

Measuring the Effectiveness of MBTI Feedback on Managers in the PetroChemicals Industry (Conclusions)



The Gaian Group

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Internal and external consultants have been using the MBTI in this petrochemical company for years as a catalyst for change. It is viewed as a transformational experience by the internal consultants and is used with the expectation of positively impacting managers' ability to promote change and empower their employees [Evans, 1994 #256]. All hypotheses in this study are written in terms of the LPI's factors assuming that if these changes occur in managers, the changes will be measurable by the LPI.

Summary

The study is an *ex post facto* comparison of managers' espoused and perceived leadership practices. The study includes managers in four sites, some of whom have had MBTI feedback and some of whom have not. The managers completed the LPI - Self and five subordinates completed the LPI - Observer. All participants completed a demographic profile to be used for other comparisons. The data analysis included ANOVAs on all traits that could affect the leadership practices: age, gender, ethnic origin, job function, and job type. The data analysis for the hypotheses used two-tailed t-tests. SAS was used for all statistical calculations. All ANOVAs used the SAS General Linear Model, which allows for multiple dependent variables.

A total of 366 employees from four sites of the petrochemical company participated. Of the 366, 69 were managers. Of these, 31 had received MBTI feedback. The group was quite homogenous; of the total participants 89.6% were Caucasian, 84.6% were male, with 67% were in the age range from 31 to 50. Of the managers, 94.2% were Caucasian, 91.3% were male, and 73.9% were in the age range from 31 to 50. Even with this, some differences were observed in LPI scores by gender and age. There were no observed ethnic related differences. The female managers scored significantly higher (\underline{M} =26.00) than male managers (\underline{M} =22.966) on the factor of Encouraging the Heart $F(1, 364) = .436, p < .05$, which is consistent with the published norms for

the LPI [Posner, 1992 #242]. There were significant differences in LPI scores based on managers age on the factors of Challenging the Process $F(2, 363) = 5.32, p < .01$, Modeling the Way $F(2, 363) = 4.46, p < .05$, and Encouraging the Heart $F(2, 363) = 3.53, p < .05$. In each of these cases, *post hoc* comparison showed that managers in the age range from 31 to 40 were significantly different from managers in the age range from 51 to 60 ($p < .05$).

Other differences emerged in the analysis based on job function, job type, and level of education. The data that were collected on job function are not very usable. The ANOVA results show significant differences on all five factors based on job function. However, post hoc comparisons using a Tukey's Studentized Range Test (which has the most strength in detecting experiment-wise error) showed the differences to be insignificant ($p < .05$). Many of the job functions reported only contained one manager, i.e. safety, finance, information systems, and marketing. This causes the cell sizes to be extremely unbalanced and the data analysis to be very weak. There were also differences according to job type on Challenging the Process $F(2, 363) = 5.46, p < .01$, Inspiring Shared Vision $F(2, 363) = 5.34, p < .01$, Modeling the Way $F(2, 363) = 10.70, p < .0001$, and Encouraging the Heart $F(2, 363) = 5.96, p < .01$. In every case of significant differences, managers and mid-managers were significantly different than 1st line ($p < .05$) and mid-managers and 1st line were significantly different than managers ($p < .05$). The mean scores were consistently highest for 1st line and lowest for managers. One other difference emerged in the area of managers level of education. There were significant differences in LPI factor scores based on education level on Challenging the Process $F(4, 361) = 7.32, p < .0001$, Inspiring Shared Vision $F(4, 361) = 7.24, p < .0001$, Modeling the Way $F(4, 361) = 9.26, p < .0001$, and Encouraging the Heart $F(4, 361) = 4.71, p < .001$. In each of these case, those managers with a doctorate received the lowest mean scores, and were significantly different than all other education levels ($p < .05$).

It was clear from the data that there was a great deal of difference in the leadership practices between sites. At site 1, the beginnings of a partial plant closure were emerging. The plant management had recently changed, ending a 15 year period with the same plant manager.

There is a great deal of role confusion and uncertainty among those employees who had been through the transition.

At site 3, a reorganization began just as data collection started. One functional manager withdrew his group from the study almost immediately afterwards. This excluded about 10 managers who were originally targeted as participants. Among those remaining, several decided not to participate because their jobs were in jeopardy. Also, none of the managers who had not received MBTI feedback chose to participate.

Site 4, a manufacturing site, has had the same plant manager for 17 years and has a very successful organization. The plant manager excluded several functional areas from the study, which eliminated another 10 to 15 managers. Additionally, he did not participate, as opposed to the other three sites, where the site managers did choose to participate. One can only wonder if the group represented was, in his opinion, the best, the worst, or the most representative.

The ANOVAs performed by site showed significant differences on all five factors. *Post hoc* comparisons did not indicate that any sites were consistently different on all of the factors. This can probably be attributed to differences in organizational expectations (as a function of site management) at each site. Four subgroups were formed by LPI - Self and LPI - Observer, with and without the MBTI. There were no significant differences between sites on the LPI - Self, either with or without the MBTI. This indicates that managers between sites espouse their performance to be similar. The t-tests between managers who had received MBTI feedback and those who had not, the managers who had received MBTI feedback scored themselves slightly higher (Challenging the Process $\bar{M} = 23.00$, Inspiring Shared Vision $\bar{M} = 21.16$, Enabling Others to Act $\bar{M} = 25.38$, Modeling the Way $\bar{M} = 23.58$, Encouraging the Heart $M = 22.61$) than managers who had not (Challenging the Process $\bar{M} = 21.82$, Inspiring Shared Vision $\bar{M} = 20.32$, Enabling Others to Act $\bar{M} = 25.60$, Modeling the Way $\bar{M} = 23.26$, Encouraging the Heart $M = 22.32$) on all factors except Enabling Others to Act. None of these differences were statistically significant.

The grouping of LPI - Observer, with and without MBTI type, showed something very different. This grouping measures the managers' perceived leadership practices. Large amounts of

variance on these groupings indicates that different employees see their supervisors in different ways. In other words, the managers' leadership practices match the expectations of some of their employees, but not all. If the experience of MBTI feedback enabled managers to adapt to their subordinates preferences, it should show on the LPI - Observer. There should be smaller amounts of difference on the LPI - Observer for managers who had received MBTI feedback than those who had not.

The results in this study were just the opposite. The LPI - Observers of managers who had received MBTI feedback showed statistically significant differences on all five factors: Challenging the Process $F(3, 126) = 3.24, p < .05$, Inspiring Shared Vision $F(3, 126) = 8.92, p < .0001$, Enabling Others to Act $F(3, 126) = 13.86, p < .0001$, Modeling the Way $F(3, 126) = 7.08, p < .001$, and Encouraging the Heart $F(3, 126) = 7.45, p < .0001$. Managers who had not received MBTI feedback showed significant differences on two of the factors: Inspiring Shared Vision $F(2, 164) = 3.87, p < .05$, and Modeling the Way $F(2, 164) = 4.07, p < .05$. The t-tests for the LPI - Observers showed the descriptive statistic for managers who had received MBTI feedback (Challenging the Process $M = 21.17$, Inspiring Shared Vision $M = 20.08$, Enabling Others to Act $M = 23.63$, Modeling the Way $M = 22.04$, Encouraging the Heart $M = 22.70$) to be lower in every case than managers who had not (Challenging the Process $M = 23.23$, Inspiring Shared Vision $M = 21.37$, Enabling Others to Act $M = 24.09$, Modeling the Way $M = 4.17$, Encouraging the Heart $M = 23.43$). Of these, three factors had differences that were statistically significant: Challenging the Process $t(273.8) = 3.75, p < .001$, Inspiring Shared Vision $t(279.8) = 2.024, p < .05$, and Modeling the Way $t(284.4) = 1.046, p < .0001$.

The performance of managers who had MBTI feedback compared to those who had not is consistent across sites. In Table 4.88, t-tests for each site compared this performance. Site 3 was excluded since all managers had received MBTI feedback. Of the 15 combinations, the descriptive statistic for managers with MBTI feedback was lower on 14. At site 3, four of the five factors were significantly lower. Only Inspiring Shared Vision was not statistically significant.

As with any complex systems there are many interactions between variables. In this data collection, differences emerged between sites, between job functions, between job types, between genders, between ages, and between education levels. Additionally, differences emerged between managers who had received MBTI feedback and those who had not. However, these differences did not occur in the expected direction.

Conclusions

For hypotheses 1 - 5, MBTI feedback is the independent variable, ability to challenge the process, ability to inspire a shared vision, ability to enable others to act, ability to model the way and ability to encourage the heart are the dependent variables.

For hypotheses 6 - 10, MBTI feedback is the independent variable, espoused ability to challenge the process, espoused ability to inspire a shared vision, espoused ability to enable others to act, espoused ability to model the way and espoused ability to encourage the heart are the dependent variables.

For hypotheses 11 - 15, MBTI feedback is the independent variable, perceived ability to challenge the process, perceived ability to inspire a shared vision, perceived ability to enable others to act, perceived ability to model the way and perceived ability to encourage the heart are the dependent variables.

Table 5.1

Summary of t-test for hypotheses

		<u>No MBTI</u>		<u>MBTI</u>	
Factor	<i>n</i>	<u>M</u>	<i>n</i>	<u>M</u>	
LPI	Challenging	205	22.97	161	21.52**
	Inspiring	205	21.17	161	20.29
	Enabling	205	24.38	161	23.98
	Modeling	205	24.00	161	22.34***
	Encouraging	205	23.40	161	22.69
Self	Challenging	38	21.82	31	23.00
	Inspiring	38	20.32	31	21.16
	Enabling	38	25.60	31	25.38
	Modeling	38	23.26	31	23.58
	Encouraging	38	22.32	31	22.61
Observer	Challenging	167	23.23	130	21.17***
	Inspiring	167	21.37	130	20.08*
	Enabling	167	24.09	130	23.63
	Modeling	167	24.17	130	22.04****
	Encouraging	167	23.43	130	22.70

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ **** $p < .0001$

Results of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI factor of challenging the process than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored lower ($\underline{M}=21.52$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=22.97$). This result is statistically significant $t(341.6) = 3.048, p<.001$.

Hypothesis 2. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI factor of inspiring a shared vision than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored lower ($\underline{M}=20.29$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=21.17$). This result is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 3. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI factor of be enabling others to act than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored lower ($\underline{M}=23.98$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=24.38$). This result is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 4. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI factor of Modeling the Way than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored lower ($\underline{M}=22.34$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=24.00$). This result is statistically significant $t(341.4) = 3.590, p<.001$.

Hypothesis 5. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI factor of Encouraging the Heart than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored lower ($\underline{M}=22.69$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=23.40$). This result is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 6. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI - Self factor of Challenging the Process than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored higher ($\underline{M}=23.0$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=21.82$). This result is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 7. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI - Self factor of Inspiring a Shared Vision than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored higher ($\underline{M}=21.16$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=20.32$). This result is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 8. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI - Self factor of be Enabling Others to Act than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored higher ($\underline{M}=25.38$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=25.60$). This result is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 9. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI - Self factor of Modeling the Way than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored lower ($\underline{M}=23.58$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=23.26$). This result is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 10. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI - Self factor of Encouraging the Heart than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored higher ($\underline{M}=22.61$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=22.32$). This result is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 11. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI - Observers factor of Challenging the Process than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored lower ($\underline{M}=21.17$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=23.23$). This result is statistically significant $t(273.8) = 3.750, p < .001$.

Hypothesis 12. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI - Observers factor of Inspiring a Shared Vision than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored lower ($\underline{M}=20.08$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=21.37$). This result is statistically significant $t(279.8) = 2.024, p < .05$.

Hypothesis 13. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI - Observers factor of Enabling Others to Act than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored lower ($\underline{M}=23.63$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=24.09$). This result is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 14. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI - Observers factor of Modeling the Way than those who have not.

Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored lower ($\underline{M}=22.04$) than those who had not ($\underline{M}=22.17$). This result is statistically significant $t(272.1) = 3.915, p < .0001$.

Hypothesis 15. Managers and facilitators who have received MBTI feedback will score significantly higher on the LPI - Observers factor of encouraging the heart than those who have not. Not supported. Managers and facilitators who received MBTI feedback scored lower ($M=22.70$) than those who had not ($M=23.43$). This result is not statistically significant.

Based on the data collection for this research study, it suggests that there is a definite relationship between receiving MBTI feedback and performance on the LPI. The data do suggest that the relationship is negative, and that receiving MBTI feedback is related to lower performance on this instrument. Even though there are other interactions in the data, it does seem that the difference in performance between managers who have received MBTI feedback and those who have not is reasonably consistent throughout.

Discussion

On the surface of this analysis it would suggest that the MBTI might indeed be a transformational experience, during which the participant becomes aware of differences between themselves and others. They would also become aware of similarities between themselves and others in similar capacities. One other aspect of type awareness training is the presentation of the weaknesses of various types, and the strengths of other types. One possible outcome of this awareness is that the participant could begin to feel that they were not the right type, or that they need the strengths that were inherent to other types. This type of awareness could lead to the type of results that are indicated in this study. The following are some possible explanations for the results of this study.

The type awareness training is indeed transformational and the participants leave with a keen awareness of their less preferred functions, or shadow tendencies, and now have a desire to develop them. Type awareness is intended to create an appreciation for these differences in others. It could lead to a person's attempting to change their own preferences, or at least their own operant styles. Jungian psychology theorizes that a person is born with innate preferences. They come to

discover them at an early age, then spend most of their life operating within and developing the strength of that preference [Myers, 1985 #226]. Choices concerning occupations [Myers, 1985 #226], mates [Rytting, 1993 #261], and friends [Hester, 1993 #262] are all made based on the strength of that preference. To decide to operate out of a different preference would be, at the least, awkward. It would be roughly equivalent to a middle-aged person deciding that they should switch from being right-handed to left-handed. They would operate unconsciously as a right-hander simply out of habit, but whenever they thought about it, they would work at being left-handed. It is not impossible, just exceedingly difficult for most people. A person who was attempting to change their psychological preference would appear awkward and unpolished. From an observers standpoint, they would be perceived as not very effective at whatever they tried. This would explain the managers receiving low ratings on the LPI - Observer, while they rated themselves higher than managers who had not received this feedback. They would see themselves as more effective, adapting to the situation when a different preference is called for, while the observer who see them as sometimes operating smoothly and normally, and at other times behaving clumsily out of character.

Another possible explanation, again assuming that the experience is transformational, involves how the managers now see the world. By suddenly seeing the world through an explanation of type differences and gaining an appreciation for those difference, the manager could adopt the attitude that all types, and therefore all positions in the organization, are equally valid. This could lead to a lack of a position on anything. It would be difficult, particularly in the areas of inspiring shared vision and challenging the process, to be perceived as effective if the managers believed that any vision was acceptable and that all processes worked.

Another position, supported by personal experience in the field, has to do with how the managers use their newly found knowledge of type. When a person accepts the explanations of personality type as they are presented in the MBTI feedback sessions, they accept that they people with whom they interact can be explained using these models. If a manager is manipulative towards his/her employees before this feedback, (s)he will probably be manipulative after the feedback.

Typological explanations of personality type have nothing to do with psychological pathology or health [Myers, 1985 #226]. If a person is mentally unhealthy before the feedback, they still will be afterwards. The problem can arise if the manager views this as a tool to use on his/her employees. If the manager uses type as a way to manipulate his/her employees, they will probably be viewed as less effective than managers who are not using this tool.

The type of feedback received can have the wrong effect on the participants. While the company delivers the feedback through a consistent format following published instructional materials, the individual instructor can be causing people to come away from the training with a feeling of inadequacy. While the training is intended to illustrate the strength of diversity of types, the instructor can inadvertently illustrate the strength of a particular type. The MBTI Team Leaders Guide warns of the tendency to embellish on your own preferences to the neglect of the others [Hirsh, 1991 #253]. If this sort of event occurs, a participant of another type can leave the session with the impression that they are the wrong type, and begin to question their ability to perform effectively [Evans, 1994 #256].

There were other interactions in the data besides those around MBTI feedback. The data collection was also incomplete because of the lack of participation in some parts of the company. There was interaction with educational level, job function, job type, and age. It is possible that the population in this study had the right combination of interactions to produce this set of effects. The results of the study should be evaluated closely in relation to the limitations of this particularly study.

Implications

Even with the limitations involved and the interactions in other areas, this study does suggest a negative relationship between receiving MBTI feedback and managers' performance as measured by the LPI. While not conclusive, it is definitely adequate to cause concern. Any program that is using the MBTI with the expectation of positive performance change should be carefully scrutinized. As some of the critics have suggested, if the MBTI is only half as good as many practitioners suggest, it would still be truly outstanding [Zemken 1992 #48]. If, as in the case of this research,

the MBTI does seem to cause diminished performance, the use should be discontinued. At the least, its use should not be taken lightly. It is, as the literature suggests, a well-researched and powerful psychological assessment tool. Used in the wrong ways and for the wrong purposes, the results can be potentially harmful.

Suggestions for Further Research

1. An evaluation specific to the MBTI should be designed and validated for use in organizations that are using the MBTI for change.
2. There is sufficient evidence to warrant the design of an experiment that determines the actual effectiveness of MBTI feedback.
3. Test for interaction of whether raters have or have not had MBTI feedback and their evaluations of managers who have or have not had MBTI feedback.
4. An in-depth qualitative study of a group of managers who have had MBTI feedback that focuses on the nature of their interactions with their peers and subordinates.

APPENDIX A
THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY

THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY

The Leadership Practices Inventory is an appraisal instrument developed by Kouzes and Posner to measure both supervisor perception of espoused leadership practices and peer perception of actual leadership practices. It is based on what the authors have identified as ten commitments of leadership. These commitments are represented on the instrument and feedback sheets as five factors: "Challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart" (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 22).

1. "Search out challenging opportunities to change, grow, innovate, and improve" (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 25).
2. "Experiment, take risks, and learn from the accompanying mistakes" (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 25).
3. "Envision an uplifting and ennobling future" (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 26).
4. "Enlist others in a common vision by appealing to their values, interests, hopes, and dreams" (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 26).
5. "Foster collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust" (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 27).
6. "Strengthen people by sharing information and power and increasing their discretion and visibility" (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 27).
7. "Set an example for others by behaving in ways that are consistent with your stated values" (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 28).
8. "Plan small wins that promote consistent progress and build commitment" (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 28).
9. "Recognize individual contributions to the success of every project" (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 29).
10. "Celebrate team accomplishments regularly" (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 29).

APPENDIX B
PSYCHOMETRICS OF THE LPI

PSYCHOMETRICS OF THE LPI

Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliability Indices for the Leadership Practices Inventory

	Mean	SD	LPI (N= 6,226)	<u>Internal Reliability</u>		
				LPI - Self (n=5,298)	LPI-Observer (N = 30,913)	Test - Retest (N = 157)
Challenging the Process	22.38	4.14	.80	.70	.81	.93
Inspiring a Shared Vision	20.44	4.89	.87	.80	.88	.93
Enabling Others to Act	23.9	4.35	.85	.75	.86	.94
Modeling the Way	22.12	4.14	.81	.71	.82	.95
Encouraging the Heart	21.96	5.17	.91	.85	.92	.93

Posner & Kouzes, 1992, p. 3

APPENDIX C
MANAGERS' DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project. Please take a moment to read this note.

This research project is directed at analyzing groups of people, not individuals. Your response will be totally confidential and will be used only for the purpose of creating generalizations about groups. They will not be reported by individual. Your responses can in no way be used to benefit or harm you. Also, the responses of those people who agree to complete the LPI - Observer about you will be totally confidential and will not be reported back to you. If you have any concerns or questions please contact me at either of the following:

Jeff Evans

Work

Chevron Chemicals Company

Orange Plant

P.O. Box 7400

Orange, TX, 77

CTN 882-6220 - PROFS MAEV

Home

2803 Nashville Ave

Nederland, TX 77626

(409)727-6539

If for some reason you decide not to participate, please return the materials.

Participant Instructions

1. Fill out the respondent information below
2. Fill out the LPI - Self form. Please do not skip any questions.
3. Write your name on the LPI - Self.
4. Enclose form in supplied envelope and return to me.
5. Solicit five people who are recently familiar with your leadership practices and will agree to fill out the LPI - Observer about you. **You will not receive this information.**
6. Distribute one of the enclosed packets to each of these people. Instructions are enclosed in each packet.

Respondent Information

Your Name _____

Mark your response with an X except where asked to write in responses.

What is your work function? Operations____ Maintenance____ Technology____

Engineering____ HR____ Finance____

What is your job type? Management____ Mid-Management____ First Line Supervision____

What is your age? 21 - 30____ 31 - 40____ 41-50____ 51-60____ 61-70____

What is your gender? M _____ F _____

Race/Ethnic origin? Black____ Hispanic____ Asian____ Caucasian____

Other (Please write in)_____

Have you ever taken the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)? Yes____ No____

If yes, how long ago? (Please write in your response in months). _____ months ago.

Can you remember your type? Yes____ No____

If yes, what is it? (Please write in your response) _____

APPENDIX D
OBSERVERS' DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project. Please take a moment to read this note.

This research project is directed at analyzing groups of people, not individuals. Your response will not be reported back to the person who solicited your participation. Furthermore, your response will not be traceable back to you. Your responses can in no way be used to benefit or harm either yourself or the person on whose practices you are reporting. If you have any concerns or questions please contact me at either of the following:

Jeff Evans

Work

Chevron Chemicals Company

Orange Plant

P.O. Box 7400

Orange, TX, 77

CTN 882-6220

Home

2803 Nashville Ave

Nederland, TX 77626

(409)727-6539

If for some reason you decide not to participate, please return the materials.

Participant Instructions

1. Fill out the respondent information below
2. Write in the name of the person about whom you are reporting in the space provided on the enclosed LPI - Observer form.
3. Fill out the LPI - Observer form. Please do not skip any questions.
4. Enclose form in supplied envelope and return to me.

Respondant Information

Name of person about whom you are reporting_____

Mark your response with an X except where asked to write in responses.

What is your age? 20 - 29___ 30 - 39___ 40-49___ 50-59___ 60-69___

What is your gender? M _____ F _____

Race/Ethnic origin? Black___ American Indian___ Asian___ Caucasian___

Other (Please write in)_____

Have you ever taken the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, how long ago? (Please write in your response in months). _____ months

ago.

Can you remember your type? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, what is it? (Please write in your response) _____