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Individual differences and personality factors have reemerged as some of the more important research topics in the applied organizational sciences. With the increasing prevalence of executive coaching and the use of personality assessments, more research needs to be done on the impact of personality variables on managerial behaviors in the workplace. The following study provides an applied analysis of personality preferences and behavioral ratings collected for a developmental multirater feedback intervention based on 343 senior managers and others in a research-driven global health services organization. Results revealed modest personality-behavior relationships, many of which were consistent with Myers-Briggs Type Indicator theory and research; differences by observer perspective were also evident. Implications for HRD practice are discussed.

The potential impact of individual personality dispositions and preferences on workplace behavior and effectiveness has reemerged in the last decade as one of the more significant research topics from a general social psychological perspective (Goldberg, 1993; Mischel, 1990; Snyder and Ickes, 1985), as well as from applied industrial-organizational (I/O) and related organization development (OD) and HRD perspectives (for example, Barrick and Mount, 1991; Church and Waclawski, 1998a; Furnham and Stringfield, 1993; Hogan, Hogan, and Roberts, 1996; Lind and Otte, 1994; Roush, 1992; Van Eron and Burke, 1992).

This heightened interest is in part due to the increased use of multirater feedback and related methodologies in executive and management development efforts as a means for enhancing managerial self-awareness and
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performance (Antonioni, 1996; Church, 1997a; Church and Bracken, 1997; London and Wohlers, 1991; McLean, 1997; Tornow, 1993). For example, as some practitioners have noted (for example, Goodstone and Diamante, 1998; Harris, 1999; Waclawski and Church, 1999a), personality measures used in conjunction with ratings from coworkers and delivered in a confidential one-on-one coaching setting can have a significant impact on a manager's or an executive's subsequent behavior. This is due to the sensitivity and specificity of the data provided and the nature of the personal coaching dynamic that can be established. Similar to a counseling relationship, when multirater feedback and personality assessments are presented in a protected, confidential coaching environment, the individual manager or executive has a greater opportunity to explore the underlying issues in the data, work through his or her initial resistance, and move toward identifying and solidifying a formal action plan for addressing needed areas of behavior change (Waclawski and Church, 1999b). Thus, understanding the interplay between one's personality preferences and one's day-to-day workplace behaviors is critical for designing and implementing effective individual development efforts.

Perhaps this is one of the reasons why some of the older, well-established self-report personality instruments such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Hirsh, 1985; Hirsh and Kummerow, 1990), the Kirton Adaptation Inventory (Kirton, 1991, 1992), or the Adjective Check List (Gough and Heilbrun, 1983) have been and continue to be extremely popular with organizational practitioners and applied researchers in industry settings (for example, Church and Waclawski, 1996; Furnham and Stringfield, 1993; Gardner and Martinko, 1996; McCaulley, 1990; Roush, 1992). Of course, the widespread acceptance and use of these tools is probably also the result of their intuitive nature, ease of use, and relatively nonevaluative approach. Moreover, it is also likely that the increased emphasis in the psychological research literature on the Big Five factor theory of personality and its associated measures has also contributed to the rising interest in the relationship between personality and behavior. Specifically, the Big Five factor theory is an integrative framework derived from decades of research that identifies five global dimensions of personality (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Costa and McCrae, 1991, 1992; Furnham, 1996; John, 1990; McCrae and Costa, 1987). These five factors are thought to have a significant impact on individual behavior. The factors are as follows: neuroticism, one's level of psychological adjustment or stress tolerance; extraversion, one's degree of sociability; openness, one's degree of openness to new experiences and ideas; agreeableness, one's degree of friendliness and trust of others; and conscientiousness, one's degree of organization, commitment, and persistence.

Although researchers may differ in their approach to defining and measuring personality, regardless of the approach taken research on the personality-behavior link continues to grow. For example, in the past decade there have been a large number of studies (meta-analytic and original contributions) directed at linking personality variables to workplace behaviors, leadership
styles, and even job performance (for example, Barrick and Mount, 1991; Chartrand, Rose, Elliot, Marmarosh, and Caldwell, 1993; Ones, Mount, Barrick, and Hunter, 1994; Tett, Jackson, and Rothstein, 1991). Despite the volume of research in this area, however, findings remain inconsistent, and thus researchers and practitioners continue to debate the underlying nature of these relationships (for example, Hogan, Hogan, and Roberts, 1996; Schmitt, Gooding, Noe, and Kirsch, 1984; Tett, 1998). Moreover, even when supported, correlations between various personality measures and workplace-related outcomes have been consistently low enough ($r \approx 0.21$) to cause further questioning of the nature of these linkages.

Clearly, more research is needed in the area of personality and its effect on managerial and executive behaviors in the workplace. In particular, assessments from knowledgeable observers (for example, one’s direct reports, peers, and supervisors) provide an additional source of external validation of the personality characteristics of the focal individual. These observers are in a unique position to provide behavioral assessments for two primary reasons: (1) they are often affected by the consequences of the focal manager individual’s actions, and (2) they have the opportunity to observe these behaviors over time and in a variety of different contexts. Moreover, although self-assessments of behavior, which have been traditionally employed in personality-behavior–based studies, do provide useful data regarding an individual’s perceptions of his or her own behavior, this information is usually not as accurate or as valid as that which can be obtained from coworkers. In fact, research has indicated that raters from these different groups can provide entirely different perspectives on an individual’s behavior, compared with self-perceptions or any single-source rating (Church, 1997b; Landy and Farr, 1980; McLean, 1997).

To this end, the following study will contribute to the existing literature by providing an empirical examination of the impact of personality characteristics on self and others’ assessments of managerial behavior in the workplace.

**Background and Issues Examined in the Study**

Before describing the study, it is important to have a better understanding of the theoretical and research history behind the personality instrument being used—the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). As noted earlier, the MBTI is one of the most commonly used applied approaches to understanding individual differences in personality (Hirsh, 1985; Hirsh and Kummerow, 1990; Myers and McCaulley, 1985). Based on Jungian concepts, the MBTI framework describes individual differences in personality preferences using four primary dichotomous dimensions: extraversion-introversion (EI), sensing-intuition (SN), thinking-feeling (TF), and judging-perceiving (JP). These fundamental preferences are thought to relate specifically to aspects of human perception and cognition. Although a number of significant concerns have been raised about the validity of the full sixteen-type model (for example, DeVito, 1985; Furnham...
and Stringfield, 1993; McCrae and Costa, 1989), the four primary dimensions have been shown to be relatively reliable across a variety of samples and applications. Although the MBTI does not measure the Big Five factors of personality directly, a number of studies have demonstrated moderate to strong correlations between it and related Big Five constructs (for example, Furnham and Stringfield, 1993; McCrae and Costa, 1989). Moreover, given its inherent accessibility to practitioners, it continues to be used for a variety of purposes in organizational settings, making it useful for research in applied settings. For example, some work-related applications of the MBTI have included the establishment of a competency model for organization development practitioners (Bushe and Gibbs, 1990), an examination of problem-solving styles among mining personnel (Davey, Schell, and Morrison, 1993), and the study of leadership effectiveness across a broad range of industries and groups (for example, Church and Waclawski, 1998a; Furnham and Stringfield, 1993; McCaulley, 1990; Oswald and Kroeger, 1988; Roush, 1992; Van Eron and Burke, 1992), including the military (for example, Roush and Atwater, 1992). Further, preferences on the MBTI have also been linked to such outcomes as job satisfaction, decision-making style, feelings of empowerment or enablement, and the acceptance of various managerial roles (Church and Waclawski, 1996; Furnham and Zacherl, 1986; Marcia, Aiuppa, and Watson, 1989).

Despite these applications, however, relatively few studies have explored the relationship between personality preferences and perceptions of workplace behavior from different independent observers. This lack of research is somewhat surprising given the widespread use of measures such as the MBTI in many developmental settings and interventions (for example, Church, 1998; McCaulley, 1990). Therefore, one viable approach to increasing knowledge in this area is to expand analyses to include behavioral ratings from coworkers (Church and Waclawski, 1996; Lind and Otte, 1994)—peers, direct reports, and supervisors—using data collected from HRD and OD-related multirater feedback applications.

Furthermore, it is a well-documented finding among ratings research that observations from different sources exhibit relatively consistent and low levels of agreement with one another (for example, Church, 1997a, 1997b; Furnham and Stringfield, 1998; Harris and Schaubroek, 1988; Landy and Farr, 1980; McLean, 1997). One possible explanation for this phenomenon, as some have suggested (Church, 1997a; Nowack, 1992), may indeed be the impact of the personality preferences of the focal individual being rated. Although there are a number of other possible explanations for these effects as well—such as differences in observational opportunities among raters, lack of formal rater training methods, individual differences in terms of rater biases, and cultural differences, to name a few—personality preferences remain a compelling and immediate source of insight into an individual’s behavioral tendencies. This is particularly true given the classic Lewinian model $B = f(P, E)$ of behavior as a function of personality and environment (Organ and Bateman, 1986).
Although several recent studies have in fact begun to explore the possibility of personality as a mediator in self-other agreement (for example, Church, 1997a; Church and Waclawski, 1996, 1998a; Davey, Schell, and Morrison, 1993; Furnham and Stringfield, 1993) with interesting results emerging, more research is needed to clarify these relationships as well.

In sum, clearly there is a need in the literature for further examination of the impact of individual-level personality preferences on day-to-day managerial behaviors, particularly as observed by others. This type of research is valuable not only for theory development and a greater understanding of the behavioral assessment process but also for practice. The purpose of this study therefore is to investigate the relationship between personality preferences and managerial behavior vis-à-vis coworker observations (direct reports, peers, supervisors) using a large sample of senior managers in an applied organizational setting. More specifically, the following exploratory research propositions will be examined:

- Personality preferences will have an impact on the way an individual perceives his or her own management behaviors.
- Personality preferences will have an impact on the way coworkers perceive an individual's management behaviors.
- Personality preferences will be linked to an individual's ability to assess accurately his or her own strengths and weaknesses compared with others' assessments (that is, greater levels of managerial self-awareness).

Method

Sample. Data for the present study were collected from 343 senior-level managers (the focal individuals) and their direct reports, peers, and supervisors in a research-driven global health services organization. The following rater or observer types were employed in this study: direct reports, or those people who received a formal performance appraisal–based report from the focal individual; peers, or those people with whom the focal individuals worked closely but did not have formal reporting relationships; and supervisors, or the person to whom the focal individual formally reported.

All of these focal individuals were participants in one of a number of senior management and executive development programs conducted by an external consulting firm during a two-year period. These programs were specifically designed to affect the focal individual's leadership behaviors positively in support of a recent change effort directed at the organization's culture and a long-term strategy that was initiated by the organization's chief executive officer and executive committee. The programs were staffed by counseling psychologists and OD and HRD practitioners. All the program staff were specialists in delivering multirater feedback and personality assessments and using these tools in a one-on-one coaching framework to develop specific
behaviorally based developmental action plans for each senior manager. Each program was held for several days at a residential off-site location in order to provide as much distance as possible from standard work-related stimuli. Participation in the program was based primarily on position in the organization (that is, senior-level status) and scheduling availability. In general, demand for the developmental program was high because it was perceived to be a significant developmental opportunity for individuals in senior positions in the company.

In terms of participant demographics, 78.4 percent of the participants were male and 21.6 percent female. Regarding tenure, the majority of senior managers had significant experience with this particular organization. More specifically, only 8.0 percent indicated having recently joined the organization within the past two years, 20.1 percent had been there between two and five years, 22.1 percent had been there for six to ten years, and the remaining 49.8 percent had been with the organization for more than eleven years. With respect to age, only 3.5 percent of these senior managers were under thirty-five, with another 17.3 percent between thirty-five and thirty-nine. Of the remaining 79.2 percent, almost half these individuals (48.4 percent) were between the ages of forty and forty-nine, and another 26.7 percent were in their fifties. Participants were extremely well educated, with 33.4 percent holding doctorates, 37.8 percent master’s degrees, and 25.6 percent bachelor’s degrees. Although geographic location was distributed among a number of different areas including Africa, Asia, Australia and New Zealand, Canada, Central or South America, Europe, and the United Kingdom, most respondents (58.7 percent) were based in the United States, with the next largest group (18.3 percent) stationed in Western Europe, followed by a smaller group in Japan (6.2 percent).

Procedure. In preparation for the program, senior managers (that is, participants) were required to complete two self-rating instruments: a behavioral measure of management practices (the Management Practices Questionnaire, or MPQ), and a personality instrument (the MBTI). In addition, parallel forms of the behavioral questionnaire (the MPQ), but not the personality measure, were distributed to the coworkers of these same senior managers. Each senior manager was allowed to receive ratings from the following rater or observer groups: up to five direct reports, up to five peers, and his or her supervisor. All response forms from all raters were returned directly to an independent external firm for scoring and report generation.

In total, returns were collected from 343 senior managers and 3,158 coworkers or observers—1,499 direct reports, 1,333 peers, and 326 supervisors. At the individual level, the average number of observers by source was $M = 4.37$ ($SD = .76$) for direct reports, $M = 3.89$ for peers ($SD = 1.40$), and $M = 0.95$ for supervisors ($SD = .22$, 95 percent response). The relative response rates or participation rates for the present sample then were 87.4 percent for direct reports, 77.7 percent for peers, and 95 percent for supervisors. In general, these levels are
consistent with (if not better than) those reported in other multirater feedback research (for example, Church, 1997b; Sederburg and Rogelberg, 1998; Westerman and Rosse, 1997), and they are far better than the return rates usually seen in organizational survey efforts (Church and Wacławski, 1998b). Although no additional information is available regarding the actual number of forms distributed or the size of each focal manager’s work group, given the robust nature of these returns it is unlikely that either of these factors affected the data obtained in any meaningfully consistent way.

Before completing the questionnaires, all raters, including the participants themselves, were given formal written instructions regarding the developmental purpose of the assessment process and the manner in which the feedback and personality results would be used. Raters were also instructed to be as open and honest in their ratings as possible. Peers and direct reports were further instructed that no one in the organization other than the focal individual would receive a copy of the results of the assessment process; their ratings would be reported to the participant only in aggregate form, and only when three or more responses for the same group of observers were received; and their unique ratings would not be released to anyone, not even the focal individual. The procedure was done this way to ensure the confidentiality of the assessments and thus to enhance rater motivation and the subsequent validity and utility of the feedback data collected (Bracken, 1994; Church, 1995; Harris, 1994; Ostroff, 1993). Thus, all specific ratings obtained from direct reports and peers remained anonymous throughout the feedback process (data were provided to participants in the form of averages for these groups). Supervisor ratings, however, given the singular position of these individuals, did not remain anonymous to the focal manager. Although these conditions do not guarantee the absence of biases entering into the rating process, they do provide an acceptable level of confidence in the integrity and accuracy of the data obtained.

**Measures.** As noted earlier, two different self-assessments were completed by each program participant: one measured personality preferences (the MBTI) and the other was a custom-designed instrument for measuring workplace behavior (the Management Practices Questionnaire). Each of these is described briefly in the following section. Parallel forms of the MPQ were also completed by coworkers, but coworkers did not complete the MBTI.

Also noted earlier, the MBTI is an extremely popular tool among OD, HRD, and I/O practitioners and researchers and has been used in numerous personal and organizational settings (Hirsh and Kummerow, 1990; Myers and McCaulley, 1985). In terms of measures, the MBTI yields four separate continuous preference scores (termed EI, SN, TF, and JP) that describe the rater’s primary tendency toward how he or she goes about deriving energy (extraversion-introversion), directing attention (sensing-intuition), making decisions (thinking-feeling), and orienting to the outside world (judging-perceiving) and the relative strength of that preference. Interpretation of these scores is
relatively simple; the strength of an individual’s preference for a given tendency is indicated by the relative size of the score value from the instrument. Usually, these scores are combined into a four-letter typology (one of a possible sixteen in total) that serves to characterize an individual’s preferences across all the dimensions (Hirsh and Kummerow, 1990). Based on prior MBTI-related research and criticisms regarding the measurement properties of the sixteen-typology approach (for example, DeVito, 1985; McCrae and Costa, 1989), only the four preference scores were used for analysis purposes in this study. In general, scores obtained on the MBTI can be interpreted as follows: 1 to 9 indicates a slight preference, 11 to 19 a moderate preference, 21 to 39 a clear preference, and 40 or more a very clear preference. Because each of the four scores represents two sides or aspects of a single construct, however, scores on the MBTI (when used for research purposes) can be negative as well as positive, with a negative value indicating a preference for the first of the paired letters describing that specific preference dimension. For example, a negative score on the TF dimension indicates a preference for thinking, whereas a positive score represents a feeling orientation.

The MPQ is a custom-designed instrument that was developed exclusively for this organization, based on a combination of prior behavioral research differentiating between higher and lower performers and a set of core competencies and strategic leadership objectives. The instrument contains forty-one items pertaining to various aspects of managerial behavior (for example, “gives others clear feedback regarding their performance,” “cooperates with others”). As with most behaviorally based multirater instruments, items were designed to be specific enough to be actionable but general enough not to be easily dismissed. For each item, respondents (self, direct reports, peers, and supervisors) were asked to rate the focal individual using a scale from 1 to 7 (where 1 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 5 = often, and 7 = almost always) on the degree to which that senior manager engaged in a given behavioral practice. Overall, the internal reliability of the instrument was quite high across each rating perspective (.95 for self, and .97 each for direct reports, peers, and supervisors).

For this study, managerial self-awareness was operationalized as an index of the level of item-by-item agreement between self and direct reports on each behavioral rating given. Termed profile similarity (Nunnally, 1978), this method has been used in a number of prior studies to explore effects related to self-awareness (for example, Church, 1997a, 1997b; Church and Waclawski, 1996, 1999; Zimmerman, 1994). It was used here along with simple Pearson correlations to test for moderating effects with respect to personality preferences.

**Analyses.** The data were analyzed for personality-behavior relationships using a relatively simple multistage approach. First, following a simple correlation matrix of the summary variables on the MPQ to examine overall trends and between-rater correlations, a principle components (PC) factor analysis was performed on the averaged direct-report ratings in order to identify a set of related behavioral factors that could then be used for more detailed analysis. Direct-report ratings were chosen as the input for this procedure because of
the greater rate of return for this group, and their propensity for enhanced observation of the focal managers’ day-to-day leadership behaviors relative to either peers or supervisors.

Results and Discussion

Results of the correlational analysis and descriptive statistics for each of the personality and summary level behavior variables by observer type are presented in Table 1. The following section focuses on broader overall relationships among the MBTI and the MPQ in response to the research hypotheses.

Summary Score Analyses. An examination of the data in Table 1 reveals a set of interesting yet consistent findings regarding the overall relationship between personality and workplace behavior in general. The results suggest intriguing areas for OD and HRD professionals to consider. First, based on the four MBTI preference score means, it is apparent that the collective set of senior managers in the present global health services organization have preferences somewhat similar to those in other executive populations (for example, Church and Waclawski, 1996; McCaulley, 1990).

At the summary score level, this group of senior managers exhibited no preference on one dimension of the MBTI, moderate preference on two other dimensions, and a very strong preference on the final area. More specifically, with respect to preference for extraversion and introversion (EI), participants in this sample demonstrated no specific preference whatsoever. Although the mean score ($M = 0.56$) was ever so slightly introverted, it was close enough to zero to suggest that these senior managers differ equally on the extent to which they prefer to be externally (social) versus internally (idea) driven. Interestingly enough, this is considerably divergent from the 65 percent to 75 percent preference for extraversion reported for the general population in the United States, though it is less startling when compared with other types of samples of senior managers (McCaulley, 1990).

Although scores on the SN and JP dimensions revealed only moderate preferences for intuition ($M = 5.55$) and judging ($M = -9.06$), which suggests a tendency to favor large-scale thinking and firm decision making on the part of these senior managers, by far the overriding preference among these individuals was for thinking as opposed to feeling ($M = -24.08$) as a means for making decisions. Although not surprising given reported averages across many different samples studied and for various occupational groups where the majority prefer thinking on this dimension (McCaulley, 1990), or the typical caricature of senior-level management as being primarily results- (as opposed to staff-) oriented in organizations—see Dilbert (Adams, 1996) for a host of examples in support of this perception—it does have implications for organizations. More specifically, this consistent and strong preference for thinking over feeling suggests that there may be a strong tendency toward logical, rational, and disciplined thinking at senior levels in the corporate world, or at least in those organizations headquartered in the United States and whose cultural
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Summary Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>JP</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>DR</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>Su</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality Preferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>25.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>25.94</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>-24.08</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>-9.06</td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct report</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile Similarity</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.52**</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = p < .05, ** = p < .01. Reliabilities are printed on the diagonal where available. Negative values for MBTI scores indicate a preference for the left-most letter in the pair. Profile similarity is the absolute self-direct report item level difference. Lower values represent higher levels of item-by-item congruence.
orientations (Hofstede, 1980) are more closely aligned with an individualistic rather than collectivistic framework. Although such a finding may not be inherently positive, it is consistent with the aggressive and hostile characterizations (that is, the so-called dog-eat-dog environment) of the corporate world.

In sum, as a group, this set of senior managers could be characterized as being well balanced on extraversion-introversion, a finding that supports some prior research regarding leadership EI preferences (for example, Van Eron and Burke, 1992) but not others (for example, Church and Waclawski, 1998a; Lord, De Vader, and Alliger, 1986), with a tendency to be conceptually focused and prefer analysis and rationality for making relatively timely decisions.

Turning now to an examination of the general effects among the total scores on the behaviorally based multirater MPQ measure (which reflect general rating tendency), as expected there were indeed significant differences in rater source means. More specifically, self-ratings were found to be significantly higher than those of direct reports and peers (t = 5.68, p < .001, and t = 5.13, p < .001, respectively), supporting the ego inflation perspective typically described as occurring at this level of management (Church and Waclawski, 1996), as well as being quite consistent with prior studies (for example, Harris and Schaubroeck, 1988; Nowack, 1992). Self and supervisor ratings did not significantly differ from each other, nor did those of direct reports and peers. Interestingly, however, supervisor ratings were found to be significantly higher than those of peers and direct reports (t = 6.63, p < .001, and t = 6.64, p < .001, respectively), suggesting possible inflation effects among the supervisors as well. This phenomenon is less common in usual ratings studies, although it has been reported in samples where influence tactics are the primary means of achieving results (for example, Church and Waclawski, 1999). The presence of such a pattern here suggests a potentially highly political process among the present sample of senior managers with respect to supervisor relationships. In short, although both senior managers (self) and their superiors were highly enamoured with the behaviors of the former group, direct reports and peers were significantly more critical in their assessments. Although this trend is not surprising, given the senior level of the focal individuals as heirs to the organization, it is somewhat disconcerting that supervisor perceptions were not more consistent with those of direct reports and peers.

With respect to summary-level rating tendencies and correlations, self-rating bias (that is, the tendency to overrate or underrate one’s own behaviors) was uncorrelated with personality preference. The only exception in this regard was between self-ratings and a preference for extraversion. More specifically, the findings did suggest that extraverted managers on average were more likely to rate their own behaviors higher on the MPQ than were introverts (r = -.13, p < .05). Although not particularly startling, this pattern does suggest that extraverts may have either higher base points for rating levels because of greater levels of social contact or more inflated egos than their reserved counterparts. Besides this relationship, however, no significant
correlations were evident at the summary-score level between personality preferences and behavioral ratings from any other source. In short, research proposition 2 was entirely unsupported and proposition 1 received only partial support from one of the four MBTI dimensions (EI). None of the other preferences had an impact on either self-ratings or others’ ratings at the overall level of analysis.

Although counterintuitive given Lewin’s classic model \( B = f (P, E) \), the absence of a host of summary score effects here does raise some questions about the direct impact of a manager’s individual personality preferences on observable workplace behaviors, at least among the present sample and using these specific measures. Of course, another interpretation is that the personality-behavior linkage may reflect a much more complex set of processes that are masked using this type of summary-level approach. Thus, further exploration of the data using a more detailed level of analysis was conducted in order to test this notion.

Before moving to these more detailed results, however, an examination of overall ratings congruence and a specific test of research proposition 3 must first be conducted at this level as well. More specifically, with respect to the degree of alignment or congruence between self and other ratings, an examination of between-source ratings indicated that although low, self-ratings were nonetheless more strongly related to both direct-report ratings \( (r = .20, p < .01) \) and supervisor ratings \( (r = .24, p < .01) \) than they were to peer ratings \( (r = .10, \text{n.s.}) \). In other words, from a correlational perspective, managers’ perceptions of their own behaviors were more similar to those of their direct reports and supervisors than those of their peers. This effect is probably due to the differential nature of opportunities afforded peers in the present setting. In any case, these findings are consistent with a number of studies in terms of overall correlation levels of patterns among various rating sources (for example, Church, 1997b; Harris and Schaubroeck, 1988; Nowack, 1992).

Finally, although personality preferences were examined for potential moderating effects on managerial self-awareness as measured by profile similarity—a commonly used item-by-item ratings agreement method (Church, 1997a, 1997b; Church and Waclawski, 1999)—no significant results emerged in support of research proposition 3. In other words, personality preferences on the MBTI were apparently unrelated to the focal manager’s ability to assess accurately his or her own behaviors. The lack of a significant relationship here could suggest that managerial self-awareness may indeed represent a psychological or perhaps cognitive skill set independent of an individual’s more general personality preferences.

**Differences in Behavioral Dimensions.** Next, in order to explore the possibility of more specific personality-behavior related effects, a principle components factor analysis was performed on the behavioral ratings data. Table 2 presents a summary of the results of the factor analysis of the MPQ, which yielded seven independent and distinct dimensions of management competencies (all with eigenvalues greater than 1.0).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Percentage of Variance</th>
<th>Item Content Description</th>
<th>Scale Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship and change management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>Works well with all types of people, has a positive and constructive approach, manages stress and pressure with grace, builds strong relationships within and across functions, responds with flexibility to changing situations, demonstrates sensitivity toward others</td>
<td>.89 .95 .95 .92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback and recognition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Gives employees clear feedback, rewards and celebrates accomplishments, provides opportunities for development, supports employees’ skills development and performance improvement, recognizes others for their contributions</td>
<td>.87 .94 .92 .91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and learning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Applies new knowledge, is innovative, generates creative solutions to problems, continually seeks out opportunities for professional development, fully develops technical skills, finds constructive solutions to problems</td>
<td>.84 .92 .91 .92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Ensures others understand and act in alignment with ethical business practices and policies, creates an ethical business environment, takes immediate action regarding unethical behaviors or situations</td>
<td>.77 .91 .92 .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic thinking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Stays abreast of global trends in the environment that impact the business, knows company’s product lines, considers cross-functional implications before making decisions, shares long-term objectives</td>
<td>.72 .93 .80 .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Makes decisions in a timely manner, manages resources effectively, follows through on commitments, organizes work to support key processes and goals</td>
<td>.72 .84 .81 .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer focus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Responds effectively to customer needs, understands the needs of customers to serve them better</td>
<td>.78 .86 .88 .77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the item content, these factors were labeled as follows: relationship and change management, feedback and recognition, innovation and learning, ethical management, strategic thinking, effectiveness, and customer focus. Overall, this seven-factor solution accounted for 69.7 percent of the total variance in behavior ratings, with the largest portion (51.9 percent of the variance) represented by the relationship and change management factor. This finding in and of itself highlights the singular importance of the social-emotional and relationship component involved in management effectiveness, particularly at the most senior level. As suggested earlier with respect to higher than normal ratings received from supervisors, it is apparent that building and maintaining relationships is a primary function and important skill set for individuals at this level of management, at least in the present organization. Of course, given the typically politicized nature of performance management and evaluation at senior levels (Gioia and Longenecker, 1994), this should probably come as no surprise. Interestingly enough, however, this explanation is also consistent with a number of elements inherent in Goleman’s (1995) work on what he calls emotional intelligence, including the argument that relationship-management skills may be one of the most critical predictors of workplace performance for all types of jobs.

Next, subscales were calculated for each of these factors by observer type for further analyses. Reliabilities were calculated for each of these and were all within a respectable range (.72 to .95). Table 3 provides a listing of the subsequent correlations among the behavioral subscales and individual personality preferences. Although no one specific result was particularly striking, a number of modest findings in support of research propositions 1 and 2 were evident and worthy of discussion. Before discussing these, however, it should be noted that it is probably most useful to read this table through a personality lens. In other words, focusing on each of the four MBTI dimensions across the range of behavioral observations (self, Dr, Pr, Su) enables a clearer understanding of how individual personality can make a difference in perceived practice and effectiveness in an organizational setting. In general, when examining these relationships it was apparent that extraverts (E), intuitors (N), feelers (F), and perceivers (P) tended to be perceived by others as practicing relatively more of the various workplace behaviors as assessed in MPQ. Each of these sets of findings will be discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

Extraverts May Be Optimistic, Introverts May Be More Ethical. First, from the extraversion-introversion perspective, it was not particularly surprising to learn that extraverted managers were likely to perceive themselves as being more engaged than introverted managers in relationship-related management behaviors, as well as those focused on feedback and recognition—in short, people and networking skills. Similarly, extraverts continued the rating trend (of inflated self-assessment), attributing higher scores to themselves on strategic thinking and customer focus-related behaviors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extraversion-Introversion</th>
<th>Sensing-Instuition</th>
<th>Thinking-Feeling</th>
<th>Judging-Perceiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship and change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback and recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Significant correlations are highlighted in bold. Significance $r > .11$ are significant at $p < .05$, and $r > .19$ are significant at $p < .01$. Negative values for MBTI scores indicate a preference for the left-most choice in the pair (for example, $-.13$ for Extraversion-Introversion represents extraversion).
It was interesting to note, however, that direct reports, peers, and supervisors did not agree on these differences. In fact, there were practically no significant relationships between EI preferences and ratings from any of the other observer sources. The only exception here was an intriguing result that peers were more likely to rate introverted managers as being better at ethical management than their extraverted counterparts. Why would this occur, and why only with peers? Although only speculation, one possibility is that extraverts may have been more likely to divulge too much information in certain conversations, leading to a possible perception of a more laissez-faire attitude in this regard. Another possible explanation is that introverts may be perceived by those who do not work as closely with them (for example, peers) to be more internally and therefore values-focused, rather than externally and therefore people-driven in their interests.

As for implications for HRD efforts, the data presented here makes it apparent that differences in how individuals chose to derive their energy—whether from social interactions or inner cognitions—have little to do with the observation of various managerial behaviors in the workplace. The only exception, of course, is that extraverts appear to be more likely to assess their own behaviors at higher levels, which may also translate to higher expectations regarding feedback-related results. This tendency needs to be carefully considered when working with these types of individuals in coaching and planning sessions, both in situations with and without data from other sources. In addition, it may also be helpful to reinforce in coaching settings with extraverts the need for enhanced discretion when communicating issues and information to others, given the lower ratings individuals with this preference received from peers on ethics and confidentiality. Finally, it is also important for managers and practitioners alike not to assume that it is better to be extraverted than introverted, or vice versa. Even though some research (for example, McCaulley, 1990; Roush, 1992) has suggested that extraverts are more successful in the workplace than introverts, there may be other dynamics occurring that would suggest otherwise. For instance, someone may be more self-aware and therefore more likely to be a high performer (Church, 1997a), but this awareness does not necessarily reflect on whether a person focuses his or her energy outwardly or inwardly.

*Intuitors Are Innovators, Learners, and Systemic Thinkers.* Moving to the sensing-intuition personality dimension of the MBTI, there were a number of significant correlations here with respect to behavioral tendencies, particularly in comparison with the other three personality dimensions. More specifically, senior managers with greater preferences for intuition tended to be consistently perceived—by themselves, and more importantly by their direct reports and supervisors—as being more effective at behaviors related to innovation and learning as well as strategic thinking than their counterparts with greater preferences for sensing. In short, the stronger their preference for intuition, the more likely they were to exhibit behaviors related to learning and
systems thinking. This finding is both interesting and quite reaffirming of classical MBTI theory and research (for example, Hirsh and Kummerow, 1990). Given that intuitors are characterized as being “big picture” visionaries who thrive on building linkages and being creative, it should come as no surprise that their workplace behaviors manifested these tendencies. Of course, the fact that the culture of the present organization was extremely research-focused may also have contributed to this general trend.

What was slightly puzzling among these correlations, however, was that peers did not have the same perception. Although the direction of the relationship suggested a similar pattern, it was not strong enough to reach significance among this group. Although limited or differential opportunities for peer observation may again be cited as possible explanations, an alternative argument is that given the competitive nature of peers, particularly at the management level at which this sample resides, individuals may be less likely to acknowledge or provide positive ratings to their peers in these areas. In fact, the presence of a significant correlation between a preference for sensing and peer ratings on effectiveness further supports this argument. It may well be, for example, that these senior managers do not want to consider high intuitors to be more effective but rather prefer to have peers who are focused on specifics in the here and now. That way the strategic thinking can be left to them.

Regardless of the reason for these trends, however, it is apparent that peers, at least at this senior level in the present organizational setting, may come from a very different mindset than each of the other sources. Although hardly a definitive finding, this does suggest that peer data, at least in higher management levels in similar types of organizational settings, might be less valid or simply more prone to competitive forces than other sources. Thus, practitioners may want to exercise care when examining and interpreting peer results in feedback based interventions.

For Feelers, the Right Relationship Is Everything. A number of interesting results were evident for the thinking-feeling dimension as well. Given today’s increasingly competitive global service environment (Rhinesmith, 1993), the ability to manage relationships effectively at all levels—within and between groups and even nations—is indeed a critical skill set. It was therefore quite encouraging to see that certain aspects of individual personality preferences do indeed appear to be significantly related to the more people-oriented managerial behaviors. More specifically, as the results in Table 3 indicate, those senior managers who had a preference for considering others’ feelings and emotions as a means for making decisions (or perhaps a less pronounced preference for focusing only on logic and rationality) tended to rate themselves and were rated by their direct reports as being more skilled at relationship and change-management behaviors. Given that this initial behavioral factor represents nearly half the total variance in managerial ratings on the MPQ measure, this is somewhat surprising, particularly in light of the recent debate about the
actual impact of participative management techniques (for example, Ledford and Lawler, 1994; Wagner, 1994). In addition to this finding, it was also interesting to note that both direct reports and peers rated more feeling-oriented senior managers as being better at giving feedback and recognition to others.

Based on these two sets of correlations and a lack of relationship with the other behavioral factors, the data would suggest that managers with stronger feeling preferences are indeed more attuned to interpersonal relationships and the process of providing feedback and recognition to direct reports. Although the absence of correlations between personality and supervisor observations might at first seem inconsistent with this interpretation, when one considers the explanation why supervisors provided the highest ratings overall—that is, greater attention to upward relationship management at this senior level—it is less surprising. In short, it may be that personality preferences on the TF dimension are not what determines how senior managers relate to their superiors but only how they relate to their direct reports and peers. This raises the central issue regarding personality preferences—that is, preferences can only be predictive of managerial behavior insofar as they are acted upon in work settings.

*Perceivers Are Seen as Innovative, Judgers Are Seen as Effective.* In general, results for the final MBTI preference dimension (judging-perceiving) were not as inherently interesting as the other three. One finding that is worth pointing out is that supervisors tended to rate perceiving managers as being better at innovation and learning-related behaviors, compared with those with a preference for judging. Consistent with MBTI theory and the Big Five factor relating to openness (McCrae and Costa, 1989), this relationship probably reflects the perception on the part of supervisors that these managers are more likely to be flexible in considering alternative perspectives and less likely to come to closure too quickly. In addition, a perceiver might be more willing to take a risk and try something novel or innovative by changing his or her mind at the last minute.

Interestingly enough and in contrast to this effect, however, a preference for judging was significantly positively correlated with self- and direct-report ratings of effectiveness. Thus, those senior managers who prefer to make decisions quickly and with certainty tended to think they were more effective, and so did their direct reports. However, neither peers nor supervisors agreed.

Clearly, these two sets of correlations provide support for the classic distinction between J and P preferences and behaviors associated with these two types (Hirsh and Kummerow, 1990; Myers and McCaulley, 1985). For example, in general, judgers tend to focus on pinning down goals, planning how to reach them, and seeking immediate closure of a situation (Hirsh and Kummerow, 1990), behaviors that for many people are synonymous with effectiveness in a work environment, even if the results obtained do not always represent the best or most creative solution. Conversely, although perceivers may be more apt to generate innovative solutions to problems in the long run, they can sometimes be seen as being resistant to making a decision until all options
have been considered. This extended time frame of consideration can allow for
greater numbers of ideas and possible approaches but may not be seen as effec-
tive in the short term. In other words, being perceived by others to be flexible
and open to new ideas does not always translate to being seen as effective in
getting the job done. Regardless of the underlying nature of these differences,
however, the results described here suggest that HRD and OD practitioners
need to be aware of the performance-related perceptions attributed to indi-
viduals with these MBTI preferences and the potential impact of these attri-
butions on subsequent assessments of performance.

In sum, once examined at a more concise behavioral level there were
indeed significant and meaningful relationships between personality prefer-
ences of these senior managers and their own and other’s perceptions of the
types of behaviors they engage in on a day-to-day basis. Table 4 provides a
summary of the major findings at the dimension level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraversion-Introversion</th>
<th>Self-Perceptions</th>
<th>Others’ Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Extraverts</em> better at relationship and change management</td>
<td><em>Introverts</em> better at ethical management (according to peers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Extraverts</em> better at feedback and recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Extraverts</em> better at strategic thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Extraverts</em> better at customer focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensing-Intuition</th>
<th>Self-Perceptions</th>
<th>Others’ Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Intuitors</em> better at innovation and learning</td>
<td><em>Intuitors</em> better at innovation and learning (according to direct reports and supervisors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Intuitors</em> better at strategic thinking</td>
<td><em>Sensors</em> more effective (according to peers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thinking-Feeling</th>
<th>Self-Perceptions</th>
<th>Others’ Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Feelers</em> better at relationship and change management</td>
<td><em>Feelers</em> better at relationship and change management (according to direct reports)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Feelers</em> better at feedback and recognition</td>
<td><em>Feelers</em> better at feedback and recognition (according to direct reports and peers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judging-Perceiving</th>
<th>Self-Perceptions</th>
<th>Others’ Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Judgers</em> more effective</td>
<td><em>Judgers</em> more effective (according to direct reports)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Perceivers</em> better at innovation and learning (according to supervisors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications for Practice. These results have a number of implications for HRD and OD-related practice and for understanding and working with senior executives in organizational settings. Though the data suggest that the impact of personality preferences in the workplace may be small or moderate, there are indeed significant relationships, and an awareness of these effects is invaluable for better interpreting and ultimately affecting change in managerial behavior.

In general, the results of this study provide support for the use of personality measures in conjunction with multirater feedback interventions to help individuals understand the importance of their own as well as others' preferences. By considering the impact of personality characteristics on specific managerial behaviors, executive coaches are better equipped with contextual and trait-based information. This can help coaches effectively identify and address the differential needs and values of their clients in leadership development activities. As a result, this is one of the primary reasons why practitioners and participants in developmental settings appreciate the use of these types of personality assessments when interpreting their multirater feedback results. More specifically, identifying these linkages on an individual basis can serve as an impetus for guiding a manager or leader on the best ways to develop certain behaviors that are in need of improvement or should be practiced more frequently. For example, preferences assessed by the MBTI may be related to managerial skills in certain areas. Specifically, managers who are more intuitive (as assessed by the MBTI) may be better at innovation than managers who are more sensing. Thus, when coaching a manager who has a strong preference for sensing it may be helpful for the coach to discuss and explore these implications with the client.

These data can also be used by managers when working with people in groups or at the individual level. For example, if a senior manager knows that his or her direct report is moderately to strongly introverted, then that senior manager may want to try to adjust his or her behavior to the preference of the introverted direct report by communicating through e-mail or other nondirect methods instead of more direct ones such as face-to-face contact or the telephone. By modifying his or her behavior to accommodate the preference of the direct report, the manager's actions illustrate the usefulness of understanding and being sensitive to others' preferences, thus demonstrating the importance and utility of the personality-behavior link. More specifically, this example shows that behaviors can be appropriately altered in response to someone else's needs.

Yet it is also important to consider that adjusting to someone else's personality preference alone might not always be the best way to behave. The appropriate behavior for a given situation may sometimes require that the manager work against his or her preferred way of operating. Because the impact of personality preferences affects managers' and others' perceptions of behavior, practitioners, coaches, and senior leaders in organizations need to realize the implications of the idea that certain preferences are likely to be linked to
certain managerial behaviors. For instance, feelers in the present study perceived themselves to be better at relationship and change-management behaviors than did thinkers, and the feelers’ direct reports actually agreed with these perceptions. The implication then is that managers must be trained on the best way to adapt to different personality preferences and to understand better the assets and liabilities of each preference.

Moreover, because the relationship and change-management subscale of the MPQ accounted for the majority of the variance (51.9 percent) in others’ ratings, we begin to see support for the idea that the so-called soft skills of management do indeed make a difference, as some studies have shown (for example, Church and Waclawski, 1999). In short, it would appear that the right relationship is everything in the work environment. Moreover, these results underscore the notion that practitioners must not ignore the connections between personality preferences and managerial behaviors. Of course, it is helpful to remember that an instrument such as the MBTI is nonjudgmental in nature and therefore yields no negative preferences, making it particularly useful in such settings.

One important caveat here. Although practitioners might be tempted to go beyond developmental applications in an effort to use these results and tools for formal types of performance management and review, this can be a very dangerous practice. Personality measures such as the MBTI provide great insights into behaviors and are entirely appropriate for coaching and individual improvement efforts, but these tools do not usually stand up to the measurement scrutiny that is required by law when used for personnel-related decision making. Great caution is warranted when working in this arena.

In sum, although the specific categories of behaviors identified in the present study may be open to debate, using personality measures in conjunction with managerial behaviors to help individual managers be effective in various tasks and work groups is clearly a useful application of any type of assessment tool.

Limitations and Future Research. Although the results described here yielded some interesting relationships with respect to linking personality orientation to managerial behavior, there are several limitations to this study that need to be addressed. First, the focal individuals included here all originated from the same global health services organization and from the senior management ranks, which may significantly limit the generalizability of the observed relationships to other settings and populations. In addition, these individuals were highly educated, self-nominated participants in a feedback-based developmental program, which may also have served as an initial selection bias. Further research is needed to cross-validate the relationships observed here in other types of organizations and with other middle- and first-line supervisory samples.

Another limitation in this study was the nature of the assessment instruments used. More specifically, the MBTI and MPQ were chosen for their
applied utility in a developmental coaching-based feedback setting, and not specifically for their psychometric properties. Thus, even with the same sample, it is possible that the use of another personality measure, such as the NEO-PI (Costa and McCrae, 1991), along with a different set of behavioral indicators, might have yielded very divergent results. However, given the strong reliabilities of the behavioral measures across each rating perspective, the relative directional consistency of the correlations observed, and the extent to which these data fit classic MBTI theory and interpretation, it seems somewhat likely that these data do represent meaningful relationships with respect to the impact of personality preferences on executive behaviors.

Conclusions

In sum, the results described here suggest that individual differences in personality preferences do have a moderate yet significant impact on management behavior as perceived by others in the workplace. In particular, senior managers with preferences for intuition, feeling, and perceiving received higher ratings from their coworkers and supervisors on selected management behaviors (for example, innovation and learning, strategic thinking, relationship and change management, feedback and recognition, and effectiveness) than did their counterparts. Conversely, although extraverted managers gave themselves higher ratings in a number of areas, these effects were not supported by direct-report, peer, or supervisor perceptions.
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