying to figure out how to talk about things” instead of using that energy on the business.

Lastly, men like Jay Forester with his pioneer work in simulation and Alvin Toffler with his work in the digital and communication revolution insisted that managers must be willing to take great leaps of faith beyond the demands of daily operations (Demarest, 1995). Their strategic management model (NT) supported the notion that managers must build organizations to support new, yet to be developed ideas. The effect of dynamic change on organizations supported their approach to the vision of management and leadership. The literature descriptors for this temperament included “competency,” “vision,” “strategies and analysis,” and “objective truth” (see Table 3). Whereas less than 10% of the United States possessed this temperament, nearly 30% of the “managers chosen as leaders” had it.

These leaders, predominantly men, talked about their “goals and visions” and how they led by getting a lot of “political support.” They were full of fresh perspectives on how to achieve Celebrations’ vision and had a plethora of “ideas where change could occur.” They talked about how they were “energized by change” and how excited they were that the company was supporting a “long overdue change initiative.” They were excited about all the changes that they could make “to the current systems” and how those changes could “turn around the company.” They talked about “creating new strategies and new ways of doing business” that would address “the needs of the marketplace.”

These leaders talked about “high performing companies” whose long-term success was tied to their ability “to be innovative and take risks.” They talked about Celebrations’ “inability to assess risk” and “its fear of cannibalization” i.e., taking away sales from existing core products. They talked about the company’s “culture of conservatism,” where “predictability always wins out over uncertainty.” One outspoken leader articulated it this way: “Our conservative cultural ways fuel predictability. It [They] ensures [ensure] that what has worked in the past continues to get reproduced.” Another leader added, “Risk-taking and innovation demand dealing with uncertainty--the opposite of predictability. Predictability reduces the possibility of failure by ensuring success, and the company only knows how to deal with success.” Another leader, as passionate as the other two, added, “Any failures, no matter how

small, have been looked upon as something to be ashamed of. How can we innovate if we are afraid to fail?"

The additional interviews and conversations confirmed the views expressed in the focus groups and contributed to the 200+ pages of transcripts. To compare the way the "managers chosen as leaders" talked about leadership and change as compared to the words used in the research and literature, the Business Research Manager searched the pages for the descriptors that the L&D team members provided (Table 3). Although she found the descriptors sprinkled throughout the transcripts, she noted that the "managers chosen as leaders" talked about leadership and change with far more breadth and depth than the descriptors could provide. Participants in all of the groups and interviews openly shared their perspectives and experiences, but they talked about them quite differently than did many consultants and theorists in their literature and research (Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Garden, 1988; Barr and Barr, 1989; Montgomery, 1989, 1990, 1993; Myers and McCaulley, 1992; Demarest, 1995; Isachsen and Berens, 1995; Keirsey, 1998; Hirsch and Kummerow, 1998; Bridges, 2000; Engler, 2003; Michael 2003). She recommended that the L&D team members accept the contested nature of the limitations of relying solely on the language of literature and reach beyond the scope of the descriptors to create more robust workshop content.

To accomplish this, the Business Research Manager acknowledged the opportunities that type and temperament provided in understanding organizational dynamics and the importance of leveraging them in changing the organization. She suggested creating content that shared each group's dialogue or "talk" as it related to discovering and interpreting cultural meaning. More so than the descriptors allowed, many of the "managers chosen as leaders," although strangers in temperament, appeared to share a great deal of common ground in how the culture impacted their ability to lead, their sincere desire for the company to change, and a belief that they could personally make a difference. Using this common ground as a starting place, she believed the different temperaments could see that they shared many of the same deeply rooted cultural assumptions about the organization and shared more similarities than differences. Clearly, the L&D team members needed to acknowledge the complexity of individual personality and the inability of the descriptors to explain, clarify, or predict adequately the feelings and behaviors of the "managers chosen as leaders."

Conclusion

The L&D team members proceeded with the recommendations and developed workshop content that incorporated the dialogue from the transcripts. Not unlike the verbal "dialoguing" process advocated by Senge (1990), the workshop participants began conversations by citing quotes or perspectives from the transcripts. Using the anonymous content provided the participants a safe way to discuss the "talk" rather than the "people doing the talking."

This impersonal process also eliminated the need for those temperaments in the minority to verbalize their unpopular or unacceptable ways of doing and knowing in the workshop. Knowingly, or unknowingly, the largest temperament group (SJ) mirrored the organization's temperament (SJ) (Bridges, 2000), and, historically, this temperament had supported and perpetuated the current culture based solely on their numbers and their preference to keep business as usual. By focusing on the dialogue, rather than the people who created it, all temperaments communicated more openly and surfaced the kinds of potentially threatening information they had only previously discussed behind closed doors. They also began to deconstruct the old individual models of believing, knowing, and doing and began to co-create a new collective thought and voice that resonated with all temperaments.

A workshop built on temperament theory will not solve the financial woes of a company. Nevertheless, a workshop designed and based solely on temperament theory or research can diminish its outcomes. If an organization wants to change its current ways of believing, knowing, and doing, replicating the workshop's impersonal dialogue process can help facilitate the change. At Celebration, Inc. dialogue proved to be more powerful than descriptors especially when embedded in workshop content.

REFERENCES

- Adickes, E. 1907. *Character and weltanschauung*. Tübingen, Germany.
- Argyris, C. 1977. Double loop learning in organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, 55: 115-125.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. 1974. *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Atkinson, J., & Heritage, J. 1984. *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Barr, L., & Barr, N. 1989. *The leadership equation: Leadership, management, and the Myers-Briggs*. Austin, TX: Eakin Press.
- Bennis, W. 1989. *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Blumenthal, A. 2001. A Wundt primer: The operating characteristics of consciousness. In R. Rieber, & D. Robinson, (Eds.), *Wilhelm Wundt in history: The making of a scientific psychology*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. 1992. *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bridges, W. 2000. *The character of organizations: Using personality type in organization development*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.
- Calori, R., & Sarnin, P. 1991. Corporate culture and economic performance: A French study. *Organization Studies*, 12: 49-74.
- Conger, J. 1985. *Charismatic leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Daub, C., Friedman, S., Cresci, K., & Keyser, R. 2000. Frequencies of MBTI types among nursing assistants providing care to nursing home eligible individuals. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 54: 12-16.
- Deal, T., & Kennedy, A. 1982. *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Demarest, L. 1995. *Using type with managers and leaders workshop*. Atlanta, GA: CAPT.
- Eisner, E. 1991. *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York: Macmillan.
- Engler, B. 2003. *Personality theories: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fleenor, J., Schneider, B., Smith, D., & Taylor, S. 1998. Personality and organizations: A test of the homogeneity of personality hypothesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83: 462-470.
- Garden, A. 1988. Jungian type, occupation, and burnout: An elaboration of an earlier study. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 14: 2-14.
- Gardner, J. 1990. *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Grant, A., Gino, F., & Hofmann, D. 2011. Reversing the extraverted leadership advantage: The role of employee proactivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 528-550.

- Hirsch, S., & Kummerow, J. 1998. Introduction to type in organizations. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Isachsen, O., & Berens, L. 1995. Working together: A personality-centered approach to management. Phoenix, AZ: Institute for Management Development.
- Jones, H. 1931. Hippocrates, volume IV: Nature of man. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jordan, A. 1994. Practicing anthropology in corporate America: Consulting on organizational culture. *Napa bulletin*, 14: 3-16.
- Jung, C., & Baynes, H. 1921. Psychological types or the psychology of individuation. London: Kegan Paul Trench Trubner.
- Keirsey, D. 1998. Please understand me II: Character and temperament types. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Books.
- Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. 1978. Please understand me: Character and temperament types. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Books.
- Keirsey, D., & Choiniere, R. 1992. Presidential temperament: The unfolding of character in the forty presidents of the United States. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Books.
- Kretschmer, E. 1925. Physique and character. London: Harcourt Brace.
- Lewis, D. 1996. Organizational culture saga from OD to TQM: A critical review of literature. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 17: 12-20.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. 1985. Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McCaulley, M. 1990. The Myers-Briggs type indicator in counseling. Gainesville, FL: Center for the Application of Psychological Type.
- Merriam, S. 1988. Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merton, R., & Kendall, P. 1946. The focused interview. *American Journal of Sociology*, 51: 541-57.
- Meyerson, D. 1991. Normal ambiguity? A glimpse of an occupational culture. In P. Frost, L. Moore, M. Louis, C. Lundberg, & J. Martin, (Eds.), *Reframing organizational culture* (pp. 131-144). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Michael, J. 2003. Using the Myers-Briggs type indicator as a tool for leadership development? Apply with caution. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10: 68-81.
- Montgomery, S. 1989. The Pygmalion project: Love and coercion among the types: The Artisan. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.
- Montgomery, S. 1990. The Pygmalion project: Love and coercion among the types: The Guardian. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.
- Montgomery, S. 1993. The Pygmalion project: Love and coercion among the types: The Idealist. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.

- Murray, A. 2010. *The Wall Street Journal guide to leadership: Lasting lessons from the best leadership minds of our time*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Myers, I. & Myers, P. 1980. *Gifts differing: Understanding personality type*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I., & McCaulley, M. 1992. *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs type indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Nietzsche, F., Tanner, M., & Whiteside, S. 1872. *The birth of tragedy: Out of the spirit of the music*. New York: Penguin Classics.
- Ouchi, W., & Johnson, R. 1974. Made in America (under Japanese management). *Harvard Business Review*, 52: 61-69.
- Pascale, R., & Athos, A. 1981. *The art of Japanese management*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Pascale, R. 1990. *Managing on the edge*. New York: Penguin Book.
- Peters, T., & Waterman, R. 1982. *In search of excellence*. New York: Warner Books.
- Rousch, P., & Atwater, L. 1992. Using the MBTI to understand transformational leadership and self-perception accuracy. *Military Psychology*, 14: 17-34.
- Saunders, F. 1995. *Katharine and Isabel: Mother's light, daughter's journey*. Boston, MA: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Schaubhut, N., & Thompson, R. 2008. *MBTI type tables for occupations*. Mountain View, CA: CPP.
- Schein, E. 1985. *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Selznick, P. 1957. *Leadership in administration*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Senge, P. 1990. *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Spränger, E. 1928. *Types of men*. New York: G. E. Stechert Company.
- Stavrou, E., Kleanthous, T., & Anastasious, T. 2005. Leadership personality and firm culture during hereditary transitions in family firms: Model development and empirical investigation. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 43: 187-206.
- Walck, C. 1996. Management and leadership. In A. Hammer, (Ed.), *MBTI applications* (pp. 55-79). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Zaccaro, S. 2001. *The nature of executive leadership: A conceptual and empirical analysis of success*. Washington, DC: APA Books.

Anna Carol Lampe is an assistant visiting professor of management at Rockhurst University. Her research interests include corporate culture and organizational behavior. She has been published in *Journal of Culture and Organization*; *Gender, Work, and Organization*; *Advances in Business Research Journal*, and others.