Leadership

“I must become an expert in a whole new set of skills.”

Scarcely a week goes by before a new leadership tome hits the shelves of our local bookstore. Powerhouse CEOs and wise gurus take turns putting a new spin on leadership, and each has a different story, philosophy, and recipe for success. Many of these works are worthwhile and inspirational, but most are incomplete, for nearly all sum up the concept of leadership with a formula designed to suit everyone—as if it could be boiled down to a clever, one-size-fits-all mantra.

Also absent from many volumes on leadership is a focus on followers. It’s been said about politics, “If the people will lead, the leaders will follow,” and the same could be said for business.

The bottom line, as the business books like to say, is that human behavior and interaction are so complex that any single approach will prove insufficient. However, Typewatching can bring us closer to an understanding of leadership through its focus on how type colors, and even controls, the kind of leader you seek and the kind of leader you are hardwired to become. Our different personality types determine our various styles, motivations, and ideas of what leadership is all about.

That said, being a good leader is no simple matter of capitalizing on the strengths of one’s personality type. In fact, some of the most remarkable people can get tripped up in leadership
roles, often with the same set of skills and talents that got them to the top in the first place.

Consider former presidents Richard Nixon and Bill Clinton. Nixon, arguably a classic INTJ, drew strength from his inner world of vision and strategy and from his ability to grasp and analyze complex situations. He is, many historians agree, the most astute U.S. foreign policy leader of the second half of the twentieth century. But the same INTJ characteristics that took Nixon to great heights also likely helped plunge him to great depths: His need to control information and his withdrawal from personal relationships may have led him into the world of secrecy and espionage that was his downfall.

Bill Clinton, most likely an ENFP, won his following by extending broadband sympathy and empathy to everyone he met. In classic NF tradition, each new person was a potential conquest, someone he could connect with on a one-to-one level. Then, when headline-making news of his infidelity tainted his public image, it appeared that the same seductive qualities that had helped get him elected had now led him into big trouble.

You don’t need to be commander in chief—or even chief executive officer—to get tripped up by your own four-letter type. Consider the story of our ESTJ client Judy, who, when we met her, had just been promoted to division manager of a major retail chain. During the decade she had already spent with the company, she’d received a great many kudos for her effective administrative and project management skills. She’d brought a painstaking attention to detail to each new project, using her ESTJ organization skills, and was expected to continue to move up the organizational ladder.

One of Judy’s primary duties in her new position was to run a number of community-based services: a suicide hot line, twelve-step programs, Habitat for Humanity, and other activities that integrated company employees with community members. Her task was to set up and staff the programs and to keep them running effectively. It was a natural project for Judy.

But suddenly, the personality strengths that had worked so well for her before—her objectivity and her attention to detail—became liabilities. They weren’t appropriate in this much more subjective, feel-good arena of volunteerism and community causes. Judy applied her best ESTJ talents. She tried to micromanage. She made unilateral decisions rather than allowing the group to work things out. She talked about accountability and wanted to know what reports would be produced and when she would see them. None of this sat well with the volunteers, who had signed on to help their neighbors and their community in a noncorporate environment. As a result, Judy’s programs were flagging; volunteers weren’t signing on, and those who had either weren’t showing up or weren’t sticking around. Even her own employees, who had given the program their enthusiastic support prior to Judy’s promotion, began to lose interest. Judy was painfully aware that she had blown her new assignment.

That’s where many of these stories end—with someone failing on the job. To her credit, Judy engaged a variety of consultants, including our staff at Otto Kroeger Associates. We helped her view the situation through a typological lens, and she quickly recognized that Typewatching could help her see why things weren’t working, and how they might.

As we worked together, Judy made a serious effort to change her management style and allow for her nonpreferences to shine through. For example, she began to hold open-ended meetings at which participants spent time sharing stories and focusing on their successes. Ultimately, recognizing her limited ability to stomach what to her was organizational “fluff,” Judy delegated an underling to run those meetings—and in true ESTJ style, made sure that this individual was accountable for all that transpired. Over time, Judy turned things around, and even won a Manager of the Year award. She has since been held up as one of the company’s exemplary leaders.

So, does becoming an effective leader mean changing your typological stripes and toning down the natural strengths that moved you up through the organizational ranks? Of course not. But as you’ll see, leaders must often learn how to access their nonpreferences—the four letters that represent the opposite of their type.
What Is Leadership?

It is difficult to define leadership in a way that all types would embrace and understand. For our purposes, we'll define it as the intentional use of power with individuals or groups toward some desired end.

Let's take a closer look at the four key components of this definition before viewing it through a Typewatching lens.

1. **Leadership is intentional.** Though not all things a leader does are deliberate—there are always mistakes, uncalculated actions, and unforeseen reactions—leadership involves the intentional use of power to influence a person or group in a chosen direction.

2. **Leadership needs people.** It might seem obvious, but leaders require followers—leadership is about how one person relates to another person or to groups of people. As a result, one's effectiveness as a leader depends not just on one's own personality type, but on that of one's followers. And, more than likely, those followers' types will range all over the typological map.

3. **Leadership is about using power.** Leaders who are able to access their individual power sources at crucial times hold a key to effectiveness and success. It is important to note that power is value-neutral—it is neither good nor bad, but simply exists. How leaders decide to use their power involves judgment.

   There are different types of power. **Personal** power is controlled by an individual, accruing by means of one's charisma, charm, knowledge, skills, and abilities. **Organizational** power is conferred upon individuals by groups and is dependent on the group's collective will or belief. Positions that bring organizational power involve authority, status, financial control, and the ability to reward and punish others. There are also hybrid power sources. For example, knowledge of a system and its bureaucracy—knowing how and by whom things actually get done and gaining that knowledge by pulling the appropriate strings—involves both organizational and personal power.

   It is critical to note that authority is a type of power, but that authority—a fancy title and a corner office—does not by itself give someone the ability to achieve organizational goals. The appointed chairperson of a committee may have organizational authority, but someone else's skill set, reputation, and knowledge of the system might mean that he or she holds more real power and is in fact the more effective leader.

   Conversely, sometimes people who appear to be slow to influence others can find themselves in a position of authority and can blossom into powerful, effective leaders once they have the weight and will of the organization behind them.

   It is a complicated equation. Power is not authority, and neither power nor authority on its own is leadership.

4. **Leadership needs an aim.** Just as leadership cannot exist without people, it cannot exist without a direction or goal.

   So, where does type fit in? Let's examine how these four components of leadership play out through the different personality types.

How Sensors and iNtuitives Lead

As stated in Chapter Three, the way we gather information is the starting point for almost all human interactions. Your preference of Sensing or iNtuition is the primary indicator of your teaching style, your learning style, and your communication style. It is also a great place to start looking at leadership style.

Sensors almost literally engage with the world around them through the five senses. Here-and-now specifics and realities—what they can touch, taste, see, smell, and feel—are the data that matter most and are most trusted; these are the things that
Sensors first notice. This makes them tactile, literal, and practical and tends to focus their work on the actual, the present, the doable. So, Sensors tend to lead by exercising their experience and their command of detail.

Among the many strengths of a Sensing leader is a natural sense of the movement of time and of how much time a project will take to complete. In addition, Sensors’ attention to the practical and tangible give them an orientation toward implementation and action—in other words, toward getting stuff done. Sensing leaders tend to exercise their creativity by cleverly and effectively maneuvering within the limits of their resources and experience. What we expect of our S leaders—and as S leaders, demand from our subordinates—has a strong effect on an S’s leadership style.

Criticism of Sensing leaders can be harsh and often comes from those with an iNtuitive bias. Some claim that Sensing leaders are lazy about generating new ideas, unimaginative, unwilling or unable to concentrate on the future, and prone to get lost in tending to the details of today rather than dealing with the overarching pattern or trend that the big picture brings to light.

In the end, what usually trips up Sensors is their limited perspective on things. Consider Sean, a team leader in an electronics firm we worked with. Sean was frustrated by several members of his team who he felt weren’t fully engaged. Laurie would consistently come in late; Brian was often working on other, unrelated matters during team meetings; Janice’s pager would seem to always go off about ten minutes into the meeting, at which point she’d leave. This lack of individual involvement was taking its toll: Sean’s team had no sense of mission, urgency, or investment.

As an effective leader, Sean’s first instinct was to deal with each individual—to try to make Laurie more punctual, Brian more focused, and Janice less electronically accessible. If only he could solve each of these problems, he reasoned, the whole team would be better able to move forward.

As a Sensor, Sean saw the organizational trees—the people and their issues—but failed to see the forest. In his case, the “forest” was the pattern formed by Laurie, Brian, and Janice’s behavior: The team lacked engagement, enthusiasm, and esprit de corps.

Typewatching helped Sean see the pattern. He began to realize that as a Sensor, he was a very in-basket kind of guy—he would deal with whatever was at the top of the pile, the latest thing to hit his desk. He wanted to know, “How can I make Laurie show up on time?” when the real question should have been, “How can I make Laurie more engaged?” Eventually, with this larger question in mind, Sean was able to allow the team members to restructure their roles and responsibilities without abandoning the team’s mission. Laurie and her teammates soon felt reenergized and possessed of a new sense of commitment—and Laurie, as a result, started showing up on time.

People who prefer iNtuition, of course, see the world in a very different light. They see the forest quite clearly, but may fail to see the trees. They are hardwired to pick up on patterns, future possibilities, and the proverbial big picture rather than on details and specifics. The line item on a report is valuable to the iNtuitive to the extent that it suggests a trend and thus a future possibility. iNtuives live in the future, and lead toward it by exercising their vision and drive to change and develop their colleagues and the systems around them.

Leaders preferring iNtuition tend to focus on the possibilities and the big picture first and the details later—if ever. This is a quality rewarded in senior-level and executive leaders far more than in junior and entry-level ones—leaders preferring iNtuition often find that behaviors that were liabilities early in their careers eventually enable them to reap great benefits.

Among the natural strengths of iNtuive leaders is their ability to think systemically and strategically. iNtuives link factual observations to form a pattern or trend, which incorporates a handful of possibilities that are connected to other ideas, possibilities, options, facts, and patterns. An effective iNtuive leader is able to harness these perceptions into a vision of the future and to use that vision to drive creative change.
But just as Sensors can get bogged down in detail and lose the ability to see the bigger picture, iNtuitives can get seduced by the vast world of possibilities—visioning and imagining much, but doing little. When this happens, subordinates of the iNtuitive—and Sensors in particular—may regard this process as mere mental gymnastics that have nothing to do with the "real world" of life in the trenches. In the worst case, the N leader can be branded an airhead, a space cadet, or an absent-minded professor, and valuable leadership capital is lost.

**How Thinkers and Feelers Lead**

Leadership has a great deal to do with judgments, so the Thinking-Feeling preference, which describes how an individual prefers to make decisions, looms large.

Let’s start with Thinkers. They make up only half of the population, yet they occupy the overwhelming majority of leadership ranks throughout the world. And the higher you go up the corporate ladder, the greater the concentration of Thinkers. More than twenty years of cross-cultural data we have collected show that Ts make up about 86 percent of middle managers, nearly 93 percent of senior managers, and more than 95 percent of executives.

How can this be? There are two likely explanations. First, the workplace has long been male-dominated, and two thirds of men are Thinkers. Second, it is a natural tendency for people—Thinkers and Feelers alike—to clone themselves in hiring and nurturing new personnel. This means that over time this natural tendency for Thinkers to replace and surround themselves with other Thinkers—combined with the historically male-dominated workplace—may have led to an overabundance of Thinkers in management ranks.

Thinkers strive to make decisions by standing back, removing themselves from the issue or subject at hand, and employing cause-and-effect logic to reach a conclusion. Thinkers are analytical; they work toward clarity using objectivity, logic, and analysis—all tools that depersonalize issues and situations. It’s not that people and human values become unimportant, but more often than not they are trumped by the T’s drive to be right, to be competent, and to remain objective. Personal issues make it into the T’s decision-making equation, but they do not control or overpower the process.

Thinkers often see the world as a series of problems to be solved. T leaders, therefore, are naturally problem-oriented. Whether engaging with a person, a group, a task, or a crisis, the T leader’s first reaction typically will be to ask questions like: “What is wrong here?”; “How can this issue, performance, or product be better?”; “What needs fixing?”; and perhaps, “Who screwed this up in the first place?” This orientation—especially if gone unchecked in an organization dominated by Ts—can lead to a culture of criticism between leaders and their followers. The subordinate’s job then becomes delivering on or working toward a task, and the leader’s job becomes criticizing the subordinate’s performance. Some T leaders may even view criticism as a compliment, bestowed only upon those people they feel are worthy of their time and attention and suggestions for improvement.

Feeling leaders engage with the human element first and see it as the determining factor in any final outcome. Feelers prefer to begin their decision-making process with subjective consideration of the people involved, their circumstances, and the solution that would be in closest harmony with the F’s own values. The personal and subjective nature of this process does not mean, however, that F leaders eschew tough, objective decisions. They will be factored in, but only after the personal issues have been considered and weighed.

As leaders, Feelers tend to exercise power through relationships and attention given to subjective human values. They are masters of putting themselves into other people’s moccasins. Their empathy tends to make F leaders circumstantial decision makers who are more concerned with the person or people impacted by an issue than with the precedent or policy designed to deal with the issue in the first place. This tendency is another aspect of “People First,” a classic F slogan, and its by-products can both help and hinder a group or organization. For example, it can create a sense of familiarity and cohesion that may be
motivating and inspiring. Many people who work for effective Feeling leaders speak to us of their loyalty and personal dedication to these individuals. (How one achieves this personal connection with subordinates—or even why one would want to— is something of a mystery to Thinking leaders.) The downside to this, of course, is that subjective or circumstantial decision making can be seen as unfair when someone is left behind, or when the bar appears to keep moving to accommodate all the different human needs on a team or in an office.

Fs' sensitivity to others is not merely a feel-good exercise.

**FAIR WARNING**

At Org. Inc., the policy is that work begins at 9:00 A.M. The employment manual says that all staff should be at their desks, engaged in their duties, by 9:00 A.M. to avoid reprimand. Today, John comes in to work twenty minutes late.

- **Thinking leader's response:** "John, I noticed you were twenty minutes late today. You know that is a violation of our policy, so in all fairness I have to give you a verbal warning that such infractions will not be tolerated." This objective approach aims to ensure fairness by maintaining—and enforcing—the same rule consistently over time.

- **Feeling leader's response:** "John, I noticed you were twenty minutes late today. Was your tardiness due to that child-care issue we spoke of last week? I know child care is a tough problem that you've been dealing with lately. Listen, we need you here on time, so let's create some backup plan so that we are not left short-staffed on mornings like this one. By the way, how is your daughter doing?" This subjective approach ensures fairness by taking into account the personal needs of all parties involved.

Which leader was more fair?

Used effectively, it can engender real power. Effective Feeling leaders use their ability to understand others' lives, to walk in their shoes, and to feel their pain as a means of strengthening a personal bond. In doing so, they often increase the amount of leverage they have with others.

There's nothing in the entire world of business that brings T-F differences to the forefront more than the awful experience of downsizing. We helped one T leader at a major defense contractor cope in a way that turned a difficult downsizing situation into... well, a less difficult one.

The plant being downsized was based in the Southwest U.S. and was by far the largest employer in its community. The downsizing put more than 10 percent of the entire local workforce out of a job, so it was a devastating blow to the community. Things were no less stressful at the plant, where second-generation employees also seemed doomed to lose their jobs in a region that had few reasonable employment alternatives. Moreover, the company's facility was rife with turf wars that had broken out among top managers vying to keep their groups far from the downsizing axe.

We were brought in to conduct a two-day intervention to help the plant's general manager and his sixteen direct reports through the process. One of the first things we did was study the group's typological profile, as well as that of the organization. In doing so, it became instantly clear what we were dealing with: an organization led exclusively by Thinking leaders, who had cloned themselves to the point where more than 90 percent of the company shared the Thinking preference. The impact of that T-based culture was wearing heavily on everyone.

As Thinkers, the company's managers were prone to look at things through the lens of impersonal objectivity, which can be an effective tool during a downsizing. It allows decision makers to be dispassionate, to make tough choices for the good of the company. But Ts, in their objectivity, tend to want to "fix" things—to find out what's wrong and make it right. What they lacked during this critical, turbulent time was subjectivity—the ability to deal with interpersonal dynamics.
We helped the group members to look at themselves—something Ts are generally loath to do—in order that they might come to and appreciate their organizational blind spots. This enabled them to better manage themselves and the process. Turf wars eased, stresses were reduced, and the whole sad process proceeded in a much more humane way.

Along the way, the T managers plastered the company walls with signs proclaiming their newfound commitment to one another—and did so in ultimate T fashion, with the slogan “THINK PEOPLE.”

How Extraverts and Introverts Lead

Carl Jung believed the preference between Extraversion and Introversion to be the biggest discriminator among people. That’s certainly the case when it comes to leadership: The behavioral differences between Extraverts and Introverts tend to be obvious and profound, and play an important role in leadership style.

Extraverts—who are energized and seduced by the outer world of people, places, and things— influence others quite naturally by engaging with them: talking, networking, and taking action. Quick to disclose plans, values, principles, and even what might seem like rather personal things about themselves, Extraverts often lead others the way they live their own lives—by putting it all out on Main Street. A good Extraverted slogan is “WHAT YOU SEE IS WHAT YOU GET.” Focused on and energized by the external world, Es are generally aware of and drawn to people and groups. Therefore, as leaders, Extraverts tend to be open verbal communicators who share more than they withhold.

The potential liability for the Extraverted leader is that he or she may share, talk, and disclose regardless of whether the information being imparted has been asked for or is being listened to. More prone to talking and engaging than to listening and reflecting, Extraverts may find it difficult to get their moorings by themselves, in meditation or without the benefit of staff and team. They may also second-guess decisions or ideas that have not been discussed out loud or thrown against a sounding board first.

On the other hand, Extraverts usually have no problem making their ideas, even half-baked ones, widely known. We fondly recall Rondell, the manager of a small retail shop in our neighborhood. Rondell was the sole Extravert; his half-dozen employees were all Introverts.

Rondell loved to walk around the store Extraverting in his seemingly random way: “Did you see CNN last night? There

MANAGEMENT BY WALKING AROUND OPEN DOORS

Many of the past few years’ popular management theories give an edge to Extraverts. For example, one management model that circulated a number of years ago was “Management by Walking Around.” This model suggests that effective managers know their people, the world in which their people work, and the problems their people struggle with every day.

The only way a leader can know these things, so suggests the model, is to get out from behind a desk and walk around the workplace—talking, greeting, shaking hands, engaging, and observing. Clearly, this is an action-oriented, Extraverted management model. Most Introverts would be hard-pressed to sustain this style for more than a brief period.

Or consider the “Open-Door” policy, an attempt to make leaders visible and approachable by inviting just about anyone to stop by at just about any time to talk with the manager about just about anything—again, a policy only an Extravert could love. The irony is that it is pointless for Extraverted leaders to have an open-door policy because they are rarely in their offices—they are out walking around!
was a great piece on Congress. That was a crazy customer who just left. What did she want? We shouldn't waste our time with people like her. Does anyone know what the lunch special is across the street? Maybe we should move the display into the front window. I'll be in my office if anyone wants to know what I'm doing.

Rondell's dutiful staff would walk behind him, taking notes, assuming Rondell's ramblings had some weight and were leading in some significant direction or to some important conclusion. As it turned out, they rarely did.

One day, in one of his ramblings, Rondell mused, "You know, it's been a really good week and we've all worked hard. Maybe we should take Friday off." That Friday, three of his staffers failed to show up. Rondell, of course, didn't recall saying anything about taking Friday off. Others heard it as a directive.

Eventually, everyone—including Rondell—figured out that not everything Rondell said was gospel.

Introverts—energized by their inner world of ideas, thoughts, and concepts—are not often motivated to influence others. When Introverts do choose to influence others, they commonly do so by presenting ideas, plans, visions, or values—often in writing—that will be compelling and attractive. As is the case with all Introverts, an Introverted leader has a lot brewing under the surface, but only lets out or shares a small piece of it.

Sometimes the issue for Introverted leaders is the speed with which they are able to make decisions. We worked with a young man named Christopher who was clearly destined to rise up the organization. At one point, however, he found himself in a position with the company where he needed to make snap decisions; typically, because a staffer would approach him with a problem that needed to be solved on the spot.

That was a bit unfair to Christopher, who, as an Introvert, didn't have the time he needed in order to process. Often he would think about it later and come up with a different answer. In some cases, it was too late—the ship had already sailed. As a result, he was labeled indecisive.

The challenge when dealing with Extraverts and Introverts is to appreciate both what comes out of their mouths and what doesn't. With Es, it's critical to give them time to noodle things publicly, and to understand that some of this noodling will be of little value. With Is, it's critical to give them time to think about things before pressing for a final answer.

How Judgers and Perceivers Lead

Because Js are decisive and emphasize closure, structure, schedules, and order in their public lives, they usually fit the stereotype of what many believe a leader should be. Both Judgers and Perceivers, however, have unique perspectives and qualities that nurture their roles as leaders.

Evidence of the Judging orientation in the workplace exists everywhere—think about puncturing the clock, meeting deadlines, achieving quotas, time-tracking, and all the other minutiae of daily work life. Given these objective elements, a Judging leader is well suited to systems that are strongly oriented toward decisive action, rigid schedules, and the accomplishment of tasks. J leaders' work-now-play-later approach to life gives them a serious, no-nonsense demeanor.

Their need for control doesn't necessarily make Js better leaders than Ps. Js' strengths can easily turn into liabilities. For example, despite the Js' apparent leadership advantages, they can run into trouble when their drive for control, scheduling, and closure prevents new data from being considered. The push to complete a project may overpower the uncertainty of a given team, members of which—if given enough time to probe—might have uncovered an important reason to slow down. Judgers, in this regard, are perfectly capable of winning a battle but losing a war when their strengths are taken to an extreme.

Perceiving leaders tend to exhibit a variety of what appear to be behavioral liabilities—they're described as scattered, directionless, unscheduled, and prone to having more starts than finishes. Often overlooked, however, are the Ps' many effective leadership qualities, especially their ability to live their lives as flexible, curious, and open-minded people who can be easygoing, informal, adaptable, and fun-loving. The spontaneous nature of
ONE O’CLOCK JUMP

Two managers—a Judge and a Perceiver—each have something on their calendars for 1:00 P.M. on Tuesday. Something else has just come up that conflicts with the scheduled appointment. In both cases, the conflicting item seems attractive, even necessary.

- **The Judge’s first response** is probably irritation that the day’s schedule did not unfold as planned, and he will seek to control the second event to the degree that it can be made to fit the original schedule. This manager will be praised for effective task, project, and time-management skills, yet criticized for being inflexible and resistant to change.

- **The Perceiver’s first response** is more than likely to be excitement that there is yet another option available at 1:00 P.M. on Tuesday, and she will readily adapt the day’s schedule to accommodate the needs of the new event. This manager will be praised for being adaptable and open to last-minute changes, but roundly condemned for allowing projects to creep along and for being late to staff meetings.

Who’s more effective, the controller or the adapter?

Perceiving leaders means you are never quite sure how they will respond to you, to a new challenge, or to a new opportunity.

As we’ve discovered with other preference pairings, the JP qualities that help people rise to the top often don’t serve them well once they get there. Consider the case of Gavin, an extremely talented marketing consultant hired by a midsize business services firm to help develop new offerings. Gavin was a brilliant, visionary, and enthusiastic ENTP, usually spouting an idea a minute. Someone once likened listening to Gavin do his thing in a brainstorming session—waving arms, pacing the room, scrawling on the whiteboard, all while spewing forth an astonishing array of creative thoughts—to “trying to sip from a fire hose.”

Gavin’s talent served his client well. He helped the business services firm, with which he worked for several years, to increase customer retention, improve cross-selling among divisions and product lines, and generally stay ahead of the competition.

As often happens with consultants, Gavin was given a chance to work in-house permanently—the firm offered him a full-time job as marketing director. At first Gavin declined, but the client insisted and made the deal impossible to resist.

Soon after he signed on, all of the qualities that had made Gavin so valuable to the company suddenly turned against him.

For example, now that he was on board, his hit-and-run technique no longer fit the bill: He couldn’t simply offer up an array of good ideas, then disappear for months while the client implemented them. Now the generating of ideas as well as all of the hands-on, nuts-and-bolts implementation fell to Gavin and his staff. It quickly became clear that he was not up to the task.

As a P, Gavin’s natural abilities led him to be spontaneous, inquisitive, and open-minded—exactly what made him such a prolific idea man. As a manager, he needed to tap into his non-preferences—to work on being decisive, accountable, and, most of all, focused on results. In other words, his J side needed to emerge. That proved to be a frustrating, formidable challenge: Gavin reported that trying to cope as an insider in the company was like “pulling around a ball and chain.”

Unlike Judges, who are decisive and firm, Perceiving leaders like Gavin may choose to follow one or several courses of action as they see fit. More often than not, what you experience with P’s is openness, choice, and questions, questions, questions. Decisions and closure will come, but often not very quickly, and rarely without exploring a variety of exciting options. This does not mean that Gavin—or any Perceiver—is unable to make snap decisions or hold fast to conclusions; they simply would prefer not to do so in the open. Their public side—what they show the world—is about gathering data and staying open to new information. Conclusions are far less likely to be spoken of and shared.
In the end, both J and P stereotypes—that Judging leaders are rigid and do not listen to new data, and that Perceiving leaders are procrastinators who cannot make decisions—are off base. Both ideas fly in the face of Type theory. Judgers can be flexible and open to new data, and Perceivers can make decisions and hold to them; it’s just that they prefer to do so quietly.

The critical difference between J and P leaders has less to do with decisiveness and more to do with the ability to give direction. Judgers are able to do this more easily than Perceivers, who

AN OPEN-AND-SHUT CASE

Not long ago, while Otto and Janet were co-leading a training event, the uncomfortably warm training room in which they found themselves elicited very different responses from these two experienced group leaders.

After his presentation, Otto, the Judger, said, “It’s hot in here. Sue, please open up that back window.” This is direction—what we count on Judgers to provide. We can reasonably assume that Otto had gathered some data about his comfort level; perhaps he’d even noticed some of the participants fanning themselves or taking off their coats. But no one really knows: With Judgers, we are usually not privy to the data gathering, only to the conclusion—in this case, that Otto wanted Sue to open the window.

After her presentation, Janet, the Perceiver, asked, “Is anyone hot in here? John, do you think it is hot?” John stated that he thought it was hot, and the group members quickly determined that most of them were hot, so three people got up to open the windows in the back of the room. This is classic Perceiver behavior: Janet didn’t state a request, she only raised a point. We can assume that beneath her data gathering, Janet had concluded that it was hot and that she wanted the windows open. But the class heard neither a conclusion nor a direction—only questions. The windows were opened just the same, but it was the group’s decision to do so.

PUTTING TYPEWATCHING TO WORK

are instead facilitative, and this distinction makes a big difference in their leadership styles.

It bears repeating that in the realm of leadership, the advantage frequently goes to the Judger. The ability to direct is closely associated with effective leadership, but Perceivers bring a more grassroots philosophy to leadership roles that can be equally powerful. Facilitative leadership can be an extremely effective way to build participation, ownership, and buy-in from the bottom up. Whereas highly directive leadership can often create an atmosphere of compliance—people doing the leader’s bidding because they were told to do so—facilitative leadership is more apt to inspire commitment—people doing the leader’s bidding because they want to.

Of course, too much of a good thing can spell trouble, and a Perceiving leader’s facilitative style can be viewed, sometimes accurately, as vacillation or indecisiveness. If not careful, Ps can become overwhelmed with options, data, and interesting side roads, to the point where few time commitments are kept and few goals accomplished.

Leadership studies indicate that productivity does not depend upon a preference for Judging or Perceiving, even though the methodologies and approaches of each differ so dramatically. The real skill for an effective leader is to know when to adapt and when to control—regardless of preference or type.

What, and Where, Is Power?

Power and authority are loaded words, and we find in our personal coaching and group consulting that discussing someone’s authority and personal power can cause anxiety and confusion. One of the principal reasons for the confusion is that the different personality types see power very differently and rooted in vastly different places. The lens of Temperament gives us tremendous insight into how each of us tends to view power itself—where it is and how we are most likely to use it.
NF Leaders—the People People

To NFs, power resides in personal relationships. Personal and interpersonal connections and values are what hold the most sway over this group: To win someone's commitment requires that a leader relate to him or her personally. This is the NF's strength, and the NF leader brings to the job an arsenal of potent power tools: a pat on the back, compliments, a warm smile, eye contact, stated feelings of warmth or appreciation, affirmation, respect, personal attention and interest, and an acknowledgment of others' values.

Effective leaders win an NF employee's commitment by making a point of caring whether the worker likes them in return. All of these efforts are for naught if insincere, for an NF highly values the genuine expression of warmth and connection but is quick to see through and resent veiled attempts at manipulation.

It's also important to understand that simple compliance with the wishes of an NF leader is not usually enough for the NF. The NF leader will continue to "sell" the idea or action until you are not only doing it, but are grateful for the opportunity and experience. NF leaders—whether in sales positions or not—never stop selling. Harmony, connection, inclusion, and group cohesion are of the utmost importance to them. Drawing on their ability to make inspirational pleas, NF leaders will be tirelessly persuasive—and take it personally if people don't follow.

NT Leaders—Competence Above All

NTs neither need nor want—and at times even actively work against—organizational or institutional structures, procedures, traditions, and hierarchy. They are not necessarily being contrary, but are merely seeking clarity and, above all else, competence. When logic, clarity, and competence—as defined by each individual NT—are not present within an organization, then the organization, its conventions, its rules, and, above all, its leaders compromise the NT's willingness to be led.

When it comes to interacting with their leaders, the NTs' scorecards are always activated and the performance bar that their leaders must clear is always on the rise. If we do a competent job leading you today, then the bar goes up overnight. Therefore, leading an NT means proving against his or her standards that you are fully competent. If you do that, you will have that NT on board—at least until the end of the day.

This drive for competence plays an important role when the NT is the leader. Because NTs are so focused on objective clarity, they tend to be quick to criticize. It is through criticism that we learn what is wrong, what could be better, and how to become more competent. One of the greatest gifts, therefore, that an NT leader can give is criticism of your performance. NT leaders, if he or she puts any stock in you, will develop you through argument and critique of your performance and ideas, eventually freeing you from their scrutiny.

SJ Leaders—the Company People

SJ see power in the structure, hierarchy, and traditions of their organizations and work teams. The power tools of an SJ are titles, salaries, tenure, official citations and commendations, managerial mandates, medals, and all of the myriad other things that make success official.

To motivate an SJ subordinate, you must first understand his or her place in the system relative to yours. SJs rely upon the system—through its leadership—to provide them with the data and structures they need to accomplish their goals. Even when SJs lose faith or confidence in a leader, they will tend to follow the proper procedures whether to transfer jobs or to file a complaint against the leader. Their faith resides in the system and its rules, not in a given individual. To SJ leaders, power is rooted in authority, and though commitment is expected, compliance is demanded.

As leaders, SJs tend to emphasize the importance of detail and practicality in order to make people efficient and capable of completing projects on time and under budget. If procedures,
rules, and regulations do not exist, SJ leaders will first establish parameters and then work within them. In fact, many SJ leaders would identify this as their primary duty—to impose order over chaos. This is the SJ leader's gift.

**SP Leaders—the Troubleshooters**

SPs live for the moment. They are driven to stay open to new sensory data and to use action and tangible tools to produce some result with immediate impact or benefit. Unlike NPs and SJs, SPs don't put considerable weight on personal relationships or organizational procedures; both are seen as overly confining. Unlike NTs, SPs don't score competency with an abstract scorecard, but against the practical demands of the moment and the situation in which they find themselves.

SP employees look to their leaders—when they do at all—to provide them with the materials and resources needed to perform the task and with the freedom to work without managerial meddling or excessive procedural control. SPs want to be free to flex and move with the demands of the day—indeed, those of the very moment.

As leaders, SPs exercise power by solving problems and acting to address the concerns of the moment, even if so doing violates policy, procedure, organizational hierarchy, an agreed-upon project plan, or the needs of any given person or group. The needs of the moment trump all of these. This focus on the here and now tends to make SP leaders good troubleshooters, with particularly good skills at crisis management—which, in some companies, is a way of life.

**Leadership and the Attitudes**

Another seldom-considered combination of preference pairings has a tremendous impact on leadership and how successfully, on average, someone will rise to the challenges of a

**DEFUSING THE SITUATION**

OKA associate Gloria Fauth, an ENTP, tells the following true story to illustrate the personal and leadership styles of each of the four Temperaments in a crisis situation:

A meeting was taking place at a U.S. embassy in Africa. Present at the meeting were several NPs, NTs, and SJs, and a solitary SP. At one point an embassy official walked in the room and calmly notified the group that a bomb threat had been made against the embassy and that they must clear the building.

- **The NPs** dashed to the phone to call their families to let them know that everything was all right and not to worry.
- **The NTs** started debating with one another the effectiveness of embassy bombing, the practice of phoning in bomb threats, and the role each plays in the efforts of international terrorism—a discussion that continued throughout the afternoon at the café across the street.
- **The SJs** automatically went to the corner of the room and pulled out an official manual to determine the standard operating procedure for dealing with bomb threats.
- **The one SP**, within moments, was in the hallway, directing traffic, answering questions, and getting her colleagues out of harm's way.
Extraverted-Judgers—the Natural Influencers

For the past few years, much of the energy at Otto Kroeger Associates has been focused on a dramatic research project. Among other things, we have studied the impact of type preferences on the successful completion of college. Our findings include evidence that the four Extraverted-Judging types (ESTJ, ESFJ, ENFJ, and ENTJ) tend to be the most over-achieving of all types and the most successful at accomplishing anything to which they devote their energies. We have since found that Isabel Briggs Myers, creator of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® instrument, discovered but never published the same findings.

The college involved in our study has a competitive and highly selective professional development program designed to breed future leaders. In the program, college juniors and seniors spend one week traveling to Boston, New York, and Washington, D.C., to shadow professionals in their area of interest. The selection process involves personal interviews and candidate-written letters in which each student sells his or her ability to set and achieve goals and be successful. In the many years’ worth of data we have on this program, EJs have predominated—making up more than 70 percent of the group every year.

This leadership training program attracts EJs for the same reason that EJs so frequently wind up in leadership positions wherever they go. Extraverted-Judgers seem to emit an aura of self-confidence, capability, competency, and assurance, so that even when they are uncertain or wrong, they seem decisive and right. Isabel Briggs Myers found that Extraverted-Judgers have an oversupply of what she called “stamina” that gives them an edge in life toward success. Because of this stamina, when something does go wrong for EJs, one of their first assumptions is that someone else caused it to happen. This tendency to externalize blame allows them to keep on moving and come out a winner, which gives them still more confidence and tends to leave others around them somewhere between intimidated and wanting to follow them. We hold just two preferences—Extraversion and Judging—responsible for that effect. Other preferences—Sensing or iNtuition, Thinking or Feeling—will fine-tune the effect that an EJ has on the world, but the preferences for Extraversion and Judging alone will boost an individual toward success in leadership roles and will tend to draw followers.

Introverted-Judgers—Strong, Silent Types

Introverts who prefer Judging (ISTJ, ISFJ, INFJ, and INTJ), much like their EJ brethren, lead with their judgment. Behaviorally they appear focused, decisive, closure-driven, directive, and overtly controlling. As Introverts, however, they are not drawn to the outer world of people, places, things, and action, but rather to their inner worlds of reflection, ideas, and concepts. IJs are common leadership types, and the list of the strengths they bring to leadership roles is long. It is this type of combination that we know stereotypically as pillars of strength or strong, silent types, and their followers appreciate the focus and reflection they bring to teams and organizations. But IJs can pay for their lack of Extraversion with the criticism that they are slow to engage and frequently appear disconnected, disinterested, or even arrogant. Introverted-Judgers, unlike their Extraverted counterparts, can seem indecisive, given that upon reflection they may later revise or even reverse their decisions. Thus, although there is no doubt that Judgers have an advantage in gaining success and appearing successful in leadership roles, a preference for Introversion makes this Attitude pairing a mixed bag.

Extraverted-Perceivers—Energizing Forces

Extraverted-Perceivers (ESTP, ESFP, ENFP, and ENTP), like all Extraverts, are energized by the external world, drawn to interaction with people, things, and events. They will be verbal, engaging, action-oriented leaders, but as Perceivers, they will
not place a priority on closure, schedules, or order, but rather on flexibility, curiosity, and adaptability. It is this open-endedness that tends to be EPs’ biggest stumbling block to achieving or thriving in positions of leadership, and they are fairly uncommon in leadership ranks.

As leaders, Extraverted-Perceivers are seen as energizing forces for change and creativity, but conversely, they are also seen as flighty, indecisive, and chaotic. The popular explanation for why many people with this Attitude pairing do not rise within organizations, despite their many gifts, is that EPs tend to overextend themselves, with limited results.

**Introverted-Perceivers—Quiet and Reflective**

In terms of how successful any given person will be on average in influencing people or groups, Extraverted-Judgers have the edge, followed by Introverted-Judgers and then Extraverted-Perceivers. Introverted-Perceivers (ISTP, ISFP, INFP, and INTP) face the greatest challenges in achieving success in leadership roles.

Introverted-Perceivers tend to be quiet, reflective, and oriented toward internal values and principles that center them and compel them toward even more reflection when action is finally taken. It is rare for these principles and values to be revealed or given much voice; therefore, IPs often seem mysterious or inconsistent. Their flexibility, openness, and casual, nonhierarchical style leads to their being viewed (especially in our Extraverted-Judging-dominated systems) as weak and indecisive. Introverted-Perceivers’ natural self-doubt and questioning manner may mark them as unconfident and wavering. Even when Introverted-Perceivers are confident in their conclusions, what comes out of their mouths is often open to change and frequently sounds tentative.

Where Extraverted-Judgers tend to assume that the fault lies elsewhere when they do something wrong, Introverted-Perceivers are apt to assume personal responsibility for things, events, and decisions that had nothing to do with them. All these factors contribute to a seeming lack of self-confidence and a diminished ability to influence people and groups in a world usually compelled by and drawn to the EJ’s forcefulness, directiveness, and bravado.

Attitude studies reveal some troubling trends and blatant type biases, and though they do reflect reality in terms of overall trends and typological tendencies, no one’s professional or personal capabilities or skill sets are determined by psychological preferences alone. Indeed, nearly everyone has the makings of an effective leader. We’ve known talented IPs who have risen to the top of their organizations, and EJs who have failed spectacularly as leaders. Our point is not that Extraverted-Judgers make better leaders than others; they merely tend to fit into conventional leadership roles more naturally. Conversely, Introverted-Perceivers will find more hurdles between themselves and success in most leadership positions, and there will, as a result, be far fewer of them in such spots.

We’ve now viewed leadership through three different lenses—the eight preferences, the four Temperaments, and the four Attitudes. That’s, admittedly, a lot of data about leadership.

While we’ve noted the leadership advantages of each type in the business world, the real power of type in leadership derives from your ability to access your preferences as well as your non-preferences. While lots of people can get along quite well in the world by doing what comes naturally, the truest, most effective leaders have it all: They can be verbal and gregarious, yet reflective and thoughtful; they can pay attention to the details of the moment while paying heed as well to the bigger picture; they must be fair, objective, humane, and just; and they must be focused on results while staying open to changing circumstances and new information.

When General George C. Marshall, the chief of staff of the U.S. Army during World War II, was later named secretary of state, he recognized the challenge and put it this way: “It became clear to me that at the age of fifty-eight I would have to learn new tricks that were not taught in the military manuals or on the battlefield. In this position I am a political soldier and
### Leadership

#### IF YOU ARE AN...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTRAVERT</th>
<th>INTROVERT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTRAVERT</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTROVERT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allow as ample time and space to talk out ideas, issues, and problems without premature closure or threat of penalty.</td>
<td>- Talk to Is frequently and openly, engage them, and keep them active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remember that little of the volume generated counts for anything.</td>
<td>- Remember that they tend to exercise power in a way that is vocal, visible, and active—so at times force yourself into the spotlight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Think before you speak (count to ten).</td>
<td>- Ask for feedback and argue/discuss it on the spot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Push and repeat what’s really important.</td>
<td>- Now and then, have a simple chat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTRAVERT</th>
<th>INTROVERT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTRAVERT</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTROVERT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remember that silence does not mean agreement or consent.</td>
<td>- Engage Is disclosing your ideas, intentions, and plans, and actively solicit input and feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allow time and space for Is to assimilate and reflect.</td>
<td>- Role-model some overt actions that might facilitate communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remember that they tend to exercise power in a way that is understated and reflective.</td>
<td>- Determine what issues need verbal vs. written reinforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ask for performance feedback, and then listen to what they have to say.</td>
<td>- Keep reminding yourself that silence is not always golden—sometimes it’s yellow!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSOR</th>
<th>INTUITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENSOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTUITIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communicate how specific actions and efforts will affect the big picture.</td>
<td>- Remember that your focus on the big picture will inspire as much as inspire your follower(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Seek outside help to keep you aware of trends, patterns, and future possibilities.</td>
<td>- Allow a focus on specifics and details, but encourage your follower(s) to discuss how microissues add up to form a bigger effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on the positive possibilities the future could bring, then communicate them to your followers, along with the specific actions.</td>
<td>- Remember that your vision will be realized only when details are seen to and ideas are implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSOR</th>
<th>INTUITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENSOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTUITIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remember that your focus on details and facts will frustrate as much as inspire your follower(s).</td>
<td>- Communicate what specific actions will be taken, when, and by whom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Within the context of acting on a new possibility, push your follower(s) to develop detailed plans of action.</td>
<td>- Seek outside guidance to keep you aware of which details of your industry will impact your efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remember that your management of detail and specifics will manifest itself in good leadership when focused toward attaining some future state.</td>
<td>- There cannot be too many reality checks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUTTING TYPETALKING TO WORK

#### IF YOU ARE A...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THINKER</th>
<th>FEELER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THINKER</strong></td>
<td><strong>FEELER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Your follower(s) will judge your effectiveness as a leader by your ability to remain objective, employ cause-and-effect logic, and make tough decisions that transcend human whim.</td>
<td>- Your follower(s) will judge your effectiveness as a leader by your ability to remain objective, employ cause-and-effect logic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on what the impact of your actions and decisions are on the people whom you lead.</td>
<td>- Say what you mean, mean what you say, and let go of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remind yourself that all humans have emotions and feelings.</td>
<td>- Work hard not to personalize everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Be slow to compliment and to apologize.</td>
<td>- Be slow to compliment and to apologize.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THINKER</th>
<th>FEELER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THINKER</strong></td>
<td><strong>FEELER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Your follower(s) will judge your effectiveness as a leader by your ability to connect personally and adjust your decision making to circumstances.</td>
<td>- Your follower(s) will judge your effectiveness by your ability to connect personally and adjust your decision making to circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Thank you” and “I’m sorry” can buy a great deal of motivation.</td>
<td>- “Thank you” and “I’m sorry” can buy a great deal of motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Try not to fix or improve everything.</td>
<td>- Try not to fix or improve everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schmoozing (within limits) can be good.</td>
<td>- Schmoozing (within limits) can be good.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGER</th>
<th>PERCEIVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUDGER</strong></td>
<td><strong>PERCEIVER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schedule a little spontaneity every so often.</td>
<td>- State your boundaries and stay within them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Now and then, “upset the apple cart.”</td>
<td>- Do the structure and closure thing even when you do not want to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Role-model and show options every chance you get.</td>
<td>- Limit your changes of mind to one a day or week or…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Give advance warning of impending changes.</td>
<td>- Don’t be afraid to be FINAL and STICK TO IT!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGER</th>
<th>PERCEIVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUDGER</strong></td>
<td><strong>PERCEIVER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State and restate your boundaries and limits.</td>
<td>- Now and then, follow through on something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Let go now and then and learn from experience.</td>
<td>- Compete with one another in being timely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Be genuine in trying new behaviors.</td>
<td>- Plan your work and work your plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Balance each criticism with a compliment or keep the criticism to yourself.</td>
<td>- Jointly check off, with some regularity, something on the check-off list.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will have to put my training in rapping out orders and making
snap decisions on the back burner, and have to learn the arts of
persuasion and guile. I must become an expert in a whole new
set of skills."

Effective leaders must know themselves typologically, but
they must also be ready, willing, and able to plumb the less ac-
cessible parts of themselves for the good of the whole.

Team Building

"I may not be the best person to
give you advice on that subject."

No matter where you work in a company, no matter what you
do, you are part of a team. The company itself represents a team
effort to reach a goal. Each department or division represents a
team too. So do the smaller groups of people working together
within those departments. In each case a team's success is di-
rectly linked to the efforts of the individual players and how
well those players get along and work with each other.

Typewatching cuts right to the heart of building and main-
taining effective teams. Success in the twenty-first century, we
believe, will result from the ability of companies to produce
more with fewer human resources and to promote collaboration
over competition within and among companies.

We see examples of this all around. Departments within a com-
pany that previously competed or worked independently find
that they must now work together. Companies that competed
bitterly unite to manufacture more cost-effectively things they
both need. And entire countries are banding together to form
powerful common marketplaces that reduce or remove barriers
to enterprise. All of this requires people to relate in new ways.

The irony is that those most likely to rise to senior manage-
ment positions—the Introverted-Thinking-Judging types—are
the ones least naturally given to motivating esprit de corps. For