

Archives
closed
LD
175
A40K
TK
697

180-1
11

CORRELATION OF THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR TO THE
REPORTED OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS OF
RESIDENT ASSISTANTS

A Thesis

by

KAY SHERREE SINCLAIR

Submitted to the Graduate School

Appalachian State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

MASTER OF ARTS

April 1984

Major Department: Counselor Education and Research

APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
BOOKS, DOCUMENTS, PERIODICALS

Copyright by Kay S. Sinclair 1984

All Rights Reserved

CORRELATION OF THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR TO THE
REPORTED OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS OF
RESIDENT ASSISTANTS

A Thesis

by

Kay Sherree Sinclair

April 1984

APPROVED BY:

Fred T. Badden

Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Glanda J. Hubbard

Member, Thesis Committee

Les E. Stoye

Member, Thesis Committee

Fred T. Badden

Chairperson, Department of Counselor
Education & Research

Joyce V. Lawrence

Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

CORRELATION OF THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR TO THE
REPORTED OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS OF
RESIDENT ASSISTANTS

Kay Sherree Sinclair, B. A., Lenoir Rhyne College

M. A., Appalachian State University

Thesis Chairperson: Dr. Fred Badders

In this study the problem under investigation is to determine if there is a relationship between an individual's psychological type and his or her effectiveness as a Resident Assistant.

A total of 54 undergraduate, first year Resident Assistants from Appalachian State University were employed in this study.

Psychological type was determined using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Form G. Effectiveness was measured through use of evaluation forms submitted by students living in the Appalachian State University Residence Halls.

The presence of significant correlation between the variables was determined through the use of a F-test for homogeneity of variance. There was not a significant difference shown between the extrovert and introvert types. There was not a significant difference between intuitive or sensor types. However the feeling and perceptive types did show a significant difference between the variances of the effectiveness ratings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chairman, Dr. Fred Badders, for his support and guidance not only in my efforts to complete this study, but in his assistance throughout my master's program.

Special thanks go to Dr. Glenda Hubbard and Dr. Les Stege for their contributions to my enthusiasm for the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

My thanks go also to Dr. Deanna Bowman for her expert assistance in statistical analysis and to Barbara Carter for helping me understand the statistical analysis. I would also like to thank Dr. Roy Jones for his support and encouragement.

Without the help of Gene Luna, University of Florida, and Judy Vantrese, Appalachian State University, gathering of a great deal of the data would have been impossible. Without the assistance of Jan Hayes, coping with the word processor would have been a catastrophe. Thank you.

Certainly, I need to express my appreciation to Ray Reid, Deborah Hartzog, the women of Newland Hall and my "special friends" who gave me their unfailing support, shoulders to cry on and encouragement when most needed.

Finally, I would like to thank my mother, sister and children for their encouragement and faith in my abilities.

DEDICATION

To my daughter, Jaimee, who lived through the writing of this thesis on a daily basis and provided emotional support by being my persistent taskmaster, my private cheerleader, but most important my "bestest" friend. With love,

Mother

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| LIST OF TABLES, | x |
| Chapter | |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem | 2 |
| Significance of the Problem. | 2 |
| Hypotheses | 3 |
| Assumptions and Limitations. | 3 |
| Assumptions. | 3 |
| Limitations. | 4 |
| Definitions. | 4 |
| Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. | 4 |
| Extraversion | 4 |
| Introversion | 4 |
| Sensing. | 4 |
| Intuition. | 5 |
| Thinking | 5 |
| Feeling. | 5 |
| Judging. | 5 |
| Perceiving | 5 |
| Resident Assistant | 5 |

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 2. | REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE. | 6 |
| | Counseling Styles | 12 |
| | The Negotiator. | 13 |
| | The Traditionalist. | 13 |
| | The Visionary | 13 |
| | The Catalyst. | 14 |
| | Leadership Styles | 14 |
| | The Negotiator. | 14 |
| | The Traditionalist/Stabilizer | 15 |
| | The Visionary | 15 |
| | The Catalyst. | 16 |
| 3. | DESIGN OF THE STUDY | 18 |
| | Data Gathering Instruments. | 18 |
| | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). | 18 |
| | Jung's Theory of Types. | 19 |
| | Four Interesting Types. | 19 |
| | Reliability of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. | 22 |
| | Validity of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator | 23 |
| | Student Evaluation of Resident Assistant. | 23 |
| | Statistical Procedures. | 24 |
| | Summary | 25 |
| 4. | PRESENTATION OF DATA AND ANALYSES OF FINDINGS | 26 |
| | Extraversion/Introversion | 26 |
| | Sensing/Intuition | 26 |
| | Thinking/Feeling. | 27 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Judging/Perceiving | 27 |
| Criterion Variable Effectiveness Scale | 29 |
| 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 33 |
| Restatement of the Problem | 33 |
| Results of Study | 33 |
| Recommendations for Further Study. | 34 |
| REFERENCES. | 36 |
| APPENDIX A | |
| The Theory: Dominant And Auxiliary Functions | 43 |
| APPENDIX B | |
| Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Form G | 45 |
| APPENDIX C | |
| Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Understanding the Type. | 52 |
| APPENDIX D | |
| Mutual Usefulness of the Opposites. | 54 |
| APPENDIX E | |
| Student Evaluation of Resident Assistant. | 56 |
| VITA. | 61 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Analysis of Data | 27 |
| 2. Effectiveness Scores of ASU Resident Assistants. | 30 |
| 3. Type Frequency of ASU Resident Assistants. | 31 |
| 4. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Type Table For Subjects Under Investigation | 32 |

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Personality type differences appear in almost every human activity. These differences are a result of the fundamental process of behavior. Differences in the way situations are perceived affect motivation, interests and the knowledge of the situations. Differences in judgment affect the style and content of decision-making. Differences in attitude affect the weight given to impersonal factors and ideas. It is important to understand that the research begins with the basic assumption that differences are necessary and valuable.

A study of personality type must be attentive to the informal as well as the formal responsibilities which appear in the job description of a Resident Assistant. Roommate problems, unofficial communication channels, rumors, and other features of residence hall life are of great significance in any university setting.

Resident Assistants are employed in college and university residence halls to assist students in making the most of their college experience. A great deal of the responsibility of whether or not the students are content with their lifestyle rests on the Resident Assistant.

The Office of Residence Life at Appalachian State University has as one of its important functions the task of selecting and placing Resident Assistants.

Factors which might affect the personality of Resident Assistants include: institutional policies and practices, nature of the residence hall, previous training and/or experience. It also seems clear that peers have a great deal of influence on what behavior will be rewarded and condoned.

Statement of the Problem

The goal of this study is to provide an answer to the following question: Is there a relationship between an individual's psychological type and his or her effectiveness as a Resident Assistant?

Significance of the Problem

Presently, selection of Resident Assistants at Appalachian State University is based on a specific grade point average, letters of recommendation from faculty and other residence hall staff, personal interviews and leaderless group discussion. These selection and placement devices have not always been successful in predicting effective staff members. The purpose of the present research is to see if a psychological measure of personality traits exists which would assist in staff selection and predicted staff effectiveness.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses, stated in the null format were considered:

1. There is no significant difference between the Myers-Briggs Personality Types of Extraversion/Introversion and the students' evaluation of overall effectiveness of Resident Assistants.

2. There is no significant difference between the Myers-Briggs Personality Types of Sensing/Intuition and the students' evaluation of overall effectiveness of Resident Assistants.

3. There is no significant difference between the Myers/Briggs Personality Types of Thinking/Feeling and the students' evaluation of overall effectiveness of Resident Assistants.

4. There is no significant difference between the Myers-Briggs Personality Types of Judging/Perceiving and the students' evaluation of overall effectiveness of Resident Assistants.

Assumptions and Limitations

Several assumptions for the study are presented. Also, three major limitations are noted.

Assumptions

1. The topic of this study was an area of interest for the population studied.

2. The respondents completed the questionnaires (Type

Indicator and Resident Assistant Evaluation Form) in a responsible, frank and adequate manner.

Limitations

1. The relatively low number of subjects may not provide adequate comparisons for some Myers-Briggs Type subgroups.
2. The relatively low number of subjects may not provide adequate strength for the analysis of the 16 specific Myers-Briggs Type classifications.
3. This study was limited to students presently living in Residence Halls at Appalachian State University.

Definitions

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: The MBTI is one of a growing number of psychological instruments concerned with variations in normal attitudes and behavior. The MBTI is a self-report personality inventory designed to measure four personality variables: (a) the individual's preferred orientation to life, (b) the preferred way of perceiving things, (c) the preferred way of making decisions, and (d) the preferred way of dealing with the outer world (Myers, 1975).

Extraversion: Preference oriented primarily to the outer world. Perception and judgment tend to focus mainly upon people and things (Myers, 1975).

Introversion: Preference oriented primarily to the inner world. Perception and judgment tend to focus mainly upon concepts and ideas (Myers, 1975).

Sensing: Awareness of things is gained through one or another of the five senses (Myers, 1975).

Intuition: Awareness of things is gained through indirect perception by way of the unconscious (Myers, 1962).

Thinking: Discriminates impersonally between true and false (Myers, 1962).

Feeling: Discriminates primarily upon feeling, which discriminates between valued and not-valued (Myers, 1962).

Judging: Deals only with accumulated facts and acts upon these facts (Myers, 1962).

Perceiving: One closes off judgment and waits for new evidence before making a final decision. (Myers, 1962).

Resident Assistant (RA): A student employee who has the responsibility for the administration, programming and operation of a living and learning sub-unit. Some of the specific duties required of Resident Assistants (RA's) can be listed as: advising, assisting students, performing designated administrative tasks, actively getting to know students, creating opportunities for member participation in decision making, performing as a para-professional counselor, performing as a mediator in conflicts among residents, recognizing individual leadership potential, maintaining open lines of communication, motivating residents to participate in programs, serving in an advisory capacity to facilitate leadership development among residents, stressing to residents the importance of cooperation and concern for others, promoting a sense of community, acting as a good role model and keeping an academic minimum grade point average of 2.25.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

According to a study by Dale Wachowiak and Gene Bauer of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (1967), the Myers-Briggs measures characteristics that seem to be relevant to Resident Assistant performance.

The extraversion-introversion scale reflects individuals' tendencies to prefer the world of ideas and concepts rather than extending themselves to others. The sensing-intuiting scale indicates whether individuals handle the act of perception through the internal generation of possibilities or in a fact-oriented fashion. The act of decision-making or judgment is handled by either the feeling or thinking functions. Finally the test reflects whether the individual's preferred process is that of perception or judgment (McCaulley, 1973).

Also in the study of Wachowiak and Bauer it was found that scores on the sensing-intuiting dimension were the only scores that correlated with specific dimensions of Resident Assistant effectiveness. Both the ability of RA's as program developers along with their ability to cope with disciplinary problems were related to scores on the sensing-intuiting dimension.

Wotruba (1969), in an exploratory study that was not statistically evaluated, suggested that satisfactory Resident Assistants

are more extraverted, intuitive, feeling and perceiving than non-satisfactory Resident Assistants.

The relevant literature indicated that Resident Assistants had not been significantly studied in relation to the Myers-Briggs. However, to show the validity of the MBTI, several studies were examined relative to type differences in career choices.

There was evidence (Conary, 1965; Margerison & Lewis, 1979; McCaulley, 1973; Myers [1962], 1975) that business attracted practical and matter of fact ST types, as well as realistic and extraverted ES types. Science and mathematics appeared to be attractive to the logical and ingenious NT types, especially INTJ and INTP (Conary, 1965; McCaulley, 1973; Myers 1975); medical students of these types were attracted to medical research and teaching (McCaulley, 1978). Engineering tended to attract TJ types, with sensing types more attracted to the applied fields of civil and industrial engineering with a greater demand for theory (McCaulley, 1976). Miller (1967) studied law students and found that the tough minded TJ's were significantly attracted to law and significantly less likely to drop out of law school. In contrast, the more people-oriented and adaptable FP's were less attracted to law school than other types and significantly more than the expected number of them dropped out.

The sympathetic and friendly SF types, with their interests in practical action (S) toward the people (F), tended to be attracted to elementary school teaching (Cage & Austin, 1979; Carlyn, 1976; McCaulley, 1973) and to bedside nursing, general practice, and patient care at professional and paraprofessional levels

(McCaulley, 1977, 1978). According to the research, these types were interested in giving practical help to people, but were relatively uninterested in helping others through psychological means.

The types who shared a preference for practical details (S) and for system and order (J) were attracted to the teaching of mathematics, especially in the lower grades (Story, 1972), and to dentistry, pharmacy, and medical technology (McCaulley, 1978). Judging types, who in theory should be quicker at decision-making than perceptive types, were in the majority among business executives (Ohsawa, 1975), school principals (von Franz, 1961), police officers (Nanewicz, 1978), and in other fields where decisiveness was the order of the day.

A basic concern of the research was to determine the social factors involved in personality type of college Resident Assistants. In the conclusion of Making the Grade (Becher, Greer, and Hughes, 1968), the authors stated: "When we apply the sociological perspective to specific areas of human activity, we invariably find that what had been thought to be matters of individual judgment, motivation, and action have a collective character" (p. 129). Emphasizing the social factors does not deny the reality of an individual and personal decision for or against using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The focus of this study was on the process by which decision-making, leadership styles and counseling styles are determined.

Although it is not intended to compare the responsibility of the Resident Assistant to that of a policeman, at times the situation may call for that type of predictive action. Nanewicz (1978)

reported that the Myers-Briggs conceptual framework provided a synthesizing, explanatory, and predictive scheme for common traits of the police personality in a related study. He stated that the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator may be a useful tool in training, counseling, and organizational change but had limited value as an exclusive instrument for selection.

According to studies of Schroeder and Willis (1973), the Myers-Briggs measures characteristics which seem to be relevant to resident staff performance. The extraversion/introversion scale reflects the tendency of people to extend themselves to others versus a preference for the world of concepts and ideas. The sensing/ intuiting scale indicates whether the people handle the act of perception in a fact-oriented fashion or through the internal generation of possibilities. The act of judgment or decision making is handled via either the thinking or feeling functions. Finally, the test reflects whether the individual's dominant or preferred process is that of judgment or perception.

The personality traits of women students in medicine, pharmacy, medical technology, physical therapy, and occupational therapy were examined in the research by Rezler and Buckley (1977). Since the instrument could measure personality type and be compared to "science-minded" or "people-minded," the study was of value in an investigation of Resident Assistants. Medical students were found to be guided more by thinking than feeling; pharmacy students preferred well-planned routine work; occupational therapy

students, changing situations and some flexibility. The traits were identified for potential career choice rather than present or past positions.

There has not been a great deal of research on the placement of students or employees using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. This is a relatively new concept. However, there have been a few studies using personality inventories, specifically the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Rutsoh (1978) studied the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in placing students with seminar leaders in an undergraduate childhood education course. Two of the relevant results were:

The judging-perceptive continuum of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was dominant.

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator data may be helpful in hiring seminar leaders.

Rezler and Buckley (1977) further studied using the inventory in placing students in a school of pharmacy when she administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to the total male and female population of a large state-supported college of pharmacy. The purpose of the study was to assess the personality type of pharmacy students. Some implications of the findings were suggested for admission.

The research in simulation between the personality inventory and gaming situation is given in a study by H.S. Rickek in 1975. Some implications from the study were given as related to personality type:

Thinking types preferred to make decisions based on data and logic.

Feeling types tended to trust their emotions. In general, feeling types rated their personal reactions to games more positively than did the thinking types.

Miller's study (1966) involving law students, Saunders' studies (1960) of theology and Myers' and Davis's study (1964) of medical students have indicated that certain types have the likelihood to drop out of these professions. The types that drop out are, as might be expected, least represented in the particular field.

In the book The Future of Student Affairs (1976) the residential program at Auburn University is examined. Auburn University is one institution that has given students control over many aspects of their environment. The environment is highly structured and organized around specific activities.

However the staff wanted to push this freedom a little further. One strategy was to utilize the Myers-Briggs in a program of roommate matching. They looked for roommates with similar academic interests and complementary personality types. They were considered to be complementary if they had the "dominant process" in common: intuitives were paired with intuitives and sensors were paired with sensors. However, the "auxiliary function" varied with each pair (see Appendix A). This was to encourage growth within the relationship. This gave room for growth while learning to cope with alternative ways of thinking or perceiving. Through this each person could help the other to develop the uncharacteristic behavior.

This concept was carried even further to the floor units. These also were assigned on the basis of commonality of the dominant process. Therefore, one unit may be composed of a group of feeling types and another unit may be composed of sensing types.

The staff believes these similarities promote a sense of group unity and cohesion and yet meet the needs for stimulation and security, freedom and order.

Each unit has an upperclassman Resident Assistant who functions as a consultant, catalyst, confrontation agent and role model. They do not attempt or make decisions to control behavior. By keeping open communications They help to stimulate problem solving. Resident Assistants are most generally selected from among those nominated by the students in their units rather than selection of administration.

Counseling Styles

In a report filed by Graff and Bradshaw (1970) it is stated that resident staff members are given a wide range of responsibilities including such "policeman" functions as protecting the physical plant and controlling noise as well as "personnel" assignments such as teaching study habits and referring students to personnel specialists. Such diverse responsibilities require the staff member to possess a high level of self-actualization, to have empathy and to be a leader.

It would appear to follow that dormitory staff members who are highly actualized individuals, would tend to be living up to their full stature and would be able to carry out effectively the diverse responsibilities of their position.

"Factors in Selecting Residence Hall Fellows" (Mullozzi and Spees, 1971) state that the staff member is also involved in a limited amount of interpersonal counseling; therefore, they must be able to empathize, to identify another person's feelings

and emotions. The function of counselor can possibly be the most important critical part of the resident staff responsibility.

In a paper presented by Dumont Schmidt (1977) are four major counseling types. They are:

The Negotiator

The Sensing, Perceiving types have major values of freedom, spontaneity, and action. Their counseling style is time-oriented toward the present. They are best at dealing with crises or problems which rest in action. They are skilled at negotiating conflicts. However, they can become bored with long-term counseling. They would prefer an action-oriented, problem solving approach to counseling.

The Traditionalist

The Sensing, Judging types have major values of belonging, social responsibility, nurturance, relatedness, and stability. Their counseling style is that of a realist. They will emphasize "common sense" content. They will tend to make use of test information, may find "career counseling" natural. They do not like to waste time, and want clear, observable results.

The Visionary

The Intuitive, Thinking types have major value of competency, ability, knowledge, capabilities and power over self. They are likely to respond to client's ideas but may have to work at responding to feelings. They are skilled at identifying alternatives, deducing logical consequences, and are likely to be

good at interpreting motives and actions from a theoretical viewpoint. They may be impatient with clients' illogical behavior and may be seen as somewhat cold, remote and intellectual.

The Catalyst

The Intuitive, Feeling types have major values of integrity, authenticity, meaning, worth and imagination. They are "natural" counselors in that they are deeply in tune with people. They are skilled at making clients aware of their problems, but not as good at developing the helping plan.

LEADERSHIP STYLES

According to Napier and Gershenfeld (1981) leadership is basically the development of a particular kind of role within an organized group, and this role is defined essentially in terms of power or the ability to influence others. Although some people enjoy exerting influence at any and all occasions, the most potent source for attempting an act of leadership is generated out of the situation. How a person will respond to situations is determined by his or her personality type.

Schmidt (1977) also described four leadership styles. They are:

The Negotiator

As leaders, more than any other, this type will know what is going on in an organization for they have acute powers of observation regarding the environment. They are flexible, patient, open-minded and adaptable in working with others who generally find the SP leader easy going. They are not threatened by the pos-

sibility of failure in themselves or others, so will take risks and encourage others to do the same. They are non-judgmental of their fellow workers and accept their behaviors as matter-of-factly as they do situations. They do not trouble themselves or others seeking to understand underlying motives or hidden meanings. They change positions easily as new facts and new situations arise--seldom finding this shift in position a threat to their ego. They verbalize appreciation easily and often voice approval before the accomplishment or achievement in order to encourage others.

The Traditionalist/Stabilizer

The Traditionalist Leaders are applied thinkers and want an organization to be run on solid facts. They are able to absorb, remember, manipulate, and manage a great amount of detail within a system. They are super-dependable leaders who are extraordinarily hard, steady workers. They will run efficient meetings, will be most comfortable with a well-ordered, well-planned agenda. They will establish a formal, impersonal style in relating with colleagues until they are well acquainted. They enjoy established routines and painstaking workers.

The Visionary

The Visionary Leaders have to work a little harder at their leadership. Their primary hunger is for competency and knowledge to see themselves as competent and knowledgeable and for others to see them as having these capabilities. This type is intellectual, ingenious and an excellent pioneer in technical or administrative areas. They are highly creative in the area of model building.

The Catalyst

The Catalyst Leaders will also have to work a little harder at their leadership. Their primary hunger is for a search for self, for identity, for meaning and authenticity. They are marked by idealism, charisma, and are superbly empathic, and have a flair for dramatizing the mundane events of living into something special. Because they give so much, they need replenishment through having others give to them in turn, expressions of enthusiasm, listening, and approval. If they receive this support they can continue contributing at their very high degree of productivity. If they do not, they are met with continual disapproval, they can become discouraged and may look outside the organization for this kind of recognition.

Although the first two types given may show the best criteria for Resident Assistants, the world today faces problems of such severity and magnitude that it will take the best efforts of all types to help in finding the solutions.

According to Carlson and Levey (1973) type theory seems especially promising as a framework since it presents a coherent model of personality which identifies an individuals' stances toward the environment and their preferred ways of perceiving and judging experience. Such a model should have important implications for exploration of basic psychological issues. Despite the great influence of Jungian thought in social science and the humanities, work on typology remains disappointingly meager and scattered.

Mary McCaulley (1981) expressed the ideas that the Intuitives are needed to see better possibilities and then the Sensing types are needed to find out how to make these possibilities work in practical terms. The Feeling types are needed to make us aware of the unseen impact of changes on people and the Thinking types to help alert us to the unforeseen costs of new courses of action.

Type theory gives us a view of events which focuses on the special gifts and excellence of individuals.

Literature relating to the study of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator reflected research on the instrument, its design and its use in related areas. However, because of limited research available, the literature did not address the relationships between the personality inventory and Resident Assistants. The related literature did document the MBTI's validity and use in predicting decision-making patterns.

Chapter 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In this chapter, the instruments used for collecting the data are examined and their reliability and validity are explored.

Data Gathering Instruments

Two instruments were used in this study to gather information concerning Resident Assistants' psychological types and the reported effectiveness.

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

The MBTI is a self-report personality inventory which is designed to measure four personality variables (Myers, 1962). In 1962 the Educational Testing Service (ETS) published Form F of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator for research only. In 1975 the Consulting Psychologists Press approved distribution of the instrument for professional application; it published Form F in 1975 and Form G in 1977 (see Appendix B). In 1975 a non-profit Center for Applications of Psychological Type, now headed by Dr. Mary McCaulley, was established to provide education, research and service to the users of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Myers (1962) attempted to create an instrument which would put Jung's (1923) theories into practical applications. She began to consider specific questions which would reliably indicate the Jungian type to which an individual belongs. Over a period of fifteen years, she developed a series of scales which she tested on large samples of subjects. This led to the eventual development of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, MBTI, the Type Indicator, or simply the Indicator. Using Jung's theory (1923) to make behavior more predictable and possibly more understandable, Isabel Myers began developing a kind of "type watching" (Myers, 1975).

Jung's Theory of Types

According to Jung (1923) psychological typing is only one small part of the personality theory and is concerned mainly with conscious elements of the personality. It assumes that to function well, an individual must have a well-developed system for perception (either Sensing or Intuition) and a well-developed system for making the decisions or judgments (either Thinking or Feeling). In more familiar terms, there must be a way to perceive the stimulus and to make an adequate response.

Four Interacting Types

Mary McCaulley (1974) explained that the four interacting preferences are used to generate each of the MBTI sixteen types. In each type, one pole of each of the four preferences is preferred over the other, and through use becomes more highly developed. The four preferences are:

Extraversion (E) or Introversion (I): A direction of interest and attention to the outer world of

objects, people, and action (Extraversion) or to the inner world of ideas and contemplation (Introversion).

Sensing (S) or Intuition (N): A preference for looking at the immediate, the real, the tangible, the solid facts of experience (Sensing) or for seeing the possibilities, meaning and relationships of experience, often with only a passing interest in the facts themselves (Intuition).

Thinking (T) or Feeling (F): Thinking and Feeling are rational processes used in decision-making. This kind is a preference for making decisions objectively, impersonally, analyzing the facts and ordering them in terms of antecedents and consequences. Feeling decides by a valuing process, weighing the importance of alternatives to oneself or others. Thinking types tend to prefer working with materials which follow logical principles; Feeling types are more interested in working with or studying people.

Judging (J) or Perception (P): A preference for living in a planned, decided, orderly way, aiming to regulate life and control it (judging) or to live in a flexible, spontaneous way, aiming to understand life and adapt to it (Perceptive) (see Appendix C).

A type is designated by four letters, ENFP, ISTJ, for example, a shorthand for the complex interactions of the theory. All 16 have their own excellences, and each type has its own pitfalls to avoid.

According to Jungian (1923) theory, in the extraverted attitude, attention seems to flow out--to be drawn out--to the subjects and people of the environment. There is a desire to act on the environment, to affirm its importance, to increase its effect. In the introverted attitude, energy seems to flow from the object back to the subjects, who conserve the energy by consolidating it within their own position.

Gordon Lawrence, in his book People Types and Tiger Stripes (1979), expressed that each type has its own individual characteristic strengths, weaknesses and possesses its own preferences.

Communicating with an opposite type can at times be most difficult. However, trying to understand and use the other's strengths can be most beneficial. One's opposite describes what one does least well. Maturity, when looking at terms of type, is the capability to use whatever attitude is needed when it is needed. The opposites point out the direction in which there is the greatest room to grow (see Appendix D).

Strengths and weaknesses in people come in patterns. By analyzing people in terms of type concepts, one can get some insights and get clues to use in planning ways to help them develop (Lawrence, 1979).

According to Wright (1966), the consistencies of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator scales are very important for comparing the Indicator to other personality instruments. The Myers-Briggs is primarily concerned with types, rather than with the scales themselves. A critical question is how often on retest do individuals come out the same type. In nine samples retested from intervals of five weeks to six years, a range of 31 percent to 61 percent of cases filled the same type on retest. The highest percentage occurred in the sample with the longest time interval; 94 elementary school teachers were retested after six years. From 70 percent to 88 percent of the cases in the samples had three of all four preferences in common on the retest. From 10 percent to 22 percent had two preferences in common, and from 2 percent to 7 percent had only one preference on the same retest. Only one individual in the composite sample of 1,444 persons changed on all four preferences.

Reliability of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

A number of reliability studies have been conducted on the MBTI since its development. The most frequently given sources are Carlyn (1977), Stricker (1964) of the Educational Testing Service, Ross (1966) of the University of Western Australia and Myers (1962).

The more liberal approach was presented by Myers (1962). She calculated tetrachoric correlation coefficients and then applied the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. Carlyn (1977) reported that his procedure would result in unrealistically high levels of reliability. However, the underlying assumption for this procedure is that the scores are normally distributed across each index, which is not the case with the MBTI.

Another procedure utilized by Stricker and Ross (1963) was estimating split-half reliabilities by calculating phi correlation coefficients and applying the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula.

Carlyn (1977) has suggested that these sources represent the conservative and liberal extremes of estimations of reliability, with Myers being rather liberal.

These studies indicate a wide range between the conservative and liberal estimates of reliability. Reported phi coefficients have ranged from .55 to .65 (E-I), .64 to .73 (S-N), .43 to .75 (T-F), and .58 to .84 (J-P) (Myers, 1962; Stricker & Ross, 1963). Tetrachoric coefficients have ranged from .70 to .81 (E-I), .82 to .92 (S-N), .66 to .90 (T-F), and .76 to .84 (J-P) (Myers, 1962). The reliability of type category is satisfactory if the assumption is made that actual reliability falls within these two extremes.

Validity of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Studies conducted (Conary, 1966; Saunders, 1957; Goldschmid, 1967) suggested that the MBTI has moderate predictive validity in care choices.

Content validity has a great deal of support from Carlyn (1977).

Myers' extensive account of the construction of the Indicator includes the criteria used for choosing and scoring items, and provides considerable evidence for the instrument's content validity. (p.468).

Carlyn (1977) states that numerous correlation studies have been conducted comparing the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator scores with scores on other personality instruments. A wealth of circumstantial evidence has been gathered and the results appear to be quite consistent with Jungian theory. These studies suggest that the individual scales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator measure important aspects of the personality which seem to be quite similar to those theories of Jung. The variables of personality, interest, value, aptitude and performance measures appear to be reasonably valid and are potentially useful for a variety of purposes.

Student Evaluation of Resident Assistant

The Student Evaluation of Resident Assistants inventory is a peer evaluation of individual Resident Assistants. The evaluation consists of a set of statements/questions concerning the Resident Assistant and how well each resident feels the RA performance can be evaluated (see Appendix E).

The instrument was created by a committee of Area Coordinators at Appalachian State University and was used for the first time in

1983. Therefore, the reliability and validity of the instrument have not yet been tested.

The Student Evaluation Inventory is used by the Office of Residence Life at Appalachian State University to rate respective Resident Assistants. A summary question, "Overall, how effective do you think your RA has been in his or her performance?" which is on the last page of the Inventory form (see Appendix E, pg. 59,) was used to determine the effectiveness of each Resident Assistant and was the variable used in comparison to each of the psychological types. The student rated the question of overall effectiveness as: Only slightly effective, somewhat effective or very effective.

To develop a mean effectiveness rating for each Resident Assistant, a numerical score was assigned to each rating. "Only slightly effective" received a 100 rating, "somewhat effective" received a 200 rating and "very effective" received a 300 rating.

The Student Evaluation of Residence Assistants was distributed to each resident by the Resident Director of each hall. A follow-up was done by the Resident Director after one week to be sure that each inventory was completed. After the evaluation forms were collected by the Resident Director they were given to the author for use in this research. For each Resident Assistant there was at least a 90% response on the Evaluation Inventories. Each Resident Assistant received at least 24 ratings, some as many as 43, dependent on the number of residents on each floor. A mean score was computed for each Resident Assistant.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was administered to all first-year Resident Assistants during their Resident Assistant Leadership Development Course in the Fall Semester 1983.

Statistical Procedures

An F-test for homogeneity of variance was used to determine if there were significant relationships between the responses from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (questions 1-95, Form C) and the reported overall effectiveness ratings from the students' evaluation of Resident Assistants.

SUMMARY

A total of 54 undergraduate, first year Resident Assistants from Appalachian State University were employed in this study to discover the degree of correlation between psychological type and Resident Assistant overall effectiveness. Psychological type was determined using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form G. Effectiveness was determined from evaluation forms submitted by those students living on the individual residence hall floors.

The presence of significant relationships between the variables was determined through the use of an F-test for homogeneity of variance.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The results of the F-test for homogeneity of variance is presented (see Table 1) for each of the Myers-Briggs subgroups. For those groups listed, two showed no significant correlation existing and the null hypothesis was not rejected. Two groups did show a significant correlation and the null hypothesis was rejected.

Extraversion/Introversion

The first null hypothesis of this study was: There is no significant difference between the Myers-Briggs personality types of Extraversion/Introversion and the students' evaluation of overall effectiveness of Resident Assistants. No significant difference was found between the effectiveness ratings of Extraverts and Introverts on the t-test and variance estimates. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Thirty-five Resident Assistants were classified as Extraverts on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator with a mean effectiveness rating of 264.6. Nineteen Resident Assistants were classified as Introverts with a mean effectiveness rating of 267.6 (see Table 1).

Sensing/Intuition

The second null hypothesis of this study was: There is no significant difference between the Myers-Briggs personality types

Table 1
Analysis of Data

| GROUP | No. | E SCALE MEAN | STAND DEV | STAND ERROR | F VALUE | PROB. |
|--------------|-----|-----------------|--------------|----------------|------------|--------|
| EXTRAVERSION | 35 | 264.6571 | 30.850 | 5.215 | 1.65 | 0.260 |
| INTROVERSION | 19 | 267.6842 | 24.014 | 5.509 | | |
| SENSING | 32 | 266.3750 | 24.714 | 4.369 | 1.86 | 0.113 |
| INTUITION | 22 | 264.7727 | 33.724 | 7.190 | | |
| THINKING | 36 | 261.9167 | 31.976 | 5.329 | 3.16 | 0.014* |
| FEELING | 18 | 273.3333 | 17.987 | 4.240 | | |
| JUDGING | 27 | 261.1481 | 34.191 | 6.580 | 2.68 | 0.014* |
| PERCEPTIVE | 27 | 270.2963 | 20.871 | 4.017 | | |

*Denotes significant difference at .05 level of significance

----- Homogeneity of Variance -----

of Intuition/Sensing and the students' evaluation of overall effectiveness of Resident Assistants. No significant difference was found between the effectiveness ratings of the Intuitives and Sensors on the t-test and variance estimates. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Thirty-two Resident Assistants were classified as Intuitives with a mean effectiveness rating of 266.3. Twenty-two Resident Assistants were classified as Sensors with a mean effectiveness rating of 264.7 (see Table 1).

Thinking/Feeling

The third null hypothesis of this study was: There is no significant difference between the Myers-Briggs personality types of Thinking/Feeling and the students' evaluation of overall effectiveness of Resident Assistants. A significant difference was found between the variances of the effectiveness ratings of the Thinking and Feeling types (see Table 1). Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. The 36 Resident Assistants who were classified as Thinking types (mean rating of 261.9), appear to come from a different population than the 18 Resident Assistants classified as Feeling types (mean rating of 273.3).

Judging/Perceptive

The fourth null hypothesis of this study was: There is no significant difference between the Myers-Briggs personality types of Judging/Perceiving and the students' evaluation of overall effectiveness of Resident Assistants. A significant difference was found between the variance of the effectiveness ratings of the Judging and Perceiving types (see Table 1). Therefore the null

hypothesis is rejected. The 27 Resident Assistants classified as Perceptive types (mean rating of 270.3) appear to come from a different population than the 27 Resident Assistants who were classified as Judging types (mean rating of 261.1).

Criterion Variable Effectiveness Scale

An effectiveness scale broken down by EI, NS, FT, and PJ are presented in Table 2. According to this breakdown, the ISFP's show the highest effectiveness rating of 282.80. The ESTJ's show the lowest rating of 223.66. However because of the small sample of population the results are considered to be biased (also see Tables 3 and 4).

Table 2

Effectiveness Scores of ASU Resident Assistants

| | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 265.72 N=54 | (I) 267.68 N=19 | (S) 269.00 N=16 | (P) 275.88 N=8 | (P) 282.80 N=5 |
| | | | | J) 264.33 N=3 |
| | | | T) 262.13 N=8 | (P) 269.50 N=4 |
| | | N) 260.67 N=3 | (P) | (P) |
| | | | | J) |
| | | | T) 260.66 N=3 | (P) |
| | E) 264.66 N=35 | (S) 263.75 N=16 | (P) 276.86 N=7 | (P) 275.40 N=5 |
| | | | | J) 278.00 N=2 |
| | | | T) 253.55 N=9 | (P) 268.50 N=6 |
| | | N) 265.42 N=19 | | J) 223.66 N=3 |
| | | | (P) 258.33 N=3 | (P) 257.50 N=2 |
| | | | T) 266.75 N=16 | J) 260.00 N=1 |
| | (P) 259.60 N=5 | | | |
| | J) 270.00 N=11 | | | |

Table 3

Type Frequency of ASU Resident Assistants

| Type | Absolute Frequency | Relative Frequency |
|------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| E | 35 | 64.8 |
| I | $\frac{19}{54}$ | $\frac{35.2}{100.0}$ |
| | Total | |
| N | 22 | 40.7 |
| S | $\frac{32}{54}$ | $\frac{59.3}{100.0}$ |
| | Total | |
| T | 36 | 66.7 |
| F | $\frac{18}{54}$ | $\frac{33.3}{100.0}$ |
| | Total | |
| P | 27 | 50.0 |
| J | $\frac{27}{54}$ | $\frac{50.0}{100.0}$ |
| | Total | |

Table 4

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Type Table For Subjects Under Investigation

| SENSING TYPES | | INTUITIVE TYPES | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| with THINKING | with FEELING | with FEELING | with THINKING | |
| <i>ISTJ</i> N = 4 % = 7.41 | <i>ISFJ</i> N = 3 % = 5.56 | <i>INFJ</i> N = 0 % = 0 | <i>INTJ</i> N = 3 % = 5.56 | JUDGING |
| <i>ISTP</i> N = 4 % = 7.41 | <i>ISFP</i> N = 5 % = 9.26 | <i>INFP</i> N = 0 % = 0 | <i>INTP</i> N = 0 % = 0 | INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE |
| <i>ESTP</i> N = 6 % = 11.10 | <i>ESFP</i> N = 5 % = 9.26 | <i>ENFP</i> N = 2 % = 3.70 | <i>ENTP</i> N = 5 % = 9.26 | PERCEPTIVE |
| <i>ESTJ</i> N = 3 ⁺ % = 5.56 | <i>ESFJ</i> N = 2 % = 3.70 | <i>ENFJ</i> N = 1 % = 1.85 | <i>ENTJ</i> N = 11 % = 20.37 | EXTRAVERTS JUDGING |

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the results of the study are summarized, conclusions are drawn and recommendations are made. In addition, the problem addressed by the study is restated.

Restatement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to see if a psychological measure of personality traits exists which would assist in predicting staff effectiveness. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was chosen for the instrument to obtain the measure of personality traits. The goal was to provide an indication of a relationship between the MBTI and effectiveness as a Resident Assistant. The Resident Assistant Evaluation Indicator was used as a measure of effectiveness.

Results of Study

After consideration of the data presented it could be concluded that the most important characteristic or type would be that of a Feeling type. The residents have expressed a preference for one who bases judgments more on personal values than on impersonal analysis and logic.

The Perceptive type also received a significant preference by the residents. This would indicate a type of leader who is

flexible and spontaneous rather than the planned, decided or orderly way of life.

There was not a significant difference shown between the extrovert and introvert types.

There was not a significant difference shown between the intuitive and sensing types.

It is also interesting to note that the ENTJ types were by far the largest in number (11) who are employed as Resident Assistants. This would indicate that those people who are most attracted to becoming an RA would be those who are hearty, decisive, leaders in activities and are usually good in anything that requires reasoning and intelligent talk.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Future studies in the area of psychological type and predicted effectiveness should consider the following:

1. Population sample size should be large enough to provide for adequate evaluation of the individual MBTI classifications and effectiveness indicators.

2. Effectiveness indicators should include a wider range of predictors. These should be broken down into different areas such as areas of leadership, areas of counseling and areas of administrative tasks.

3. Further investigation should include the degree of intensity of each psychological type. This should be included in the correlation.

4. Compare residents' ratings with Resident Directors' ratings of RA's.

5. If possible, types of residents should be taken into consideration to see if residents prefer the same or similiar types of RA's.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Anastasi, A. Psychological testing. (5th ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1982.
- Becher, K. L., Greer, J. C., and Hughes, C. N. Making the grade. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Cage, B. N., & Austin, T. Affective influences during elementary student teaching. Paper presented at Mid-South Educational Research Association, Little Rock, Arkansas, 1979.
- Carlson, S., & Levey, N. Studies of Jungian typology. I: Memory, social perception, and social action. Journal of Personality, 1973, 41 (4), 559-576.
- Carlyn, M. The relationship between Myers-Briggs personality characteristics and teaching preferences of prospective teachers. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37 3493A; University Microfilms No. 76-27, 081.
- Carlyn, M. An assessment of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1977, 41, 461-473.
- Conary, F.M., An investigation of the variability of behavior response of Jungian psychological types to select educational variables. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1965). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1965, 26, 5222; University Microfilms No. 65-13, 898.

- Conary, F. M. Test-retest reliabilities of Form G of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Research Psychological Type, 1979, 2, 83-84.
- Downie, N. M. & Heath, R. W. Basic statistical methods. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Goldschmid, M. L. Prediction of college majors by personality type. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967,14, 302-308.
- Graff, R. W. & Bradshaw, H. E. Relationship of a measure of self-actualization to dormitory assistant effectiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17: 502-505, 1970.
- Jung, C. G. Psychological types. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1971 (originally published in 1923).
- Lawrence, G. D. People types and tiger stripes. Gainesville, Florida: Center for Applications of Psychological Type, 1979.
- Margerison, C. J., & Lewis, R. C. Management educators and their clients. Cranfield, Bedfordshire: Management and Organization Development Center, Cranfield School of Management, 1979.
- McCaulley, M. H. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator applications. Report of Committee 13, University of Florida Counseling Study, Gainesville: Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Florida, 1973.
- McCaulley, M. H. Personality variables: Model profiles that characterize the various fields of science. Symposium presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Boston, MA., 1976.
- McCaulley, M. H. Psychological types in engineering; Implications for teaching. Engineering Education, 1976b, 66(7), 729-736.

- McCaulley, M. H. Application of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to medicine and other health professions. Monograph I., Contract No. 231-76-0051, HRA, DHEW. Gainesville, Florida: Center for Applications of Psychological Type, 1978.
- McCaulley, M. H. The Myers longitudinal medical study. Gainesville, Florida: Center for Applications of Psychological Type, 1977.
- Miller, P. V. A follow-up study of personality factors as predictors of law student performance. Unpublished report to LSAT Council, 1966-67. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1967.
- Miller, T. & Prince, J. S. The future of student affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.
- Mullozzi, A., Jr., & Spees, E. R. Factors in Selecting Residence Hall Fellows. Journal of the National Association of Women, Deans and Counselors. (4) 185-187, 1971.
- Myers, I. B. Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologist Press, 1975 (Originally published 1962).
- Myers, I. B. Introduction to type. (2nd ed.), Gainesville, Florida: Center for Applications of psychological type, 1976.
- Myers, I. B. Supplementary manual: The Myers-Briggs type indicator, Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1977.
- Myers, I. B., & Davis, J. A. Relation of medical students' psychological type to their specialties twelve years later. Paper presented at meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, September, 1964.

- Nanewicz, M. L. Police personality measures. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1976. University Microfilms No. 95-6638.
- Nanewicz, M. L. Police Personality: A Jungian perspective. Crime and Delinquency, 1978, 24 (2), 152-172.
- Napier, R. W. & Gershenfeld, M. K. (1981). Groups: theory and experience (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Ohsawa, T. MBTI experience in Japan: Career choice, selection placement and counseling for individual development. Paper presented at First National Conference on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Gainesville, Florida, 1975.
- Rezler, D. L. & Buckley, R. T. Personality traits of women students in medicine, pharmacy, medical technology, physical therapy, and occupational therapy. University of Michigan, 1977. University Microfilms. No. 96-3406.
- Ricke, H. S. Gaming-situation set including personality inventory with prospective teachers. Michigan State University, 1975. University Microfilms No. 98-6631.
- Ross, J. The relationship between a Jungian personality inventory and tests of ability, personality, and interest. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1966, 18 1-17.
- Rutsoh, A. J. A study to determine the relationship between personality and student responsiveness to a particular learning technique. Gainesville, Florida: Center for Application of Psychological Type Indicator, 1978.

- Saunders, D. R. Evidence bearing on the existence of a rational correspondence between the personality typologies of Spranger and Jung. (ETS RB 60-6). Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1960.
- Schroeder, C., & Willis, B. An attempt to use a measure of self-actualization in the selection of resident assistants. Journal of College and University Student Housing. 3:30-32, 1973.
- Schmidt, D. Counseling & leadership styles as expressed in the Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicator. Unpublished Manuscript, 1977.
- Story, G. An analysis of the relationships between personality types of mathematics teachers (7-12) as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, and selected factors related to teaching. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 3471A; University Microfilms No. 74-978.
- Stricker, L. J., & Ross, J. Some correlates of a Jungian personality inventory, Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 623-643.
- von Franz, M. L. Implications for school administration of the personality structure of educational personnel. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1961.
- Wachowiak, D. & Bauer, G. The use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator for the selection and evaluation of residence hall advisors. Journal of College and University Student Housing. 3:34-37, 1967.

Wotruba, R. T. Can residence hall staff be selected

scientifically? National Association Student Personnel
Administration Journal, 7:107-111, 1969.

Wright, J. A. The relationship of related administrator and

teacher effectiveness to personality as measured by the

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Unpublished doctoral

dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1966). Dissertation

Abstracts International, 1967, 28, 981A: University Microfilms

No. 67-10, 765.

APPENDIX A

THE THEORY: DOMINANT AND AUXILIARY
FUNCTIONS FOR EACH TYPE

THE THEORY: DOMINANT AND AUXILIARY FUNCTIONS FOR EACH TYPE

According to Jung's theory of psychological types, everyone uses all four functions (S, N, T, F) and adopts all four attitudes (E, I, J, P). The types are called preference types because people in each type prefer one of the two perceptive functions (S or N), and one of the two judgment functions (T or F). These preferences appear in the two middle letters of the type formula. Types also differ in the functions they prefer to use when in the introverted or extraverted attitudes.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p><u>ISTJ</u> INTRO SENSING WITH THINKING.</p> <p>SENSING IS DOMINANT AND INTROVERTED. THINKING IS AUXILIARY AND EXTRAVERTED.</p> | <p><u>ISFJ</u> INTRO SENSING WITH FEELING.</p> <p>SENSING IS DOMINANT AND INTROVERTED. FEELING IS AUXILIARY AND EXTRAVERTED.</p> | <p><u>INFJ</u> INTRO INTUITION WITH FEELING.</p> <p>INTUITION IS DOMINANT AND INTROVERTED. FEELING IS AUXILIARY AND EXTRAVERTED.</p> | <p><u>INTJ</u> INTRO INTUITION WITH THINKING.</p> <p>INTUITION IS DOMINANT AND INTROVERTED. THINKING IS AUXILIARY AND EXTRAVERTED.</p> |
| <p><u>ISTP</u> INTRO THINKING WITH SENSING.</p> <p>THINKING IS DOMINANT AND INTROVERTED. SENSING IS AUXILIARY AND EXTRAVERTED.</p> | <p><u>ISFP</u> INTRO FEELING WITH SENSING.</p> <p>FEELING IS DOMINANT AND INTROVERTED. SENSING IS AUXILIARY AND EXTRAVERTED.</p> | <p><u>INFP</u> INTRO FEELING WITH INTUITION.</p> <p>FEELING IS DOMINANT AND INTROVERTED. INTUITION IS AUXILIARY AND EXTRAVERTED.</p> | <p><u>INTP</u> INTRO THINKING WITH INTUITION.</p> <p>THINKING IS DOMINANT AND INTROVERTED. INTUITION IS AUXILIARY AND EXTRAVERTED.</p> |
| <p><u>ESTP</u> EXTRA SENSING WITH THINKING.</p> <p>SENSING IS DOMINANT AND EXTRAVERTED. THINKING IS AUXILIARY AND INTROVERTED.</p> | <p><u>ESFP</u> EXTRA SENSING WITH FEELING.</p> <p>SENSING IS DOMINANT AND EXTRAVERTED. FEELING IS AUXILIARY AND INTROVERTED.</p> | <p><u>ENFP</u> EXTRA INTUITION WITH FEELING.</p> <p>INTUITION IS DOMINANT AND EXTRAVERTED. FEELING IS AUXILIARY AND INTROVERTED.</p> | <p><u>ENTP</u> EXTRA INTUITION WITH THINKING.</p> <p>INTUITION IS DOMINANT AND EXTRAVERTED. THINKING IS AUXILIARY AND INTROVERTED.</p> |
| <p><u>ESTJ</u> EXTRA THINKING WITH SENSING.</p> <p>THINKING IS DOMINANT AND EXTRAVERTED. INTUITION IS AUXILIARY AND INTROVERTED.</p> | <p><u>ESFJ</u> EXTRA FEELING WITH SENSING.</p> <p>FEELING IS DOMINANT AND EXTRAVERTED. INTUITION IS AUXILIARY AND INTROVERTED.</p> | <p><u>ENFJ</u> EXTRA FEELING WITH INTUITION.</p> <p>FEELING IS DOMINANT AND EXTRAVERTED. INTUITION IS AUXILIARY AND INTROVERTED.</p> | <p><u>ENTJ</u> EXTRA THINKING WITH INTUITION.</p> <p>FEELING IS DOMINANT AND EXTRAVERTED. INTUITION IS AUXILIARY AND INTROVERTED.</p> |

APPENDIX B

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR

FORM G

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR

Form G

DIRECTIONS:

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to these questions. Your answers will help show you like to look at things and how you like to go about deciding things. Knowing your own preferences and learning about other people's can help you understand where your special strengths are, what kinds of work you might enjoy and be successful doing, and how people with different preferences can relate to each other and be valuable to society.

Read each question carefully and mark your answer on the separate answer sheet. Make no marks on the question booklet. Do not think too long about any question. If you cannot decide on a question, skip it but be careful that the next space you can make on the answer sheet has the same number as the question you are then answering.

Read the directions on your answer sheet, fill in your name and any other facts asked for and, unless you are told to stop at some point, work through until you have answered all the questions you can.

Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. 577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, California 94306. Copyright 1976, 1977 by Isabel Briggs Myers.

PART I. WHICH ANSWER COMES CLOSER TO TELLING HOW YOU USUALLY FEEL OR ACT?

1. When you go somewhere for the day, would you rather
(A) plan what you will do and when, or
(B) just go?
2. If you were a teacher, would you rather teach
(A) "fact" courses, or
(B) courses involving theory?
3. Are you usually
(A) a "good mixer," or
(B) rather quiet and reserved?
4. Do you prefer to
(A) arrange dates, parties, etc., well in advance, or
(B) be free to do whatever looks like fun when the time comes?
5. Do you usually get along better with
(A) imaginative people, or
(B) realistic people?
6. Do you more often let
(A) your heart rule your head, or
(B) your head rule your heart?
7. When you are with a group of people, would you usually rather
(A) join in the talk of the group, or
(B) talk with one person at a time?
8. Are you more successful
(A) at dealing with the unexpected and seeing quickly what should be done, or
(B) at following a carefully worked out plan?
9. Would you rather be considered
(A) a practical person, or
(B) an ingenious person?
10. In a large group, do you more often
(A) introduce others, or
(B) get introduced?
11. Do you admire more the people who are
(A) conventional enough never to make themselves conspicuous, or
(B) too original and individual to care whether they are conspicuous or not?
12. Does following a schedule
(A) appeal to you, or
(B) cramp you?

13. Do you tend to have
(A) deep friendships with a very few people, or
(B) broad friendships with many different people?
14. Does the idea of making a list of what you should get done over a weekend
(A) appeal to you, or
(B) leave you cold, or
(C) positively depress you?
15. Is it a higher compliment to be called
(A) a person of real feeling, or
(B) a consistently reasonable person?
16. Among your friends, are you
(A) one of the last to hear what is going on, or
(B) full of news about everybody?
- (ON THIS NEXT QUESTION ONLY, IF TWO ANSWERS ARE TRUE, MARK BOTH.)
17. In your daily work, do you
(A) rather enjoy an emergency that makes you work against time, or
(B) hate to work under pressure, or
(C) usually plan your work so you won't need to work under pressure?
18. Would you rather have as a friend
(A) someone who is always coming up with new ideas, or
(B) someone who has both feet on the ground?
19. Do you
(A) talk easily to almost anyone for as long as you have to, or
(B) find a lot to say only to certain people or under certain circumstances?
20. When you have a special job to do, do you like to
(A) organize it carefully before you start, or
(B) find out what is necessary as you go along?
21. Do you usually
(A) value sentiment more than logic, or
(B) value logic more than sentiment?
22. In reading for pleasure, do you
(A) enjoy odd or original ways of saying things, or
(B) like writers to say exactly what they mean?
23. Can the new people you meet tell what you are interested in
(A) right away, or
(B) only after they really get to know you?

24. When it is settled well in advance that you will do a certain thing at a certain time, do you find it
 (A) nice to be able to plan accordingly, or
 (B) a little unpleasant to be tied down?
25. In doing something that many other people do, does it appeal to you more to
 (A) do it in the accepted way, or
 (B) invent a way of your own?
26. Do you usually
 (A) show your feelings freely, or
 (B) keep your feelings to yourself?

GO ON TO PART II.

27. (A) scheduled unplanned (B)
 28. (A) gentle firm (B)
 29. (A) facts ideas (B)
 30. (A) thinking feeling (B)
 31. (A) hearty quiet (B)
 32. (A) convincing touching (B)
 33. (A) statement concept (B)
 34. (A) analyze sympathize (B)
 35. (A) systematic spontaneous (B)
 36. (A) justice mercy (B)
 37. (A) reserved talkative (B)
 38. (A) compassion foresight (B)
 39. (A) systematic casual (B)
 40. (A) calm lively (B)
 41. (A) benefits blessing (B)
 42. (A) theory certainty (B)
 43. (A) determined devoted (B)
 44. (A) literal figurative (B)
 45. (A) firm-minded warm-hearted (B)
 46. (A) imaginative matter-of-fact (B)
 47. (A) peacemaker judge (B)
 48. (A) make create (B)
 49. (A) soft hard (B)
 50. (A) sensible fascinating (B)
 51. (A) forgive tolerate (B)
 52. (A) production design (B)
 53. (A) impulse decision (B)
 54. (A) who what (B)
 55. (A) speak write (B)
 56. (A) uncritical critical (B)
 57. (A) punctual leisurely (B)
 58. (A) concrete abstract (B)
 59. (A) changing permanent (B)
 60. (A) wary trustful (B)

61. (A) build invent (B)
 62. (A) orderly easygoing (D)
 63. (A) foundation spire (B)
 64. (A) quick careful (B)
 65. (A) theory experience (B)
 66. (A) sociable detached (D)
 67. (A) sign symbol (B)
 68. (A) party theater (B)
 69. (A) accept change (D)
 70. (A) agree discuss (E)
 71. (A) known unknown (E)

GO ON TO PART III.

72. Would you say you
 (A) get more enthusiastic about things than the average person, or
 (B) get less excited about things than the average person?
73. Do you feel it is a worse fault to be
 (A) unsympathetic, or
 (B) unreasonable?
74. Do you
 (A) rather prefer to do things at the last minute, or
 (B) find doing things at the last minute hard on the nerves?
75. At parties, do you
 (A) sometimes get bored, or
 (B) always have fun?
76. Do you think that having a daily routine is
 (A) a comfortable way to get things done, or
 (B) painful even when necessary?
77. When something new starts to be the fashion, are you usually
 (A) one of the first to try it, or
 (B) not much interested?
78. When you think of some little thing you should do or buy, do you
 (A) often forget it till much later, or
 (B) usually get it down on paper to remind yourself, or
 (C) always carry through on it without reminders?
79. Are you
 (A) easy to get to know, or
 (B) hard to get to know?
80. In your way of living, do you prefer to be
 (A) original, or
 (B) conventional?

81. When you are in an embarrassing spot, do you usually
(A) change the subject, or (B) turn it into a joke, or
(C) days later, think of what you should have said?
82. Is it harder for you to adapt to
(A) routine, or (B) constant change?
83. Is it higher praise to say someone has
(A) vision, or (B) common sense?
84. When you start a big project that is due in a week, do you
(A) take time to list the separate things to be done and the
order of doing them, or (B) plunge in?
85. Do you think it more important to be able
(A) to see the possibilities in a situation, or
(B) to adjust to the facts as they are?
86. Do you think the people close to you know how you feel
(A) about most things, or
(B) only when you have had some special reason to tell them?
87. Would you rather work under someone who is
(A) always kind, or (B) always fair?
88. In getting a job done, do you depend on
(A) starting early, so as to finish with time to spare, or
(B) the extra speed you develop at the last minute?
89. Do you feel it is a worse fault
(A) to show too much warmth, or (B) not to have warmth enough?
90. When you are at a party, do you like to
(A) help get things going, or (B) let people have fun in their
own way?
91. Would you rather
(A) support the established methods of doing good, or
(B) analyze what is still wrong and attack unsolved problems?
92. Are you more careful about
(A) peoples's feelings, or (B) their rights?
93. If you were asked on a Saturday morning what you were going to do
that day, would you
(A) be able to tell pretty well, or (B) list twice too many
things, or (C) have to wait and see?
94. In deciding something important, do you
(A) find you can trust your feeling about what is best to do, or
(B) think you should do the logical thing.
95. Do you find the more routine parts of your day
(A) restful, or (B) boring?

APPENDIX C

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR:
UNDERSTANDING THE TYPE

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR

UNDERSTANDING THE TYPE TABLE

Four preferences are scored to arrive at a person's type. The preferences are:

Does the person's interest flow mainly to

The outer world of actions,
objects and persons?

The inner world of concepts
and ideas?

E = EXTRAVERSION

I = INTROVERSION

Does the person prefer to perceive

The immediate, real, prac-
tical facts of experience
and life?

The possibilities, relation-
ships and meanings of
experiences?

S = SENSING

N = INTUITION

Does the person prefer to make judgments or decisions?

Objectively, impersonally,
considering causes of events
and where decisions may lead?

Subjectively and personally,
weighing values of choice and
how it matters to others?

T = THINKING

F = FEELING

Does the person prefer mostly to live

In a decisive, planned and
orderly way, aiming to
regulate and control events?

In a spontaneous, flexible way
aiming to understand life and
adapt to it?

J = JUDGMENT

P = PERCEPTION

Myers, 1962.

APPENDIX D

MUTUAL USEFULNESS OF THE OPPOSITES

MUTUAL USEFULNESS OF THE OPPOSITES

INTUITIVE NEEDS
A SENSING TYPE:

To bring up
pertinent facts

To remember things that
weren't relevant at the
time they happened

To read over a contract

To check records, read
proof, score tests

To notice what ought
to be attended to

To inspect

To keep track of detail

To have patience

SENSING TYPE NEEDS
AN INTUITIVE:

To see the
possibilities

To supply ingenuity
on problems

To deal with a
complexity having
too many imponderables

To explain what
another intuitive
is talking about

To look far ahead

To furnish new ideas

To "spark" things
that seem impossible

THINKER NEEDS
A FEELING TYPE:

To persuade

To conciliate

To forecast how
others will feel

To arouse enthusiasm

To teach

To sell

To advertise

To appreciate the
thinker himself

FEELING TYPE NEEDS
A THINKER:

To analyze

To organize

To find the flaws
in advance

To reform what
needs reforming

To weigh "the law
and the evidence"

To hold consistently
to a policy

To stand firm
against opposition

APPENDIX E

STUDENT EVALUATION OF RESIDENT ASSISTANT

APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Boone, North Carolina

RESIDENCE LIFE OFFICE
223 WORKMAN HALL

STUDENT EVALUATION OF RESIDENT ASSISTANT

Residence Hall _____ Name of RA Rated _____

The following is a set of statements/questions concerning your RA and how well you feel s/he has done his/her job this semester. Please be as specific as possible so that each RA can get a better picture of how s/he is performing on his/her floor.

| <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> |
|--------------|----------|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| very well | well | not well | not at all | no chance to observe |

COMMUNICATIONS:

1. Makes an effort to keep information posted on important dates, events, etc.

Please explain:

1 2 3 4 5

2. Visits room socially and/or to relay information.

Please explain:

1 2 3 4 5

3. Speaks openly/honestly to residents.

Please explain:

1 2 3 4 5

4. Listens to residents whenever approached.

Please explain:

1 2 3 4 5

5. Knows where, who to refer to if s/he does not know the answer.

Please explain:

1 2 3 4 5

6. Holds hall meetings on a regular basis to convey information.

Please explain:

1 2 3 4 5

RESIDENT AWARENESS AND GUIDANCE:

1. Makes an effort to get to know me as a person.

Please explain:

1 2 3 4 5

2. Makes an effort to promote respect, responsibility, and rights among floor members.

Please explain:

1 2 3 4 5

3. Makes an effort to be available as much as possible.

Please explain:

1 2 3 4 5

4. Helps me learn to confront other residents on concerns which interfere with the living/learning atmosphere of the floor.

Please explain:

1 2 3 4 5

5. You speak with your RA often.

Please explain:

1 2 3 4 5

Please Answer the Following Questions:

1. I feel my RA is (check all that apply)

____ A Friend

____ A Disciplinarian

____ A Counselor

____ A Resource Person

____ Approachable

____ A Mediator

____ A Good Listener

____ Not Approachable

____ Not A Listener

2. OVERALL, HOW EFFECTIVE DO YOU THINK YOUR RA HAS BEEN IN HIS/HER PERFORMANCE?

____ Only slightly effective ____ Somewhat effective

____ Very effective

3. List three adjectives that best describe your RA

VITA

VITA

Kay Sherree Sinclair was born in Valdese, North Carolina on June 28, 1941. She graduated from Valdese High School, Valdese, North Carolina in 1959. In 1960 she began her education at Carson-Newman College, majoring in Religious Education & Music. Her degree in English was completed at Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory, North Carolina in 1969. She received certification in Theatre Arts from High Point College and a third certification in Teaching Gifted & Talented at Mars Hill College.

Teaching experiences include four years at Oak Hill School, Morganton, North Carolina; one year teaching at McDowell Technical Institute; ten years at McDowell High School, Marion, North Carolina.

In 1982 she entered Appalachian State University to begin work on a Master's Degree in Counselor Education and Research. While at the university Ms. Sinclair held a graduate assistantship as a Resident Director. While in the Counselor Education and Research program Ms. Sinclair completed an internship in the Appalachian State University Office of Admissions.

The author is a member of the American Association for Counseling and Development.