
IN THIS ARTICLE

Management Styles, Models,

Learner Analysis

BUDDY, CAN YOU PARADIGM?

BY PIERCE J. HOWARD AND JANE M. HOWARD



Heads up—the personality paradigm is shifting. Find out how you can use the “Big Five” theory of personality traits to help both individuals and work teams thrive.

A half-dozen years ago, an intern with whom we were working looked at his results on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator assessment. His scores sat at zero on each of the four scales. He asked forlornly, "Does this mean that I don't have a personality?"

I wish that intern were with us today, looking at his Five-Factor Model test results. He never would have asked that question.

For three decades, the training community has relied largely on the MBTI instrument for personality assessments. The Five-Factor Model, or "Big Five" paradigm, evolves from the MBTI instrument rather than radically departing from it. Still, the Big Five model is different enough from the MBTI instrument to require a significant shift in thinking.

The MBTI model—which rests on the personality theory of Carl Jung—assumes the following:

- ▶ Personality hangs on a four-dimensional framework.
- ▶ Scores on each dimension will fall along a bimodal distribution.
- ▶ The judger/perceiver dimension is a key determinant of a person's preferences.

The Five-Factor Model, on the other hand, is based on experience, not theory. It proposes that the following statements are true:

- ▶ Personality has five dimensions.
- ▶ Scores on the dimensions will fall along a normal distribution.
- ▶ Personality is best described by individual traits rather than types.
- ▶ The strength of scores indicates preferences.

The FFM or Big Five model has gained widespread acceptance in the academic-psychology community. We believe the FFM also offers human resource practitioners a broadly applicable and practical tool. For the last four years, we have used the FFM in many areas of our practice, including the following:

- ▶ team building
- ▶ employee selection
- ▶ job analysis
- ▶ training design

- ▶ customer service
- ▶ management and leadership development
- ▶ coaching and counseling
- ▶ career development
- ▶ conflict management.

We use Costa and McCrae's NEO tests—both the short version, called the NEO-FFI, and the long version, called the NEO-PI-R. (See the box, "Guidelines for Using the FFM," on page 31.) Several other researchers also have developed tests for using the FFM to assess personalities.

Searching for the source

The FFM rests on the language of personality. All personality theories (including the MBTI model) are in fact metaphors for describing something indescribable—the complex fabric of a human being. Language is the one ingredient that all theories share. Language itself—not theories—provides the ultimate metaphor for describing personality.

Decades ago, that insight sparked the research that eventually produced the Five-Factor Model of personality. By analyzing the language of personality descriptors, researchers identified five correlated groups of behaviors, each of which exists along a continuum. (See figure 1, "The Five-Factor Model.") The groups of behaviors are as follows:

- ▶ negative emotionality
- ▶ extraversion
- ▶ openness
- ▶ agreeableness
- ▶ conscientiousness.

Essentially, the FFM reflects the fact that all languages include words that describe those personality traits. Allport and Odbert were the first researchers to identify the English-language words that describe personality traits. Their 1936 compendium of 4,500 words has served as the cornerstone of language-based, personality-trait research for the last 60 years.

In 1949, Fiske suggested that five factors—not 16, as was previously thought—accounted for the variance in people's personalities. From 1954 to 1961, two Air Force personnel researchers, Tupes and Christal, built on the work of Fiske and other pioneers. Tupes and Christal validated the five factors that comprise the FFM. Unfortunately, they published their results in an obscure Air Force publication that was overlooked by both the psychological and academic communities.

In the late 1950s, Warren Norman at the University of Wisconsin learned of Tupes and Christal's work. In 1963, Norman replicated their study and confirmed the five-factor structure for trait taxonomy. (The academic-psychology community inappropriately dubbed the model, "Norman's Big Five.") A

Figure 1
The Five-Factor Model

DIMENSION	LEVEL		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Negative Emotionality	Resilient (N-)	Responsive (N)	Reactive (N+)
Extraversion	Introvert (E-)	Ambivert (E)	Extravert (E+)
Openness	Preserver (O-)	Moderate (O)	Explorer (O+)
Agreeableness	Challenger (A-)	Negotiator (A)	Adapter (A+)
Conscientiousness	Flexible (C-)	Balanced (C)	Focused (C+)

flurry of other personality researchers confirmed Norman's findings.

By the early 1980s, academic interest in the Five-Factor Model began to surge. Today, many experts embrace the Five-Factor Model as the basic paradigm for personality research.

Defining the Big Five

You can think of the Big Five dimensions as five buckets. Each bucket holds a set of traits, called facets, that tend to occur together. The labels attached to each bucket represent a com-

mon element among the traits. The common elements are called factors.

Costa and McCrae have developed the most commonly accepted vocabulary for both factors and facets. They published their work in their *NEO-PI-R Professional Manual* (Psychological Assessment Resources, 1992).

Costa and McCrae developed their nomenclature for academics and clinicians. We have modified their vocabulary for business applications, as follows. For a list of the facets that make up each of the five factors, see figure

2, "Professional Development Version of the Five-Factor Model."

Now, let's look at the five factors in more detail:

Negative emotionality. The negative-emotionality factor refers to a person's ability to withstand stress.

At one end of the negative-emotionality continuum are reactive people, who experience more negative emotions and report less satisfaction with life than most people. Reactives react to all sorts of stimuli. Their susceptibility to emotion and their discontent with

Figure 2
Professional Development Version of the Five-Factor Model

LEVEL	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Factor 1: NEGATIVE EMOTIONALITY	Resilient (N-)	Responsive (N)	Reactive (N+)
Facets: N1: Worry N2: Anger N3: Discouragement N4: Self-Consciousness N5: Impulsiveness N6: Vulnerability	more calm (N1-) slow to anger (N2-) seldom sad (N3-) seldom embarrassed (N4-) seldom yielding (N5-) stress resistant (N6-)	worried/calm (N1) some anger (N2) occasionally sad (N3) sometimes embarrassed (N4) sometimes yielding (N5) some stress (N6)	more worried (N1+) quick to anger (N2+) often sad (N3+) easily embarrassed (N4+) often yielding (N5+) stress prone (N6+)
Factor 2: EXTRAVERSION	Introvert (E-)	Ambivert (E)	Extravert (E+)
Facets: E1: Warmth E2: Gregariousness E3: Assertiveness E4: Activity E5: Excitement-Seeking E6: Positive Emotions	aloof (E1-) prefers to be alone (E2-) in background (E3-) leisurely (E4-) low need for thrills (E5-) seldom exuberant (E6-)	attentive (E1) alone/others (E2) in foreground (E3) average pace (E4) occasional need for thrills (E5) moderate exuberance (E6)	cordial (E1+) prefers company (E2+) a leader (E3+) vigorous (E4+) craves thrills (E5+) usually cheerful (E6+)
Factor 3: OPENNESS	Preserver (O-)	Moderate (O)	Explorer (O+)
Facets: O1: Fantasy O2: Aesthetics O3: Feelings O4: Actions O5: Ideas O6: Values	here and now (O1-) uninterested in art (O2-) ignores feelings (O3-) the familiar (O4-) narrow focus (O5-) conservative (O6-)	occasionally imaginative (O1) moderate interest in art (O2) accepts feelings (O3) a mixture (O4) moderate curiosity (O5) moderate (O6)	a dreamer (O1+) major interest in art (O2+) values all emotions (O3+) variety (O4+) broad intellectual curiosity (O5+) open to new values (O6+)
Factor 4: AGREEABLENESS	Challenger (A-)	Negotiator (A)	Adapter (A+)
Facets: A1: Trust A2: Straightforwardness A3: Altruism A4: Compliance A5: Modesty A6: Tender-Mindedness	skeptical (A1-) guarded (A2-) uninvolved (A3-) aggressive (A4-) superior (A5-) hardheaded (A6-)	cautious (A1) tactful (A2) willing to help others (A3) approachable (A4) equal (A5) responsive (A6)	trusting (A1+) frank (A2+) eager to help (A3+) defers (A4+) humble (A5+) easily moved (A6+)
Factor 5: CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	Flexible (C-)	Balanced (C)	Focused (C+)
Facets: C1: Competence C2: Order C3: Dutifulness C4: Achievement Striving C5: Self-Discipline C6: Deliberation	unprepared (C1-) unorganized (C2-) casual about obligations (C3-) casual about success (C4-) easily distracted (C5-) spontaneous (C6-)	prepared (C1) half-organized (C2) covers priorities (C3) serious about success (C4) mix of work and play (C5) thoughtful (C6)	capable (C1+) well-organized (C2+) strong conscience (C3+) driven to succeed (C4+) focused on work (C5+) careful (C6+)

Adapted with permission from Costa and McCrae, 1992.

life often push them into such roles as social scientists, customer-service professionals, and academicians.

At the other end of the negative-emotionality continuum are resilient people. Resilients tend to experience life on a more rational level than most people; at times, they appear impervious to what's going on around them. Very little bothers resilient people. You'll find unflappable resilients managing air traffic, piloting airplanes, and serving as military snipers, finance managers, and engineers.

Responsives fall in the middle range of the negative-emotionality continuum. Responsives demonstrate a mix of resilient and reactive qualities.

Extraversion. The extraversion factor describes one's comfort level with relationships. At one end of the spectrum, extraverts tend to spend much of

their time maintaining and enjoying a large number of relationships. At the other end, introverts have fewer relationships and spend less time on them.

Extraverts tend to lead, talk, and exert themselves physically more often than other people. They also tend to be more friendly and outgoing. You often find extraverts in sales, politics, the arts, and the social sciences.

Introverts tend to be more independent, reserved, steady, and comfortable with solitude than most people are. The introverted profile frequently surfaces among production managers and physical and natural scientists.

Between the extremes are the ambiverts, who move comfortably between social and solitary situations.

Openness. The openness factor addresses one's range of interests.

Openness to new experiences is an important ingredient in creativity.

Extremely open people, called explorers, are fascinated by novelty and innovation. Others generally perceive explorers as liberal. Explorers describe themselves as more introspective and reflective than most people describe themselves. The explorer profile underlies such social roles as entrepreneurs, architects, change agents, artists, and both social and physical theoretical scientists.

At the other end of the openness spectrum are the preservers. They have narrower interests than explorers, appear more conventional, and find comfort in the familiar. Preservers come across as more conservative than most people, but not necessarily as more authoritarian. The preserver profile often shows up in such roles as financial manager, project manager, and applied scientist.

Between explorers and preservers are the moderates. Moderates find too much novelty tiresome and too much of the status quo boring.

Agreeableness. The agreeableness factor refers to a person's propensity to defer to others.

Highly agreeable people, called adapters, defer to many others, including spouses, religious leaders, friends, bosses, or pop-culture idols. Adapters prize harmony more than they prize having their say or their way. The adapter profile forms the core of such roles as teaching, social work, and psychology. At the extreme, adapters—also called “tender-minded”—can become dependent personalities who lose their sense of self.

People who score low on the agreeableness factor (“challengers”) focus more on their own norms and needs than on those of others. Challengers seek to acquire and exercise power. You'll often find challengers in the fields of advertising and business management and among the ranks of military leaders. In the extreme, challengers—known as “tough-minded”—can become narcissistic, antisocial, authoritarian, or paranoid personalities who have lost their sense of feeling for others.

In the middle of the continuum you find negotiators, who shift from leadership to “followership” as situations demand.

Guidelines for Using the FFM

This article cannot substitute for a university course in tests and measurements or for the NEO manual. Nonetheless, here are some guidelines for using FFM test scores.

Aging slightly affects all five personality dimensions. From late adolescence through young adulthood (roughly from 20 years old to 30 years old), agreeableness (A) and conscientiousness (C) tend to increase, while negative emotionality (N), extraversion (E), and openness (O) tend to decrease. Consider this correlation when presenting test feedback to participants.

Extraversion and agreeableness significantly affect relationships. Extremely divergent scores on these two dimensions tend to intensify the effects of other differences between two people.

For example, two co-workers who must cooperate on a project might include one who is A+ and O+ (tender-minded and extraverted) and one who is A- and O- (tough-minded and introverted). The tough-minded partner may have trouble accepting the other person's outgoing nature.

On the other hand, if they share an A+ score on agreeability, they probably will accept each other's difference on the O factor.

Factors versus facets. Whenever possible, use all 30 facets to explore individual differences. Use the five factors only as shorthand to refer to the groupings of facets.

If we are working with a team that has less than three hours to spend, we use a shorter version of the form. When we have more time with a team, or when we work with one person, we use the full-facet approach. We can present full-facet results to one person in about one hour.

Short or long form? The reliability of the NEO-FFI (60 items) averages around 80 percent; the reliability of the NEO-PI-R (240 items) averages around 90 percent. So if the risks are higher, it's generally better to use the full-facet version—the long form.

For example, you will want to use the full-facet version when you counsel a borderline employee or make a selection decision.

When staging interventions that have potential for legal repercussions, the more reliable long form is essential.

The shorter form, on the other hand, works well for teaching the FFM vocabulary as a tool for understanding individual differences in such contexts as team building.

Conscientiousness. The conscientiousness factor refers to the number of goals on which one focuses. A highly conscientious person—a focused person—pursues fewer goals, in a purposeful way. A person who scores low on conscientiousness (a “flexible”) pursues many goals, in a spontaneous, scattered way.

In general, focused people tend to be high achievers. But taken to an extreme, focus can become workaholicism. You’ll often find highly focused people serving as leaders and executives.

Flexibles are more easily distracted, less focused on goals, and more hedonistic. Flexibles lack control over their impulses: A passing idea, an alternate activity, or another person can easily seduce a flexible away from the task at hand. Flexibles do not necessarily work less than focused people, but they direct less of their work at specific goals.

Flexibility facilitates creativity. Flexibles stay open longer to possibilities. Flexibles often play such roles as researchers, detectives, and consultants.

In the middle of this spectrum is the balanced person, who finds it easy to move from a focused to a flexible outlook. Managers with balanced profiles deal equally well with both flexible and focused subordinates—they keep flexibles on target without alienating them, and they help their more focused employees remember to relax from time to time and enjoy life.

Using the FFM

HR people can use the FFM when employees come to them for coaching or counseling for a variety of reasons:

- ▶ borderline performance
- ▶ difficulties with other employees
- ▶ boredom with work
- ▶ frustration with work
- ▶ career exploration

- ▶ desire for self-improvement
- ▶ preparation for promotion opportunity
- ▶ job searches.

Consider Henry, a free-lance television sports producer. Henry came to us because he was rich and miserable. He was good at his job, he loved sports, and he had plenty of work. But he was worn out. At 11 p.m., after wrapping up his evening basketball broadcast, he would find himself frazzled and unable to sleep until five or six in the morning. Henry didn’t know what ailed him, but he wanted to improve the quality of his life.

We found the key to understanding Henry’s troubles in his Big Five profile. Henry’s profile was N+, E+, O-, A, and C+ (reactive, extravert, preserver, negotiator, focused). In other words, Henry scored high on the dimensions for negative emotion-

Figure 3
The Effects of Trait Congruence and Trait Diversity

Each column describes the effects on a relationship when the two people involved display the same or different levels of each factor. For each combination, the “+” indicates a positive effect that results; the “-” indicates a negative effect.

	Both Hi	Both Mid	Both Lo	Hi + Mid	Lo + Mid	Hi + Lo
NEGATIVE EMOTIONALITY	+ Nothing escapes attention - High stress	+ Even-tempered - Take stability for granted	+ Stress-free - Can miss important cues	+ Hi admires Mid’s control - Mid can tire of Hi’s reactions	+ Mid admires Lo’s steadiness - Lo’s needs may not get expressed	+ Lo provides stability for Hi - Hi seen as out of control; Lo seen as uncaring
EXTRAVERSION	+ Many friends - Little time for reflection	+ Balance of group and solitude - Longing for more of both extremes	+ Close relationship - Inadequate communication	+ Hi attracted to M’s balance - Mid wishes Hi were more private	+ Mid draws Lo out socially - Mid impatient at reading Lo’s mind	+ Hi handles relationship as Lo works - Hi seen as shallow; Lo as afraid of people
OPENNESS	+ Enjoy dreaming together - Never achieve efficiencies	+ Lots of common sense - No competitive edge	+ Respect for expertise - Rigid in outlook	+ Mid keeps Hi’s “feet on ground” - Mid resents Hi’s risk-proneness	+ Mid respects Lo’s constancy - Mid resents Lo’s lack of dreaming	+ Balance of dreams with reality - Lo seen as boring; Hi, a dreamer
AGREEABLENESS	+ Strong bonds - Overly dependent	+ Good decision makers - Caught up in politics	+ Respect for fighting spirit - Fight constantly	+ Mid draws out Hi’s needs - Mid impatient with Hi’s martyrdom	+ Mid helps Lo see others’ needs - Mid impatient with Lo’s rigidity	+ Fight to balance individual/group needs - Hi “taken to cleaners”; Lo rejected
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	+ High achievement - Little pure relationship building	+ Balance of work and play - No one “goes for the gold”	+ Spontaneity and discovery - Always out of time and money	+ Mid helps Hi to relax - Hi feels held back	+ Mid helps Lo meet goals - Mid resents Lo’s drain on resources	+ Lo handles crisis; Hi wins the campaign - Constantly at each other—make versus spend

ality, extraversion, and conscientiousness, low on openness, and moderately on agreeableness.

Henry's scores on four dimensions were perfectly suited for the job, but his N+ score pinpointed a mismatch between his job and his personality. Henry reacted strongly to the stress of producing live sports broadcasts, especially of fast-paced games like basketball. On-air sports production, which leaves no margin for error, is no job for a reactive personality.

Henry later switched from producing live sports programs to producing sports documentaries, which he can edit with less stress. He also has started working toward a master's degree in Eastern studies. Eventually, he wants to specialize in television documentaries of eastern cultures—including sports, of course.

FFM in the classroom

HRD specialists can also use the FFM in many different kinds of training classes, including those addressing the following topics:

- ▶ management development
- ▶ conflict management
- ▶ leadership development
- ▶ problem solving and decision making
- ▶ communications



- ▶ meeting management
- ▶ training design
- ▶ customer service.

In each case, the FFM can help trainers teach the vocabulary of individual differences. Then, participants can learn to use their new vocabulary to explain their pasts and to plan for their futures.

For example, a person who scores A+ (highly agreeable) will tend to avoid conflicts. We help an A+ person understand how agreeable behaviors (trust, straightforwardness, altruism, deference, humility, and empathy) have caused him or her to avoid conflicts in the past. Then, we help the

person learn strategies for managing conflict.

Participants in our training classes say they appreciate the nuances of interpretation that the FFM provides. Clients who had been identified previously as introverts, but who knew they had an extraverted side, seem comfortable with the term ambiverts. So do extraverts who know they possess a strongly introverted side. Also, with the FFM, people who score in the middle of the bell curve do not see themselves as blank slates, as our forlorn intern did after taking the MBTI assessment. Instead, they see themselves as well balanced.

The FFM and teams

By introducing the FFM vocabulary to members of a team, a facilitator can identify and discuss team strengths and weaknesses constructively and without causing people to become defensive.

Keep two factors in mind when using the Big Five vocabulary to identify a team's developmental needs. First, consider the unique elements of the team's situation, such as geography, politics, product maturity, competitive environment, and workforce morale. Second, consider the natural benefits and drawbacks teams find when a high proportion of members share one trait ("high loadings"), and when members widely diverge on a particular trait ("split loadings").

When all or most members of a team "load" on one end of dimension—for instance, when all or most of the members are more extraverted—we describe the circumstance as trait congruence, or trait homogeneity. When team members fall at different points along the continuum of a trait, we call this circumstance trait diversity, or trait heterogeneity.

Both trait congruence and trait diversity have benefits and drawbacks. Figure 3, "The Effects of Trait Congruence and Trait Diversity," shows the typical key effects for trait congruence and trait diversity for all five dimensions.

The key effects of trait congruence and diversity tend to be stable and lasting. So how do you cope with the permanent effects of trait interactions within relationships? Robert Sternberg of Yale University has suggested in his *Triarchic Mind* that we can

Figure 4
Examples of Adaptation Strategies

STERNBERG'S STRATEGY TYPES:	EXAMPLES:
1. Changing Me	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Develop procedures to compensate for weaknesses ▶ Delegate ▶ Training ▶ Counseling
2. Changing Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Give permission for someone to play a role that no one likes but everyone needs ▶ Develop a set of team norms ▶ Tinker with team roles (such as chair, recorder, and timekeeper) ▶ Assign names and deadlines to all action items ▶ Evaluate team performance periodically (in light of norms) ▶ Training ▶ Negotiate job descriptions, goals, and rewards
3. Changing the Situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Add more team members ▶ Ask for a volunteer to perform missing functions ▶ Invite nonmembers to attend permanently or occasionally ▶ Clarify the purpose of each agenda item (for example, idea generation, problem solving, and decision making) ▶ Clarify type of decision process intended (by boss, vote, or consensus) ▶ Transfer or terminate individuals ▶ Redesign or reengineer spaces, processes, roles, and policies

choose from three kinds of problem-solving strategies:

- ▶ We can try to change ourselves.
- ▶ We can try to change others.
- ▶ We can try to change the situation.

Sternberg proposes that people of higher intelligence will employ strategies from all three groups and will flexibly select the most appropriate strategy for the situation. Figure 4 lists adaptation strategies in each category that can help counter the effects of trait congruence and trait diversity.

Less intelligent people, Sternberg continues, tend to fix rigidly on one type of strategy and become stuck in unproductive patterns of behavior. For example, people who persist in trying to change themselves become known as doormats, people who persist in trying to change others become

known as control freaks, and people who persist in trying to change situations become known as quitters.

Explain to teams that other traits influence the key effects listed in figure 3. For example, we point out to teams that people at opposite ends of the conscientiousness dimension tend to conflict with each other constantly, particularly if they also are low in agreeableness. But if they also are high in agreeableness, they probably won't spar as frequently and overtly.

Finally, remind teams that individual differences define us as human beings. In the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Every individual nature has its own beauty."

The Big Five vocabulary enables us to communicate constructively about our personality differences. The model

provides us with a comprehensive source metaphor that celebrates the fullness of human personalities. ■

Jane Howard is director of programs at the Center for Applied Cognitive Studies and **Pierce Howard** is director of research at the center. They can be reached at CentACS, 719 Romany Road, Charlotte NC 28203-4849; phone 800/BIG-5555; e-mail address: centacs@cybernetics.net.

To purchase reprints of this article, please send your order to ASTD Customer Service, 1640 King Street, Box 1443, Alexandria, VA 22313-2043. Use priority code FKM. Single photocopies, at \$10 each, must be prepaid. Bulk orders (50 or more) of custom reprints may be billed. Phone 703/683-8100 for price information.

Team-Building With the FFM

In all teams, both similarities and differences will surface in the personality traits of team members. All kinds of workplace teams can benefit from studying the effects of those similarities and differences. Here are several case studies that illustrate the broad utility of the FFM.

A two-person team of peers. Sandy and Harvey each manage a major division of an automotive manufacturer. Their divisions are located under one roof. Each division has its own manufacturing department, and the two divisions share support departments—human resources, purchasing, and materials handling.

The two general managers must cooperate with one another in managing the support functions. Sandy's division has higher sales but smaller margins, while Harvey's division has lower sales and larger margins. Harvey accuses Sandy of limiting profits through unnecessary spending, and Sandy retorts that Harvey limits growth by excessively tight controls.

We found the key to the dynamics of this relationship: Sandy's high O and moderately low C were interacting with Harvey's low O and moderately high C. In Sandy, we have a flexible explorer who's willing to try innovative methods but who neglects the bottom line. In Harvey, we have a focused preserver who's fixated on

efficiently milking the status quo but who is blind to opportunities for change and growth.

These two managers can learn from one another. Perhaps they could institute a once-a-month "I'll-take-one-of-your-suggestions-and-you-will-take-one-of-mine" session, in which they agree to listen to each other.

Reporting teams. Cesar is president of a highly successful construction conglomerate. Shelly is vice-president of the firm's barely profitable management division. Cesar continually picks at Shelly for failing to meet budgets and deadlines. Shelly, in frustration, responds that the division is performing as well as market conditions permit. Shelly feels that Cesar doesn't trust her, and Cesar is losing confidence in Shelly.

Cesar, it turns out, is a highly introverted (low E) preserver (low O) who focuses on results (high C). Shelly is an outgoing explorer who excels at developing business during an economic upturn. During market downturns, Shelly's high O has no outlet, and her low appetite for efficiency (moderately low C, moderately low N) is exposed.

Cesar needs to find a way to communicate more frequently with Shelly. Both of them must address Shelly's frustration and find ways to focus on the bottom line.

Multiperson team. This team of 16 employees works for a nonprofit organization. At meetings, members talk loudly and compete for control. Little real listening takes place. Side conversations continually crop up within the team. Its members love to brainstorm but lose track of many of their good ideas. Some tend to feel arrogant with respect to the rest of the agency, particularly to what they perceive as sluggish upper management. But most of the team members are uncomfortable with conflict and dread the meetings, at which members frequently wind up accusing, blaming, and intimidating each other.

This team includes many extraverts (high E). They need strict norms on how to conduct meetings. The team also includes an abundance of explorers (high O), who need detailed minutes with follow-up to evaluate suggestions, establish priorities, and assign responsibility for implementation. The high number of adaptive profiles (high A) accounts for the discomfort with conflict—they need to agree to turn every complaint into a plan of action. ("Fix it or accept it.")

The large number of high-C team members explains why these members view others as sluggish. They need to ask for and accept time lines for decisions from top management.