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OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Definitions of institutional advancement terms 3-6, 9, 11 were adapted from the Glossary of Fund-Raising Terms (1986) published by the National Society of Fund Raising Executives Institute.

1. Alumni(ae)—Persons who attended an institution.
2. Alumni administrators—Persons who make their living working as managers of programs designed to involve alumni in the affairs of the institution.
3. Development—A term used to define the total process of organizational or institutional fund raising, frequently inclusive of public relations and (in educational institutions) alumni(ae) affairs. Also called institutional advancement.
4. Development staff—All paid personnel involved in an organization's fund-raising program. In this study the participants in this category are called educational fund raisers.
5. Fund raiser—One who makes his or her living from working as a member of an organization's or institution's development department.
6. Institutional advancement—See development.
8. Philanthropy—The philosophy and practice of giving to nonprofit organizations through financial and other contributions; all voluntary giving, voluntary getting, voluntary service, and voluntary association and initiative.

9. Professional development—Experiences, both formal and informal, which assist the institutional advancement officer in obtaining knowledge, improving performance, or developing new skills.

10. Public relations—The practice of developing the reciprocal understanding and good will of an organization and opinion leaders with the general public. For the purposes of this study, persons who are employed in this field by institutions of higher education are called public information officers. Terms specifically related to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator are defined within the narrative.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

As institutions of higher education in the United States approach the 21st century, they are feeling both an economic and a demographic squeeze. While the numbers of college-age students decline, reductions are taking place in federal and state support of higher education. Inflation, combined with these decreases, exacerbates the financial dilemma of post-secondary institutions (Keller, 1983).

Given their current and projected financial future, institutions are actively seeking funds from all sources—student tuition, federal and state appropriations, contracts, selling services and goods, and philanthropic gifts. The latter activity, known to the general public as fund raising and broadly in higher education as institutional advancement, has increasingly come to popular attention as institutions mount campaigns to raise previously unimaginable amounts. In October 1990 Cornell University announced plans to seek $1.25 billion in private donations by the year 1995. This is the largest fund-raising goal in the history of American public education (Tifft, 1990). Yale is also expected to embark on a $1 billion-plus campaign, and Harvard may be considering a target as high as $2 billion.

Even public higher education, which traditionally relies upon appropriated support, has entered the fund-raising
arena with multi-million dollar goals. These institutions, called "state-supported" in the past, now often refer to themselves as "state-assisted," and their fund-raising staffs appear to be structured like the large private institutions' organizations (Council for Advancement and Support of Education [CASE], 1990).

Martin Grenzebach, president of the consulting firm of John Grenzebach & Associates, Fund Raising Counsel, has noted:

Fund raising as a distinct administrative function contained in a designated area in the organizational chart, under the responsibility of an individual known as the development officer, is a phenomenon of the modern era in higher education. As the administration of the institution became more complex, functional specialization became imperative and as the costs of education rose, the need for sophisticated programs in fund raising became crucial (Cook, 1979, p. 4).

As Muller (1977) stated nearly 15 years ago, "The function of educational advancement in American institutions of higher education is to enable a college or university to do well in a competitive environment and to assist the whole sector of higher education to compete effectively for available resources" (p. 1).

More recently, Muller (1986) noted:

The job of institutional advancement is to do all the things necessary to maintain an adequate supply of resources to a college or university. In the unique world of American higher education, this is a crucial task, as diverse as our colleges and universities themselves, as urgent as next year's
budget, and as complex as the host of people whose responses spell out failure or success (p. 9).

The highly publicized campaigns have drawn the attention of researchers interested in philanthropic behavior. Models for predicting donor behavior or projecting gift revenue have been proposed (Drachman, 1983; Leslie and Ramey, 1988; Woods, 1987), and the structure of the capital campaign has been studied (Gearhart, 1989). Less research has been focused on the creation, management, and professional development of the institutional advancement team, which typically includes alumni administrators, educational fund raisers, public information officers, and senior advancement professionals. Several research studies have recommended this as an important area for ongoing analysis. These studies are discussed in Chapter 2, Review of the Literature.

In addition, university administrators themselves have become aware of the role of the staff in successful development work. Theodore L. Hullar, chancellor of the University of California-Davis, noted in a study by Slinker (1989) that a competent staff is the backbone of the institutional advancement effort. "If you don't have quality staff, you don't advance. I think it dooms your enterprise to poor or less than adequate results" (p. 1).

Concern for competent staff is echoed in smaller institutions, as well. Writing in his guide to trustees of
small colleges, Sandberg (1980) emphasizes that the selection and retention of institutional advancement staff is a key component of a successful advancement program.

Loessin and Duronio (1989), in Case Studies in Fund Raising Effectiveness: Executive Summary, developed a model for fund-raising effectiveness and stated: "... there is evidence to suggest that administrators hoping to increase fund raising effectiveness might focus on ... building commitment among staff to improve outcomes" (p. 10).

Even fund raisers themselves rate professional improvement as one of their highest priorities. In 1985 Myers surveyed 56 institutional advancement professionals, asking them what types of research questions they felt needed to be addressed within the profession. Among the responses was "how to improve the training of current personnel as well as the ideal background for an institutional advancement officer" (p. 46).

Statement of the Problem

Institutional advancement professionals are offered a range of professional development experiences, which include periodicals and reference books, mentoring opportunities, networking, and a broad selection of formally designed conferences, workshops, or seminars focusing on advancement topics. CASE alone delivers more than 90 programs yearly (Lamm, 1990).
In addition to CASE, many fund-raising professionals in education belong to the National Society of Fund-Raising Executives (NSFRE), although membership is not limited to those employed by educational institutions. Institutional advancement officers may belong to multiple associations, including those targeted associations that serve advancement specialties, such as prospect research (American Prospect Research Association), alumni administration (Council of Alumni Association Executives), or public relations (Public Relations Society of America).

Even though virtually thousands of advancement officers are spending tens of thousands of dollars to attend meetings, seminars, and conferences annually, a review of literature suggests that little, if any, formal attention has been given to studying the personality types and learning style preferences of these professionals. If professional development experiences are to benefit advancement employees, then such studies are timely and worthwhile.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are to utilize the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI): 1) to identify the psychological types and learning style preferences of institutional advancement officers in three geographic areas. These participants included: alumni administrators,
educational fund raisers, public information officers, and senior advancement professionals; and 2) to determine if there are statistically significant differences between advancement officers and samples in education and business. Gender differences are reviewed also where data are available.

The MBTI is a 166-item, pencil-paper inventory which identifies contrasting preferences on four bipolar scales: 1) how we direct our energy and attention, 2) how we take in information, 3) how we make judgments, and 4) how we handle tasks in the outer world (DiTiberio, 1983).

Since 1975, when it began to be more widely used, the MBTI has been used to provide counseling on career planning, to improve educational practice through understanding of type differences, and to improve communication and teamwork within organizations. DiTiberio (1983) states, "... research with MBTI indicates preference patterns profoundly affect students' motivation and performance as well as aspects of teaching, teamwork and leadership" (p. 4).

Since a 1990 survey by the consulting firm of Ketchum, Inc., working with CASE, revealed that workshops and conferences were the primary mode of continuing education for advancement professionals (Lamm, 1990), recommendations
are made in Chapter 5 regarding how these activities might be structured to address learning style preferences.

Rationale for the Study

Outgoing, people-oriented, backslapping, extremely well organized, goal oriented, brilliant. A combination Auntie Mame and Lee Iacocca. This magnificent creature probably doesn't exist. It's really hard, perhaps impossible, to know what makes an ideal fund raiser. If you were designing the perfect fly-catcher, you probably wouldn't design it to look like a frog! (Panas, 1988, p. 177).

With these irreverent words, fund-raising consultant Jerold Panas, author of two best sellers on mega-donors and those who solicit mega-gifts, sums up the current wisdom on common characteristics of successful chief development officers. "The most common characteristic of the peak performers is actually their diversity" (p. 211).

However, in a year-long study of job notices in The Chronicle of Higher Education, Lamm (1990) observed that several categories of skills were commonly emphasized, including:

1. Interpersonal skills
   - organizational skills
   - analytical skills
   - motivational skills
   - management skills
   - financial skills
   - creative skills
   - leadership skills
   - communication skills
   - marketing skills
   - computer skills
   - visionary skills
   - and ability to represent the institution.
2. Professional experience

3. Education

Yet, as an emerging profession, institutional advancement has no typical career paths (Lamm, 1990) and there is no required training nor educational preparation for entry into the fund-raising profession (Harrah-Conforth and Borsos, 1990) or into alumni administration or public information, although many public information officers have training in communications (journalism, marketing, advertising, etc.).

Fund-raising literature since 1960 speaks of the "right" personal characteristics of development officers. Gerald P. Burns (cited in Milne, 1979), author of Administrators of Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination, lists for fund raisers the attributes of "high intelligence, good judgment, coolness under pressure, the ability to organize and direct others, friendliness, integrity, dedication, energy, patience, perseverance, stability, and physical stamina" (pp. 16-17).

Harold J. Seymour (cited in Milne, 1979), frequent author on fund-raising, saw these attributes as essential:

First, there is a kind of liveliness that generates and communicates enthusiasm, knows and likes people by instinct and preference, exhibits a genuine kind of pleasure and gratitude for good advice and wise talk, and wears proudly the mantle of the job. Then there is sensitivity—to people, to ideas, to environment—without which, in some adequate degree, failure in this or any other field of
personal service in almost certain. And the third value to be nurtured is perspective (p. 17).

Milne's own study (1979) identified the most common characteristics recommended by fund raisers as being enthusiastic (75.4 percent), being articulate (74.9 percent), relating well to others (70.8 percent), demonstrating integrity (62.6 percent), being persuasive (59.5 percent), being creative (55.9 percent), having sound judgment (54.4 percent), and being determined (50.8 percent). However, available empirical research indicates that the only characteristics of staff and chief development officers that have significant relevance to the likelihood of successful fund raising are: 1) advancement experience, and 2) age (Miltner, 1990; Willard, 1985). According to Willard, personal characteristics have no bearing on success.

Thus, it seems reasonable that an institution desiring to increase gift income dramatically and over the long-term should be concerned with the longevity and professional development of the institutional advancement staff.

Researchers studying other aspects of advancement have recognized this need. Among those items deemed important to enhance abilities in fund-raising management were "identifying techniques to assist in the professional development and management of fund raising staffs" (Dunn, Jr., 1989, p. 3). Payton (1988) noted the absence of such
research in his volume, *Philanthropy: Voluntary Action for the Public Good*: "The literature that deals with the philanthropic relationship emphasizes the priority of the giver and the receiver . . . Very little attention is given to the role of the professional as agent. . ." (p. 83). In a report to the Exxon Education Foundation, Loessin, Duronio, and Borton (1988) recommended further research to "improve the management of fund raising and institutional advancement (in such areas as planning and goal-setting, and human resources, for example. . ." (p. 7).

Cook observed that fundraising continues to grow in importance in higher education, and more emphasis will be placed on training programs for professional fund raisers (1988).

An extensive compilation of research questions regarding institutional development is that prepared by Robert F. Carbonne (1989), Director of the Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising, located at the University of Maryland College Park. Carbonne's work, some of which has been funded by the Lilly Endowment, Inc., assists in identifying the following research areas in need of further attention:

1. Role perception and role definition studies of individuals involved in fund raising and philanthropic activity,

2. Surveys of career mobility of fund-raising personnel,
3. Surveys of job satisfaction of fund-raising personnel,
4. Career paths of fund raisers and others in related positions, and
5. Psychological studies of fund raisers.

Thus, the need for the current study increases as more and more pressure is put on educational institutions to expand funding bases and increase private gift revenue. The development or refinement of methods by which advancement staff persons learn about themselves and their work and become more productive is directly related to the needs of educational institutions of all sizes and types.

Research Questions

During the conceptualization of this study, the following research questions were identified:
1. What are the predominant MBTI types among institutional advancement officers as a group?
2. What are the learning style preferences of each MBTI type?
3. Are women employed in institutional advancement different MBTI types from men in institutional advancement?
4. Is there a difference in type and learning style preferences among institutional advancement officers in CASE Districts I/II, VI, and VIII?
5. Compared to the base population of university teachers, are any types significantly over- or under-represented in the sample?

6. Compared to the base population of business managers and administrators, are any types significantly over- or under-represented in the sample?

7. What do these differences suggest in terms of improving the learning situation and role perception of institutional advancement officers?

**Study Limitations**

The limitations of this study include the following:

1. The sample population was drawn from those who elected to attend one of the CASE district conferences. Thus some psychological types may be under-represented in the sample, especially Sensing types who are less likely to participate in these learning experiences.

2. The respondents volunteered to participate, and thus there may have been some self-elimination and additional under-representation of certain types.

3. In Districts I and II a fee ($7 or $12) was charged for processing and interpreting the responses. Some persons may have chosen not to participate due to the fee and/or lack of familiarity with the MBTI.
4. The MBTI is a self-reporting instrument. Therefore, an assumption must be made that the respondents were objectively reporting their preferences.

5. There is no uniformity among titles in institutional advancement. There exists the possibility that some persons were misclassified.

6. No data were collected regarding age or years in the field of advancement, so caution should be used in making any generalizations.

7. Sample size may not be adequate in smaller cells to make useful comparisons, especially for senior advancement professionals.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 has established the problem, built rationale for its study and significance, and identified specific purposes, research questions, and operational definitions.

In Chapter 2, MBTI preferences, gender and ethnic differences, and organizational uses of MBTI will be discussed.

Chapter 3 explicates the methodology and design of the study. Hypotheses are stated. The chapter contains discussions of data collection procedures, study participants, and data analysis.
Results of the data analysis are contained in Chapter 4. Findings based on the hypotheses are presented and discussed.

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, as well as conclusions, implications of the research findings for the practical use of information on psychological type, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter considers the current literature available concerning the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), including studies which discuss learning style preferences of various populations as suggested by MBTI interpretations.

Reference is also made to literature which places the use of MBTI in the context of organizational and staff development. Attention is given to selected literature on gender and ethnic differences.

The literature review came from a variety of sources, including unpublished dissertations. Since the empirical study of fund raising is a relatively new phenomenon, nearly all of the literature quoted was prepared in the 1980s and 1990s. There is no scholarly research journal for the institutional advancement profession, although many of the national development associations have begun to emphasize research by offering research awards. At the national level, these associations include the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) and the National Society of Fund Raising Executives (NSFRE).

Formal academic programs in the study of philanthropy are an even more recent phenomenon, and they only now are beginning to generate a body of empirical research. The MBTI, however, has been extensively researched and tested;
its use in this study allows for consistent interpretation and application of the responses.

Background on the MBTI

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator has been used in over 1,300 research studies, establishing itself as one of the most widely used personality instruments (Farni, 1987). Although it has gained widespread use in studies of learning style, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was not created specifically for this purpose. Instead it "aims to ascertain, from self-report of easily reported reactions, people's basic preferences in regard to perception and judgment, so that the effects of the preferences and their combinations may be established by research and put to practical use" (Myers and McCaulley, 1985, p. 1). It does so by implementing C. G. Jung's theory of type (1971, originally 1923). According to Jung, much of the human behavior perceived as random variation is actually orderly and consistent, being due to certain basic differences in the way people prefer to use perception and judgment. Perception and judgment, according to Myers and McCaulley (1985, originally 1962) in the introduction to the Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, is concerned with normal attitudes and behavior, rather than psychopathology.
The Indicator was developed by an American mother and daughter team, Katherine Briggs and Isabel Myers. The measure of personality is accomplished by looking at eight preferences that all people use in different ways at different times; thus, each of these preferences is equally important.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was selected because other learning style assessments report how the student is behaving or how the student believes he or she performs best. Therefore, patterns of behavior can be observed. However, other learning style inventories do not indicate whether this behavior is the student's true learning style or how he or she was taught to learn. MBTI assesses personality type. "A student's MBTI results can be used to predict on a probability model, what kind of behaviors, instructional tools, and environment facilitate or hinder learning for what student" (Jensen, cited in Provost and Anchors, 1987, p. 183).

The classification of learning characteristics by type has obvious applications to teaching style. "Teachers who present information counter to their students' preferred learning styles increase the risk of ineffective learning... Teachers must be sensitive to learner preferred methods to increase learning and retention" (Campbell, 1985, p. 127). In the same sense, when conferences, seminars, and workshops
are prepared, the directors and presenters should be sensitive to information regarding learning style preferences of their audiences.

Type will not provide all of the answers, but a global perspective provided by learning theory, individual development and personality type will lead to the creation of an integrated model of learning styles, according to Claxton and Ralston (1978).

Jungian Types

Jung's theory of psychological type is a part of his personality theory. This theory assumes that all individuals have a way to perceive a stimulus and to make a response. The system of perception relies on sensing or intuition, and the system for making decisions or judgments (responding) relies on thinking or feeling (Myers and McCaulley, 1985).

Further, Jung postulated that each person has a preferred way of using his or her mind; i.e., sensing (S), intuition (N), thinking (T) or feeling (F). In some persons one of the perceptive processes (S or N) may dominate the personality, aided by a judging process (T or F). In others a judging process may be the dominant force, aided by a less strong process of perception. The complexity of the theory is further heightened by the use of these processes in extraverted (E) or introverted (I) attitudes. By combining
the four processes in all possible combinations, a table of 16 types can be developed. The four preference pairs are explained by McCaulley (1974) below.

**Extraversion (E) or Introversion (I):** A direction of interest and attention to the outer world of objects, people, and action (Extraversion) or to the inner world of ideas and contemplation (Introversion). Approximately 75 percent of the U.S. population is estimated to be Extraverted.

**Sensing (S) or Intuition (N):** A preference for looking at the immediate, the real, the tangible, the solid facts of experience (Sensing) or for seeing the possibilities, meaning and relationships of experience, often with only a passing interest in the facts themselves (Intuition). Approximately 75 percent of the normal distribution is described as Sensing.

**Thinking (T) or Feeling (F):** A preference for making decisions objectively, impersonally, analyzing the facts and ordering them in terms of antecedents and consequences (Thinking). Feeling types have an interest in working with or studying people; therefore, they tend to value alternatives by their positive or negative impact on people. Thinking types make decisions by following logical principles.
This is the one dimension in which gender differences are apparent, with 60 percent of males preferring Thinking and 65 percent of females indicating a preference for Feeling (Myers and McCaulley, 1986).

Judging (J) or Perception (P): A preference for living in a planned, decided, orderly way, aiming to regulate and control life (Judging) or to live in a flexible, spontaneous way, adapting to life (Perception). About 60 percent of the general population prefers Judging.

A type is designated by four letters, ESFJ, INTP, for example, which represent the interactions of the theory (McCaulley, 1974).

Type is considered a dynamic concept. Through maturation a person can learn to use the eight processes effectively as required.

That is, one sometimes takes the Extraverted attitude in attending to what is outside, and sometimes the Introverted attitude in attending to the inner world of concepts and ideas. He, at times, focuses his attention on what the situation actually is (S) and at other times is seeing possibilities of what it might become (N). He sometimes makes decisions logically and objectively (T) and at other times he chooses by what he cares most deeply about (F). Sometimes he is planful and systematic (J) and at other times flexible and spontaneous (P) (McCaulley, 1974, p. 5).

According to McCaulley, "The theory assumes that one pole of each preference has a greater appeal, and that a child, unless hindered, will use the preferred way whenever he can, developing and strengthening it through use" (p. 5).
The application of type to learning style emphasizes the importance of Sensing and Intuition. Sensing types will be interested in immediate data received through their senses, while Intuitive types are more interested in perceiving the relationships, meanings, and possibilities suggested by experience.

Extraverts will learn best if the concept precedes experience; Introverts, on the other hand, will prefer the contemplation allowed by individual projects and those that require longer attention span.

Thinking-dominant types will likely score higher in areas of mathematics and science, which are disciplines relying upon objective proof. Feeling types may do better on tests which measure social sensitivity.

Educators expect that Perceptive types will pick up more information because they are open and curious, while Judging types, who take an orderly approach to problem-solving, may make more effective use of their capabilities.

In the general population the Sensing types outnumber the Intuitive types 75 percent to 25 percent. However, the further along in academic pursuits, the greater is the proportion of Intuitive types. As McCaulley has noted (1974), "Higher education, with its demand for complex problem-solving, and for working at an abstract,
theoretical, or imaginative level, suits the interest of the Intuitive types" (p. 7).

MBTI and the Learning Situation

"Matching instruction to each student's uniqueness is, in most situations, an unrealizable objective. Yet to ignore individual differences in learners is foolish" (Lawrence, 1982, p. vii).

The early work in assessing student type and relating it to learning style was begun in the 1950s in the field of medical education by MBTI co-author Isabel Briggs Myers. It was continued by McCaulley in 1976, 1978, and 1980. McCaulley, Yokomoto, Sloan, and others also studied populations of engineering students (1973, 1983).

Peters (1981) studied the relationship of psychological type and preferred styles of inquiry among a sample of graduate students enrolled in research methodology courses offered within the College of Education at The Ohio State University, noting:

Results indicated a statistically significant relationship between personality and preference for predicted style of inquiry as well as for knowledge derived from that approach . . . Thinking types tended to prefer traditional empirical and theoretical inquiry, while feeling types preferred more people-oriented action-research and personal anecdote methodologies (p. 417B).

In his study of adult learners, Buxton (1985) discussed the "remarkable similarity" in description of cognitive
styles and the MBTI perception categories. He indicated that adults appear to prefer a teaching approach emphasizing their preference for inference, the abstract and possibilities (intuition) while making assumptions and decisions relying upon the use of logic and objectivity.

Watson (1985) reports only a limited relationship between personality (psychological type) and the extent of learning activities during life transitions for adults. Earlier, Taylor (1968) had reported a similar lack of significance when studying the relationship between psychological types in six classes of college juniors majoring in education and the student perception of the teacher and preferred teaching practices. Wentura's results were consistent (no significant differences) when studying the coincidental matching or mis-matching of teaching and learning style with respect to student rank-ordered performance (1984).

Others disagree, however. In 1975 Niec completed a study of the interactions among the learning styles of 940 college students, instructional styles and academic fields related to achievement. He reported that "the difference between an instructor's style and his/her students' learning style was related to the students' achievement" (p. 6561A). Davis (1985) notes that his investigation of the relationship of personality types and learning style
preferences of high school students "substantiates earlier research which contends that there was a relationship between personality types and learning styles" (p. 1600).

Badenoch (1986) is more emphatic. He studied a select group of retail clothing store managers, relating personality type, learning style preference, and strategies for delivering training.

There is substantial evidence that variables of personality and learning style are related. Researchers have found that teaching by learner's instructional preference can significantly increase achievement and motivation (interest). Further, it has been demonstrated that adult groups of learners do show a specific skill preference for processing information and this process preference will vary by occupation (p. 94).

Badenoch concludes by recommending that researchers, teachers, trainers, and developers of training should be aware of the personality and learning style of the occupational group being trained.

Robinson (1990) recently completed an analysis of data on veterinary medicine faculty and students. In his discussion of teaching/learning styles, he suggests: "If our teaching styles reflect our own learning style preferences, and if we are to meet the challenges to diversify the veterinary medicine student body, then a diversity of teaching and learning style options also becomes critical" (p. 9).
Learners regularly use all four mental processes—sensing, intuition, thinking, and feeling—but they do not use them equally well. One process seems more comfortable or secure, and learners unconsciously rely upon it; in Lawrence's words (1979),

That one process becomes the centerpost, the core of the personality. . . If the best learning is to happen, thinking types must pursue logical order; feeling types must follow their hearts; sensing types must strive to engage their sense in the mastery of practical skills and intuitive types must follow whatever inspires (pp. 8, 17).

When thinking about instruction, however, keeping 16 possible combinations of type in mind is impractical. Lawrence recommends starting with four basic models--IS, IN, ES, and EN. The descriptions of each subgroup, taken from the MBTI Atlas of Type Tables (p. 7) is as follows:

**Subgroups of the Preferences**

- IN The thoughtful innovators
- EN The action-oriented innovators
- IS The thoughtful realists
- ES The action-oriented realists

Combinations of the preferences contribute to learning style as well as personality.

**MBTI and the Organization**

Sandra K. Hirsh has written extensively on this subject, including *Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in Organizations* (1985) and *Introduction to Type in Organizational Settings* (1987, with J. M. Kummerow). She
says, "Organizational use of MBTI is an area of high growth and pioneering applications of typology" (p. vii).

While traditionally used to assist small groups or individuals, an understanding of MBTI can also help workers and managers "reduce unproductive interpersonal and intraorganizational conflict" (p. 1).

Specifically, applications of MBTI in the work place include:
1) team building,
2) career planning,
3) time management,
4) communication, and
5) organizational development (Bayne, 1990).

Kummerow and Hirsh (cited in Rideout and Richardson, 1989, p. 520) reported: "The MBTI is a personality inventory that has become a useful tool in assisting managers match staff and assignments to gain the greatest productivity and satisfaction for employees."

MBTI co-author Isabel Briggs Myers (1980) noted in Gifts Differing:

Ideally, co-workers constitute a team with a common purpose and should work toward the same general goal. Their differences in type can be an asset because they help people to do and to enjoy widely different kinds of work . . . Cooperation, however, can run into difficulties because people of opposite types often disagree on what should be done. Such disagreements are natural: opposite kinds of perception make people see different aspects of a situation, and opposite kinds of
Combining the two information gathering modes—Sensing and Intuition—with the two modes for decision-making—Feeling and Thinking—gives four temperaments: Sensing-thinking types (STs), Sensing-feeling types (SFs), Intuitive-thinking types (NTs), and Intuitive-feeling types (NFs).

Mitroff (cited in The Type Reporter, 1985) describes the "ideal organization" for each of these temperaments.

STs like an emphasis on specifics and factual details. They need control, certainty, and specificity. They need a clear line of authority, goals that are precise, limited, and realistic. They want leaders to give them order and stability, a sense of direction. Their preferred organization might be described as bureaucratic or technical.

NTs prefer to focus on general concepts or global issues. They are interested in intellect and theory, concerned with efficiency in the abstract. They may be idealistic, and want their leaders to be creators or formulatures. Their preferred organization may be represented by research and development.

NFs, being idealistic and adaptive, do not mind if the organization is decentralized and has no prescribed behaviors. The NFs are oriented to the long-term, putting
an emphasis on personal and human goals within the organization. Since they are concerned with serving humanity, their preferred organization may be called humanitarian.

The SFs do not care about theory, but they are interested in the detail of human relations. They can focus on specific people, and treat them like family. They are realistic and consider their organization like a home, thus the label familial (Mitroff, 1983).

There is a preponderance of TJ types in management, supervisory and decision-making roles, even in organizations with the Feeling (F) dimension predominant (Craig, Craig, and Sleight, 1988). School administrators in a 1986 study nearly all fell in the top or bottom rows of the type table. Eighty-six percent preferred the Judging dimension; most being practical, realistic, matter-of-fact ESTJs (Hoffman, 1986). A study of 100 top executive educators in North America (Lueder, 1986) revealed that there were significantly more ENTJs in a sample of top educators than might be expected in the CAPT databank population of 904 school administrators (22 percent to 9 percent), more NTs (41 percent to 20 percent), and more Ns (71 percent to 47 percent).
Gender and Ethnic Issues

Type applications can contribute to awareness and understanding of gender differences in many settings, including the professional development of staff in an organizational setting. For example, while females tend to focus on caring aspects of relationships, males are more concerned with competition and fairness (Feeling versus Thinking dimensions) (Moody, 1989).

According to Harrah-Conforth and Borsos, the majority of the people now staffing fund-raising offices are women. Women make up 55 percent of these positions. This represents a dramatic demographic change (1990, p. 59). Yet men in her study expressed little surprise that women are succeeding in the field.

According to Patrick Ryan, who was interviewed in the Harrah-Conforth and Borsos study:

I have a theory about women, and that is that there are certain fundamental differences between men and women and that on balance women are better qualified in this field than men are. Their personality and characteristics--their strengths, their skills--make them better candidates to be exceptional fund raising executives than men. For example, caring about other people and having an ego need that does not demand recognition and visibility but that allows a person to be comfortable in support of others and encouragement of others is far more a female than a male trait... Women are generally more nurturing, more comfortable with that role than men are (p. 68-69).

While exploring the relationship of type and gender, Stokes (1987) observed that many suffer, however, as they
act out their preferences. FP women may be regarded as too flexible, too accommodating, and will not be taken seriously. IP women (and men) may not be seen as forceful or leaders. NFs may be seen as critical and demanding, but lacking in logic or a sense of reality.

Any T woman who expresses her individuality and principles of behavior will be resisted; TJ women are often called aggressive, while TJ men are called assertive. In help/service occupations T women are considered unsupportive.

Yet, as Rideout and Richardson (1989) report,

Effective team building is a critical aspect of management. The concept of appreciation of differences through understanding personality types and female/male developmental issues adds not previously tapped dimensions to team building. Leadership that supports, appreciates, and encourages differences and provides an environment for mutual respect can only enhance the effectiveness of teams (p. 532).

Ethnicity and type were addressed in a study of engineering students (McCaulley, Godleski, Yokomoto, Harrisberger, and Sloan, 1983). In this sample, Asians were more Introverted, more Sensing and more Judging than the general population. African Americans were significantly more Judging, and there were fewer Thinking preferences than expected. The authors conclude that, overall, foreign students ranked highest in proportion of Sensing and Judging types.
Malone's study (1988) of 302 managers in one department of a national U.S. firm included 49 black managers (16.2 percent), 44 Hispanic managers (14.6 percent), and 209 white managers (69.2 percent). Results of the study suggest that blacks tend to be more tough-minded, as a whole, than the white managers in the study. Hispanics were found to be the most benevolent of the racial groups studied, but these benevolent qualities did not seem to be valued highly enough for promotion of the Hispanics into decision-making levels within the organization. Malone urged additional studies to examine further the typological differences among races in organizations.

Anderson (1988) postulated that different cultures produce different learning styles. He suggested that, "It would seem feasible that different ethnic groups with different cultural histories, different adaptive approaches to reality and different socialization practices would differ concerning their respective cognitive/learning styles" (p. 3).

Summary of Literature Review

Literature regarding the implications of using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator has been reviewed, along with specific information on the creation, history, and purpose of the instrument itself. The MBTI has been viewed in the context of organizational staff development, with some
attention given to the differences in frequency of preferences between men and women and among ethnic groups.

The literature suggests that there is a relationship of psychological type to preferred learning style, and, therefore, to teaching style. There are, however, studies in which there seemed to be no or little relationship (Watson, 1985; Taylor, 1968; Wentura, 1984).

Additional materials were reviewed regarding the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in the organizational setting. In these cases, emphasis is placed on developing teams and utilizing individual strengths to improve the work team. Reference was made to the preponderance of TJ types in management, and to the growing percentage of Intuitives as individuals move up the educational continuum from elementary through college-age.

A discussion of gender noted that there are now more women than men in institutional advancement careers, and they bring Feeling preferences into the workplace. Also reviewed were two studies having to do with ethnicity and type which indicate that ethnic samples may vary from the traditional samples.

This review of literature suggests that an initial study using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to determine the psychological type and learning style preferences of institutional advancement officers could provide useful
information for organizing and presenting professional development opportunities. These background materials were utilized to create a study of the learning style preferences of institutional advancement officers as suggested by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The data from this study suggest that a mix of teaching styles appears necessary, as reported by Hanna (1979), "professional development which applies a variety of approaches/strategies/modes is more likely to meet staff needs than the singular strategy approach" (p. 85A).

According to Rowland (1986) such attention must be given to professional staff development in institutional advancement, especially in terms of developing educational programs for those who wish to enter the field.

In addition, comparisons of type among related groups may provide information for the understanding of the role of the institutional advancement officer. When Miltner (1990) provided recommendations in his study of the characteristics of successful chief development officers, he said: "A new method for testing these so-called personality traits must also be developed."

One of the goals of the current study is to utilize personality measurement to identify differences among
advancement professionals and to use that information to improve advancement practice. The results of the study follow in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

The first purpose of this study was to identify the psychological type and learning style preferences of institutional advancement officers in three geographical areas. These participants included: alumni administrators, educational fund raisers, public information officers, and senior advancement professionals. These type portraits can then be compared to relevant groups in the Center for the Application of Psychological Type (CAPT) data bank. Results of these comparisons, as well as intra-sample analyses, will address the second purpose of the study: to determine if there are statistically significant differences between advancement officers and samples in education and business. Gender differences will also be reviewed where data are available.

Instrument Selection

Both practical and useful information regarding individual strengths and preferences may be obtained from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The MBTI Manual (Myers, 1985) offers this instrument description:

The purpose of the Indicator is to implement Jung's theory of type. The gist of the theory is that much apparently random variation in human behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent, being due to certain basic differences in the way people prefer to use perception and judgment. 'Perception' is here understood to include the processes of becoming aware of things or people or
occurrences or ideas. 'Judgment' is understood to include the processes of coming to conclusions about what has been perceived (p. 2).

Using this hypothetical framework, the Indicator attempts to ascertain people's basic preferences with regard to perception and judgment, their method of dealing with the surrounding world. From this information, it is possible to discern their preferences with regard to the learning environment.

As Jensen (cited in Provost and Anchors, 1987) has commented,

The study of learning styles is a rather recent phenomenon. . . . Since 1960, approximately 30 instruments of learning styles have appeared. . . . The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), while it cannot earnestly claim to be comprehensive, has important strengths that are not often found in the rest of these instruments (p. 181).

These strengths include: 1) MBTI was developed and tested over 20 years, a longer time than most instruments of its kind; 2) MBTI is more sophisticated and complex than most learning style assessments; and 3) MBTI can account for most of the traits identified by other widely used instruments. "A student's MBTI results can be used to predict, on a probability model, what kind of behaviors, instructional tools, and environments facilitate or hinder learning for what student" (Jensen, 1987, p. 183).

Reliability may be discussed in two ways by researchers: 1) test-retest reliability, and 2) split-half reliability.
The latter is used primarily for questions of internal consistency. In the original MBTI Manual (Myers, 1962) reliability studies are presented. They yielded split-half reliability coefficients (Pearson R's) exceeding 0.80 on all four preferences of more than 100 female and male college students.

Carlynn (1977) also discussed the reliability and validity of the MBTI. He used dichotomous type categories and continuous data, and estimates of internal consistency of continuous MBTI scores ranged between 0.70 and 0.90, adequate for a self-report instrument. Carlynn also reported that the scores of college students appear to be reasonably stable over time in terms of type category (Cited in Anchors, 1988).

The MBTI Manual reviews 12 studies regarding the internal consistency derived from product-moment correlations of split-half continuous scores with Spearman-Brown prophecy formula correction. The patterns that emerge include lower reliabilities for individuals in their teens. These stabilize after age 20. College and university samples are shown to have higher reliabilities than high school samples. If a change occurs for older individuals, it is most likely to occur for the preference that had a low original score.
The validity of the MBTI centers on whether or not it measures Jung's theory of psychological type as it claims. The most useful study regarding type prediction is the construct validity study used to determine the relevancy of the MBTI to Jung's theory.

Myers and Davis (1964, cited in Anchors, 1988) reported on a longitudinal study of 5,300 medical students tested in the 1950s and the 1960s. The participants' choices in terms of medical speciality selection were significantly in the directions predicted by the theory.

According to Richard W. Coan, professor of psychology at the University of Arizona, Tucson, writing in The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook (1978): "There is now a substantial body of empirical data gathered on the use of MBTI. . . . It would be fair to say that the group differences and correlations are broadly supportive of the construct validity of the scales" (p. 631).

The MBTI Manual provides information on the correlation of MBTI with other scales of other instruments, such as the Adjective Checklist and the Ambiguity Scale. The data show that the MBTI is related to several variables including personality measures.

In particular the MBTI is correlated with a Jungian measure, the Jungian Type Survey, which measures the same dimensions as MBTI except the J-P pair. The correlations
between these two instruments, both of which claim to measure Jung's theory, are moderately high and statistically significant (Myers and McCaulley, 1985).

The remainder of this chapter describes the subjects of the study, the distribution of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to study participants, and the statistical procedures used in analyzing the data.

Study Participants

The data collection process for this study was reviewed by the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research at Iowa State University prior to approval for distribution of the questionnaire. The committee determined that the rights and welfare of the subjects were protected, that confidentiality of the data was assured, and that all potential subjects were informed of the voluntary nature of the study.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was completed by a total of 545 institutional advancement professionals, each of whom had registered to attend one district conference sponsored by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). While the respondents represented a wide variety of job titles, the career track or emphasis of their work could be classified in one of four categories for respondents in Districts VI and VIII as: alumni administrators, educational fund raisers, public information officers, and
senior advancement professionals. The first three categories represent uniquely identifiable disciplines within the profession of institutional advancement. The fourth category, senior advancement professional, was included to accommodate those subjects who held administrative positions that supervised more than one of the other three categories. Typically, these individuals were at the level of vice president or president of the institution. Respondents who did not provide a job title, or whose job title appeared to fall outside the institutional advancement categories noted above, were classified as "Other" and represented 16.28 percent of the sample for Districts VI and VIII combined. Information on job title or gender was not available for Districts I and II, so caution must be used in generalizing the conclusions beyond the Midwest and Northwest districts.

The subjects of the study included:

*A total of 295 persons working in the northeast United States (CASE Districts I and II). These data were collected by Deni Thurman-Eyre, Director, Work/Life Center, Northhampton Community College, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Verbal interpretation of data was presented by Ms. Thurman-Eyre at district conferences in 1988 and 1989 held in Boston and Philadelphia, respectively. The type tables
Ms. Thurman-Eyre prepared were made available for this study.
*A total of 155 persons working in the upper Midwest (CASE District VI). These data were collected by the author in January 1990. Dr. Daniel C. Robinson, Professor and Leader, Higher Education Section, Iowa State University, presented these data at a district conference held in Des Moines.
*A total of 95 persons working in the Northwest (CASE District VIII). These data were collected by the author in March 1990 from persons attending the district conference held in Cour d'Alene. No interpretation was provided to respondents in this group.

The gender make-up and career classification of the respondents is illustrated in Table 1.

**Questionnaire Distribution**

As described in Chapter 2, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is a widely used psychometric measure which can be self-reported by respondents following the printed instructions on the survey instrument, Form G. Therefore, a mail survey was deemed the most practical and economical means of gathering relevant data for a large number of participants in three geographic areas (See Figure 1 for delineation of the CASE district boundaries).
Table 1. Gender and career classification of total sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>I/II</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>Total Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Classification</th>
<th>I/II</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>Total Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Administration</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Fund Raising</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Advancement</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or Don't Know</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Districts I and II held a joint conference in 1988, and the more than 2,000 conferees were invited to participate in the MBTI data collection and interpretation through an announcement in the conference brochure. In 1989 data were again collected in District II. In these studies interested persons were asked to return a registration form and a
Figure 1. Approved district boundaries for CASE
participation fee. This fee was used to offset the costs of MBTI materials and scoring.

No information was available regarding what percent of those who registered to participate actually completed the instrument, but data on 295 respondents, or approximately 15 percent of the registrants is available.

In District VI, the 280 conferees were sent a letter following their registration for the conference. This letter invited them to participate in the MBTI data collection and interpretation. Of 280 persons invited to participate, 138 or 49.3 percent requested the questionnaire. One hundred twenty-four or 44.3 percent completed and returned the instrument.

In District VIII, the conferees were sent a letter approximately two weeks after their attendance at the conference. In all, 356 were invited to participate, of which 111 or 31.2 percent requested the questionnaire and 95 or 26.7 percent returned the completed instrument.

The data presented in Chapter 4 were provided, therefore, by volunteers. According to Carouthers, Miller, Topping, and Carskadon (1988), in their report on the use of volunteer samples in MBTI research, "In general, the use of volunteer samples to study the type distributions of groups of interest probably does not introduce extreme bias, and the use of such samples when complete groups cannot be
tested is, while not ideal, probably still quite useful" (p. 77).

Data Analysis

Data preparation involved recording the responses from individual answer sheets by the name of the respondent. When available, gender information was also entered. Information on career classification was not entered, but frequencies were determined at a later time for Districts VI and VIII.

The data were first displayed on type tables to create portraits of each sample population, as well as subsets of the total population emphasizing gender and geographic location. These tables, in and of themselves, provide useful information regarding the preferences of the respondents. As McCaulley and Macdaid (1989) note in their Handbook for the MBTI Researcher, important information about type can be gathered from simple statistical approaches; i.e., "most questions about types can be answered with relatively simple designs and statistics" (p. 27).

However, additional information is gained when the data are analyzed using the Selection Ratio Type Table (SRTT) computer program (Granade, Hatfield, Smith, and Beasley, 1987). SRTT provides an easy way to do research with type tables (McCaulley, 1985).
As McCaulley explains, the "selection ratio" or "self-selection ratio" was the name Isabel Myers gave to the statistic she used when she studied the medical specialty choices of 4,556 medical students, whom she tracked in a long-term study. The selection ratio was simply the ratio of the number of the type choosing a specialty to the number that would be expected, based on the proportion of that type in the total sample. The computer software to compute this ratio was developed in 1976 at the Center for the Application of Psychological Type, and it was called Selection Ratio Type Table program or SRTT. "This name is still used, though the SRTT is also used for computing retention ratios, dropout ratios, or indices of attractiveness, depending on the research hypotheses" (McCaulley, 1985, p. 47).

When SRTT analysis is run, the researcher is attempting to determine if a type is more or less prevalent in the sample than expected. Therefore, the most appropriate analysis is a two-by-two contingency table analysis (Macdaid, 1987). The SRTT actually provides an output of 44 separate analyses on one page, as well as calculating the selection ratio.

Tables 2 through 25 provide the type tables for this study. The number of each type is shown in the appropriate block, and the number for each type dimension or combination
of dimensions is shown below. Also shown is the percentage of the sample that falls in any type or grouping of types. The legend I on the SRTT tables refers to the index or ratio. This ratio can be computed in either of two ways: 1) as the ratio of the observed frequency to the expected frequency, or 2) as the percentage of the type in the sample divided by the percentage of the type in the base population.

SRTT also provides a probability statement, indicating the probability that the difference found could be an effect of chance.

Statistical significance of the ratios is established through a series of 2 x 2 chi-square calculations with one degree of freedom. If cell frequencies are 5 or less, the SRTT program computes a Fisher's exact probability instead of chi-square. Directly under the type table is a note defining symbols which appear after the index number if the chi-square or Fisher's exact tests are significant. . . (McCaulley, 1985, p. 50).

The self-selection index to the right may be interpreted as follows:

When the index or ratio is greater than 1.00, there are more people in that cell of the table than we expected from their numbers in the base population. If the index or ratio is less than 1.00, there are fewer in that cell than expected (McCaulley, 1985, p. 50).

If the probability of the chi-square value is less than the alpha level chosen, the researcher can reject the null hypothesis, since type does appear to affect the sample. However, as Macdaid (1987) points out, when working with 44
independent contingency table analyses, at least two of the 44 could be statistically significant purely by chance.

Review of Tables

The following tables are included with this study:

1. Type distributions for the total sample of 545 persons; see page 56.

2. Type distributions for each of the three geographic districts, representing samples of 295 (CASE I and II combined), 155 (CASE VI), and 95 (CASE VIII); see pages 73, 74, and 78.

3. For the total sample, type distributions for men and for women; see pages 67 and 68.

4. For each of Districts VI and VIII, type distributions for the four career classifications: alumni administrators, educational fund raisers, public information officers, and senior advancement professionals; see pages 90 and 91.

One of the most frequent uses of the SRTT program is to compare the study sample with base populations or within the sample itself. The index or ratio which results compares the number of observations in the sample to the expected number of that type in the total base population. Thus the researcher, with the aid of SRTT, can identify significant differences among samples or within the subsets of a single sample; i.e., gender, ethnic, or geographic differences.
Data on sample populations were obtained from the MBTI data bank at CAPT by utilizing the MBTI Atlas of Type Tables.

(It) has been maintained by CAPT to provide a data base for large-scale psychometric and normative analyses of MBTI data. When Form F and Form G answer sheets are received for scoring, the staff of CAPT Scoring Services check each answer sheet to see if the person has filled in an occupation. If so, they code the occupations following a system modified from the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Over the years CAPT has added codes or sub-categories for occupations which have been of special interest to MBTI users. Coding requires judgment, especially if the occupation given on the answer sheet is not listed or is so general that it is hard to tell precisely which category. . . . Users of this Atlas should be constantly alert to the fact that there has been slippage in the coding as coders puzzled out the best assignment of unclear occupational title to an imperfect classification system. Despite these limitations, the MBTI Data Bank is the largest sample of MBTI data available in English (Macdai, McCaulley, and Kainz, 1986, p. 3).

Since the data bank samples depend on cases sent to CAPT, the samples have the bias of the types of professions most represented by persons who have interest in MBTI data collection, such as counselors, educators, student personnel administrators, or organizational consultants. Thus, there may be some bias toward Introversion and Intuition, and a probable under-representation of Sensing types.

The tables produced by this sample were analyzed within the sample as follows:

1. Comparison of men and women in total sample (page 70), and
2. Comparison of learning style preferences in Districts I/II, VI, and VIII (pages 72, 75, and 77).

The sample was then compared to two base populations:

1. University teachers (page 84), and
2. Business managers and administrators (page 88).

The SRTT was used to identify significant differences among and between the sample groups and these reference groups.

The career classification data were presented for review as frequencies and percentages only.

Hypotheses

Stated in the null form, the hypotheses of this study were as follows.

1. There will be no significant difference among the type preferences of institutional advancement professionals by gender in Districts VI and VIII combined.
2. There will be no significant difference among the type preferences of the sample and the base population of university teachers.
3. There will be no significant difference among the type preferences of the sample and the base population of business managers and administrators.
4. There will be no significant difference between the type distribution in District I/II and District VI, between
District I/II and District VIII, or between District VI and District VIII.

The acceptance or rejection of these hypotheses will set the stage for psychological type and learning style preferences to be reported in Chapter 4 and for recommendations regarding the professional development experiences and the role of advancement officers, as discussed in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter contains the results of the study of psychological type among institutional advancement officers. These results are presented to accomplish the first purpose of the study: to identify the psychological types and learning style preferences of institutional advancement officers in three geographic areas by utilizing the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Once the type frequencies and distributions have been displayed, the second purpose of the study is addressed; i.e., to determine if there are statistically significant differences between advancement officers and samples in education and business.

The chapter is organized as follows:

1. Presentation of data regarding the entire sample, including frequency and distribution of MBTI type preferences among the 545 respondents;
2. Summary of the learning style preferences associated with each MBTI type preference;
3. Comparison of the type preferences of the sample, noting over- and under-representation with the general population;
4. Presentation of data regarding the differences based on gender in the entire sample;
5. Presentation of data regarding the differences among respondents based on their geographic location;

6. Presentation of data regarding the differences between respondents and a base population of university teachers;

7. Presentation of data regarding the differences between respondents and a base population of business managers; and

8. Presentation of data regarding the frequency of type preferences among respondents in differing career classifications.

The data were obtained through completion of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator by mail by a total of 545 institutional advancement officers who registered to attend district conferences in the Northeast, Midwest, and Northwest. These advancement officers included persons working as alumni administrators, educational fund raisers, public information officers, and senior advancement professionals.

Interpretation of the results of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is accomplished by reviewing the frequency and distribution of the 16 types as displayed on a type table for each sample of the population being studied. Since each of the 16 MBTI types represents a distinct set of personality characteristics, it is possible to determine
strengths and weaknesses of the groups in terms of the
frequencies documented.

For the purposes of this study, the frequencies are also
used to illustrate differences among men and women, among
persons attending CASE conferences in different geographic
areas, and among persons who are employed in different
careers of the institutional advancement profession.

When the data have been presented and reviewed, the
research questions will be addressed, including:
1. What are the predominant MBTI types among institutional
   advancement officers as a group?
2. What are the learning style preferences of each MBTI
type?
3. Are women employed in institutional advancement
different in MBTI type from men employed in
institutional advancement?
4. Is there a difference in type and learning style
   preferences among institutional advancement officers in
   CASE Districts I/II, VI, and VIII?
5. Compared to the base population of university teachers,
   are any types significantly over- or under-represented
   in the sample?
6. Compared to the base population of business managers and
   administrators, are any types significantly over- or
   under-represented in the sample?
7. What do these differences suggest in terms of improving the learning situation and role perception of institutional advancement officers?

Frequency and Distribution of the Total Sample

Table 2 illustrates the frequencies and distribution of MBTI types in the total sample of 545 respondents. All MBTI psychological types are represented in the sample, which may be summarized as follows.

Table 2. Preferences of total sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBTI Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>MBTI Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>62.94</td>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>37.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>34.31</td>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>65.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>58.72</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>41.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>64.78</td>
<td>Perceiving</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>35.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a group (Table 3), the sample includes a greater number of Extraverts than Introverts (62.94 percent versus 37.06 percent). Extraverts are persons who direct their attention and energy to the outer world.
Table 3. Type distribution of total sample of institutional advancement officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N = 545</th>
<th></th>
<th>= 1% of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>n = 41</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>n = 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.52%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>n = 34</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>n = 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.24%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>n = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.65%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>n = 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>n = 103</td>
<td></td>
<td>(18.90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample also includes a higher proportion of Intuitives, persons who prefer to deal with the possibilities, meaning and relationships of experience.
rather than Sensing types, who prefer the real, tangible, solid facts of experience (65.69 percent versus 34.31 percent).

A similarly strong preference is shown in the total sample for living in a planned, decided, orderly way (Judging types) rather than living a flexible, spontaneous, adaptive life as preferred by Perceiving types (64.78 percent versus 35.06 percent).

The preferences exhibited in the Thinking-Feeling dimension are not so strong, however, as 58.72 percent of the total sample prefers Thinking; that is, making decisions objectively, impersonally and logically. The other 41.28 percent prefers to emphasize the human aspects of the decision, especially the positive or negative impact on people. This type preference is called Feeling.

Thus, the most frequent type represented in the sample of 545 respondents is ENTJ (103 persons or 18.90 percent of the total). The least represented is ISFP (8 persons or 1.47 percent), as this type is a combination of the four MBTI characteristics least preferred by the respondents.

Over- and Under-representation of Type

The sample of institutional advancement officers used for this study shows some variation from the percentages expressed in the general population. For example, approximately 75 percent of the U.S. population is estimated
to be Extraverted. The study sample was 62.29 percent Extraverted.

The percent of the general population preferring the Sensing dimension also is approximately 75 percent. However, the study sample was 65.69 percent Intuitives, and only 34.31 percent Sensers.

Since the Thinking-Feeling dimension is one in which gender differences are apparent, comment on that dimension will be made in the section on gender of the sample.

The institutional advancement officers most closely resembled the general population in the percent of Judging preferences. The sample was 64.78 percent, the general population is about 60 percent.

Learning Style Preferences of the Total Sample
Several authors, particularly Gordon Lawrence, Mary McCaulley and F. L. Natter, David Keirsey and Marilyn Bates, Judith Provost and Scott Anchors, and Keith Golay, have provided insight into the learning style preferences of each MBTI type. These learning style preferences most common in the study sample are summarized below, especially as adapted from McCaulley and Natter (1974) and Lawrence (1982).

Extraverts (Es) tend to enjoy getting involved, trying out an activity, participating in a demonstration. They may be talkative and like to respond to questions, which they do while thinking on their feet. Trial and error may be an
Exciting way to learn for an Extravert. Extraverts respond better to oral rather than written feedback.

E's prefer theories or specific facts that relate to their experiences, so they may develop a better understanding of the subject by working on a group project or participating in a discussion.

Extraverts tend to offer opinions readily, to ask questions about the expectations of the group or the teacher, to share personal experiences, and to work quickly. Extraverts generally enjoy the opportunity to experience a presentation through large group interaction, even though there may be interruptions and relatively short time periods for concentration on the problem at hand.

Intuitives (Ns) represent 65.69 percent of the study sample. The strength of preference for intuitive perception in the sample of institutional advancement officers indicates that the respondents may rely upon hunches and impressions, even to the point of neglecting details. When information is gathered, it is processed deductively. Intuitives like words, especially as they represent abstract concepts or symbols, and may respond best when asked "what if . . .".

Once Ns have developed a conceptual understanding of material, they may daydream as factual lectures are presented. For Ns, the quick flashes of insight are the
most useful, even beyond the actual facts of a situation or problem. Therefore, Ns can appear restless and impatient with routine or extended explanations.

Judging types (Js) make up the third area of strong preference in the total sample. Their focus is in the area of organizing or managing the outside world. The Judging types in the sample value decisiveness. They wish to get things done, and, therefore, gauge their own learning by measurable objectives. They may feel successful when they have read a specified number of books, written a certain number of pages, or met other quantifiable goals set personally or for a group. Theirs is a more structured learning environment.

For Js the passage of time is important, and Js usually respond well to comments about how efficient and punctual they are. They, in turn, expect that others are well organized. Unplanned happenings are not easily tolerated, since Judging types regularly evaluate others on the basis of purposeful and exacting measures which they have set up and adhere to themselves.

Thinking (T) and Feeling (F) type preferences indicate how decisions are made. In this study, 58.72 percent preferred Thinking. These persons are logical and objective, willing to analyze. They can accept direct criticism, and see the value of a systematic approach to
problems. They do, however, want fair standards set for all and rely upon right versus wrong in making decisions.

Because Ts value competence, they are most motivated when there is a rationale for each project or learning experience. They are particularly adept at understanding systems or cause-and-effect relationships.

Since 41.28 percent of the respondents indicated a preference for Feeling judgment, it is noted that a number of the persons in this total group are motivated not so much by the logic of a situation or assignment as by the personal encouragement they are given. They appreciate acknowledgment as an individual--by name, by special interest, by human contact.

Persons preferring Feeling, however, are likely to agree with others because those others provide motivation. Although Fs may be upset by conflict, they can arouse enthusiasm during a speech, presentation, or other meeting because they permit feelings to override logic.

Margaret K. Morgan has related MBTI type to instructional strategies. Table 4 illustrates each of the 16 MBTI type combinations and the preferred instructional style is shown below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBTI Type</th>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ISTJ**  | Linear learner with strong need for order (SJ)  
Likes direct experience (S)  
Likes audiovisuals (S)  
Lectures (I)  
Enjoys working alone (I)  
Likes well-defined goals (S)  
Prefers practical tests (S) |
| **ISFJ**  | Linear learner with strong need for order (SJ)  
Likes direct experience (S)  
Likes listening to lectures (I)  
Likes audiovisuals (S)  
Enjoys working alone (I)  
Likes practical tests (S) |
| **ISTP**  | Linear learner; needs help in organizing (SP)  
Likes direct experience (S)  
Likes lectures, audiovisuals (S)  
Enjoys working alone (I)  
Wants logically-structured, efficient materials (IT) |
| **ISFP**  | Linear learner; needs help in organizing (SP)  
Likes direct experience (S)  
Needs well-defined goals (S)  
Needs harmony in group projects (F)  
Likes audiovisuals, practical tests (S)  
Enjoys working alone (I)  
Needs sensitive instructor (IF) |
| **ESTP**  | Linear learner; needs help in organizing (SP)  
Needs to know why before doing something (S)  
Likes group projects, class reports, team competition (E)  
Likes direct experience (S)  
Likes audiovisuals (S)  
May like lecture (T) |
| **ESFP**  | Linear learner; needs help in organizing (SP)  
Likes direct experience (S)  
Likes audiovisuals, practical tests (S)  
Needs to know why before doing something (S)  
Likes group projects, team competition, class reports (E)  
Needs orderly, well-defined goals (S) |
| **ESTJ**  | Linear learner with strong need for structure (SJ)  
Needs to know why before doing something (S)  
Likes direct experience (S)  
Likes group projects, class reports, team competition (E) |
| **ESFJ**  | Linear learner with strong need for structure (SJ)  
Needs to know why before doing something (S)  
Needs well-defined goals (S)  
Values harmonious group projects, team competition, class reports (E) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Preferences and Learning Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ESTJ (Cont.) | Likes audiovisuals, practical tests (S)  
May like lecture (T) |
| INFJ | Can be global or linear (NJ)  
Wants to consider theory first, then applications (N)  
Enjoys working alone (I)  
Prefers open-end instruction (N)  
Needs harmony in group work (F) |
| INFP | Global learner; may need help in organizing (NP)  
Likes reading, listening (N)  
Wants to consider theory first, then applications (N)  
Needs harmony in group work (F)  
Prefers open-end instruction (N)  
Enjoys working alone (I)  
Likes autonomy (NP) |
| ENFP | Global learner; needs choices and deadlines (NP)  
Likes seminars (EN)  
Likes reading if can settle down long enough (EN)  
Likes harmonious group projects, team competition, class reports (EF)  
Likes autonomy (NP)  
Needs help with organizing (NP) |
| ESFJ (Cont.) | Likes audiovisuals; practical tests (S)  
Likes direct experience (S) |
| INTJ | Can be global or linear (NJ)  
Wants to consider theory first, then applications (N)  
Enjoys working alone (I)  
Prefers open-end instruction (N)  
Good at paper-and-pencil tests (NT) |
| INTP | Global learner, needs help in coming to closure (NP)  
Likes reading, listening (N)  
Wants to consider theory first, then applications (N)  
Good at paper-and-pencil tests (NT)  
Prefers open-end instruction (N)  
Enjoys working alone (I)  
Likes autonomy (NP) |
| ENTP | Global learner; needs choices and deadlines (NP)  
Likes autonomy (NP)  
Likes seminars (EN)  
Likes reading, listening (N)  
Wants to consider theory, then applications (N)  
Good at paper-and-pencil tests (NT)  
Prefers open-end instruction (N) |
Table 4. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENFJ</th>
<th>ENTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can be global or linear learner (NJ)</td>
<td>Can be global or linear learner (NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes seminars (EN)</td>
<td>Likes seminars (EN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes reading if can settle down long enough (ENF)</td>
<td>Likes reading if can settle down long enough (EN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes harmonious group projects, class reports (EF)</td>
<td>Likes group projects, class reports, team competition (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes listening (N)</td>
<td>Likes listening (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes pencil-and-paper tests (NT)</td>
<td>Likes pencil-and-paper tests (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers open-end instruction (N)</td>
<td>Prefers open-end instruction (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants to consider theory, then applications (N)</td>
<td>Wants to consider theory, then applications (N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copyright 1977 Margaret K. Morgan. Pages 52-53, Gordon Lawrence, People Types and Tiger Stripes, Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Gainesville, Florida. 1982. Used with permission.

Comparison with Expected Percentages

As illustrated in Table 5, the sample of institutional advancement officers differs from comparison group presented by Lawrence (1982, p. 40). When these two samples are compared on the preferences that most affect learning style, IN (Introverted Intuition), EN (Extraverted Intuition), IS (Introverted Sensing), and ES (Extraverted Sensing), it becomes apparent that the institutional advancement officers are over-represented in IN and EN and under-represented in IS and ES. It is a significant finding of this comparison that among this sample of institutional advancement
Table 5. Learning style comparison, expected and advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>% of Institutional Advancement Officers</th>
<th>Expected Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IN (120)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN (238)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS (82)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES (105)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

officers, all four learning types are not equal in representation.

Frequency and Distribution of Type by Gender

For the purposes of this study, information on the gender of the respondents was available only for CASE Districts VI and VIII. Tables 6 (women) and 7 (men) illustrate the distribution of type for 151 women and 99 men in the sample.

The greatest number of women (Table 8) were ENTJs (16.56 percent), but a strong showing was also made by the ENFPs (11.26 percent). By far the least representation in the sample of female institutional advancement officers was the ISTPs (1.32 percent).
Table 6. Preferences of women in total sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBTI Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>MBTI Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>(62.25)</td>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(37.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(39.74)</td>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>(60.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(52.98)</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(47.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>(66.89)</td>
<td>Perceiving</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(33.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Preferences of men in total sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBTI Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>MBTI Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(64.65)</td>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(35.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(40.40)</td>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(59.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(56.57)</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(43.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(67.68)</td>
<td>Perceiving</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(32.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Type distribution of female institutional advancement officers Districts VI and VIII  
\[ N = 151 \quad | = 1\% \text{ of } N \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.26%</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.56%</td>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ E = 62.25\% \quad I = 37.75\% \quad S = 39.74\% \quad T = 52.98\% \quad J = 66.89\% \]
\[ F = 47.02\% \quad P = 33.11\% \quad IS = 17.22\% \quad ES = 22.52\% \]
The 99 male respondents (Table 9) tended to be represented most strongly in four types: ENTJ (15.15 percent), ESTJ (14.14 percent), and ESTJ and ISTJ (10.10 percent each). There were no male respondents indicated of
the type ESTP, and only one ISFP (1.01 percent) and two ISTPs (2.02 percent). These men, it appears, have a strong preference for bringing about conclusion, for deciding, and organizing; they have less preference for open-endedness and spontaneity.

The one dimension in which gender differences are apparent in the general population is the T-F dimension. In the general population 60 percent of males prefer Thinking. In the study sample, this percentage is 56.57 percent.

In the general population, 65 percent of females prefer Feeling, but in the study only 47.02 percent indicate this preference.

Table 10 illustrates the SRTT table when female institutional advancement officers are compared with male institutional advancement officers. By using the self-selection index (I) on the right-hand side of the table, information on the ratio of the percent of type in the group (women) to percent in the comparison sample (men) may be seen.

The SRTT shows that in this sample of institutional advancement officers there are more men indicating a preference for specific dimensions than would be expected. For example, the self-selection ratio for Extraversion is more than 1 (I = 1.04); the self-selection ratio for Sensing is 1.02, and the ratio for Thinking is 1.07.
Table 10. Type distribution of female institutional advancement officers, and SRTT comparisons with male advancement officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
<th>INFJ</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64.65</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.10%)</td>
<td>(3.03%)</td>
<td>(6.06%)</td>
<td>(4.04%)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.40</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56.57</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.04%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.43</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67.68</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ISTP</th>
<th>ISFP</th>
<th>INFP</th>
<th>INTP</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.32</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.02%)</td>
<td>(1.01%)</td>
<td>(6.06%)</td>
<td>(3.03%)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.26</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ESTP</th>
<th>ESFP</th>
<th>INFP</th>
<th>ENTP</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.05%)</td>
<td>(7.07%)</td>
<td>(8.08%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>JT</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.43</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ESTJ</th>
<th>ESFJ</th>
<th>ENFJ</th>
<th>ENTP</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14.14%)</td>
<td>(5.05%)</td>
<td>(10.10%)</td>
<td>(15.15%)</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.40</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, women show an under-representation in the opposite dimensions (Introversion, Intuition, and Feeling).
In this case I = 0.94 for Introversion, I = 0.99 for Intuition, and I = 0.92 for Feeling. However, none of these differences are statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Gender Differences in Learning Style

The SRTT analysis also illustrates learning style preferences, as shown by pairs of preferences: EN, IN, ES, and IS.

The EN (I = 1.02) and the ES (I = 1.08) are over-represented, while the IS (I = 0.94) and IN (I = 0.93) are under-represented.

However, since the differences are not significant at even the 0.05 level, no such relationship can be empirically drawn. Instead, the study suggests that, in the case of female advancement officers in this sample, a learning situation in which the principles and theories of a concept are emphasized may be preferable to a fact-oriented presentation.

Frequency and Distribution of Type in Districts I and II Combined

Table 12 shows the distribution of type among institutional advancement officers in Case Districts I and II combined. Of a total of 295 respondents, 63 (21.36 percent) were type ENTJ. This percentage is more than twice any of the other 16 types. In particular, an especially
strong preference was shown for Intuition, with 209, or 70.85 percent expressing this preference.

Utilizing Lawrence's four basic models of ES, EN, IS, and IN to understand learning styles, the following percentages are shown.

Table 11. Learning style preferences Districts I and II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(16.27)</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>(47.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(12.88)</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(23.72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data (Table 11) suggest that, for respondents in Districts I and II combined, the most effective way to learn is to review the "big picture." Since Intuitive types are global learners, they will appreciate first the abstractions (definitions, theories, lists of procedures). In addition, because the group is made up of a majority of Extraverts, the situations in which they will gain the most should be action-oriented, with experiential activities and opportunities to discuss and question.
Table 12. Type distribution of institutional advancement officers Districts I and II
\[ N = 295 \quad | = 1\% \text{ of } N \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>District I (% of District II)</th>
<th>District II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>20 (6.78%)</td>
<td>14 (4.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>8 (2.71%)</td>
<td>23 (7.80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>14 (4.75%)</td>
<td>63 (21.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>23 (7.80%)</td>
<td>13 (4.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>5 (1.69%)</td>
<td>29 (9.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>5 (1.69%)</td>
<td>13 (4.21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>20 (6.78%)</td>
<td>13 (4.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>27 (9.15%)</td>
<td>13 (4.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>24 (8.14%)</td>
<td>63 (21.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>11 (3.73%)</td>
<td>13 (4.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>20 (6.78%)</td>
<td>13 (4.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>63 (21.36%)</td>
<td>13 (4.41%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency and Distribution of Type in District VI

Table 13 shows the distributions of MBTI type in District VI. Although there were clear preferences in each of the four dimensions of type in District VI, the most
obvious trend is in the preference for Judging (68.39 percent) over Perceiving (31.16 percent). For this particular group, emphasis on order and logic, reaching conclusions, and having measurable objectives for successful learning outcomes is important.

Table 13. Type distribution of institutional advancement officers District VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N = 155</th>
<th>N = 1% of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(12.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(7.74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(4.52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(4.52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1.94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(4.52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(5.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(11.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3.23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(10.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(5.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(11.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(5.81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(5.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(16.77%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| E     | 59.35%  |
| I     | 40.65%  |
| IN    | 18.71%  |
| S     | 43.87%  |
| N     | 56.13%  |
| T     | 58.71%  |
| F     | 41.29%  |
| J     | 68.39%  |
| P     | 31.61%  |
| ES    | 21.94%  |
Unlike Districts I/II, which showed a marked preference for ENTJ, District VI respondents showed a preference for ENTJ (17.77 percent), ESTJ (11.61 percent), ISTJ (12.26 percent) and ENFP (10.32 percent). There was broader distribution of preferences in this district.

The learning style indicators (Table 14) are as follows:

Table 14. Learning style preferences District VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When District I/II is compared with District VI using SRTT analysis, a number of significant differences between the districts is revealed (see Table 15).

For example, the respondents in District VI show an over-representation of Sensing types (significant at the 0.001 level) and for Judging types (significant at the 0.001 level) as noted above. For Sensing, I = 1.50 and for Judging, I = 1.10.
Table 15. Type distribution of District VI institutional advancement officers, and SRTT comparisons with District I/II advancement officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
<th>INFJ</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>59.35</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12.26%)</td>
<td>(7.74%)</td>
<td>(4.52%)</td>
<td>(4.52%)</td>
<td>I = 1% of N</td>
<td>I = Selection Ratio Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>I = 2.85</td>
<td>I = 0.95</td>
<td>I = 0.58</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56.13</td>
<td>0.79*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>58.71</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41.29</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |      |       |       |       | J  | 106 | 68.39 | 1.10"
|       |      |       |       |       | P  | 49  | 31.61 | 0.83"|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTP</th>
<th>ISFP</th>
<th>INFP</th>
<th>INTP</th>
<th>IJ</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.32#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.94%)</td>
<td>(4.52%)</td>
<td>(5.16%)</td>
<td>(5.16%)</td>
<td>I = 1% of N</td>
<td>I = Selection Ratio Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>I = 0.67</td>
<td>I = 1.17</td>
<td>I = 1.75#</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56.13</td>
<td>0.79*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>58.71</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41.29</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |      |       |       |       | J  | 106 | 68.39 | 1.10"
|       |      |       |       |       | P  | 49  | 31.61 | 0.83"|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESTP</th>
<th>ESFP</th>
<th>ENFP</th>
<th>ENTP</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.29%)</td>
<td>(3.23%)</td>
<td>(10.32%)</td>
<td>(5.16%)</td>
<td>I = 1% of N</td>
<td>I = Selection Ratio Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>I = 1.90</td>
<td>I = 1.05</td>
<td>I = 0.56</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56.13</td>
<td>0.79*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>58.71</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41.29</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |      |       |       |       | J  | 106 | 68.39 | 1.10"
|       |      |       |       |       | P  | 49  | 31.61 | 0.83"|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESTJ</th>
<th>ESFJ</th>
<th>ENFJ</th>
<th>ENTJ</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.75&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11.61%)</td>
<td>(5.81%)</td>
<td>(5.16%)</td>
<td>(16.77%)</td>
<td>I = 1% of N</td>
<td>I = Selection Ratio Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>I = 1.56</td>
<td>I = 0.76</td>
<td>I = 0.79</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56.13</td>
<td>0.79*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>58.71</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41.29</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |      |       |       |       | J  | 106 | 68.39 | 1.10"
|       |      |       |       |       | P  | 49  | 31.61 | 0.83"|

*p < .001.
#p < .01.
"p < .05.
Learning style characteristics as indicated by the ES, EN, IS, and IN dimensions, show significant differences as follows:

Over-representations of IS (I = 1.70, significant at the 0.001 level using Fisher's exact probability), and ES (I = 1.35, significant at the 0.01 level) are shown.

Corresponding under-representations are noted for EN (I = 0.79, significant at the 0.05 level), and for IN (I = 0.79, significant at the 0.001 level).

Frequency and Distribution of Type in District VIII

Table 17 provides data on District VIII, respondents living in the northwestern United States and western Canada. The largest cells on the type table for the overall group were ENTJ (14.74 percent); ENFJ, ESTJ, and INFJ (each 11.58 percent).

Shown as learning style indicators (Table 16), the preferences are as follows:

Table 16. Learning style preferences District VIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.21</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17. Type distribution of institutional advancement officers District VIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.21%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.05%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.58%</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.37%</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.58%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.37%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E 67.37%  S 34.74%  T 48.42%  J 67.37%
I 32.63%  N 65.26%  F 51.58%  P 32.63%

IN 22.11%  EN 43.16%  IS 10.53%  ES 24.21%
Table 18. Type distribution of institutional advancement officers District VIII, and SRTT comparison with advancement officers District VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001.
_(underscore)_ indicates Fisher's exact probability used instead of chi-square.

#p < .01.
"p < .05.
When compared with District VI (Table 18), District VIII data indicate an over-representation of Extraverts (I = 1.14, significant at the 0.05 level). There is also a stronger preference for Intuition than expected in comparison with the District VI respondents (I = 1.16).

While the occurrence of IN and EN learning style indicators is expected, the only significant difference calculated is the under-representation of IS (I = 0.48, significant at the 0.001 level).

These data suggest that Districts I/II and District VIII may be more alike than they are similar to District VI. When I/II and VIII are compared the following differences are noted.

District VIII includes more respondents with preference for Feeling (I = 1.36, significant at the 0.001 level), and a correspondingly smaller number preferring Thinking (I = 0.78, significant at the 0.001 level).

When the learning style indicators are studied, the only significant difference is between the IS and ES preferences, with an over-representation of ES (I = 1.49, significant at the 0.05 level).

Differences with Related Occupations

The role of the institutional advancement officer is often one of facilitation. The alumni relations professional attempts to inform and involve an alumnus or
Table 19. Type distribution of institutional advancement officers District VIII, and SRTT comparison with advancement officers District I/II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>District VIII</th>
<th>SRTT Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>64 (67.37)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>31 (32.63)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>33 (34.74)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>62 (65.26)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>10 (10.53)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>21 (22.11)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>10 (10.53)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>16 (16.84)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>30 (31.58)</td>
<td>0.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>24 (25.26)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>9 (9.47)</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>22 (23.16)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>15 (15.79)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>16 (16.84)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>33 (34.74)</td>
<td>1.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>21 (22.11)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>41 (43.16)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>10 (10.53)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>23 (24.21)</td>
<td>1.49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .001, #p < .01, "p < .05.
friend of the institution in the life of the college, university, or school. The fund raiser attempts to show a prospective donor how and why his or her gift is needed and important. The public information officer interprets the institution to many publics that read and hear about it. The senior advancement professional oversees all of these processes.

By comparing the MBTI type preferences of these institutional advancement officers with other occupations with which they interact, information can be obtained on this facilitation role. Table 20 illustrates the type preferences of a sample of 2,282 university teachers. This sample was made available from the Center for Applications of Psychological Type through the CAPT-MBTI Atlas. The largest percentage of types are ISTJ (12.84 percent) and INTJ (10.87 percent). ENTJ, the most common type among the study sample of institutional advancement officers, represents 9.64 percent of the university teachers. Like the institutional advancement officers, the teachers indicate a preference for the Thinking process quite different from the general population.

The most significant difference between the institutional advancement sample and the university teachers in the CAPT sample appears to be in the preference for Introversion. The selection ratio index of 1.38
Table 20. Type distribution of university teachers

\[ N = 2,282 \quad | = 1\% \text{ of } N \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>12.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>7.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>10.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>9.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>9.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>45.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>54.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>31.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>32.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>13.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ T = 53.37\% \quad J = 65.91\% \quad F = 46.63\% \quad P = 34.09\% \]
Table 21. Type distribution of total institutional advancement officers, and SRTT comparison with university teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001.

#p < .01.

"p < .05.
(significant at the 0.001 level) indicates an over-representation of Extraverted types in the advancement group.

An SRTT analysis (Table 21) of the total sample of institutional advancement officers compared to the base population of university teachers shows significant differences in learning style indicators, also.

The institutional advancement officers show an under-representation of IN (I = 0.69) and IS (I = 0.67) and a corresponding over-representation of EN (I = 1.36) and ES (I = 1.40). All are significant at the 0.001 level.

While, the university teachers represent an internal constituency with which the institutional advancement officer must relate, businesspersons are one external constituency. It is the businessperson from whom the fundraiser seeks contributions, to whom the public relations officer directs news releases, and whom the alumni relations administrator seeks to involve in the life of the university.

The CAPT-MBTI Atlas provides a base population of 7,463 business managers and administrators for comparison purposes. In this sample, shown on Table 22, the ESTJ type preference was 17.04 percent. This was followed by 14.94 percent indicating ISTJ and 10.06 percent indicating ENTJ.
Like the university teachers, the business managers and administrators differed from the institutional advancement officers in significant ways. For example, the advancement officers were under-represented in the Sensing preference when compared to the business sample. This difference was significant at the 0.001 level. There was also a difference in the E-I dimension and the J-P dimension. The advancement officers were over-represented as Extraverts (I = 1.11) and under-represented in preference for the Judging (I = 0.93).

The SRTT analysis (Table 23) of institutional advancement officers and business managers and administrators reveals an over-representation of IN (I = 1.30) and EN (I = 1.63) and a ratio of 0.57 for IS and 0.65 for ES (under-representation). All are significant at the 0.001 level.

Further comment on the differences among the internal and external audiences and the role of the institutional advancement officer as facilitator is provided in Chapter 5.

Type Preference and Career Classification
Information on the occupational title of respondents was available for Districts VI and VIII in this study. Those data are shown on Tables 24 and 25. Some observations may be made by reviewing the tables.
Table 22. Type distribution of business managers and administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>14.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>6.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>17.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>10.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extroverted</th>
<th>Introverted</th>
<th>Sensing</th>
<th>Intuitive</th>
<th>Thinking</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Judging</th>
<th>Perceiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>56.32%</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>61.56%</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>69.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>43.68%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38.44%</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>30.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IN        | EN         | IS | ES        | 26.80%    | 26.45%  | 29.87%  |
Table 23. Type distribution of total institutional advancement officers and SRTT comparison with business managers and administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.52%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.87%</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.24%</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.24%</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>62.94</td>
<td>1.11#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>1.28#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>1.15&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9.54%</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>1.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>28.07</td>
<td>1.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.16%</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>1.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>43.67</td>
<td>1.63*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = Selection Ratio Index

*p < .001.

#p < .01.

*p < .05.
In District VI

*The greatest number of educational fund raisers cluster at the bottom of the table, indicating preferences for Extraversion and for Judging perception. The 45 public relations officers include 22 with a preference for Introversion.

*There were no ISFPs out of the entire sample of 155.

*The TJ dimension is represented by 45.16 percent of the sample, with all other choices (FJ, TP, FP) making up the other 54.84 percent.

*Like the educational fund raisers, the senior advancement professionals cluster along the bottom (ESTJ, ESFJ, ENFJ, and ENTJ).

In District VIII

*Although the educational fund raisers still cluster at the bottom of the table, the greatest frequency is ENFJ, not ENTJ, as in District VI.

*There is a large cell of public relations professionals in INFJ.

*The alumni administrators, senior advancement professionals, and educational fund raisers show a clear preference for Extraversion, while the public relations officers more often prefer Introversion.

*Of the 95 total respondents, 65.53 percent prefer Intuition to Sensing.
Table 24. Type distribution of institutional advancement officers District VI by career classification
N = 155

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>EFR</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: AA = Alumni Administrator
EFR = Educational Fund Raiser
PR = Public Information Officer
SR = Senior Advancement Professional
O = Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E 59.35%</td>
<td>43.87%</td>
<td>58.71%</td>
<td>68.39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 40.65%</td>
<td>56.13%</td>
<td>41.29%</td>
<td>31.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IN 18.71% | EN 37.42% | IS 21.94% | ES 21.94% |
Table 25. Type distribution of institutional advancement officers District VIII by career classification
N = 95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
<th>INFJ</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(AA = 2)</td>
<td>(EFR = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PR = 8)</td>
<td>(PR = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(O = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>INTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PR = 1)</td>
<td>(PR = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(O = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(EFR = 3)</td>
<td>(EFR = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PR = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SR = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(O = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PR = 2)</td>
<td>(PR = 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SR = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(O = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PR = 7)</td>
<td>(PR = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SR = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(O = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>67.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>32.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>66.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>33.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>48.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>67.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>32.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>43.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>22.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>43.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>24.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: AA = Alumni Administrator
EFR = Educational Fund Raiser
PR = Public Information Officer
SR = Senior Advancement Professional
O = Other
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This chapter briefly summarizes the research project, discusses the results in terms of the research questions and hypotheses set forth in Chapters 1 and 3, and presents conclusions and implications or applications of the research. The final section of the chapter contains recommendations for further study.

Summary of the Research Project

The purposes of the study were 1) to identify the psychological types and learning style preferences of institutional advancement officers in three geographic areas, and 2) to determine if there were statistically significant differences between advancement officers and samples in education and business. Gender differences were reviewed also where data are available.

To obtain data on psychological type, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was completed and returned by mail by 545 institutional advancement professionals who were registered for one district conference of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). These conferences were as follows: combined Districts I and II (1988) and District II (1989), District VI (1990), and District VIII (1990).

Four hypotheses were tested, including those involving differences in MBTI type between male and female
respondents, differences between CASE Districts I/II, VI, and VIII, and differences in type between institutional advancement professionals and two related populations, university teachers and business managers and administrators. Data were also provided to show trends in the type differences among the four career classifications within institutional advancement: alumni administrators, educational fund raisers, public information officers, and senior advancement professionals.

In addition to identifying significant differences in MBTI type, the study provided data on the differences in preferred learning styles among the sample sub-populations. Information on preferred learning style for each type was taken from published reports of research and from the writings of the authors of MBTI research on learning style, including Isabel Myers Briggs, Mary McCaulley and F.L. Natter, Gordon Lawrence, David Keirsey, Marilyn Bates, Judith Provost, Scott Anchors, and Keith Golay.

Geography did provide some significant differences. District VI included an over-representation of Sensing types, and District VIII included more Intuitives. When Districts I/II and VIII were compared, District VIII included more persons with a preference for Feeling.

To accomplish the second purpose of the study, the institutional advancement sample was compared with large
samples of university teachers and of business managers and administrators. These two populations represent the internal and external constituents of the advancement officer as he/she attempts to facilitate the interaction of various publics with the life of an institution of higher education.

Significant differences in areas of Introversion-Extraversion and Sensing-Intuition were identified between the comparison groups by using a chi-square analysis. Analysis was not undertaken by career classification, but frequency data were presented which suggest that there may be differences among the alumni administrators, educational fund raisers, public information officers and senior advancement professionals themselves.

Discussion of Research Questions

The research questions are reviewed below:

Research question 1

What are the predominant MBTI types among institutional advancement officers as a group? The "active innovator" type, ENTJ (as described in the MBTI Atlas), was identified as the most frequent psychological type (18.90 percent) in the sample of institutional advancement professionals. With a preference for Extraverted Thinking with Intuition, these
types are described as hearty, frank, and good at public speaking. Myers reports that ENTJs are likely to be well-organized, logical, analytical, critical, and somewhat impersonal. Because of their reliance on Intuition, ENTJs can see possibilities beyond the known, but they may overlook facts or details in gathering information.

Discussion The ENTJ psychological type appears to match the demands of the institutional advancement profession. Often involved in marketing and persuasion, the institutional advancement professional calls upon Extraversion. Less a science than an art, fund raising requires intuitive understanding of the "right" moment to request gift support. The ENTJ's logical approach and efficiency serve him or her particularly well because of the number of events and activities that must be promoted, executed, and evaluated.

An ENTJ may act too hastily, however, without considering others' feelings. He or she likes to solve problems and find new solutions, but needs other team members to point out relevant details or the human impact of decisions.

The NT combination typically represents about 12 percent of the general population; in the institutional advancement sample it represents 43.65 percent of the sample. As noted in Chapter 2, NTs prefer to focus on general concepts or
global issues. They are interested in intellect and theory, concerned with efficiency in the abstract. They may be idealistic.

Although the ENTJ type was predominant in the study, there was some indication that the public information officers have a preference for Introversion, making them unlike their colleagues in educational fund raising. This difference, if proven to be statistically significant, may assist advancement specialists to understand each other and to work more cooperatively.

Research question 2

What are the learning style preferences of each MBTI type? As noted in Chapter 4, the learning style preferences of institutional advancement officers differ from those of a standard comparison sample provided by Lawrence (1982, p. 40). More than twice the expected percentage preferred the EN learning style indicator (44 percent of the total sample). The smallest percentage, or least preference, was for IS (15 percent).

Since all four learning styles were not equally represented in the advancement sample, consideration should be given to utilizing this information to vary learning situations and teaching styles.

Discussion A series of succinct descriptors suggests the differences between the E and I, S and N, T and F, and J
and P preferences in terms of learning style. These differences are charted below:

**Extraverts**
- Focus on outer world and get involved
- Think on their feet, talk
- Learn from demonstration
- Respond without pause
- Take breaks from tasks

**Introverts**
- Seek quiet for concentration
- May prefer writing
- Prefer description first
- Need time to reflect
- Have longer attention span

**Sensers**
- Observe directly with senses
- Collect facts through concrete detail
- Like present, hands-on activity
- Describe details before implications

**Intuitors**
- May neglect details
- Gather perceptions through hunches, impressions
- Attend to future possibility
- Like intangible, abstract

**Thinkers**
- Follow objective criteria
- Need logical rationale to learn
- Want fair standards for all

**Feelers**
- Follow subjective criteria
- Care about people affected
- Like supportive leaders

**Judgers**
- Values decisiveness
- Organizes

**Perceivers**
- Prefers inconclusiveness
- Leaves unstructured

When the E-I and N-S preferences are combined, (EN, IN, ES, and IS) into four models, additional comment may be made.

The ENs are global learners, who like seminars and reading (if they can settle down). As Ns they can listen actively, deal with open-ended instruction, and consider theory before they determine appropriate applications. As
Es, class projects may be appealing, as well as competitions.

INs may be either global or linear learners. They are comfortable first with theory, then with applications, but they may like to work alone or autonomously rather than with the groups or teams of the Es.

ESs typically learn in a linear sequence, with direct experience being preferred to discussion of theory. Known to be practical, ESs may need to be told why before doing something. Well-defined learning goals are important to this group.

ISs represent the reflective expression of the linear learning style. Audiovisual materials may provide the sensory experiences they need; lectures may do the same. Most ISs prefer to have clear goals set toward which they can work.

Research question 3

Are women employed in institutional advancement different in MBTI type from men employed in institutional advancement? Men and women expressed approximately equal preferences for three of the four preference pairs: E-I, S-N, and J-P. There was a greater difference in their preferences for Thinking and Feeling, but it was not strong enough to be statistically significant. Thus the advancement sample was different from the general population
in an important way; there was no apparent difference between men and women in preference for Thinking-Feeling in the advancement sample. In the general population females show a 65 percent preference for Feeling, and men show a 60 percent preference for Thinking.

The greatest percentage of women were ENTJs (16.56 percent); the next most frequent preferences were ENFP (11.26 percent) and ESTJ (10.60 percent). The male participants in the study expressed a preference for ENTJ (15.15 percent), as well as ESTJ (14.14 percent) and ISTJ and ENFJ (both 10.10 percent). The differences in type formula between men and women appeared to be in the FP dimension, where the advancement sample of men was over-represented (INFP and ESFP). However, given the lack of statistical significance, it is not possible to draw conclusions about these differences.

Discussion Given the information available from other studies, a researcher would expect a difference between men and women, with the women having a stronger preference for the Feeling dimension than is revealed in this study. However, given the emphasis on Thinking in both universities (most often combined with Intuition) and businesses (most often combined with Judging), it may be that women who enter the advancement field reflect the environment in which they work.
The nurturing role assigned to women may be less useful or valuable to the two constituencies with whom they interface on a daily basis.

**Research question 4**

Is there a difference in type and learning style preferences among institutional advancement officers in CASE Districts I/II, VI, and VIII? The chi-square analysis revealed significant differences between Districts I/II and VI in the S-N and J-P preference pairs. The District I/II advancement officers relied more upon Intuition and Perceiving; that is, they were more willing to deal in abstraction and to function spontaneously.

When District VIII professionals were compared with District VI, all of the preference pairs showed significant differences, except J-P. Professionals from District VIII were more Extraverted, more Intuitive, and relied more on Feeling in making judgments. When District VIII is compared with District I/II, only the T-F pair is significantly different, with an over-representation of Feeling in the District VIII professionals.

In terms of learning style comparisons, the fact that 47.12 percent of the respondents in District I and II combined prefer EN suggests that they appreciate first the abstractions, rather than the details. However, they enjoy
direct experience, especially if it can be organized as group projects, discussions, seminars, etc.

When compared to District I/II, District VI respondents showed statistically significant over-representation of persons preferring IS and ES. These are the more practical Sensors. It may be noted that this tendency fits the folk wisdom that Midwesterners are practical, down-to-earth, and direct.

District VIII respondents provide a statistically significant under-representation of IS learning style preferences. District VIII respondents rely more on Intuition than their colleagues in District VI. However, when compared with District I/II, the persons in District VIII expressed a statistically significant over-representation of ES learning style preferences.

Discussion The presentation of data by geographic area has both an abstract and a practical value. First, the data provide insight in and of themselves regarding differences that need to be recognized for the understanding of colleagues and the success of professionals working in advancement. Different geographic areas are believed to attract different types of individuals and to have definable "cultures" to which professionals adjust as they move from place to place. However, the data presented in this study only begin to delineate differences in persons in a
particular sample. These data cannot speak for all individuals in a geographic area, even all of those employed in a specific field.

What the data do, however, is delineate the existence of differences and something of the nature of those differences. In a practical sense, then, persons who may be planning professional development experiences (workshops, conferences, seminars, professional meetings, etc.) should be alert to the need to provide a variety of learning style situations designed to accommodate individual differences in learning style preference. For example, the data in this study suggest that the institutional advancement officers in the Mid-America (District VI) sample are fact-oriented, practical, or concerned with details and step-by-step procedures. By recognizing these preferences, it is possible to organize the information and presentation of material in a conference to successfully reach the participants. A similar conference held in a different geographic area might be organized differently, with more question and answer, discussion of ideas and concepts, etc.

Research question 5

Compared to the base population of university teachers, are any types significantly over- or under-represented in the sample? The SRTT analysis of the total sample of
institutional advancement officers showed a significant
difference between these two populations.

The most obvious difference between the institutional
advancement officers and the university teachers is revealed
in the E-I preference pair. While more than 62 percent of
the advancement officers used Extraversion, the university
teachers were more than 54 percent Introverted. This
difference was significant at the 0.001 level.

Another difference, significant at the 0.01 level, was
shown in T-F. Advancement officers appear to utilize
Thinking more frequently than university teachers, even
though the sample of teachers was strongly influenced toward
Thinking (63.94 percent).

There were also significant differences in learning
style preferences; advancement officers were significantly
under-represented in the IN and IS dimensions.

Discussion Institutional advancement officers spend
a considerable amount of their time relating to faculty
members at their university, college, or school. They must
understand the institution, its faculty, and its students,
but they also must translate internal agreement about
curriculum, program needs, student financial aid, etc., into
the lay terms of the potential alumni advisor or funder.

Every advancement specialist serves in this facilitation
or translation role. For example, the alumni administrator
devises alumni programs (meetings, publications, activities) that give alumni and friends an opportunity to be directly involved with the institution. Some of these programs include alumni chapter meetings, reunions, service on advisory boards, alumni magazines, and alumni recognition and awards activities.

The educational fund raiser sets out to convince the prospective donor that the institution is worthy of financial support. To accomplish this goal, the fund raiser must interpret the institution, its faculty, its programs, and its future in a variety of ways, from writing campaign case statements to preparing direct mail packages.

The public information officer in higher education does more than write news releases. He/she engages in media relations by attempting to place stories that help position the institution in the eyes of the public. Research on campus must be explained, along with ongoing curricular matters. In these financially troubled times, the public information officer must also explain the value of higher education and provide information on issues addressing society and its educational system.

In his/her role as an administrator for an advancement program, the senior advancement professional may find himself or herself performing any one of the functions noted above. In addition, the senior professional must understand
the larger context of the institution as a whole and must be familiar with the state or regional climate in which the institution provides service.

Frequently, institutional advancement officers share concerns that faculty members do not understand advancement. Further, the ideas and abstract concepts which are valued in higher education (academic freedom, for example) are difficult to interpret to a non-academic audience. Advancement officers have difficulty helping faculty members think from the perspective of an individual donor or corporate friend who may support the institution. In some measure, at least, the reason for this lack of understanding may be a result of the difference in psychological type of university teachers and institutional advancement professionals.

Research question 6

Compared to the base population of business managers and administrators, are any types significantly over- or under-represented in the sample? Unlike their comparison with university teachers discussed in the previous research question, institutional advancement professionals find themselves significantly different from business managers and administrators in the preference pair S-N.

Although there were significant differences in E-I, with the advancement officers being more Extraverted, and in J-P,
with the advancement officers being more Perceptive, the S-N difference was significant at the 0.001 level (I = 1.11). Far more reliant on Sensing than Intuition, business managers in the comparison population were oriented toward a world of facts, figures, and concrete details.

**Discussion** This difference is important as it affects the external relations role of the institutional advancement professional. Because of the Sensing preferences of business managers and administrators, who typically sit on college advisory committees, boards of trustees, or major donor clubs, institutional advancement officers find it necessary to translate the goals and ideals of higher education (the ivory tower) into specific terms for the business community. For example, abstractions such as collegiality or concepts like faculty governance have little meaning in the bottom line-oriented world of business and industry.

Yet it is the job of the alumni relations director to get such persons involved in the institution. It is the job of the educational fund raiser to obtain financial support from such persons. The public information officer endeavors to explain the world of academe to a business readership.

**Research question 7**

What do these differences suggest in terms of improving the learning situation and role perception of institutional
advancement officers? The discussion of this question is contained in the Implications sub-section of this chapter. In summary, this study does provide data that can be used to recognize and appreciate individual differences, to improve learning situations, and to describe the roles played by institutional advancement officers today.

Conclusions

There were four hypotheses of the study, as follows:

1. There will be no significant difference among the type preferences of institutional advancement professionals by gender in Districts VI and VIII combined.
2. There will be no significant difference among the type preferences of the sample and the base population of university teachers.
3. There will be no significant difference among the type preferences of the sample and the base population of business managers and administrators.
4. There will be no significant difference between the type distribution in District I/II and District VI, between District I/II and District VIII, or between District VI and District VIII.

Hypotheses 2 through 4 were each rejected because significant differences were reported by geographic location and with each of the two comparison groups, university teachers and business managers and administrators.
Hypothesis 1 was accepted since there were no significant gender differences in this study.

Although analysis was not completed, trends suggested by frequency and distribution indicate differences in psychological type and preferred learning style by career classification as well. These differences may be utilized to better the presentation and organization of professional development activities such as conferences, meetings, seminars, etc., as well as to assist the advancement officer in performing his/her role successfully.

Implications

An understanding of Myers-Briggs type data is useful in any profession where colleagues must rely on team work, deal with multiple constituencies, and continue to learn and grow. When originally conceived, this study attempted to identify distinctive type characteristics that would allow for the differentiation of alumni administrators, educational fund raisers, public information officers, and senior advancement professionals. Of special interest was the opportunity to use the unique learning style characteristics of each career classification to structure conferences and other professional development experiences.

Even though there were areas of statistically significant difference between various sub-groups, the necessary distinctions were not identified which would
suggest dramatic changes in the ways in which persons of
different type interact with each other or the ways in which
advancement professionals construct professional development
experiences.

For example, one needs to keep a knowledge of type in
mind in all interactions in the advancement profession.
Understanding how differences may be predicted and
accommodated can facilitate many activities, from
donor-solicitor relationships to staff seminars.

Extraverted advancement professionals, for example, will
be expected to like variety and action, to act without
thinking on occasion, to communicate freely, and to enjoy
the association with others, as well as the excitement of
a dynamic environment or situation.

Introverted colleagues, on the other hand, may need
quiet, more time to work, solitude, and prior reflection.
They may not communicate as readily or easily.

Persons in the work place with a preference for Sensing
can understand the routine, work step by step and with
precision, understand the established method of working and
relating, and maintain a high level of factual accuracy.
Their Intuitive office mates will have much less tolerance
for routine work, steady work, or established methods.
Instead, they will be relying upon flashes of inspiration
that come from intense periods of work. They will respond to new problems and analyze complicated situations.

The Thinking types on the advancement team will analyze and place things into logical order, even when that analysis is uncomfortable or might hurt someone's feelings. They often seem to be cutting ideas up into pieces, so that they can reorder them into a grander plan. Frequently described as "tough-minded", Thinkers are not afraid to reprimand when they believe logic calls for such action.

In contrast, the feelings of their fellow workers, external constituents, family, etc., are of utmost importance to those with preference for Feeling. These advancement professionals will work toward harmony in the workplace, even at the expense of their own best interests. They will be sympathetic to those with whom they work, whether alumni seeking to arrange reunions, donors discussing why and how they want to give, or news sources elaborating upon a story.

The fourth pair—Judging types and Perceptive types—indicate how advancement professionals will implement their preferences. Some will need to work in a planful way, getting things finished, being satisfied with reaching a judgment or conclusion to a situation. By contrast, the Perceptive types will leave decisions undone, being willing to change or to welcome new information. Examples of when
knowledge of differences in psychological type preference may be useful in advancement include:

Arrangement of offices;
Setting agendas for staff meetings;
Expectations for participation on committees;
Selection of staff members to give public presentations at alumni meetings, fund-raising events, etc.;
Selection of staff members to handle event arrangements, donor acknowledgment, alumni membership drives, or college publications which require a high degree of accuracy and detail, as well as meeting deadlines;
Assignment of employees to various programs such as planned giving, student alumni association/foundation programs, reunion or young alumni activities, where patience, energy, or concern about persons' feelings may play an important part in success; and
Promotion to management positions requiring decisiveness, grasp of possibilities, and an understanding of broad institutional issues.

Of the additional areas in which the results of this study might show effect, the organization and planning of professional development experiences for alumni administrators, educational fund raisers, public information officers, and senior advancement professionals seems the most urgent and useful. Advancement officers rely heavily on these activities (conferences, seminars, professional association meetings, etc.) for their skill improvement, as well as their professional and personal growth.

However, the differences revealed in this study were not so strongly in any one direction that a single conference plan or presentation outline can be developed. In addition, it is impractical to obtain MBTI data prior to each
professional development activity, although effort should be made to identify learning style preferences where possible.

When available, obtaining and utilizing MBTI data in planning for conferences, for example, will allow the organizers to incorporate various learning styles. Since the Es predominate in institutional advancement, an opening conference session that is active, noisy, and group-oriented may set an exciting tone for the remainder of the sessions. However, since a larger percentage of the public information officers are Introverted, their sessions may rely more heavily on lecture, while the fund raisers and the senior advancement professionals participate in roundtables, discussions, and panels.

Public information officers may prefer to have session outlines or texts in advance, allowing time for reflection. If the advancement group is predominantly female, the presenter may wish to put more emphasis on personalizing the information being presented, rather than presenting a strictly logical or analytical case.

Even within a single presentation, the speaker or facilitator should study the four learning style models and utilize various techniques to reach and involve the MBTI types in the room. A single presentation could include some lecture, some audiovisual material, some class discussion or
question and answer, and a balance of theory and specific how-to material.

Lawrence (1982) gives this advice for planning instruction with the help of type concepts:

1. Begin by planning for the needs of ES students.
2. Develop alternate activities that will appeal to IS, EN, and IN students.
3. Adjust the plans for TF and JP differences.

Formal conferences are not the only way that MBTI data may be put to use. In-service programs, especially those that help work teams assess their strengths and weaknesses may benefit from a psychological type approach. Mentoring or intern relationships may be improved by matching similar types, and on-the-job training may be better matched to employee learning style preference.

After attention is paid to psychological type and preferred learning styles, teachers and managers can deal with such practical matters as chair arrangements, hand-out materials, use of audiovisual materials, and feedback mechanisms, structuring these to accommodate individual and group preferences.

A related implication of this research has to do directly with team building. Use of MBTI profiles can assist a work group in recognizing group strengths and accepting group weaknesses. Special effort can be made to
develop under-utilized functions and to value team members' differences.

Career choice and fit has been explored in the larger sense using MBTI, but institutional advancement has a number of specialties. Some specialties, such as annual giving, may require more Sensing orientation. Other specialties, such as planned giving, may rely more heavily on Intuition.

The implication of the data obtained by comparing institutional advancement officers with university teachers, and then with business managers and administrators, provides insight into what might be called the facilitation or translation role of the advancement staff member. Specifically, the advancement officers are called upon to interpret the abstractions and concepts of higher education to the fact-oriented world of business and commerce. Further, faculty members are often focused on the difficult-to-define product of their endeavors; i.e., the educated student, the expansion of knowledge through research, the improvement of the human condition.

To bring these disparate constituents together, the advancement officer must appreciate the true nature of his/her role as facilitator in an ongoing dialogue between groups that see the relationship through different eyes (preferences). The advancement professional can improve the communication and understanding between "town and gown" by:
1. Attending faculty meetings to understand the faculty point of view,

2. Inviting business and corporate leaders to campus to meet faculty members in friendly interaction,

3. Taking faculty and administrators on visits to persons in the business world and to professional meetings of advancement officers,

4. Restating abstract concepts or ideas in concrete terms and identifying appropriate statistics or factual data about the teaching and research mission of the institution,

5. Assisting faculty in the communication process (written proposals, public presentations, etc.) with potential institutional advisors or funders.

Clearly, faculty members and businesspersons, as groups expressing opposite type preferences for Sensing and Intuition will continue to rely upon the alumni administrator, educational fund raiser, public information officer, and senior advancement professional to represent the institution and to facilitate interaction for the benefit of higher education.

Lastly, as professional organizations, most notably CASE, undertake curriculum studies to ascertain the desired preparation for institutional advancement officers, the MBTI may became a helpful instrument to study the make-up of this profession.

Whatever the implication or application, the study of psychological type as indicated by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator takes the profession beyond technical skill to a
better understanding of responsibilities and professionalism.

Recommendations for Further Study

The significant findings of this study of psychological type and preferred learning styles of institutional advancement officers as suggested by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator provide several opportunities for further study.

The first includes adding data from the other four CASE districts, District III (the Southeast), District IV (the Southwest), District V (the Great Lakes), and District VII (the Far West). (See map, page 43). The study can be replicated in each of these districts as they hold district conferences. Thus it would be possible to learn if there are significant differences between and among advancement professionals in other geographic locations.

Additional work needs to done to define the significant differences in MBTI type and learning style preferences among the career classifications of alumni administrator, educational fund raiser, public information officer, and senior advancement professional. One of the opportunities to obtain data on the latter group is to conduct research on those who attend the CASE Annual Assembly which is specifically targeted to senior professionals. Also, Coloia (1980) has called for study of educational programs for entry-level advancement staff members.
No data were collected in the current study regarding two important factors: age of respondents and length of service in the advancement profession. Jung defines stages of type development and suggests that older persons generally feel more comfortable using inferior functions. They become more well-rounded, and thus more able to accept and utilize less preferred learning styles.

Isabel Briggs Myers also discusses the dynamics of type development, pointing out that type development begins early in one's life and reaches a time when the dominant type functions are clearly formed and useful. Later stages of type development, which are not reached by all persons, include further development of less preferred functions. A mature person may recognize weaknesses or one-sidedness and either allow for or work at a fuller, richer expression of himself or herself. In this way, inferior functions are exercised and accepted. Robinson (1990) describes these stages in faculty:

First is the specialization stage in which we develop clear preferences, become more proficient in some areas than others, and attain social and economic security. Then we move into the second stage in which we focus on becoming more complete, more well-rounded, and less specialized in our preferences and responses. It is likely that an aging faculty is in the more flexible adaptive stage and is therefore able to respond to changing educational programs and changing demographics within the student body (p. 10).
Therefore, persons with significantly more years of experience in the advancement field may have a greater comfort level with themselves and, thus, with various personality functions. While MBTI research would suggest that one’s true preferences would not change strictly on the basis of length of job service, a study might be conducted to test this hypothesis. Carbonne (1986) has conducted research to identify the percentages of advancement officers in several age ranges and with several ranges of experience.

There is real need to utilize the MBTI in conjunction with other learning style instruments such as Kolb's Learning Styles Inventory, the Student Learning Styles Questionnaire, Hill's Cognitive Style Map, or Dunn, Dunn, and Price's Learning Styles Inventory (Jensen, 1987; Claxton and Ralston, 1978). Correlations between these instruments may prove revealing. Making such correlations would allow for substantiation of MBTI concepts, as well as add useful information to the study of learning and teaching.

In addition, further research might be conducted to determine the differences and similarities between MBTI and the Social Styles Model now taught through the Fund Raising School, Center for Philanthropy, Indiana University (Carlson, 1990). This model identifies four behavioral patterns that suggest how persons relate and communicate in interpersonal situations. These patterns are then discussed
in the context of major gift fund raising, especially regarding the donor-solicitor relationship.

One of the most promising areas of further study may be in determining the use of psychological type data for specialization in advancement (for example, planned giving versus annual giving, alumni marketing versus continuing education, etc.). Since the original work done by Isabel Briggs Myers concerned career selection, a study of the psychological type of specialized advancement personnel might suggest a "fit" of certain personalities with specialized advancement work. The MBTI might be used in combination with other vocational instruments such as American College Testing's Vocational Interest, Experience and Skill Assessment; the Vocational Preference Index published by Slossen Educational Publications, Inc.; or the Vocational Preference Inventory by John L. Holland, published by Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. (Mitchell, 1983).

The whole area of interpersonal communication can be explored in terms of MBTI type. For example, one might ask the question, how does the MBTI type influence the relationship of the fund raiser with the donor prospect? Can a fund raiser actually begin to identify the type of a prospect by observing the physical surroundings (office, home) of the prospect? (Eason, 1990). Could the
presentation to the prospect be tailored to his or her preferred personality dimensions? (Hartzler and Hartzler, 1982).

**Summary**

The growth in use of the MBTI has been "phenomenal" (Carskadon, 1985). Similarly, even conservative estimates put the number of institutional advancement professionals at 25,000 and growing (Lamm, 1990). It is not likely that there will be a decrease in professional development conferences, seminars, and activities for this expanding career population. In fact, more than 65 percent of experienced fund raisers believe that newly appointed colleagues should participate in short seminars, conferences, and association meetings as a part of their training (Carbonne, 1986).

Since the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator allows for the determination of preferred learning styles and structuring of appropriate learning situations, the application of this knowledge should contribute to the continual improvement of professional development and role perception among institutional advancement officers at a critical time in the history of higher education. As Francis C. Pray, of Frantzreb, Pray, Ferner, and Thompson, Inc. (cited in Milne, 1979) described the advancement professional:
I see a new and expanding role for the development officer who is big enough, courageous enough, educationally oriented enough, trustworthy enough, and professionally competent enough to lead the task of mobilizing the effort to maximize the resources. Furthermore, I see him as a new kind of staff organizer for a new concept of team approach which will involve the whole institution and its entire leadership in the program to build growing strength as of the organization (p. 9).
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APPENDIX A:

INFORMATION ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
INFORMATION ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
(Please follow the accompanying instructions for completing this form.)

1. Title of project (please type): Study of psychological type among advancement-professional using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to ensure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are properly protected. Additions to or changes in procedures affecting the subjects after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review.

   Phyllis J. Lepke 12/22/89
   Typed Name of Principal Investigator  Date  Signature of Principal Investigator

   Alumni Suite, Memorial Union  294-4607
   Campus Address  Campus Telephone

3. Signatures of others (if any)  Date  Relationship to Principal Investigator
   Larry H. Ebbers (see below)  12/20/89  Major Professor

4. ATTACH an additional page(s) (A) describing your proposed research and (B) the subjects to be used, (C) indicating any risks or discomforts to the subjects, and (D) covering any topics checked below. CHECK all boxes applicable.

   - Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
   - Samples (blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
   - Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
   - Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
   - Deception of subjects
   - Subjects under 14 years of age and/or Subjects 14-17 years of age
   - Subjects in Institutions
   - Research must be approved by another institution or agency

5. ATTACH an example of the material to be used to obtain informed consent and CHECK which type will be used.

   - Signed informed consent will be obtained.
   - Modified informed consent will be obtained.

6. Anticipated date on which subjects will be first contacted: Month Day Year
   Anticipated date for last contact with subjects: Month Day Year

7. If Applicable: Anticipated date on which audio or visual tapes will be erased and/or identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments:

   Month Day Year

8. Signature of Head or Chairperson  Date  Department or Administrative Unit
   George G. Karas  11/4/90  Chairperson

9. Decision of the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research:

   - Project Approved
   - Project not approved
   - No action required

   Name of Committee Chairperson  Date  Signature of Committee Chairperson
APPENDIX B: INVITATION LETTERS, DISTRICTS VI AND VIII
December 23, 1989

Dear Advancement Colleague:

As chairperson of CASE District VI, I want to thank you for registering for the Des Moines Conference. When we gather there January 21-24, we'll enjoy outstanding hospitality provided by Jack Ohle, conference chairperson, and a first-rate program under the supervision of Charlotte Legg.

Although it gives me great pleasure to write to you as a registrant, I have an additional reason to contact you. First, let me take off my chairperson's hat and assume the "civilian" status of the part-time graduate student I am.

My dissertation research focuses on the study of psychological type among advancement professionals. I have data from Districts I and II and hope this year to acquire additional data from our own District VI, as well as District VIII.

Psychological type in my research is indicated by a well-known tool, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). You may be familiar with MBTI use and application in student personnel work, leadership training, industry, and education.

Now, about how you might like to be involved.

I have been given permission by Jack Ohle to contact conference registrants by mail and offer each of you the opportunity to complete the MBTI, have it scored and a personal profile completed. On Monday, January 22, Dr. Daniel C. Robinson, Associate Professor and Leader, Higher Education Section, Iowa State University College of Education, will offer an interpretive discussion at 5:15 p.m. at the Marriott. Dan is a certified MBTI instructor and a delightful speaker. He will address the special strengths and weaknesses of each psychological type in relation to leadership, team building, decision-making, organizational development, and personal preferences.

MBTI can provide a fascinating new look at your own management style as well as practical insight into your relationships with colleagues and persons external to your institution.

Completing the MBTI requires approximately 35-40 minutes. There is no charge for participation, but there is some urgency in terms of getting the survey booklets to you and returned for scoring prior to January 22.

If you would like to participate, we need to observe the following schedule:

1) Complete the enclosed response card and return it immediately to me. If you prefer, you may call me directly at 515/294-4607.

2) I shall send you a survey packet as well as a return envelope.

3) Survey booklets and answer sheets returned by January 12 will be scored and your personal, confidential profile will be developed for your receipt at the January 22 session.
Again, let me emphasize that there is no cost to you beyond the time you invest in completing the survey and attending the session. My research deals only with numbers of persons of various type in selected advancement disciplines, at several geographic locations, and at different types of institutions. Therefore, I can promise you that your personal information will be treated as confidential.

I do hope you can find the time to participate. I have participated in MBTI sessions at executive retreats and know the principles are valuable in our advancement work.

Whether you elect to participate or not, let me say again how pleased we are to have you among the conference registrants. See you in Des Moines for a breakthrough conference.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Lepke

P.S. I am attaching a brief summary of MBTI applications prepared by Dr. Robinson for your review.
DATE: December 21, 1989

TO: Study Participants

FROM: Daniel C. Robinson  
Associate Professor and Leader  
Higher Education Section  
Professional Studies in Education  
Iowa State University  
N232B Lagomarcino Hall  
Ames, IA 50011

RE: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is one of the growing number of psychological instruments concerned primarily with variations in normal attitudes and behavior, rather than with psychopathology. It is a questionnaire developed by Isabel Briggs Myers and her mother, Katherine C. Briggs, to facilitate use of that part of the theory of C.G. Jung, a Swiss psychiatrist, which is concerned with what Jung referred to as "psychological types."

The MBTI has been employed as a tool for many years by a variety of users in small business and large corporations, service industries and manufacturing concerns, consulting and training services, government at all levels, established forms and new ventures by entrepreneurs, and educational and health care institutions.

In general, the MBTI functions as a tool that can help your management staff:
- understand themselves and their behaviors
- appreciate others so as to make constructive use of individual differences
- see that approaching problems in different ways can be healthy and productive for the management team.

Specifically, advancement professionals may use the MBTI for:
- communicating more effectively with supervisors, peers and employees
- making the most of human resources
- assisting in professional development
- improving teamwork
- understanding/adapting to differences in management/leadership style
- understanding individual contributions to the organization
- conflict resolution.

The following publications may be helpful to you in learning more about MBTI:
Keirsey, David and Marilyn Bates, Please Understand Me
Briggs-Myers, Isabel with Peter Briggs-Myers, Gifts Differing
Keirsey, David, Portraits of Temperament
Hirsh, Sandra and Jean Kummerow, Lifetypes
Lawrence, Gordon, People Types and Tiger Stripes: A Practical Guide to Learning Styles

cc: Phyllis Lepke
March 5, 1990

Dear CASE Colleague:

This is one of those letters I sometimes ignore, especially when my advancement responsibilities are heavy. (And isn't that most of the time for all of us!)

But I'm writing to you with the hope that you will make a special effort to participate in some intriguing research I have been conducting about our field. I've collected a great deal of data from CASE Districts I, II, and VI, and I'm hopeful that your involvement—along with that of your District VIII colleagues—will allow me to represent a broader geographic sample.

First, here's a little bit about me. I am associate director in charge of giving programs at the Iowa State University Foundation. This is my thirteenth year in advancement, and my career includes jobs in alumni relations and editorial services as well as fund-raising. In 1989 I served as chair of CASE District VI and as a member of the CASE national district services commission.

Some time ago, I began coursework toward a PhD in higher education administration. In the course of my program I became interested in the study of psychological type among advancement professionals and that is the focus of my dissertation research.

Psychological type in my research is indicated by a well-known tool, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). You may be familiar with MBTI use and application in student personnel work, leadership training, industry, and education.

Now, about how you might like to be involved.

I have been given permission by your 1989 District Chair and 1990 conference committee to contact conference registrants by mail and offer you the opportunity to complete the MBTI, have it scored and a profile of professionals in District VIII completed. The group profile will address the special strengths and weaknesses of each psychological type in relation to leadership, team building, decision-making, organizational development, and personal preferences.

MBTI can provide a fascinating new look at our management preferences as well as practical insight into relationships among colleagues and persons external to our institutions.

Completing the MBTI requires at most 35-40 minutes. You need simply to indicate your interest in participating via the enclosed card, and I will get the survey booklet to you by return mail. If you prefer, you may call me directly at 515/294-4607.
Let me emphasize that there is no cost to you beyond the time you invest in completing the survey. My research deals only with numbers of persons of various type in selected advancement disciplines, at several geographic locations, and at different types of institutions. Therefore, I can promise you that your personal responses will be treated as confidential.

I do hope you will take the opportunity to participate. As a colleague, I know it's difficult to find the time, but I believe much will be added to my information if District VIII is represented along with I, II, and VI.

Thank you for your consideration of this opportunity, and, I hope, your generosity in participating. You'll enjoy receiving the follow-up materials, I'm sure.

Sincerely,

Phyllis J. Lepke

PL/jo
attachment

P.S. I am attaching a brief summary of MBTI applications prepared by my major professor for your review.
APPENDIX C:
RETURN CARD
MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR RESEARCH STUDY

Please register me for participation in your study, Phyllis. I understand that I will receive a survey packet to be returned to you by January 12, 1990.

Name ____________________________
Title ______________________________
Address ____________________________

For a speedier response, call Phyllis Lepke, 515/294-4607. Thank you.
APPENDIX D:

MBTI COVER LETTER, DISTRICTS VI AND VIII
January 3, 1990

Thank you for indicating your interest in my research study of psychological type and institutional advancement professionals and your willingness to be a part of it.

I have enclosed for your use the Myers-Briggs Form F and a computer-scored answer sheet. Please read the directions on the booklet carefully and mark your answers clearly using a number two pencil.

It is also necessary that you include your name in the designated box on the answer sheet. Your name will be used only for the purpose of preparing your personal confidential profile to be distributed at the interpretive session on Monday, January 22 at 5:15 p.m. in the Sioux City Room, Marriott Hotel, Des Moines.

For the purposes of my research, your responses to the MBTI will be matched with categories of information provided on the conference registration form (type of institution you represent, area of professional interest, length of service to the profession, etc.). Then individual names will be removed entirely. The purpose of my study is to determine the relationship of psychological type to several variables. It will not be necessary or important for me to identify individuals when I do my research analysis.

As the survey booklet indicates, there are no right or wrong or even typical answers to any of the items in the survey. Your participation is entirely voluntary and constitutes no risk to you. In fact, I believe you will find the information you receive to be helpful in your advancement work. If you have any questions at all about the purpose, method, or use of the research, please call me directly at 515/294-4607.

As I noted in my initial invitation letter, it is essential that the surveys be returned immediately so that the individual packets may be prepared. Please respond prior to January 12 to insure your inclusion. I have provided a stamped envelope for your convenience.

Again, I offer my sincerest appreciation for your willingness to participate.

Sincerely,

Phyllis J. Lepke

P.S. Please make special note of the requirement to return your survey booklet along with your answer sheet. Thanks.