

# What Makes a Successful Leader?

Findings from a Study of  
Leadership, Emotional Intelligence, and Personality Type

Working Paper

By Sharon L. Richmond, MBA

Pam Fox Rollin, MBA

Julie M. Brown, MBA/MPH

January 16, 2004

## Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
Introduction.....	6
Background: Emotional Intelligence and Leadership.....	7
Background: Personality Type (MBTI) and Leadership .....	9
Findings: What Leaders Want to See in Other Leaders.....	10
Findings: Differences across Personality Type, Level, Experience, and Gender.....	13
Implications: For Individual Leaders.....	17
Implications: For People Who Help Leaders Develop .....	18
Next Steps: Two Further Reports .....	19
Appendix A: Overall Respondent Demographics.....	20
Appendix B: Type Table of Participants .....	21
Appendix C: Respondents, by Job Classification and Level .....	22
Appendix D: Methodology .....	23
Appendix E: Caution in Applying Findings .....	25
Appendix F: Definition of MBTI Preference Research Groupings.....	27
Appendix G: Leadership Attribute Rankings, by All Groupings .....	29
Appendix H: Bibliography.....	36
Appendix I: Authors .....	40

## **Executive Summary**

This study examines how leaders of various personality types value and develop emotional intelligence (EI). This report, the first of three, covers findings on which attributes participants associate with successful leadership.

265 leaders participated in this exploratory research. One-third are executives, another third directors or managers, and the rest are primarily business owners and consultants. We asked participants to choose the five most and least important leadership attributes from a list of twenty, which included items that reflect both emotional intelligence and general leadership capabilities. We analyzed their views of leadership and EI by four variables: personality type, as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) ®<sup>1</sup>; job classification/level in organization; years of leadership experience; and gender.

### *Findings*

Participants showed substantial agreement with the following:

- The five most important leadership attributes of those presented are **Vision, Strategic Thinking, Relationship Building, Execution, and People Development**.
- Emotional Intelligence attributes are essential to successful leadership, especially the “relationship management” attributes — **Vision, Relationship Building and People Development**.
- Of the remaining attributes, all the EI competencies are more important than all the general leadership attributes, such as External/Market Orientation, Financial Acumen, and Planning.

Overall findings are summarized on the following chart.

---

<sup>1</sup> Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and MBTI are registered trademarks of CPP, Inc.

## Findings: What's Important to Successful Leadership

All Respondents (n=265)

	Leadership Attributes, by Frequency of Selection	% leaders listing in Top 5
Five Most Frequently Selected	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Vision*</i></li> <li>2. Strategic Thinking</li> <li>3. <i>Relationship Building*</i></li> <li>4. Execution</li> <li>5. <i>People Development*</i></li> </ol>	<p>56%</p> <p>51%</p> <p>47%</p> <p>42%</p> <p>38%</p>
Middle 10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. <i>Achievement Drive*</i></li> <li>7. <i>Adaptability*</i></li> <li>8. <i>Self-Awareness*</i></li> <li>9. <i>Initiative*</i></li> <li>10. <i>Teamwork*</i></li> <li>11. <i>Change Leadership*</i></li> <li>12. <i>Optimism*</i></li> <li>13. <i>Empathy*</i></li> <li>14. <i>Conflict Management*</i></li> <li>15. External Market Orientation</li> </ol>	<p>36%</p> <p>34%</p> <p>28%</p> <p>26%</p> <p>25%</p> <p>23%</p> <p>21%</p> <p>16%</p> <p>15%</p> <p>12%</p>
Five Least Frequently Selected	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16. Planning</li> <li>17. Analytical Capability</li> <li>18. Global Perspective</li> <li>19. Functional/Technical Expertise</li> <li>20. Financial Acumen</li> </ol>	<p>12%</p> <p>9%</p> <p>7%</p> <p>6%</p> <p>3%</p>

*\*Emotional Intelligence attributes are italicized*

However, differences in personality type, job classification and level, leadership experience, and gender reveal important distinctions regarding those attributes seen as crucial to successful leadership (see Appendix F for details). For example,

- Far more Executives valued Optimism as an important leadership attribute than did Managers/Directors, Consultants or Founders/Owners; however, Executives valued Relationship Building far less.
- The more experienced the leader, the more value placed on Change Leadership and Optimism and the less value placed on Execution.
- Women rated Strategic Thinking and Relationship Building more highly than did men, who rated Achievement Drive more highly.
- While participants who prefer Thinking (T) and those who prefer Feeling (F) rated most attributes quite similarly, T leaders more frequently selected Execution and Achievement Drive, while F leaders more frequently selected Self-Awareness and Adaptability.

We anticipated that leaders with Feeling Judging (FJ) decision-making styles – those whose personality descriptions most closely match Goleman and colleagues' descriptions of emotionally intelligent leaders – might rank the core EI attributes higher than did other leaders, and this was so. Participants with FJ preferences selected Adaptability, Self-Awareness and Empathy more often than did other leaders.

Similarly, we wondered how Thinking Judging (TJ) leaders – the types most frequently found in leadership positions – would value EI attributes. Profiles of TJ leaders can sound at odds with popular descriptions of emotionally intelligent leaders. However, TJ leaders rated EI attributes quite similarly to other leaders, although not as highly as FJs. Notably, Thinking Perceiving (TP) leaders valued Achievement Drive more highly, while Feeling Perceiving (FP) leaders most highly valued Relationship Building.

### *Implications*

Leaders can increase their potential for success by

- Mastering competencies most highly valued across personality types and levels: building relationships, developing people, thinking strategically, offering vision, executing work, taking initiative, and fostering teamwork.
- Developing strength in the “building block” aspects of emotional intelligence – such as self-awareness, adaptability, empathy – to enable higher performance in the competencies described above.
- Recognizing that their executives, peers, and teams may define effective leadership differently. We found these expectations varied substantially by personality type, as well as level and gender. Some of these leadership expectations may represent blind spots or potential development areas for particular personality types or individuals.
- Looking beyond stereotypes. For example, women in our study valued strategic thinking more highly than did men. Many of our findings relative to personality type reflected a deeper understanding than is common; for example, ENFJs valuing Empathy more highly than ENFPs, and SJs highly valuing Relationship Building.
- Being alert to potential blind spots in identifying and developing next-generation leaders. To the extent that executives view their own strength profiles as especially desirable, they may overlook high potential leaders with different and perhaps complementary strengths.

The next two releases of findings, projected for May and October 2004, will address how leaders view their own emotional intelligence and what they are doing to develop these capabilities further.

## **Introduction**

How do executives, managers, and consultants describe successful leaders? What do leaders think of “Emotional Intelligence” (EI)? How do EI capabilities stack up against other capabilities valued in leaders? How do leaders understand and develop their own emotional intelligence? And, how does this vary by personality type?

In our work with coaching and consulting clients, we found ourselves discussing these questions almost daily, and these conversations left us wanting data-based answers. We suspected that popular presentations of Emotional Intelligence would appeal more to some personality types than others. Yet, we had observed that most leaders seem to value and want to develop their EI – in different ways. After reviewing related studies, we created an online survey to explore the relationships between successful leadership, emotional intelligence, and personality type (as described by the MBTI). We invited specific groups and individuals to participate (see Methodology, Appendix B). The survey was completed by 265 leaders (see Demographics, Appendix A).

This report offers the first segment of findings and implications of our exploratory study of emotional intelligence, leadership, and personality type. This segment focuses on what is perceived as important to successful leadership. Participants evaluated a set of leadership attributes, including both Emotional Intelligence (EI) attributes, such as people development and self-awareness, and non-EI leadership attributes, such as strategic thinking and execution.

This summary of findings and implications should appeal to a number of audiences:

- Leaders who want to develop their own emotional intelligence and lead their teams to high performance;
- Executives, managers, HR/OD staff and consultants who want to design career paths, succession planning, leadership training, and coaching programs that enable best performance from leaders with different personality types;
- Consultants, coaches, and trainers who help leaders assess their competencies and develop their performance, and
- Theorists and researchers in emotional intelligence, leadership, and personality type.

## **Background: Emotional Intelligence and Leadership**

Emotional intelligence, the competencies leaders use to handle themselves and their relationships with others, has been researched for nearly a century. Our current understanding of Emotional Intelligence begins with Reuven Bar-On, who coined the phrase Emotional Quotient (EQ) in 1985, and Mayer and Salovey who, in 1990, first published their theory of Emotional Intelligence (EI). Daniel Goleman popularized Emotional Intelligence with his 1995 book of the same title.

In 2002, Goleman teamed with Richard Boyatzis and Annie McKee to publish *Primal Leadership*, which explores the role of EI in leadership. In their words, “leaders who are skilled, or *resonant*, in EI ... are able to balance a group’s focus on task or results with the quality of members’ relationships. (p.15)”

In Goleman and colleagues’ model, Emotional Intelligence among leaders is composed of capabilities in four domains.

- \* *Self Awareness* is the foundation of EI. Resonant leaders are adept in recognizing and understanding their own emotions and have a clear sense of their purpose. Self-aware leaders have a deep understanding of their strengths and limitations, as well as their values and motives.
- \* *Self Management* is described as the ability to manage effectively one’s emotions, which allows the focused energy required by leadership. Leaders who are effective in self-management display an authentic openness to others about their feelings, beliefs and actions, which engenders trust. Effective self-management is key to working successfully in ambiguous and dynamic environments.
- \* *Social Awareness* has empathy at its core. Empathy is the ability to recognize other people’s feelings and make thoughtful decisions that reflect this understanding. Empathetic leaders are effective at recognizing the needs of clients, customers and employees. They invite input, listen carefully to people, and respond in ways that build connection.
- \* *Relationship Management* relies on the first three building blocks and is the ability of leaders to handle others’ emotions well in service of specific aims. Socially skilled leaders have resonance and rapport with a wide circle of people and have a knack for finding common ground and building support. Goleman and colleagues describe this ability as “friendliness, with a purpose.” Relationship skills are pivotal to cross-functional effectiveness, leading other leaders, and mobilizing people for change and high performance.

Table 1 shows these four key domains of EI, along with the leadership attributes Goleman and colleagues associate with EI competency.

**TABLE 1**  
**Emotional Intelligence Domains**  
*(Goleman, Boyatzis, McKee, Primal Leadership)*

Intrapersonal Competence	Interpersonal Competence
<p><i>1. Self Awareness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emotional self-awareness *</li> <li>• Accurate self-assessment</li> <li>• Self-confidence</li> </ul>	<p><i>3. Social Awareness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Empathy *</li> <li>• Organizational awareness</li> <li>• Service</li> </ul>
<p><i>2. Self Management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emotional self-control</li> <li>• Transparency</li> <li>• Adaptability *</li> <li>• Achievement *</li> <li>• Initiative *</li> <li>• Optimism *</li> </ul>	<p><i>4. Relationship Management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspirational leadership (Vision) *</li> <li>• Influence</li> <li>• Developing others *</li> <li>• Change catalyst *</li> <li>• Conflict management *</li> <li>• Teamwork and collaboration*</li> </ul>

The segment of our research described in this paper focuses on the subset of Goleman’s EI competencies asterisked above. We chose this subset to focus our questions on a manageable and understandable set of attributes. Future reports will include data on the full set of attributes.

We selected Goleman’s model for our research because of its broad acceptance among corporate leaders. Other recognized models of Emotional Intelligence (Mayer/Salovey/Caruso, Bar-On, Dulewicz/Higgs) differ primarily in focusing on the first three domains and in setting aside the fourth domain (Relationship Management) as related to but outside the realm of EI. The models are similar in regarding Self-Awareness, Self-Control, and Empathy as central to what is meant by Emotional Intelligence. The models differ in how they view the role of cognition in EI and how they measure EI.

Highly effective leaders have developed a critical mass of roughly six EI competencies, with at least one competency from each of the four quadrants (Boyatzis, 1982, and McClelland, 1998). Leaders able to demonstrate a broader range of EI strengths are more effective and flexible in handling the wide ranging demands within an organization.

The Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) has studied why managers derail on their way to becoming executives. Four themes have emerged that endure through time and across countries:

1. Problems with interpersonal relationships
2. Failure to meet business objectives
3. Failure to build and lead a team
4. Inability to change or adapt during a transition  
(Van Velsor and Leslie, 1995)

In short, difficulties with emotional intelligence are prime contributors to the failure of otherwise promising executive careers. The first item relates directly to Empathy, with derailed executives often described as insensitive to others. CCL found problems with interpersonal relationships in two-thirds of the cases in Europe and one-third of the cases among derailed American executives. The third item, teamwork, is found in what Goleman describes as the Relationship Management domain, which sits just outside the models of other EI theorists. The fourth item references the EI element of Adaptability.

A growing body of research shows higher business performance from teams and/or leaders with higher emotional intelligence. Many of these studies are cited in *Primal Leadership* (Goleman, et al, 2002); some can be accessed via the websites listed in our bibliography.

### **Background: Personality Type (MBTI) and Leadership**

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) identifies common differences among normal people. “The essence of the theory is that much seemingly random variation in behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent” based on differences in the way individuals prefer to perceive information and reach conclusions (Myers, et al, 1998). People differ in their preferences for Extraversion (E) or Introversion (I); Sensing (S) or Intuition (N); Thinking (T) or Feeling (F); Judging (J) or Perceiving (P). These differences yield 16 personality types and multiple frameworks or “lenses” for grouping these types (see Appendix F). For extensive information on the MBTI, its reliability and validity and numerous applications, see the MBTI Manual (Myers, et al, 1998).

A growing body of research shows that personality type explains some of the variation in leadership behavior and perceived effectiveness across a range of levels, industries, and cultures. (For depth, see Fitzgerald, 1997, Chapter 3. See Bibliography for additional resources.) A brief summary includes:

- While leaders come from all 16 personality types, people select into (or are selected for) leadership roles disproportionately by type. The most common MBTI types of

leaders vary by culture, industry, type of organization, and job level. However, nearly every study of leaders by type finds TJs over-represented relative to other types (Fitzgerald, 1997).

- Type represents, to some extent, habits of attention. Research shows that leaders of different types indeed focus on different aspects of their roles and also choose to handle the same activities differently.
- So, which types lead their groups to superior performance? Research to date offers no clear answer. We consider this appropriate, as leadership is highly context-dependent, and personality is only one influence on leadership effectiveness.

Studies that explore the relationships between EI, leadership, and personality type — such as this one — are just beginning to emerge in the literature. Existing studies focus on validating EI frameworks (Sala, 2002), exploring potential relationships between the MBTI and EI models (Dulewicz and Higgs, 1999; Higgs, 2000), and finding correlations between MBTI types and specific aspects of EI (Morand, 2001). In addition, Roger Pearman has drawn on his deep understanding of type to identify strengths and challenges regarding EI for each of the 16 MBTI types (Pearman, 2002).

### **Findings: What Leaders Want to See in Other Leaders**

In our study, participants (see Demographics, Appendix A) were presented with 20 leadership attributes (see Table 2) and asked to select the five they considered most important to successful leadership. Our leaders showed significant agreement: they identified **Vision, Strategic Thinking, Relationship Building, Execution, and People Development as the top five attributes of successful leadership**. Our respondents, then, view successful leadership as a blend of EI and non-EI skills, according to Goleman and colleagues' definitions of the EI competencies Vision (called Inspirational Leadership), Relationship Building and People Development. Table 2 shows the overall frequency with which each of the 20 attributes was mentioned.

**Survey respondents ranked all 12 EI competencies among their top 14 attributes considered most important to successful leadership.** This reinforces what may be obvious to some — that while functional and technical expertise, planning skills, and even analytical capability may be necessary to get into the leadership ranks, the differentiating capabilities of successful leaders are those described by Goleman and colleagues' EI model.

**TABLE 2**  
**Findings: What’s Important to Successful Leadership**  
*All Respondents (n=265)*

	<b>Leadership Attributes*, by Frequency of Selection</b>	<b>% of Leaders Listing as Top 5</b>
Five Most Frequently Selected	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Vision*</i></li> <li>2. Strategic Thinking</li> <li>3. <i>Relationship Building*</i></li> <li>4. Execution</li> <li>5. <i>People Development*</i></li> </ol>	<p>56%</p> <p>51%</p> <p>47%</p> <p>42%</p> <p>38%</p>
Middle 10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. <i>Achievement Drive*</i></li> <li>7. <i>Adaptability*</i></li> <li>8. <i>Self-Awareness*</i></li> <li>9. <i>Initiative*</i></li> <li>10. <i>Teamwork*</i></li> <li>11. <i>Change Leadership*</i></li> <li>12. <i>Optimism*</i></li> <li>13. <i>Empathy*</i></li> <li>14. <i>Conflict Management*</i></li> <li>15. External Market Orientation</li> </ol>	<p>36%</p> <p>34%</p> <p>28%</p> <p>26%</p> <p>25%</p> <p>23%</p> <p>21%</p> <p>16%</p> <p>15%</p> <p>12%</p>
Five Least Frequently Selected	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16. Planning</li> <li>17. Analytical Capability</li> <li>18. Global Perspective</li> <li>19. Functional/Technical Expertise</li> <li>20. Financial Acumen</li> </ol>	<p>12%</p> <p>9%</p> <p>7%</p> <p>6%</p> <p>3%</p>

*\*Emotional Intelligence attributes are italicized*

In a separate question, we asked participants to choose the five attributes from our list that they consider *least important* to successful leadership. In general, responses mirror the reverse of the list above.

Two interesting differences surfaced, however, in the comparative rankings (see Table 3, below). When asked which attributes are “Least Important” to successful leadership, participants least often selected Teamwork and Initiative (each 4%). This suggests these two attributes would be considered highly important to successful leadership. Yet, when asked which attributes are “Most Important” to successful leadership, Teamwork and Initiative were selected by only 25% of respondents, ranking at about the middle of the list.

**TABLE 3**

**Comparative Rankings: Most Important Leadership Attributes vs. Least Important**  
*(Least Important is Reverse Ranked)*

"Most Important "to Successful Leadership		Not "Least Important" to Successful Leadership	
1	<i>Vision</i>	<i>Teamwork</i>	20
2	Strategic Thinking	<i>Initiative</i>	19
3	<i>Relationship Building</i>	Strategic Thinking	18
4	Execution	<i>Relationship Building</i>	17
5	<i>People Development</i>	<i>People Development</i>	16
6	<i>Achievement Drive</i>	<i>Vision</i>	15
7	<i>Adaptability</i>	<i>Adaptability</i>	14
8	<i>Self-Awareness</i>	<i>Conflict Management</i>	13
9	<i>Initiative</i>	Execution	12
10	<i>Teamwork</i>	<i>Change Leadership</i>	11
11	<i>Change Leadership</i>	<i>Achievement Drive</i>	10
12	<i>Optimism</i>	<i>Self-Awareness</i>	9
13	<i>Empathy</i>	<i>Optimism</i>	8
14	<i>Conflict Management</i>	Planning	7
15	External/Market Orientation	External/Market Orientation	6
16	Planning	<i>Empathy</i>	5
17	Analytical	Analytical	4
18	Global Perspective	Global Perspective	3
19	Functional/technical Expertise	Financial Acumen	2
20	Financial Acumen	Functional/technical Expertise	1
Not "Most Important" to Successful Leadership		"Least Important" to Successful Leadership	

Looking at these two different “stack rankings” of what is considered important and what is considered not important to successful leadership, we see five categories of attributes:

- 1. WIDELY VALUED ATTRIBUTES: Strategic Thinking, Relationship Building, and People Development** were consistently viewed as “most important” to successful leadership across most respondents, almost regardless of Myers-Briggs type, level in organization, years of leadership experience, or gender.
- 2. VALUED HIGHLY, WITH VARIATION: Vision and Execution** were seen as quite important by most, but with more variation across years of experience and MBTI type (see Chart, above).
  - The greater the years of leadership experience, the more frequently **Vision** was selected as essential. ESTJs, ENTJs, and INFPs selected **Vision** most frequently.
  - The fewer the years of leadership experience, the more frequently **Execution** was selected. Ranking for **Execution** ranged quite widely, from the second to the eleventh most valued attribute, across all our various groupings. ENTJs, INFPs, and INTJs mentioned **Execution** most frequently.

3. **ESSENTIAL, BUT NOT TOP-OF-MIND: Teamwork** and **Initiative** emerged as the third grouping of valued characteristics.
  - While they did not rise to the top of "most important" ratings **Teamwork** and **Initiative** were the attributes placed least often in the "least important" leadership attributes category (see Chart, above).
  - TJs and FJs valued **Teamwork** more highly than **Initiative**, while the reverse held true for TPs. FPs rated both equally.
4. **MODERATELY VALUED:** All the other EI competencies were mentioned with moderate frequency: **Self-Awareness, Conflict Management, Adaptability, Change Leadership, Optimism, Achievement Drive, and Empathy.**
5. **LEAST VALUED: Analytical Skills, Global Perspective, Financial Acumen, Functional/Technical Expertise, and External/Market Orientation** were consistently mentioned least frequently as attributes critical to successful leadership.

### **Findings: Differences across Personality Type, Level, Experience, and Gender**

One impetus for this study is that our reading of descriptions of emotionally intelligent leaders, especially in *Primal Leadership*, sounded like ENFJs. Yet, most leaders have Thinking Judging (TJ) preferences, and we've worked with many TJ leaders who strike us as emotionally intelligent. We were interested in exploring how leaders with ENFJ and TJ preferences valued emotional intelligence.

We also sought to explore broader differences based on the demographics of our survey respondents. The most striking findings emerged when viewed through the lenses of MBTI Decision-Making Styles, MBTI Whole Type Preferences, job classification/level, years of leadership experience, and gender.

See Appendix F for descriptions of the MBTI lenses and Appendix G for tables displaying the complete attribute rankings for each of these demographic groupings.

#### *MBTI Decision-Making Styles*

As mentioned earlier, Goleman and colleagues describe emotionally intelligent leaders as those able to "build resonance by tuning into people's emotions (their own and others') and guiding them in the right direction." To those familiar with type theory, this sounds most like descriptions of leaders with Feeling and Judging (FJ) preferences. FJ leaders are described as "observant about people and their needs, ... [are] highly attuned to people's desires and expectations, ... and focus on organizing and structuring the environment to ... facilitate the achievement of individual and group

goals” (*MBTI Manual*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, page 54). Our expectation was that FJ leaders would place a higher value on EI attributes than leaders with other decision-making styles.

This was, in fact, the case. While FJ leaders agreed with other respondents by ranking Vision, Strategic Thinking, and Relationship Development as the top three most important leadership attributes, **FJ leaders also ranked, or valued, the core EI attributes of Adaptability, Self-Awareness, and Empathy more highly than did leaders with other decision-making styles.** This finding is particularly significant, as these three attributes are central to most leading EI models.

FJ leaders also placed more value on Conflict Management, consistent with expectations from type literature. However, FJs placed lower value on Execution, Change Leadership, Optimism, and Planning than did other types.

Leadership studies usually indicate that most corporate leaders exhibit TJ preferences (Roach, 1986). For example, 58% of participants in Center for Creative Leadership programs prefer TJ (*MBTI Manual*, p. 327). TJ leaders “are considered tough minded, executive, analytical... leaders [who] communicate their confidence in the ... primacy of focusing on logical outcomes. TJs may be seen by others as ... too quick to judge and act, and tactless in their style of communication ...” (*MBTI Manual*, pps. 52-53).

We anticipated that leaders with TJ decision-making styles might rank the core EI attributes lower than other leaders, but this was not so. TJ participants did value Execution and Planning more highly than others, but **ENTJs did not rate the EI leadership attributes notably lower** than any other type subgroups.

Other findings that reinforce typical descriptions of MBTI decision-making styles include the following:

- Strategic Thinking was ranked by all four decision-making styles in their top five leadership attributes, but TJ leaders ranked it most highly.
- TP leaders valued Achievement Drive and Initiative more highly than other pairings, but placed much lower value on Teamwork and Self-Awareness than did other leaders.
- Relationship Building was ranked as the most important leadership attribute by FPs, with 57% agreement.

Departing somewhat from typical TJ descriptions, the TJ leaders in our study identified both People Development and Relationship Building as quite important (top 5). This finding underscores the importance of looking beyond shorthand descriptions and behavioral stereotypes of the types.

### *MBTI Whole Type Preferences*

Beyond Decision-Making Styles, survey results were analyzed against a range of MBTI lenses: whole type, preference dichotomies, dominant preferences, function pairs, temperament, and interaction styles (see Appendix D). Findings associated with whole type were most compelling. Other lenses might have been more revealing had participants included more SPs and SFJs. Nonetheless, there were interesting findings for the ten whole types for which we had at least ten respondents.

Findings consistent with type literature include these:

- ENTJs rated Strategic Thinking as most critical to successful leadership, while ESTJs valued Strategic Thinking less than all other types.
- Twice as many ENFJs ranked Empathy in the top five leadership attributes than did ENFPs (28% vs. 14%).
- Teamwork was described as most important by more ESTJs than any other type (35%). For all Extraverted whole types, Teamwork is rated more highly than for all Introverted whole types.
- INFJs rated Self-Awareness as the second most important leadership attribute and mentioned it more frequently than any other type; they less frequently mentioned Achievement Drive and Initiative as important leadership attributes.
- ENFPs rated Relationship Building as their top leadership attribute, and placed lower value on Achievement Drive than did any other type.
- ENTPs valued Achievement Drive and Optimism more highly than did other types.
- INTPs were the only type to place Initiative in their top five leadership attributes.

Thus, leaders and practitioners that use the MBTI will be reassured to know that most findings from this study confirm thoughtful descriptions of the MBTI types.

Still, some findings gave us pause for thought. For example:

- ESTJs mentioned Vision more often than all other types. ESTJs also showed the greatest agreement in how they ranked their top five attributes, with more than 75% agreeing on the top attribute, Vision.
- Relationship Building was ranked number one by ISTJs, who also valued Execution far less than other types.
- INFJs ranked Analytical Capability seventh, while no other type gave it a ranking higher than 14<sup>th</sup>.
- INFPs valued Achievement Drive very highly (2<sup>nd</sup>, 50%).

This strikes us as a useful reminder to go beyond quick-reads of the types. Furthermore, it would be a misreading of this research to assume that people of a particular type have strengths or weaknesses in any leadership behavior on the basis of

this data. Indeed, this data concerns what people value in effective leadership, not their skills. See Appendix D for important guidelines in applying these findings.

### *Job Classification and Level*

While participants from all job levels put Vision and Strategic Thinking at the top of their lists, there were some interesting differences between leaders with different job profiles:

- Of all job levels, far more Executives (34%) valued Optimism as a leadership attribute than did Managers/Directors (14%), Founder/ Owners (18%), or Consultants (13%).
- At the same time, far fewer Executives (31%) valued Relationship Building than leaders with other job classifications (50-70%)
- 40% of Consultants rated Self-Awareness as a key leadership attribute, while ratings for other job levels ranged from 24%-31%.

### *Years of Leadership Experience*

- As years of leadership experience increased, the ranking of Initiative progressively dropped, from 6<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup>.
- Empathy was valued most highly by those with 20 years or more experience (27%).
- As years of experience increased, Optimism and Change Leadership were valued more frequently as important leadership attributes.
- Execution was valued more highly by individuals in the earlier phases of their careers (1-9 years' leadership experience) than by those with more experience.
- Achievement Drive was ranked as the number three attributes by those with 10-19 years of leadership experience, which might be considered the time in most individuals' careers where they are striving for professional establishment.

### *Gender*

While men and women ranked most items similarly, a few differences stand out. Men included Achievement Drive as the third most important attribute (46%), while women placed it seventh (28%). Women rated Strategic Thinking as their number one attribute (58%), while men rated it fourth (41%). Relationship Building, People Development, and Teamwork were also ranked more highly by women than men.

## **Implications: For Individual Leaders**

Leaders can use these findings to develop insights into what their executives, peers, and “next levels” may be looking for from them.

- **Assess and increase your effectiveness in building relationships, developing people, and thinking strategically.** Nearly all participants identified these areas as critical to successful leadership.
- **Consider your effectiveness in providing vision and inspiration, executing work to plan, taking initiative, and fostering teamwork.** Evaluate your situation to see whether increasing your effectiveness in these areas could strengthen your abilities as a high-performing leader. Note the attributes that you consider less important; these may be a blind spot for you. Start with the charts in Appendix F to see which attributes others of your personality type consider less important. Use this insight in conjunction with other performance feedback and your assessment of your situation to craft your development agenda.
- **To excel at the highly-ranked Relationship Management attributes, develop your EI “building block” capabilities such as Self-Awareness, Empathy, and Adaptability.** Leaders expect successful peers to excel in the complex capabilities in Goleman’s fourth EI domain, such as inspiring and developing others. (See Table 1.) The “building block” attributes were rated more modestly overall. Yet, EI research shows that these Relationship Management attributes depend on solid skills in Self-awareness, Self-management, and Social Awareness.
- **When seeking to influence others, be aware of differences in what each of you values in leaders.** For example, if you are a manager with ENTJ or INFJ preferences, be aware that your ENTP or INTJ CEO may value or respect Optimism in leaders more than you do. Or if you are a consultant who prefers ENFP or ISTJ, be aware that your ENTJ or INTP CEO client may value Relationship Building less and Execution more than you do. At the same time, keep in mind that descriptions of people by any grouping (personality type, level, experience, gender) may not apply to all individuals in that group (see Appendix D).
- **Look beyond common MBTI stereotypes.** For example, this study did not support a common stereotype that people who prefer J value execution and those who prefer P value adaptability. J’s and P’s were indistinguishable in how they valued Execution, Achievement Drive, and Adaptability. We especially recommend becoming familiar with the processes underlying the type codes (type dynamics) and the usual maturity paths of each type (type development).

- **Use the type-specific and level-specific findings to start conversations with your colleagues on how leadership expectations may vary across teams.**

Leaders who develop others will also be interested in the next set of implications.

### **Implications: For People Who Help Leaders Develop**

People who help leaders develop -- senior executives, consultants, HR executives, coaches, trainers, and managers -- can use this research in succession planning, leadership initiatives, and development program design.

- **Be alert to potential type-related blind spots in identifying and developing next-generation leaders.** 62% of 750 CEOs in CCL's recent study cited succession planning as a key concern. (Haapaniemi, 2003) As your organization seeks to identify and develop high-potential leaders, ask yourself whether you are considering the full range of leadership capabilities in your choices. Be aware that the personality type profile of those identifying the talent may contribute to undervaluing people with differing but potentially valuable leadership capabilities. In conversations among senior executives and consultants, be aware that your priorities for leadership development may differ. Also be alert to the differences across levels regarding which of the leadership attributes are seen as essential (See Appendix F).
- **Assess your leaders' EI capabilities.** Participants of all personalities and levels selected EI attributes as more important to successful leadership than most of the non-EI attributes. Yet, companies spend substantial budget developing global perspective and functional expertise in their leaders. This data suggests assessing your leaders' EI capabilities and determining if you need to invest in developing these capabilities.
- **Frame the different aspects of leadership development to appeal to different personality types.** For example, if you want your NT leaders to take time to learn how to lead change more effectively, stress the link to strategic objectives; if you want to attract your SJ leaders to change leadership programs, stress the link to building important relationships. Our next release, in May 2004, will include data on how people of different levels and types approach their development.

### **Next Steps: Two Further Reports**

Our next report, scheduled for May 2004, will address how leaders view emotional intelligence, and what they do to develop their emotional intelligence. These development activities vary by types, levels, experience, and gender.

Our third report, scheduled for October 2004, will address how these leaders rate themselves on various aspects of emotional intelligence. This report will further describe the leadership factors that emerged from statistical analysis of our findings, and that relate to or extend current literature on leadership and EI.

### **Acknowledgements**

We extend our sincere appreciation to the people who have informed and encouraged us in this initial work. In particular, we thank our 265 study participants for making time to complete the survey; Heather Myers, [heather@psych.stanford.edu](mailto:heather@psych.stanford.edu), for able statistical consultation and document review; Roger Pearman, of Qualifying.org, for guidance; and our review team of Jennifer Selby, Jean Tips, and Bruce Richmond, for helping us develop clarity in our message.

## **Appendix A: Overall Respondent Demographics**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Number (n=265)</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents</b>
--------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------

### LEVEL

Executives/Vice Presidents	90	34%
Directors/Managers	87	33%
Founders/Owners	39	15%
Consultants	30	11%
Other	19	7%

### GENDER

Males	112	43%
Females	151	57%

### YEARS OF LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE

1-4 Years	33	13%
5-9 Years	97	38%
10-19 Years	95	37%
20+ Years	33	13%

### AGE

20-29 Years Old	10	4%
30-39 Years Old	112	43%
40-49 Years Old	86	33%
50-59 Years Old	43	17%
60+ Years Old	9	3%

### INDUSTRY

High Tech Industry	71	28%
Consulting	38	15%
Health Care	25	10%
Financial Services	20	8%
Advertising/Marketing	15	6%
Not for Profit Sector	13	5%
Education Sector	12	5%
Other	59	22%

### ETHNICITY

White/Caucasian	218	84%
Black/African American	14	5%
Chinese/Chinese American	8	3%
Other Ethnicity	20	8%

Numbers may not total 265 as some respondents did not provide type, job level, years of experience, or gender.

## Appendix B: Type Table of Participants

### Research Participants

TYPE TABLE

n= 257

<b>ISTJ</b> 20 8%	<b>ISFJ</b> 5 2%	<b>INFJ</b> 11 4%	<b>INTJ</b> 30 12%
<b>ISTP</b> 2 1%	<b>ISFP</b> 2 1%	<b>INFP</b> 12 5%	<b>INTP</b> 23 9%
<b>ESTP</b> 2 1%	<b>ESFP</b> 2 1%	<b>ENFP</b> 44 17%	<b>ENTP</b> 22 9%
<b>ESTJ</b> 17 7%	<b>ESFJ</b> 2 1%	<b>ENFJ</b> 18 7%	<b>ENTJ</b> 45 18%

<b>E = 152</b>	<b>TJ = 112</b>
<b>I = 105</b>	<b>FJ = 36</b>
<b>S = 52</b>	<b>TP = 49</b>
<b>N = 205</b>	<b>FP = 60</b>
<b>T = 161</b>	
<b>F = 96</b>	<b>Se = 4</b>
<b>J = 148</b>	<b>Si = 25</b>
<b>P = 109</b>	<b>Ne = 66</b>
	<b>Ni = 41</b>
<b>NT = 120</b>	<b>Te = 62</b>
<b>NF = 85</b>	<b>Ti = 25</b>
<b>ST = 41</b>	<b>Fe = 20</b>
<b>SF = 11</b>	<b>Fi = 14</b>
<b>SJ = 44</b>	
<b>SP = 8</b>	

## Appendix C: Respondents, by Job Classification and Level

### Respondents, by Job Classification and Level, across other variables

BY LEVEL (YLE and GENDER)	Exec/VP n=90 (34%)	Dir/Mgr n=87 (33%)	Founder/Owner n=39 (15%)	Consultant n=30 (11%)	Other n=19 (7%)	Overall
1-4 years	14	7	4	3	5	33
5-9 years	27	40	14	7	9	97
10-19 years	38	27	13	14	3	95
20+ years	11	11	6	4	1	33
Female	36	56	25	21	13	151
Male	53	31	14	9	5	112

By LEVEL (YLE & GENDER) (%)	E	M	F	C	O	Overall
1-4 years	16%	8%	11%	11%	28%	13%
5-9 years	30%	47%	38%	25%	50%	38%
10-19 years	42%	32%	35%	50%	17%	37%
20+ years	12%	13%	16%	14%	6%	13%
Female	40%	64%	64%	70%	72%	57%
Male	60%	36%	36%	30%	28%	43%

Numbers may not total 265 as some respondents did not provide type, job level, years of experience, or gender.

LEVEL by WHOLE TYPE	Exec		Mgr/Dir		Fnd/Own		Consult		Other		Overall
ENFJ	3	3%	6	7%	4	10%	3	10%	2	12%	18
ENFP	11	12%	9	10%	11	28%	10	33%	3	18%	44
ENTJ	17	19%	15	17%	7	18%	5	17%	1	6%	45
ENTP	14	16%	4	5%	1	3%	2	7%	1	6%	22
ESFJ	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	1	6%	2
ESFP	0	0%	1	1%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	2
ESTJ	6	7%	6	7%	2	5%	2	7%	1	6%	17
ESTP	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2
INFJ	4	4%	6	7%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	11
INFP	3	3%	5	6%	1	3%	1	3%	2	12%	12
INTJ	13	14%	7	8%	5	13%	3	10%	1	6%	29
INTP	9	10%	9	10%	3	8%	1	3%	1	6%	23
ISFJ	2	2%	1	1%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	5
ISFP	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2
ISTJ	5	6%	11	13%	2	5%	1	3%	1	6%	20
ISTP	0	0%	1	1%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	2
(blank)	3	3%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	7
Grand Total	90		87		39		30		17		263

## **Appendix D: Methodology**

### **Survey Participants**

265 people completed our online survey in May 2003.

We invited participation from these groups:

- Our current and former clients
- Stanford Business School alumni from 6 classes (1987-1989, 1994-1996)
- Our colleagues and their clients
- “Successful leaders” referred by the groups above

The qualification page asked for participation from people who met both criteria:

1. You are an Executive or Leader in any organization, and
2. You can identify your 4-letter Myers-Briggs (MBTI) type

### **Survey Design**

The survey included four sections, in this order:

1. Self-rating on behaviors associated with emotional intelligence
2. Selection of most and least important attributes of successful leaders
3. Definition in their own words of emotional intelligence, how they rate their own EI, and what they have done to develop their EI
4. Demographics, including MBTI type (4 letter type, clarity of preference, setting in which they learned about MBTI), job title, industry, years of leadership experience, age, gender, and ethnicity

This first report on our findings covers the second section above. Our next report on our findings, to be released in or around May 2004, will focus on section 3. The third report on our findings, to be released in or around October 2004, will focus on section 1.

### **Analysis**

Participants were asked to indicate the five leadership characteristics they believe are most important to successful leadership. The companion question asked them to indicate the five that are least important to successful leadership.

The findings in this release result from mathematical analysis of the frequency of mention of each leadership attribute *as one of the “Top 5.”* We looked at a number of constructs to help us interpret the meaning of this large quantity of data, including:

- Percent of each group that selected each attribute
- Overall “ranking” of frequency of selection
- Variation between groups regarding how often an attribute was selected or how many in a group chose a specific attribute

- Range and standard deviation of “rankings” for each attribute
- Absolute value of all differences in ranking between the whole group and sub-groups as well as between sub-groups

We examined each leadership attribute, using job level/title, years of leadership experience and gender, as well as the MBTI research groupings described in Appendix F, to explore the differences by group in how each leadership attribute is valued (i.e. how often it is identified as a Top 5). Adequate sample size was unavailable to conduct a useful analysis of differences based on ethnic group identification.

Similar analysis was conducted for examining the “least important” items as well as for looking at the relative rankings of the Most Important and the Least Important, Reversed (i.e. “not least important”) leadership attributes, to look for internal consistency in rating.

If you would like more detailed information regarding the methodology or data feel free to contact the authors.

## **Appendix E: Caution in Applying Findings**

We can understand, but must strongly discourage, any temptation to apply these findings along the following lines: “People of type ABCD highly value adaptability; we need adaptable people, so let’s aim to hire and promote people of type ABCD.”

This would be a mis-application of this research, for several reasons:

1. Personality type, as indicated by the MBTI, describes preferences, rather than behavior or competence. People often become quite skilled at behavior that is not typical of their own type preferences.
2. Individual people are more than their personality type, gender, years of experience and job title. Every individual’s values, capabilities, and behavior are shaped by many factors, including education, family environment, culture, mentoring, and life experiences.
3. We asked what attributes participants associate with successful leadership. We did not, in this segment of the analysis, determine whether they believe they possessed these attributes. We do not know anything about our participants’ skill at these attributes. It is possible for people to want in their leaders attributes that differ from their own skills.
4. Words appeal differently to certain types, including the words we chose to describe leadership attributes. Isabel Myers, the originator of the MBTI instrument, was deeply learned in this; we do not profess to understand yet how our word choices might have led to participant bias in responses.
5. Among certain types, representation within our survey was skewed toward one level or gender, compared to the other types. For example, 64% of ENTP participants are at the Executive level (vs. 34% of all participants) while only 9% are consultants (vs. 11% of all participants); 36% are women (vs. 57% of total). For ENFPs, only 25% are Executives and 23% are consultants; 73% are women. When we present findings for participants of a specific type, the responses may actually be more representative of level or gender. While we can separate out the interaction effect among type/level/gender for other segments of our analysis (to be discussed in future releases) we cannot yet do this with the data on leadership attributes because of the ranking methodology we selected, and the extremely high numbers of variables we are considering.
6. Responses varied within each grouping, that is, people within each type, gender, level, etc. answered differently. Even if our sample could somehow be proven representative of the population of leaders in the U.S., the individual in front of you might have answered in a way different from the typical response.
7. This is exploratory research. There may be confounding factors of which we are unaware at this time.

Instead, it would be appropriate to use these findings to jump-start your inquiry into leadership attributes and individual values and capabilities. For example,

- “My type is ABCD. I see that people of type ABCD tend to value adaptability in leaders more highly than do people of other types. Does this hold true for what I value in leaders? If so, what can I see as the consequences of being more responsive to adaptable leaders than perhaps others in my organization? Is this what I value in myself? Does my performance match my values (i.e., how adaptable am I as a leader)? How does being adaptable serve me/my team/the organization? When might my adaptability generate difficulties for me/my team/the organization?”
- “I see that people differ greatly in how they much value they place on adaptability in leaders. How does this particular person in front of me value adaptability? How well do our corporate culture and processes invite high-performance from people who highly value adaptability and those who value it less?”

## **Appendix F: Definition of MBTI Preference Research Groupings**

We sought participation from leaders who knew their MBTI type (this four letter code is also called “Whole Type”). Of our 265 participants, 97% provided their types. Of these, 76% were very clear that this was their accurate type, 21% somewhat clear, and only 3% were not clear or didn’t know. We are satisfied that our sample represents people who are clear about their MBTI type.

Using participants’ four-letter MBTI code, we were able to analyze responses by personality type using seven different “type lenses.” Each of these lenses has been described in the personality type literature and offers a different portrait of typological differences.

### **Whole Types**

Full four-letter descriptions of each of the 16 MBTI personality types. The 16 types differ in the priority given to each function (S, N, T, F) and in the attitude (E or I) in which they typically use each function.

***ENFJ, ENFP, ENTJ, ENTP, ESTJ, INFJ, ENFP, INTJ, INTP, ISTJ***

*[Insufficient data for ESFJ, ESFP, INFJ, ISFJ, ISTJ and ISTP]*

### **Preference Dichotomies**

Building blocks of the MBTI; as described by C. G. Jung and expanded by Isabel Myers.

***Extraversion (E) or Introversion (I)*** -- Orientations of energy

***Sensing (S) or iNtuition (N)*** – How information is gathered; two kinds of perception; described by Jung as the “irrational” (receptive) functions

***Thinking (T) or Feeling (F)*** – How decisions are made; two kinds of judgment; described by Jung as the “rational” (deciding) functions

***Judging (J) or Perceiving (P)*** -- Orientations to the outer world

### **Dominants**

Most strongly preferred function in the preferred attitude; this is the function typically preferred by and most accessible to people of these whole types.

***Introverted Sensing (Si) (ISTJ, ISFJ)***, *[Insufficient data for Se (ESTP, ESFP)]*

***Introverted iNtuition (Ni) (INTJ, INFJ)***, ***Extraverted iNtuition (Ne) (ENTP, ENFP)***

***Introverted Thinking (Ti) (INTP, ISTP)***, ***Extraverted Thinking (Te) (ENTJ, ESTJ)***

***Introverted Feeling (Fi) (INFP, ISFP)***, ***Extraverted Feeling (Fe) (ENFJ, ESFJ)***

### **Function Pairs**

Combination of preferred mental functions (receptive and deciding); widely studied as learning styles, cognitive styles, or communication styles.

***ST, SF, NT, NF***

## **Temperament**

Four patterns of human behavior noted and described for 2500 years; correlation with MBTI described by David Keirsey.

***Guardian (SJ), Rational (NT), Idealist (NF), [Insufficient data for Artisan (SP)]***

## **Decision-Making Styles**

Combination of preferred deciding function (T or F) and orientation toward the outer world (J or P).

***TJ, TP, FJ, FP***

## **Interaction Styles**

Characteristic interaction patterns; a recent addition to type literature from Linda Berens.

***Chart-the-Course (INTJ, INFJ, ISTJ, ISTP)***

***Behind-the-Scenes (INTP, INFP, ISFP, ISFJ)***

***In-Charge (ENTJ, ENFJ, ESTJ, ESTP)***

***Get-Things-Going (ENTP, ENFP, ESFP, ESFJ)***

## Appendix G: Leadership Attribute Rankings, by All Groupings

Order of charts in this Appendix:

MBTI lenses: Whole Type, Preference Dichotomies, Dominant Function, Function Pairs, Temperament, Decision Styles, Interaction Styles

Other Variables: Job Type/Level, Years of Leadership Experience, Gender

### Most Important Leadership Attributes, by Whole Type (10 types only)\*

ENFJ n=18 (7%)		ENFP n=44 (17%)		ENTJ n=45 (17%)		ENTP n=22 (8%)		ESTJ n=17 (6%)	
Vision	56%	Relationship building	59%	Strategic thinking	60%	Achievement drive	59%	Vision	76%
Adaptability	50%	Strategic thinking	52%	Vision	60%	Relationship building	55%	Relationship building	59%
People development	39%	Vision	52%	Execution	51%	Vision	55%	People development	53%
Relationship building	39%	Adaptability	39%	Achievement drive	38%	Execution	45%	Achievement drive	47%
Strategic thinking	39%	People development	36%	People development	36%	Strategic thinking	45%	Execution	47%
Execution	33%	Self-awareness	36%	Relationship building	36%	Adaptability	32%	Self-awareness	35%
Teamwork	33%	Execution	34%	Teamwork	31%	Initiative	32%	Teamwork	35%
Achievement drive	28%	Initiative	30%	Adaptability	27%	Optimism	32%	Initiative	29%
Conflict management	28%	Optimism	27%	Change leadership	27%	Change leadership	27%	Strategic thinking	29%
Empathy	28%	Teamwork	27%	Self-awareness	20%	People development	27%	Adaptability	24%
Self-awareness	28%	Achievement drive	20%	External/market orientatic	16%	Teamwork	23%	Change leadership	24%
Initiative	22%	Change leadership	20%	Initiative	16%	External/market orientatic	18%	Planning	18%
Change leadership	17%	Conflict management	14%	Optimism	16%	Self-awareness	18%	Conflict management	12%
Functional/technical expe	17%	Empathy	14%	Analytical capability	13%	Conflict management	9%	Empathy	12%
Optimism	17%	External/market orientatic	14%	Conflict management	13%	Empathy	9%	External/market orientatic	12%
Planning	11%	Analytical capability	11%	Empathy	13%	Global perspective	9%	Optimism	12%
External/market orientatic	6%	Functional/technical expe	7%	Global perspective	11%	Analytical capability	5%	Analytical capability	6%
Financial acumen	6%	Planning	7%	Planning	11%	Functional/technical expe	5%	Financial acumen	6%
Global perspective	6%	Financial acumen	2%	Financial acumen	4%	Planning	5%	Functional/technical expe	6%
Analytical capability	0%	Global perspective	2%	Functional/technical expe	4%	Financial acumen	0%	Global perspective	6%

INFJ n=11 (4%)		INFP n=12 (5%)		INTJ n=30 (11%)		INTP n=23 (9%)		ISTJ n=20 (8%)	
Adaptability	55%	Vision	67%	Strategic thinking	70%	Strategic thinking	57%	Relationship building	60%
Self-awareness	55%	Achievement drive	50%	Vision	53%	People development	48%	Achievement drive	45%
Strategic thinking	55%	Execution	50%	Execution	50%	Adaptability	43%	Strategic thinking	45%
Vision	55%	People development	50%	People development	40%	Initiative	43%	Vision	45%
Relationship building	45%	Relationship building	50%	Relationship building	33%	Vision	43%	Adaptability	40%
People development	36%	Strategic thinking	42%	Optimism	30%	Achievement drive	39%	Initiative	35%
Analytical capability	27%	Adaptability	33%	Achievement drive	27%	Execution	39%	People development	30%
Empathy	27%	Change leadership	33%	Adaptability	23%	Relationship building	39%	Planning	30%
Execution	27%	Self-awareness	25%	Change leadership	23%	Change leadership	26%	Self-awareness	30%
Teamwork	27%	Teamwork	25%	Initiative	20%	Self-awareness	22%	Change leadership	25%
Achievement drive	18%	Conflict management	17%	Self-awareness	20%	Conflict management	17%	Execution	25%
Conflict management	18%	Empathy	17%	Teamwork	20%	External/market orientatic	17%	Teamwork	25%
Optimism	18%	Initiative	17%	Conflict management	17%	Empathy	13%	Optimism	20%
Change leadership	9%	Analytical capability	8%	Empathy	17%	Optimism	13%	Empathy	15%
External/market orientatic	9%	External/market orientatic	8%	Analytical capability	13%	Planning	13%	Conflict management	10%
Functional/technical expe	9%	Functional/technical expe	8%	External/market orientatic	13%	Teamwork	13%	Global perspective	10%
Initiative	9%	Financial acumen	0%	Planning	13%	Functional/technical expe	9%	Analytical capability	5%
Financial acumen	0%	Global perspective	0%	Global perspective	10%	Financial acumen	4%	External/market orientatic	5%
Global perspective	0%	Optimism	0%	Financial acumen	3%	Analytical capability	0%	Financial acumen	0%
Planning	0%	Planning	0%	Functional/technical expe	3%	Global perspective	0%	Functional/technical expe	0%

\* Whole Types with fewer than 10 respondents are omitted (in this analysis only)

### Most Important Leadership Attributes, by MBTI Dichotomies

E n=152 (57%)		I n=105 (40%)		S n=52 (20%)		N n=205 (77%)	
Vision	59%	Strategic thinking	53%	Vision	62%	Strategic thinking	55%
Strategic thinking	49%	Vision	51%	Relationship building	54%	Vision	55%
Relationship building	47%	Relationship building	45%	Achievement drive	42%	Relationship building	44%
Execution	43%	People development	40%	Execution	38%	Execution	42%
People development	37%	Execution	39%	People development	38%	People development	38%
Achievement drive	36%	Achievement drive	34%	Strategic thinking	35%	Adaptability	35%
Adaptability	33%	Adaptability	34%	Self-awareness	33%	Achievement drive	34%
Teamwork	30%	Self-awareness	28%	Initiative	31%	Self-awareness	26%
Self-awareness	28%	Initiative	28%	Adaptability	27%	Teamwork	25%
Initiative	24%	Change leadership	24%	Teamwork	27%	Initiative	24%
Change leadership	23%	Teamwork	20%	Change leadership	23%	Change leadership	23%
Optimism	21%	Optimism	19%	Planning	21%	Optimism	21%
Conflict management	14%	Empathy	18%	Optimism	17%	Empathy	16%
Empathy	14%	Conflict management	17%	Empathy	17%	Conflict management	16%
External/market orier	14%	Planning	13%	Conflict management	15%	External/market orier	14%
Planning	10%	External/market orier	10%	Global perspective	12%	Analytical capability	10%
Analytical capability	9%	Analytical capability	10%	External/market orier	8%	Planning	9%
Global perspective	7%	Global perspective	7%	Analytical capability	8%	Functional/technical	7%
Functional/technical	7%	Functional/technical	7%	Functional/technical	6%	Global perspective	6%
Financial acumen	3%	Financial acumen	2%	Financial acumen	2%	Financial acumen	3%

  

T n=161 (61%)		F n=96 (36%)		J n=148 (56%)		P n=109 (41%)	
Vision	56%	Vision	56%	Vision	58%	Vision	53%
Strategic thinking	53%	Relationship building	51%	Strategic thinking	53%	Relationship building	51%
Execution	45%	Strategic thinking	46%	Relationship building	43%	Strategic thinking	48%
Relationship building	43%	Adaptability	40%	Execution	42%	Execution	41%
Achievement drive	41%	People development	39%	People development	39%	People development	38%
People development	38%	Execution	36%	Achievement drive	34%	Achievement drive	37%
Adaptability	30%	Self-awareness	36%	Adaptability	31%	Adaptability	37%
Initiative	27%	Teamwork	27%	Self-awareness	28%	Initiative	31%
Teamwork	25%	Achievement drive	26%	Teamwork	28%	Self-awareness	27%
Change leadership	25%	Initiative	24%	Change leadership	23%	Change leadership	24%
Self-awareness	22%	Change leadership	21%	Initiative	22%	Teamwork	23%
Optimism	21%	Empathy	20%	Optimism	18%	Optimism	23%
Planning	14%	Optimism	19%	Empathy	17%	Conflict management	16%
Conflict management	14%	Conflict management	18%	Conflict management	16%	Empathy	15%
External/market orier	14%	Analytical capability	11%	Planning	14%	External/market orier	15%
Empathy	14%	Functional/technical	10%	Analytical capability	11%	Planning	8%
Global perspective	9%	External/market orier	9%	External/market orier	11%	Analytical capability	6%
Analytical capability	8%	Planning	6%	Global perspective	9%	Functional/technical	6%
Functional/technical	4%	Global perspective	4%	Functional/technical	7%	Global perspective	4%
Financial acumen	3%	Financial acumen	2%	Financial acumen	3%	Financial acumen	2%

## Most Important Leadership Attributes, by Dominant Function

Se n=4 (2%)	Si n=25 (9%)	Ne n=66 (25%)	Ni n=41 (15%)
	<i>Relationship building</i> 56%	<i>Relationship building</i> 58%	Strategic thinking 66%
	<i>Vision</i> 48%	<i>Vision</i> 53%	<i>Vision</i> 54%
	Strategic thinking 44%	Strategic thinking 50%	Execution 44%
	<i>Achievement drive</i> 40%	Execution 38%	<i>People development</i> 39%
	<i>People development</i> 36%	<i>Adaptability</i> 36%	<i>Relationship building</i> 37%
	<i>Initiative</i> 36%	<i>Achievement drive</i> 33%	<i>Adaptability</i> 32%
	<i>Self-awareness</i> 36%	<i>People development</i> 33%	<i>Self-awareness</i> 29%
	<i>Adaptability</i> 32%	<i>Initiative</i> 30%	<i>Optimism</i> 27%
	Execution 24%	<i>Self-awareness</i> 30%	<i>Achievement drive</i> 24%
	Planning 24%	<i>Optimism</i> 29%	<i>Teamwork</i> 22%
	<i>Change leadership</i> 24%	<i>Teamwork</i> 26%	<i>Change leadership</i> 20%
	<i>Teamwork</i> 20%	<i>Change leadership</i> 23%	<i>Empathy</i> 20%
	<i>Empathy</i> 16%	External/market orientatic 15%	<i>Initiative</i> 17%
	<i>Optimism</i> 16%	<i>Empathy</i> 12%	<i>Conflict management</i> 17%
	<i>Conflict management</i> 12%	<i>Conflict management</i> 12%	Analytical capability 17%
	Analytical capability 12%	Analytical capability 9%	External/market orientatic 12%
	Global perspective 12%	Planning 6%	Planning 10%
	Functional/technical expe 8%	Functional/technical expe 6%	Global perspective 7%
	External/market orientatic 4%	Global perspective 5%	Functional/technical expe 5%
	Financial acumen 0%	Financial acumen 2%	Financial acumen 2%

\*Insufficient data to include Extraverted Sensing (Se)

Te n=62 (23%)	Ti n=25 (9%)	Fe n=20 (8%)	Fi n=14 (5%)
<i>Vision</i> 65%	Strategic thinking 52%	<i>Vision</i> 60%	<i>Vision</i> 57%
Strategic thinking 52%	<i>Vision</i> 48%	<i>Adaptability</i> 45%	<i>Relationship building</i> 57%
Execution 50%	<i>People development</i> 44%	Strategic thinking 40%	Execution 50%
<i>Relationship building</i> 42%	<i>Initiative</i> 44%	<i>Relationship building</i> 40%	<i>People development</i> 43%
<i>People development</i> 40%	Execution 40%	<i>People development</i> 35%	<i>Achievement drive</i> 43%
<i>Achievement drive</i> 40%	<i>Relationship building</i> 40%	Execution 35%	<i>Adaptability</i> 36%
<i>Teamwork</i> 32%	<i>Achievement drive</i> 40%	<i>Teamwork</i> 35%	Strategic thinking 36%
<i>Adaptability</i> 26%	<i>Adaptability</i> 40%	<i>Achievement drive</i> 30%	<i>Change leadership</i> 36%
<i>Change leadership</i> 26%	<i>Change leadership</i> 24%	<i>Self-awareness</i> 30%	<i>Teamwork</i> 29%
<i>Self-awareness</i> 24%	<i>Self-awareness</i> 20%	<i>Conflict management</i> 25%	<i>Self-awareness</i> 21%
<i>Initiative</i> 19%	<i>Conflict management</i> 20%	<i>Empathy</i> 25%	<i>Conflict management</i> 21%
<i>Optimism</i> 15%	<i>Optimism</i> 16%	<i>Initiative</i> 20%	<i>Empathy</i> 21%
External/market orientatic 15%	External/market orientatic 16%	<i>Change leadership</i> 20%	<i>Initiative</i> 14%
<i>Empathy</i> 13%	<i>Empathy</i> 16%	<i>Optimism</i> 15%	<i>Optimism</i> 7%
<i>Conflict management</i> 13%	<i>Teamwork</i> 12%	Functional/technical expe 15%	Functional/technical expe 7%
Planning 13%	Planning 12%	Planning 10%	Planning 7%
Analytical capability 11%	Functional/technical expe 8%	Global perspective 10%	External/market orientatic 7%
Global perspective 10%	Global perspective 4%	External/market orientatic 5%	Analytical capability 7%
Functional/technical expe 5%	Financial acumen 4%	Financial acumen 5%	Global perspective 0%
Financial acumen 5%	Analytical capability 0%	Analytical capability 0%	Financial acumen 0%

### Most Important Leadership Attributes, by Function Pairs

ST		SF		NT		NF	
n=41 (15%)		n=11 (4%)		n=120 (45%)		n=85 (32%)	
Vision	61%	Vision	64%	Strategic thinking	59%	Vision	55%
Relationship building	56%	Execution	45%	Vision	54%	Relationship building	52%
Achievement drive	46%	Relationship building	45%	Execution	48%	Strategic thinking	48%
People development	39%	Self-awareness	45%	Relationship building	39%	Adaptability	42%
Execution	37%	People development	36%	Achievement drive	39%	People development	39%
Strategic thinking	37%	Strategic thinking	27%	People development	38%	Execution	35%
Initiative	32%	Achievement drive	27%	Adaptability	30%	Self-awareness	35%
Self-awareness	29%	Change leadership	27%	Change leadership	26%	Teamwork	28%
Adaptability	29%	Initiative	27%	Initiative	25%	Achievement drive	26%
Teamwork	29%	Empathy	27%	Teamwork	23%	Initiative	24%
Planning	24%	Adaptability	18%	Optimism	22%	Change leadership	20%
Change leadership	22%	Teamwork	18%	Self-awareness	20%	Optimism	20%
Optimism	20%	Conflict management	18%	External/market orientat	16%	Empathy	19%
Empathy	15%	Analytical capability	18%	Conflict management	14%	Conflict management	18%
Conflict management	15%	Global perspective	18%	Empathy	13%	Analytical capability	11%
Global perspective	10%	Functional/technical ex	18%	Planning	11%	External/market orientat	11%
External/market orientat	10%	Optimism	9%	Analytical capability	9%	Functional/technical ex	9%
Analytical capability	5%	Planning	9%	Global perspective	8%	Planning	6%
Functional/technical ex	2%	External/market orientat	0%	Functional/technical ex	5%	Financial acumen	2%
Financial acumen	2%	Financial acumen	0%	Financial acumen	3%	Global perspective	2%

### Most Important Leadership Attributes, by Temperament

Guardian (SJ)		Artisan (SP)		Rational (NT)		Idealist (NF)	
n=44 (17%)		n=8 (3%)		n=120 (45%)		n=85 (32%)	
Vision	61%			Strategic thinking	59%	Vision	55%
Relationship building	57%			Vision	54%	Relationship building	52%
Achievement drive	43%			Execution	48%	Strategic thinking	48%
People development	41%			Relationship building	39%	Adaptability	42%
Strategic thinking	39%			Achievement drive	39%	People development	39%
Self-awareness	36%			People development	38%	Execution	35%
Execution	34%			Adaptability	30%	Self-awareness	35%
Initiative	32%			Change leadership	26%	Teamwork	28%
Adaptability	27%			Initiative	25%	Achievement drive	26%
Teamwork	27%			Teamwork	23%	Initiative	24%
Change leadership	25%			Optimism	22%	Change leadership	20%
Planning	20%			Self-awareness	20%	Optimism	20%
Optimism	14%			External/market orientat	16%	Empathy	19%
Empathy	14%			Conflict management	14%	Conflict management	18%
Conflict management	11%			Empathy	13%	Analytical capability	11%
Global perspective	11%			Planning	11%	External/market orientat	11%
Analytical capability	9%			Analytical capability	9%	Functional/technical ex	9%
External/market orientat	7%			Global perspective	8%	Planning	6%
Functional/technical ex	7%			Functional/technical ex	5%	Financial acumen	2%
Financial acumen	2%			Financial acumen	3%	Global perspective	2%

\*Insufficient data to include Artisan (SP)

### Most Important Leadership Attributes, by MBTI Decision-Styles

TJ		FJ		TP		FP	
n=112 (42%)		n=36 (14%)		n=49 (18%)		n=60 (23%)	
Vision	58%	Vision	58%	Vision	51%	Relationship building	57%
Strategic thinking	55%	Strategic thinking	44%	Strategic thinking	49%	Vision	55%
Execution	46%	Relationship building	42%	Achievement drive	49%	Strategic thinking	47%
Relationship building	43%	Adaptability	42%	Relationship building	45%	Execution	40%
People development	38%	Self-awareness	42%	Execution	43%	People development	38%
Achievement drive	38%	People development	39%	People development	37%	Adaptability	38%
Adaptability	28%	Execution	31%	Initiative	37%	Self-awareness	33%
Teamwork	28%	Teamwork	28%	Adaptability	35%	Achievement drive	27%
Change leadership	25%	Achievement drive	25%	Change leadership	24%	Teamwork	27%
Self-awareness	24%	Empathy	25%	Optimism	24%	Initiative	27%
Initiative	22%	Conflict management	22%	Self-awareness	18%	Change leadership	23%
Optimism	20%	Initiative	19%	Teamwork	18%	Optimism	22%
Planning	16%	Change leadership	17%	External/market orier	18%	Empathy	17%
Empathy	14%	Functional/technical	17%	Conflict management	16%	Conflict management	15%
Conflict management	13%	Optimism	14%	Empathy	12%	External/market orier	12%
External/market orier	13%	Analytical capability	14%	Planning	10%	Analytical capability	10%
Analytical capability	11%	Global perspective	8%	Functional/technical	6%	Planning	7%
Global perspective	10%	External/market orier	6%	Global perspective	6%	Functional/technical	7%
Financial acumen	4%	Planning	6%	Analytical capability	2%	Global perspective	2%
Functional/technical	4%	Financial acumen	3%	Financial acumen	2%	Financial acumen	2%

### Most Important Leadership Attributes, by Interaction Styles

Chart-the-Course		Behind-the-Scenes		In-Charge		Get-Things-Going	
(INTJ, INFJ, ISTJ, ISTP)		(INTP, INFP, ISFP, ISFJ)		(ENTJ, ENFJ, ESTJ, ESTP)		(ENTP, ENFP, ESFP, ESFJ)	
n=63 (24%)		n=42 (16%)		n=82 (31%)		n=70 (26%)	
Strategic thinking	57%	Vision	50%	Vision	62%	Vision	56%
Vision	52%	Strategic thinking	48%	Strategic thinking	49%	Relationship building	56%
Relationship building	44%	People development	48%	Execution	46%	Strategic thinking	49%
Execution	38%	Relationship building	45%	People development	40%	Execution	40%
People development	35%	Execution	40%	Relationship building	40%	Adaptability	36%
Adaptability	33%	Achievement drive	38%	Achievement drive	38%	Achievement drive	34%
Achievement drive	32%	Adaptability	36%	Teamwork	33%	People development	33%
Self-awareness	29%	Initiative	33%	Adaptability	30%	Self-awareness	31%
Optimism	25%	Change leadership	29%	Self-awareness	24%	Initiative	30%
Initiative	24%	Self-awareness	26%	Change leadership	23%	Optimism	27%
Teamwork	22%	Conflict management	19%	Initiative	20%	Teamwork	26%
Change leadership	21%	Teamwork	17%	Conflict management	17%	Change leadership	23%
Empathy	19%	Empathy	17%	Empathy	16%	External/market orientatic	14%
Conflict management	16%	External/market orientati	12%	Optimism	16%	Empathy	13%
Planning	16%	Functional/technical exp	12%	External/market orientatic	13%	Conflict management	11%
Analytical capability	13%	Optimism	10%	Planning	13%	Analytical capability	9%
External/market orientatic	10%	Planning	10%	Analytical capability	9%	Planning	6%
Global perspective	10%	Analytical capability	7%	Global perspective	9%	Global perspective	6%
Functional/technical exp	3%	Global perspective	2%	Functional/technical exp	7%	Functional/technical exp	6%
Financial acumen	2%	Financial acumen	2%	Financial acumen	5%	Financial acumen	1%

### Most Important Leadership Attributes, by Job Classification/Level

Exec n=90 (34%)		Mgr/Dir n=87 (33%)		Founder/Owner n=39 (15%)		Consultant n=30 (11%)	
Vision	57%	Relationship building	53%	Vision	62%	Vision	77%
Strategic thinking	52%	Vision	49%	Strategic thinking	59%	Relationship building	67%
Execution	46%	Strategic thinking	48%	Relationship building	49%	Strategic thinking	43%
Achievement drive	40%	Execution	41%	Execution	41%	People development	43%
People development	38%	People development	37%	Achievement drive	38%	Execution	40%
Optimism	34%	Adaptability	37%	People development	33%	Self-awareness	40%
Adaptability	32%	Achievement drive	36%	Adaptability	31%	Achievement drive	27%
Relationship building	31%	Initiative	25%	Initiative	31%	Adaptability	23%
Teamwork	29%	Change leadership	25%	Self-awareness	31%	Change leadership	23%
Self-awareness	27%	Teamwork	24%	Teamwork	26%	Initiative	20%
Initiative	24%	Self-awareness	24%	Empathy	21%	Teamwork	13%
Change leadership	21%	Conflict management	18%	Optimism	18%	Empathy	13%
Conflict management	16%	Empathy	16%	Change leadership	15%	Optimism	13%
Empathy	16%	Optimism	14%	Conflict management	13%	External/market orientatic	13%
Planning	13%	Planning	13%	Analytical capability	13%	Global perspective	13%
External/market orientatic	11%	Analytical capability	13%	External/market orientatic	13%	Planning	10%
Analytical capability	4%	External/market orientatic	11%	Global perspective	10%	Conflict management	7%
Functional/technical expe	4%	Functional/technical expe	8%	Planning	8%	Analytical capability	7%
Global perspective	4%	Global perspective	6%	Functional/technical expe	8%	Functional/technical expe	7%
Financial acumen	0%	Financial acumen	2%	Financial acumen	8%	Financial acumen	7%

\*Data from 19 participants from other job classifications (e.g., students, retirees) have been excluded from this chart

### Most Important Leadership Attributes, by Years of Leadership Experience

1-4 years n=90 (34%)		5-9 years n=87 (33%)		10-19 years n=39 (15%)		20+ years n=30 (11%)	
Strategic thinking	61%	Vision	55%	Vision	56%	Vision	64%
Execution	55%	Relationship building	52%	Strategic thinking	53%	Strategic thinking	52%
Vision	48%	Strategic thinking	45%	Achievement drive	47%	Relationship building	42%
Relationship building	45%	Execution	42%	Relationship building	44%	People development	36%
Adaptability	42%	People development	39%	Execution	40%	Execution	33%
Initiative	33%	Adaptability	36%	People development	40%	Change leadership	33%
People development	30%	Achievement drive	36%	Self-awareness	33%	Optimism	33%
Teamwork	30%	Self-awareness	28%	Adaptability	29%	Adaptability	30%
Achievement drive	24%	Initiative	25%	Change leadership	24%	Teamwork	30%
Empathy	18%	Teamwork	25%	Initiative	23%	Empathy	27%
Optimism	18%	Change leadership	22%	Teamwork	21%	Self-awareness	24%
External/market orientatic	15%	Optimism	19%	Optimism	20%	Achievement drive	21%
Self-awareness	15%	External/market orientatic	18%	Conflict management	17%	Initiative	21%
Analytical capability	12%	Conflict management	18%	Empathy	13%	Planning	12%
Change leadership	12%	Empathy	15%	Planning	12%	Global perspective	12%
Conflict management	12%	Planning	13%	Functional/technical expe	8%	Analytical capability	12%
Global perspective	9%	Analytical capability	9%	External/market orientatic	7%	Conflict management	9%
Planning	9%	Global perspective	5%	Global perspective	6%	External/market orientatic	9%
Functional/technical expe	6%	Functional/technical expe	5%	Analytical capability	5%	Functional/technical expe	3%
Financial acumen	0%	Financial acumen	4%	Financial acumen	2%	Financial acumen	0%

### **Most Important Leadership Attributes, by Gender**

Women n=151 (57%)		Men n=112 (42%)	
Strategic thinking	58%	<i>Vision</i>	55%
<i>Vision</i>	56%	Execution	46%
<i>Relationship building</i>	52%	<i>Achievement drive</i>	46%
Execution	38%	Strategic thinking	41%
<i>People development</i>	37%	<i>Relationship building</i>	40%
<i>Adaptability</i>	36%	<i>People development</i>	40%
<i>Achievement drive</i>	28%	<i>Adaptability</i>	30%
<i>Teamwork</i>	27%	<i>Self-awareness</i>	30%
<i>Self-awareness</i>	26%	<i>Initiative</i>	26%
<i>Initiative</i>	25%	<i>Optimism</i>	26%
<i>Change leadership</i>	24%	<i>Teamwork</i>	23%
<i>Empathy</i>	17%	<i>Change leadership</i>	21%
<i>Optimism</i>	17%	<i>Conflict management</i>	15%
<i>Conflict management</i>	16%	<i>Empathy</i>	14%
Planning	13%	External/market orientatic	13%
External/market orientatic	11%	Planning	10%
Analytical capability	9%	Global perspective	10%
Functional/technical expe	6%	Analytical capability	9%
Global perspective	5%	Functional/technical expe	7%
Financial acumen	3%	Financial acumen	3%

## **Appendix H: Bibliography**

Berens, Linda V. 1999. "Dynamics of Personality Type: Understanding and Applying Jung's Cognitive Processes." Huntington Beach, CA: Telos Publications.

Berens, Linda V. 2000. "Understanding Yourself and Others: An Introduction to Temperament." Huntington Beach, CA: Telos Publications.

Berens, Linda V. 2001. "Understanding Yourself and Others: An Introduction to Interaction Styles." Huntington Beach, CA: Telos Publications.

Boyatzis, Richard. 1982. *The Competent Manager: A Model for Organizational Effectiveness*. New York, NY: Wiley-Interscience.

Cherniss, Cary, and Daniel Goleman. 2001. *The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cooper, Robert K. 1997. *Executive EQ*. New York: Penguin Putnam.

Dulewicz, Victor, Malcolm Higgs, and Jane Cranwell-Ward. "Ocean's Twelve." *People Management*, Vol. 8, Issue 11.

Dulewicz, Victor and Malcolm Higgs. 1999. "Can Emotional Intelligence be Measured and Developed?" *Leadership and Organisational Development Journal*, Volume 20.

Dulewicz, Victor and Malcolm Higgs. 2000. "Emotional Intelligence." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. Vol.15, Issue 4.

Emmerling, Robert J. and Daniel Goleman. 2003. "Emotional Intelligence: Issues and Common Misunderstandings." Paper posted on <http://www.eiconsortium.org>.

Fitzgerald, Catherine. 1994. "The Relationship between the MBTI and Ratings of Management Skills, Occupational Stress, and Managerial Job Satisfaction." Conference proceedings, MBTI and Leadership, University of Maryland.

Fitzgerald, Catherine and Linda K. Kirby. 1997. *Developing Leaders: Research & Applications in Psychological Type and Leadership Development*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black. Especially:

Chapter 1. Kirby, Linda K. "Introduction" see pp. 27-29 Overrepresentation of TJ Managers and Leaders, Underrepresentation of Feeling.

Chapter 3. Walck, Christa L. "Using the MBTI in Management and Leadership: A Review of the Literature."

- Gardner, Howard. 1983. *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, Howard. 1999. *Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goleman, Daniel. 1998. *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, Daniel. 1999. "What Makes a Leader?" Harvard Business Review.
- Goleman, Daniel. 2000. "Emotional Intelligence: Issues in Paradigm Building." In *The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace*, Cherniss and Goleman, cited above.
- Goleman, Daniel. August, 2000. "Leadership that gets Results." Harvard Business Review.
- Goleman, Daniel, Richard Boyatzis, and Annie McKee. 2002. *Primal Leadership*. Cambridge, MA: HBS Press.
- Haapaniemi, Peter. 2003. "Leading Indicators: The Development of Executive Leadership." Center for Creative Leadership.
- Higgs, Malcolm. 2000. "Is There a Relationship Between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Emotional Intelligence?" Working Paper.
- Johnson, Donald A. and John P. Golden. 1994. "How Psychological Type Influences Effective Leadership: The Survey of Management Practices and the Type Differentiation Indicator." In conference proceedings, MBTI and Leadership, University of Maryland.
- Johnson, Douglas A. and Jana Miller. 2003. "Emotional Intelligence: Construct Validity Findings from the Global Personality Inventory." Working Paper
- Keirse, David. 1998. *Please Understand Me II*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kirby, Linda and Nancy Barger. 1995. *The Challenge of Change in Organizations*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Mayer, J.D., and P. Salovey, D. R. Caruso, and G. Sitarenios. 2001. "Emotional Intelligence as a Standard Intelligence." *Emotion*, 1, 232-242.
- McCaully, M.H. 1990. "The MBTI and Leadership." In K. E. Clark and M.B. Clark (eds.), *Measures of Leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

- McClelland, David C. 1998. "Identifying Competencies with Behavioral-Event Interviews." *Psychological Science* 9: 331-339.
- Morand, David A. 2001. "The EI of Managers: Assessing the Construct Validity of a Nonverbal Measure of 'People Skills'." *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Volume 16.
- Myers, Isabel Briggs, et al. 1998. *MBTI Manual, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Osborn, Dede Bergerhouse, and T. Noel Osborn. "21st Century Idealized Leadership Types of 20th Century Managers: U.S. and Latin American Viewpoints." On <http://www.spectrumconsortium.com/osbart1.htm>
- Pearman, Roger R. 1998. *Hardwired Leadership*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Pearman, Roger R. 2002. *Introduction to Type & Emotional Intelligence*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Reynierse, J.H. 1993. "The Distribution and Flow of Managerial Types through Organizational levels in Business and Industry." *Journal of Psychological Type*, Volume 25.
- Roach, Ben. 1986. "Organizational Decision-Makers: Different Types for Different Levels." *Journal of Psychological Type*, Volume 12.
- Roush, Paul E. 1992. "Using the MBTI to Understand Transformational Leadership and Self-Perception Accuracy." *Military Psychology*, Volume 4.
- Rothmann, S., et al. 2002. "Personality Preferences and Emotional Intelligence: Implications for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises." Presented at The International Conference for Small Business, Puerto Rico.
- Sala, Fabio. 2002. *Emotional Competence Inventory: Technical Manual*. Hay/McBer.
- Sala, Fabio. 2001. "It's Lonely at the Top: Executives' EI Self (Mis)Perceptions." Hay/McBer.
- Schettler, Joel. 2002. "Q&A with Annie McKee." *Training*, Vol. 39, Issue 9.
- Sundstrom, Eric, Robert G. Koenigs, and Douglas Huet-Cox. "Personality and Expressed Values in Management Teams: MBTI and Co-Worker Ratings on SYMLOG Values." In conference proceedings, MBTI and Leadership, University of Maryland.

Van Eron, Ann Marie. 1991. "Key Components of the Transformational/Transactional Leadership Model: The Relationship between Individual Difference, Leadership Disposition, Behavior, and Climate." Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.

Van Velsor, Ellen and Jean Brittain Leslie. 1995. 'Why Executives Derail: Perspectives Across Time and Cultures.' Academy of Management Executive, Vol. 9, Issue 4.

Van Velsor, Ellen and John Fleenor. 1994. "Leadership Skills and Perspectives, Gender and the MBTI." In conference proceedings, MBTI and Leadership, University of Maryland.

Emotional Intelligence websites:

Goleman and EI Consortium: <http://www.eiconsortium.org>

Mayer, Salovey, Caruso: <http://www.emotionaliq.com>

MHS, publisher MSCEIT and Bar-On EQi: <http://www.emotionalintelligencemhs.com>

Dulewicz and Higgs: <http://www.eitest.com/eiq.htm>

## **Appendix I: Authors**

**Sharon Lebovitz Richmond, MBA**  
Richmond & Associates Consulting

650-856-8687  
[sharonrichmond@mindspring.com](mailto:sharonrichmond@mindspring.com)

Sharon consults with executives, helping them implement strategically significant changes in their organizations. She works closely with senior teams committed to improving their effectiveness, both as individual leaders and as a team. For more than 16 years, Richmond & Associates has helped executives build the organizational capability, culture, structure and leadership crucial to their company's success.

Clients have included Roche Biosciences, CISCO Systems, DHL, Stanford Graduate School of Business, Stanford Medical Center, and Pacific Gas & Electric Company. Richmond & Associates has also worked with many early-stage, venture-backed companies, including Brocade Communications, FastForward Networks, PlaceWare, and Alteon WebSystems.

Sharon is a senior facilitator for Stanford University's Graduate School of Business's high-impact Interpersonal Dynamics course. Sharon is Western Region Chair for Association of Psychological Type (APT) International, and is a Past-President of the Bay Area Chapter of APT. She is Certified to administer and interpret the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® and other developmental instruments. Sharon has previously been a Partner or Consultant with 54th Street Partners, LLP, APM, Inc., and Touche Ross Management Consulting. She earned her MBA from Stanford Graduate School of Business and her BA from Duke University.

**Pam Fox Rollin, MBA**  
IdeaShape Coaching & Consulting

408-245-2600 [pam@ideashape.com](mailto:pam@ideashape.com)  
[www.ideashape.com](http://www.ideashape.com)

Pam specializes in consulting with executives who are leading complex organizations through rapid change. She also leads three-month leadership coaching programs by phone. Her firm, IdeaShape, strengthens company performance and individual achievement with leadership programs, coaching, custom 360s, in-depth assessments, training, facilitation, and project design.

Clients have included United HealthGroup, Kaiser Permanente, Blue Shield of CA, Charles Schwab, DHL, Kellogg's, Varian, and Accenture. She earned an MBA with depth in strategy and leadership from Stanford University Graduate School of Business and is a senior facilitator of the Interpersonal Dynamics course. Her BA is in Organization Studies from the University of California, Davis. Additionally, she has advanced training in corporate coaching and is Certified to administer and interpret assessments including the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator®. Pam facilitates a learning community of nearly 200 coaches around the world who use the MBTI.

**Julie M. Brown**, MBA, MPH

650-571-6690 [Lavieboehm@aol.com](mailto:Lavieboehm@aol.com)

Julie M. Brown and Associates Management Consulting

Julie is Principal of Julie M. Brown and Associates, which provides management consulting services in the areas of operational performance improvement, new program/product launch and leadership development. Julie utilizes her experience as a former hospital CEO to support clients navigating the whitewaters of organizational change. Her expertise includes strategic planning/business plan development, project implementation, and human resource development.

Julie's consulting engagements have involved diverse clientele, including Kaiser Permanente, The Permanente Medical Group, Lifeguard Insurance Company, Hospice and Palliative Care of Contra Costa, UC Berkeley, the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, the Contra Costa County Transit Authority and numerous community-based organizations.

Julie earned her Bachelors degrees in Psychology and Social Welfare, as well as Master's degrees in Business and Public Health, all from UC Berkeley. She is qualified to administer and interpret assessments including the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator®.