

May 2012

REINVENTING THE APPROACH TO PERSONALITY-TYPE AND ETHICAL IDEOLOGY: A NEW MODEL

Paul Arsenault
West Chester University

Peter F. Oehlers
West Chester University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/cbj>



Part of the Advertising and Promotion Management Commons, Curriculum and Instruction Commons, E-Commerce Commons, Economics Commons, Higher Education Commons, Hospitality Administration and Management Commons, Marketing Commons, Real Estate Commons, Recreation Business Commons, and the Tourism and Travel Commons

Recommended Citation

Arsenault, Paul and Oehlers, Peter F. (2012) "REINVENTING THE APPROACH TO PERSONALITY-TYPE AND ETHICAL IDEOLOGY: A NEW MODEL," *The Coastal Business Journal*: Vol. 11 : No. 1 , Article 4.
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/cbj/vol11/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals and Peer-Reviewed Series at CCU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Coastal Business Journal by an authorized editor of CCU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact commons@coastal.edu.

REINVENTING THE APPROACH TO PERSONALITY-TYPE AND ETHICAL IDEOLOGY: A NEW MODEL

Paul Arsenault, West Chester University, parsenault@wcupa.edu
Peter F. Oehlers, West Chester University, poehlers@wcupa.edu

ABSTRACT

As unethical managerial behavior is increasing, people are looking to understand why. The result has led to a lack of trust in managers. One area being explored is managers' ethical behavior. Based on previous models, the relationship between ethical ideology (idealism & relativism) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is examined. Results show a significant relationship between idealism and the mental function (cognitive style) and dominant auxiliary function of the MBTI. In addition, the most innovative result shows a more salient model by combining ethical ideology and the dominant-auxiliary function. This new model strengthens the relationship between personality type theory and ethical ideology.

Key words: personality-type, ethics, personality, Myers-Briggs type instrument, ethical ideology, idealism, relativism

Business ethics has garnered increased attention in recent years, especially with worsening economic conditions during the past few years. Scandals such as Bernard Madoff's ponzi scheme, Wall Street banking scandals like at AIG and Bear Stearns and the environmental event with British Petroleum have raised concerns about whether there is an ever increasing widespread epidemic of unethical behavior in business organizations. People are suggesting that these incidents are the result of greed, unfair treatment of workers, fraudulent accounting practices and other unethical behaviors. These incidents point significant to why people harbor a declining lack of trust in top executives (Poldolny, 2009).

There are significant costs to unethical behavior. Osland, Kolb, Rubin, & Turner (2007) state the costs can range from loss of revenue due to customer defections, to the decreased ability to borrow money, and even to the termination of careers. There are many reasons for these high costs, but the focus has been the lack of management knowledge of ethics. Many factors have been raised as to why this lack of knowledge exists. One factor has been the reluctance of managers to discuss the ethical aspects of decision-making due to their own lack of training in or awareness of ethics (Bird & Waters, 1989). Another factor is how personal characteristics affect ethical decision-making. Drucker (2007), in his seminal article on managing oneself, emphatically states that an instrumental component of achieving excellence is a personal knowledge of one's own ethics.

Pressure for reducing the frequency of unethical behavior has also been placed on business school curriculums. Podolny (2009) states that he is angry that there is a lack of attention to ethics and value-based literature in these

curriculums. One major reason for not teaching values and ethics is the lack of expertise in the area. Korn and Light (2011) state that in one study conducted by a major university, soft skills subjects such as ethics and decision-making are covered only in 10% to 15% of the classes. The authors go on to state, “Business schools are falling short where it matters most.” (p. B10). The lack of teaching and/or incorporating ethics into the curriculum of business schools has made the general public feel that a business school’s value system is different than theirs, thereby creating distrust (Podolny, 2009).

Therefore, the question arises of how to revamp this curriculum to improve ethical behavior in managers/executives, and hopefully reduce the distrust? One so solution we propose is a better understanding of a person’s ethical behavior. An age-old issue that has been studied for thousands of years, it is an issue that has become even more relevant due to the advancement of neuroscience research. Current research has shown that people’s brains are very different and result in innate differences or, as Eagleman (2011) states, “we cannot presume that everyone is coming to the table equally equipped in terms of drives and behaviors (p. 115)”. Eagleman goes on to say we do not steer our boat as much as we believe, as we are a product of our inaccessible molecular blueprints.

The interest in the molecular blueprint on behavior has increased in the workplace. Caldu and Dreher (2007) suggest, “It has been increasingly accepted that traits, attitudes, and behaviors relevant to the workplace have a genetic component (p. 61). “ This interest has led to acceptance of genetic influence on workplace behavior (Shane, 2010). One of these components, which is a combination of traits, attitudes, and the social and physical environment is personality defined by the American Psychiatric Association (2000) as

“enduring patterns of perceiving, relating to, and thinking about the environment and oneself that are exhibited in a wide range of social and personal contexts (p. 686).”

This study examines the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) as an antecedent of ethical ideology. Past studies using the MBTI have only touched on the dichotomies and mental functions of the instrument, and have not used the more dynamic aspects. This study’s results provide a strong foundation for beginning to understand the importance of an individual’s ethical behavior and for developing business school curriculums that enhance a future management of their ethical decisions.

Ethical Ideology

Ethics is defined as the study and evaluation of decision-making by businesses according to moral concepts and judgments. Ethical questions range from practical, narrowly defined issues, such as a company’s obligation to be honest with its customers, to broader social and philosophical questions, such as a company’s responsibility to preserve the environment and protect employee rights (Columbia Encyclopedia, 2011).

Individuals use different ethical philosophies to respond to ethical questions. This philosophy is operationalized by Forsyth (1980) as an individual's ethical ideology.

Ethical ideology is used to help determine how prepared an individual is to make decisions, and organizations use a number of tools to assess a potential employee's characteristics. Predicting ethical decisions has created a number of ethical decision-making models and theories. Understanding an individual's ethical ideology provides a framework for individuals to consider one's ethical dilemmas (Barnett, et al., 1998). Ethical ideology, or an individual's personal moral philosophy, and its influence on ethical decision-making is found in the Ethical Position Theory (EPT). This theory assumes that a person's idealism and relativism determines his ethical ideology (Forsyth, et al. 2008). EPT also suggests that individuals are intuitive moral philosophers, who base their judgments of right and wrong on a personal ethical position they have developed over a lifetime of experience in confronting and resolving moral issues (Forsyth, et al. 2008, p. 815). Reiter found that Forsyth's taxonomy of idealism and relativism is a well-cited measure in the psychology and management literature (Reiter, 2007, p. 274-275).

The first dimension, idealism, describes the degree to which one believes that favorable outcomes will result from morally appropriate actions (Davis, et al., 2001). More highly idealistic individuals have a significant concern for the welfare of others, while individuals with lower idealism are more pessimistic, believing that ethical acts will result in favorable outcomes for some, and unfavorable outcomes for others (Perri, et al., 2009). The second dimension, relativism, assesses the extent to which one rejects the applicability of a universal moral code. Individuals who are more highly relativistic in their moral philosophy tend to view moral standards as fluid in determining whether an act is ethical or unethical; whereas individuals with a lower degree of relativism believe strongly in absolute moral principles when determining whether an act is ethical or not (Perri, et al., 2009).

The two dimensions – idealism and relativism - are dichotomized and crossed so that they yield a 2 x 2 classification of ethical ideologies. This classification creates four categories for individual moral judgments (As shown in Figure I): 1) Situationalists, 2) Absolutists, 3) Subjectivists, and 4) Exceptionists. Situationalists, who have high idealism and high relativism, reject moral rules and advocate individualistic analysis of each act in each situation. Absolutists, who have high idealism and low relativism, assume that the best possible outcome can always be achieved by following universal moral rules. Subjectivists, who have low idealism and high relativism, make appraisals based on personal values and perspectives rather than universal moral principles. Exceptionists, who have low idealism and low relativism, use moral absolutes to guide judgments but pragmatically, they are open to exceptions to the standards.

These dimensions provide insights into how individuals use information in ethical dilemmas. Since ethical ideology is correlated with ethical judgments (Forsyth and Berger, 1982; Barnett, et al., 1998; Kleiser, et al., 2003; Steenhaut and van Kenhove, 2006) determining antecedents to the formation of ethical ideology creates a better understanding of how different ethical positions relate to decision making.

Figure1. Taxonomy of Ethical Ideologies

Relativism

	High	Low
High	Situationalists	Absolutists
Idealism	Reject moral rules and advocate individualistic analysis of each act in each situation.	Assume that the best possible outcome can always be achieved by following universal moral rules.
Low	Subjectivists Make appraisals based on personal values and perspectives rather than universal moral principles.	Exceptionists Use moral absolutes to guide judgments but pragmatically, they are open to exceptions to the standards.

Source: Barnett, Bass, & Brown, 1994.p. 470.

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

The MBTI was developed from C. J. Jung's theories of psychological type. His mission was to make normal/healthy people's life more understandable and useful by making sense of the world (Myers et. al., 1998). Jung concluded that differences in people's behavior are due to inborn tendencies to use their minds in different ways, which then develop patterns of behavior (Myers, 1998).

Jung's theory defined eight types of behavior. The basis came initially from his observations that there are two types of people, extraverts and introverts (later labeled as attitude). Extraverted people use their psychic energy outwardly to people and events, while introverted people prefer to direct their energy inward

toward thought and actions (Myers et. al., 1998). Later, Jung added that when people's minds are active, they get involved in two mental activities; (1) taking in information (perceiving) and (2) organizing the information to make a decision (judging) (Myers, 1998). He further determined that there were opposite preferences that people perceived (sensing and intuition) and judged (thinking and feeling). Adding the preference of introversion or extraversion now created eight types. Jung eventually labeled these eight types as "functions," with one of these functions (sensing, intuition, thinking or feeling) becoming the dominant function, the one most habitually used. Differences in these mental functions lead to the fundamental differences in people (Myers, 1998).

Myers and Briggs in developing the MBTI added the second attitude, judging-perceiving, built on Jung's auxiliary function that balanced the dominant function. This attitude explains a person's orientation to the world; with judging being a preference for living a planned and organized life, or perceiving, a preference for a flexible and a spontaneous life (Hirsh & Kummerow, 1990). This addition of Myers and Briggs created the sixteen personality types that the MBTI currently includes.

Every one of these sixteen types is a unique dynamic energy system (Myers, 1998). Jung (1971) claimed that these types (i.e., ISFJ, ENTJ, ESTP) are not static boxes, but a multifaceted aspect of personality that enhances the understanding of oneself and of others. The whole type is then seen as greater than the sum of the four preferences (Quenk, 2000). Myers and Briggs (1998) propose that this understanding provides a conscious development path.

Since the inception of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) over 60 years ago, the assessment has grown in popularity. In the 1990's it was reported that over 3 million people a year complete the MBTI (Gardner & Martinko, 1996). Osland, Kolb, Rubin, & Turner (2007) state that the MBTI is the most popular personality assessment in the world. Most importantly, the MBTI is more than a diagnostic tool because it has business, group, educational, and career applications (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2002). It has been used successfully in business research from showing managerial differences in decision-making (Kendall & Carr, 1997) and creative styles (Gryskiewicz & Tullar, 1995), to developing relevant advertising campaigns (LaBarbera & al., 1998). As McCaulley (2000, p. 117) adds, the MBTI sheds light on "basic differences in the ways human beings take in information and make decisions."

The popularity of the MBTI has resulted in some unintended consequences. The major reason for these consequences has been the lack of understanding of type theory. In many cases the interpretation of the MBTI has fallen into the seduction of the measurement mentality instead of using the MBTI as a best-fit type pattern for people (Berens, 1999). Other consequences have not been fully understanding the different dynamics of the MBTI and (2) utilizing the type dynamic theory to its fullest potential by using the dominant-auxiliary characteristics. The following section shows the different ways to view the characteristics of the MBTI.

The Different Characteristics of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

The four building blocks of the MBTI are the preference dichotomies. The dichotomies have two opposite poles with people utilizing both poles on an everyday basis, but preferring to use one more often than the other. This preference is more comfortable and comes naturally to them (Myers, 1996). The example most often used is how a person would describe the difference between writing with their preferred versus their non-preferred hand. Using the preferred hand is effortless and yields more legible results, while using the non-preferred hand is awkward, labored, and produces less legible results. The two core blocks are the sensing-intuition, or the perception preference on receiving information, and the thinking-feeling preference in making decisions.

Stumpf and Mullen (1992) describe perception dichotomy, as how a person prefers to become aware of people, things and events. A person with a preference of sensing primarily uses their five senses to take in information and focus on facts and details. In the intuition preference, people take in information through hunches and impressions. Intuitive preference people have a strong innovative and future orientation and like to find patterns in information (Killen & Williams, 2009).

The thinking and feeling dichotomy has a significant impact on how a person makes decisions, copes with challenges and deals with others (Stumpf & Mullen, 1992). A person with a thinking preference relies on the principles of cause and effect and primarily tends to be objective and impersonal (Kritz & Arsenault, 2004). A person with a feeling preference recognizes the affects on people and is empathetic (Barger & Kirby, 2004). Decision-making is more subjective and is determined by weighing relative values and merits of the issues (Kritz & Arsenault, 2004).

The two other building blocks, or dichotomies, are preferences to the outside world: extraversion or introversion and the relationship with the outside world and, secondly, preferences in how to deal with the outside world: the judging-perceiving dichotomy. As described above, the difference between extraversion and introversion is whether a person focuses their attention and uses their psychic energy with the outside world (extraversion) or whether they prefer to focus this energy on the inner world of ideas and experiences (introversion). People who prefer judging like to organize their lives, be systematic and make plans. People who have a perceiving preference, on the other hand, like to be flexible, like things loose, and are open to change and spontaneity (Myers, 1999).

The mental functions are the combination of the two core building blocks: the perceiving and judging dichotomies. This combination is often called a person's cognitive style (Fleming, 1985) and used the most in research (Myers et. al., 1998 & Gardner & Martinko, 1996).

As shown in Figure II, the mental functions affect how people prefer to focus, handle information, and how they make decisions. For example a person with a ST mental function preference will focus on accuracy and will depend on manuals and published research while a person with a NF preference likes to be unique and

insightful and loves knowledge for self-discovery (Myers et. al., 1998). Therefore, their decisions will differ by what they focus on (facts vs. possibilities) and how they handle this information (objective analysis vs. personal warmth).

Individuals with ST preferences are practical and matter-of-fact in their decision-making. People with a SF preference are friendly and sympathetic, focus on facts and use personal warmth to make decisions while a person having a NF preference is insightful and enthusiastic in their decision-making. NT people have a preference for being logical and ingenious in their decision-making.

Type dynamics is the most comprehensive use of the MBTI by incorporating three dichotomies in an interactive manner. Myers and Kirby (1995) claim that type dynamics show differences and patterns of development originating from the way people use their mental functions in a hierarchy via their orientation to the world (extraversion or introversion). Therefore, it is the richest understanding of psychological type and the MBTI instrument (GS Consultants, 2009) for the following reasons. First, it designates one dominant function that becomes the guiding force of one’s personality (Myers & Kirby, 1995). Second, type dynamics is the basis for one’s motivation (GS Consultants, 2009). And third, it clarifies the dominant-

Figure 2. The Preferences of the Four MBTI Mental Functions

<u>Preferences</u>	<u>ST</u>	<u>SF</u>	<u>NF</u>	<u>NT</u>
Focus Attention On	Facts	Facts	Possibilities	Possibilities
And handle these with	Non-personal analysis	Personal Warmth	Personal Warmth	Non-personal analysis
They tend to become	Practical & matter-of-fact	Sympathetic & friendly	Enthusiastic & insightful	Logical & ingenious

Source: Adapted from I. B. Myers, M. H. McCaulley, N. L. Quenk, & A. L. Hammer, MBTI Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Indicator, 3rd. Edition, 1998.

auxiliary balance between perception and judging, or the eight original Jungian tools (discussed above). The dominant function therefore “gives overall direction to the personality and typically, is the mental tool people rely on the most” (Myers & Kirby, 1995, p. 5).

The difference between using the four mental functions and using type dynamics is a significant one. The mental functions only combine the two dichotomies without taking into consideration how a person directs their mental functions and how the auxiliary balances the dominant function. As Myers and Kirby (1995) propose, this difference in decision-making is that the mental functions do not ensure how people reliably take in information, arrive at decisions and have a trustworthy way to interact with either the external or internal worlds. Examples of this difference are the ISTJ and ENFP types. The preferred decision making difference in the mental functions ST and SF are discussed above, but in a type dynamic scenario the two types are as follows. ISTJ types introvert their dominant sensing function. Consequently, they internally have a profound respect for facts, which they then extravert via thinking (the auxiliary function) in a very logical and tough-minded fashion. People with an ENFP type are innovators by initiating projects and using energy to get them underway. They extravert their intuition (dominant function) and use their feeling function inwardly by making decisions and applying personal values through identifying with others (Myers et. al., 1998).

The dilemma with knowing the importance of type dynamics in decision-making is the lack of attention in research. Gardner and Martinko (1996), after an extensive review of the use of the MBTI to study managers, observed that the type dynamic theory is largely ignored in managerial research. This study includes the type dynamic theory (dominant-auxiliary relationship) along with the dichotomy preference and mental functions in relationship with ethical ideology. The results will indicate which or all these MBTI characteristics are important in understanding the levels of idealism and relativism.

Integrating Ethics and Personality Type

Although few articles have demonstrated a link between personality type and ethics, four articles provide the foundation for this study. Fleming (1985) focuses on the theoretical relationship between functions and ethics, based on the bounded rational decision model. Within the model, his major focus is the development of decision-making criteria from a set of values (personality types), and the step of evaluating alternatives (information gathering and mental processing). From this perspective, Fleming develops a preferred decision cognitive style model in relationship to the Myers-Briggs mental functions as shown in Figure III. For example, the NT decision maker would make a managerial ethical decision based on the good of the company or to avoid government regulation. The SF decision maker would make a managerial ethical decision based on his (her) religious convictions or personal code of ethics.

Figure 3. Preferred Decision Cognitive Style Model

(T) Thinking

ST

| NT

	Legal Systems	For the good of the Company	
	Audits	To Avoid Government Regulation	
	Corporate Policy		
	Code of Ethics	To Increase the Efficiency of the Economy	
	Philosophical Precepts		
(S)	SF	NF	(N)
Sensation			Intuition
	Religious Convictions	Conscience	
	Personal Code of Ethics	Personal Integrity	
	Ethical Leader	Increase Employee Morale	
	Stakeholder Requirements	Tradition	
(F) Feeling			

Source: Fleming, J. 1985, p. 141

McIntyre and Capin (1993) and McIntyre, et al (1995) take Fleming's recommendation and empirically study the relationship between cognitive style and ethical issues. In 1993, McIntyre and Capin examined different cognitive styles to determine if each style analyzes the ethical question in a given scenario. The study found that the cognitive style differed significantly in the perception of ethical questions. People with a preference for NF were more prone to consider ethical questions than either people with a preference for ST or NT.

McIntyre et al (1995) hypothesized that the perceiving dichotomy (sensing-feeling) and the judging dichotomy (thinking-feeling) would affect both the person's level of idealism and relativism. Utilizing a path analysis, the authors found only a significant effect of the judging preference in relativism but not idealism. There were no significant differences for either idealism or relativism by the perceiving dichotomy. Therefore, people with a preference for sensing are less tolerant for "rule bending" or "rule breaking" than people with a preference for intuition (Sensing-Intuition). Within the thinking-feeling dichotomy, people with a preference for thinking are more tolerant about "rule bending" and likely to reject universal moral rules than people with a feeling preference.

Barnett, Bass and Brown (1994) based on Forsyth's (1980) ethical ideology framework examine idealism and relativism at high and low levels in the context of ethical business decisions. The categories are presented in Figure I. The authors find that an individual's ethical ideology is significantly related to his / her ethical judgments. By separating individuals into the four categories of high and low idealism and relativism, different groups make different ethical judgments. For example, most absolutists (high idealism-low relativism) are stricter in their ethical judgments than situationalists (high idealism-low relativism), subjectivists (low idealism-low relativism), and exceptionists (low idealism-low relativism).

Based on the studies, the first four hypotheses examine the dichotomies of perceiving (sensing-intuition) and judging (thinking-feeling).

H1: An individual's level of idealism is not related to his/her perceiving dichotomy.

H2: An individual's level of relativism is not related to his/her perceiving dichotomy.

H3: An individual's level of idealism is not related to his/her judging dichotomy.

H4: An individual's level of relativism is not related to his/her judging dichotomy.

Further, the relationship between mental function type and ethical ideology is examined. Based on Fleming's model, the mental function type is expected to be related to an individual's total level of idealism and relativism.

H5: An individual's level of idealism is not related to his/her mental function.

H6: An individual's level of relativism is not related to his/her mental function.

Finally, an individual's dominant function and the dominant-auxiliary function is expected to be related to an individual's ethical ideology.

H7: An individual's level of idealism is not related to his/her dominant function

H8: An individual's level of relativism is not related to his/her dominant function

H9: An individual's level of idealism is not related to his/her dominant function and auxiliary function

H10: An individual's level of relativism is not related to his/her dominant function and auxiliary function

METHODOLOGY

Sample

A total of 295 people responded to the survey in business classes in a northeast university. The vast majority of these respondents were business and pre-business majors. Females represented 65% of the sample and almost 66% of the respondents were 23 and younger.

In addition, the break-up of the sample by the four dichotomies and mental functions are shown in Table I. According to the MBTI national representative sample (Myers et al., 1998), the results coincide with the thinking-feeling national sample (60-40%, thinking-feeling) but there is a skew in the results for the sensing-intuition with the national sample. This is probably due to the finding that people with intuitive preferences choose business-related majors such as human resource management, and go on to become management analysts and consultants. Support for this finding is shown in a national type distribution study by the Center for Application of Personality Types (1998) where human resource and management analysts are more likely to have a preference for intuition (62% and 67%, respectively, versus 63% in our results). The skew of people who have a preference for the NF mental function is probably due to the claim that females being more likely to have a feeling preference (75%) as shown in the national representative sample (Myers, et al., 1998).

Survey Instruments

The Ethical Position Questionnaire (Forsyth, 1982) was used in this study. It measures the two dimensions of ethical ideology, idealism and relativism. This questionnaire has been found to have consistent internal validity and to be well established (Davis, et al., 2001). Two subscales are included in the questionnaire with ten questions for each dimension. Each scale asks questions related to idealism and relativism, respectively, with Likert responses of 1 (completely disagree) to 9 (completely agree). Therefore, a total idealism and relativism score can range from 10 to 90. (See Appendix A for complete version of questionnaire.)

We used the Form M of the MBTI in this study. This form has 93 items comprised of word-pair and phrase questions. Scoring to determine their type was completed by template. Each respondent received a description of their type from the Introduction to Type and Organization by Hirsch and Kummerow (2003). In addition, each respondent was given contact information for one of the authors if they had any questions or comments regarding their type.

Results

The results for H1, H2, H3 and H4 indicate there is no significant difference between the dichotomies, or idealism and relativism. The analysis for the first four hypotheses of the specific characteristics of thinking and feeling and sensing and intuiting are shown in Table II.

TABLE I

Descriptive Statistics

Gender

Male	123	35%
Female	172	65%

Age

Less than 23	194	65.8%
23 or more	89	30.2%
Not reported	12	4.1%

Dichotomies by Characteristics

Thinking	121	41.0%
Feeling	174	59.0%
Sensing	108	36.6%
Intuition	187	63.4%

By Mental Functions

NT	60	20.3%
----	----	-------

ST	47	15.9%
SF	61	20.7%
NF	127	43.1%

TABLE 2

ANOVA results for H1 – H4

Thinking / Feeling Dichotomy

		F	p-value
Idealism	1.108	0.293	
Relativism	1.189	0.276	

Sensing / Intuition Dichotomy

		F	p-value
Idealism	0.554	0.457	
Relativism	0.116	0.734	

The ANOVA results presented in Table III indicate a significant relationship between idealism and function type with an F score of 7.088 (p value = 0.000), but do not support relativism and function type. Therefore H5 is supported, but H6 is not. The significant differences for idealism are found between the NT and ST and the NF and SF mental functions. Using the Tukey HSD for all comparisons, the test reveals that the NT ($M=57.13$) and ST ($M=60.13$) were significantly ($p < .05$) lower in total idealism scores than the NF ($M=65.06$) and SF ($M=66.80$) scores. These results partially support Fleming's theoretical framework for the relationship between ethics and personality type.

TABLE 3

ANOVA Results for H5 & H6

		F	p-value
Idealism	7.088	0.000	
Relativism	0.355	0.786	

When analyzing the dominant characteristic for H7 and H8, there is a significant relationship between the dominant type and idealism ($F = 4.517$, $p < 0.004$), while relativism is not found to be statistically significant. The significant differences between the dominant types are associated with thinking (ISTP, INTP, ESTJ & ENTJ) and the other three dominant function types. Using the Tukey HSD for all comparisons, the dominant thinking mean for total idealism of 57.52 is significantly ($p < .05$) lower than the dominant means for sensing ($M = 64.70$), intuition ($M = 63.23$) and feeling ($M = 65.59$).

For the last 2 hypotheses (H9 & H10), a multiple ANOVA was run, analyzing dominant and auxiliary functions. The results are shown in Table IV where the dominant function is significant for idealism but not for relativism. The auxiliary function is not significant for relativism or idealism. The use of the dominant function alone results in an r squared of 0.044, when the auxiliary function is added to the model, r squared increases to 0.148, which strengthens the case for the use of both the dominant and auxiliary functions.

Probably the most important and interesting result is the non-significance of the interaction between the dominant and auxiliary types. The balance provided by the auxiliary function on the dominant function creates a new way to analyze personality type with Forsyth's Taxonomy of ethical ideologies. Figure IV shows the new model with how the dominant/auxiliary types fit into the taxonomy of ethical ideologies. The results above indicate that a deeper understanding of one's MBTI type is paramount in order to teach or explain ethics. Previous studies such as Fleming (1985) and McIntyre et al. (1993 & 1995) did not do this therefore missing the richness of the MBTI.

TABLE 4

ANOVA results for Dominant/Auxiliary Function

By Dominant Function

		F	p-value
Idealism	4.685	0.003	
Relativism	1.570	0.197	

By Auxiliary Function

		F	p-value
Idealism	1.877	0.134	
Relativism	0.861	0.462	

Interaction between Dominant Function and Auxiliary Function

		F	p-value
Idealism	0.635	0.531	
Relativism	0.274	0.761	

Figure 4. Ethical Ideology by Dominant and Auxiliary Functions

Relativism

High

Low

	<i>SITUATIONALISTS</i>	<i>ABSOLUTISTS</i>
High	Dom F: Aux S	Dom F: Aux N
	Dom N: Aux F	Dom S: Aux F
		Dom S: Aux T
Idealism	<i>SUBJECTIVISTS</i>	<i>EXCEPTIONALISTS</i>
	Dom N: Aux T	Dom T: Aux N
Low	Dom T: Aux S	

Dom = Dominant; Aux = Auxiliary

DISCUSSION

Idealism was significant with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) mental functions, dominant and dominant-auxiliary characteristics. This significance was driven by the thinking-feeling dichotomy, or how one prefers to make a decision, in combination with the sensing-intuition dichotomy (mental function). It was further driven by their interaction with the extraversion-introversion attitude with eight mental functions (dominant-auxiliary).

Overall, the results met our expectations that a more in-depth personality type analysis needs to be used when relating to ethical ideology. Our study has extended Fleming's model, which asserts that mental functions differently influence ethical decision-making, by integrating Jung's original type theory (dominant-auxiliary) with ethical ideology. Further, we have demonstrated a link between the dominant-auxiliary characteristic with Forsyth's four ethical ideologies, and have thereby created a new model to analyze this relationship.

Implications

When a final ethical decision has to be made, it will generally be one that is congruent with a person's dominant personality function and ethical ideology. This relationship is crucial in business managers who regularly face ethical decisions that require ethical behavior. When encountering an ethical situation, managers who know their personality type in relationship to their ethical ideology are more likely to understand the consequences of their choice.

For example, a management entity is faced with having to choose whether or not to do regular maintenance on an oilrig in an environmentally sensitive area. The ethical decision is whether to continually maintain the equipment on a regulated basis, or to save money for the company and thereby improve profitability by "cutting corners" with less frequent maintenance. From the results of this study, managers with a dominant T (i.e., ISTP & ESTJ) are more likely to be exceptionists, and will tend to violate ethical rules to circumvent negative consequences by saving money for the company. This is important to know because people who have a dominant T preference appear in national MBTI samples to be twice as likely to hold managerial positions. In a sample of managers, dominant T people represent almost 40% (38.9%) of the sample (Osborne, Osborne & Twilman, 1996) while representing about 20% (19.2%) of a total national sample (Myers et al., 1998).

Given this predominance of dominant T and exceptionists in management and business schools (both graduate and undergraduate), strategies need to be developed to help prepare an individual in understanding the foundations of their ethical decision-making criteria.

Another example comes from an award-winning article by Clayton Christensen (2010) where he discusses an ethical dilemma about playing a crucial basketball game on a Sunday. As a deeply religious person, he chooses not to play in this game because of his moral convictions. This example suggests Christensen is an absolutist and is either a dominant S, auxiliary F or T or dominant F, auxiliary N MBTI types because he believes he can achieve a positive outcome by following universal moral rules. Further, Fleming's original model reinforces this suggestion that Christensen has a dominant S type because of his religious convictions and personal code of ethics (See Figure III for further information).

Corporations can use their information systems to frame decisions based on a manager's personality type, information processing and ethical ideology. Corporate information systems, as the primary source of information received, can be adapted based on personality type and the related ethical ideology to help an individual recognize potential consequences. A manager who is an exceptionist might have a decision support system that can generate a list of possible consequences for consideration and the corporate policies that relate to those decisions. An absolutist will not require the same level of information, as he will only approve actions with positive consequences for all, and will conform to absolute moral principles.

This study highlights the salient role of the MBTI type dynamics in understanding personality dynamics. By the same token, it demonstrates the possibly harmful results of not understanding personality dynamics. Given the global use of this instrument in many capacities, the insight into type dynamics can create additional

value for the individual and the organization. This study helps to spur this discussion by illustrating that a type dynamic approach is more effective than the less interactive mental function/cognitive style approach.

The implications for business school curriculums and organizational training programs are wide reaching. One is that the relationship between innate characteristics, like personality type and ethical ideology, is inseparable from the foundation for teaching ethics. Therefore the inclusion of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is essential. This claim can be further applied as a foundation for other areas like communication and leadership, leading to a personalized development plan (Arsenault, 2003). The second implication is that type dynamics should be an integrated focus in explaining one's MBTI type. To accomplish this, teachers/trainers need to have a more complete understanding of type dynamics. The third implication touches on the organizational impact. While we cannot change the science of the brain, a deeper understanding of how it works can help managers adapt to basic differences of their peers and subordinates. Through the use of the MBTI, managers now have insight into how their colleagues make decisions, interact with others, and communicate. This knowledge should in turn create more trust.

This study creates vast opportunities to further examine the relationship between personality type and ethical ideology. One is to use a more diverse population. For example, including people of different age categories allows a researcher to examine sociological influences such as generational differences and psychological influences by type development patterns which change as ones gets older, as postulated by Jung (Myers & Kirby, 1994). Ethical scenarios to measure ethical behavior are another area of research. These allow for an examination of casual relationships between personality type, ethical ideology and ethical decision-making. Another area of study is the impact of other innate characteristics like gender and the more recent genetic discoveries.

CONCLUSION

This study has provided new insight into an age-old analysis of ethics, a continuous problem in business. It advances the discussion to a broader and more complex analysis of the relationship between individual preference and ethics. A revised model is provided to further this discussion and its implication for improving educational and training procedures.

REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association (2000). *Diagnostic and Statistical manual of mental disorders*, (4th ed). Washington, DC: Author.

- Arsenault, P. (2003). Leadership Assessment and Development: Recommendations for a New Assessment Model. In R. Riggio & S. Orr (Eds.), *Improving Leadership in Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 252-266.
- Barger N. J. & Kirby, L. K. (2004). *The Challenge of Change in Organizations: Helping Employees thrive in the new Frontier*. Mountain View, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press, Inc.
- Barnett, T., Bass, K., & Brown, G.. (1994) Ethical Ideology and the Ethical Judgments in Business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13, 469-480.
- Barnett, T., Bass, K., Brown, G. & Hebert, F. (1998) Ethical Ideology and the Ethical Judgments of Marketing Professionals. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17, 715-723.
- Berens, L. V. (1999). *Dynamics of Personality Type: Understanding and Applying Jung's Cognitive Processes*. Huntington Beach, CA.; Telos Publications.
- Bird, F. & Waters, B. (1989). The Moral Muteness of Managers. *The California Management Review*, 32(1), 73-88.
- Caldu, X., & Drehur, J. (2007). Hormonal and genetic influences on processing reward and social information. *Annals of New York Academy of Sciences*, 118, 43-73.
- Center for Application Type (1998). *CAPT Databank*.
- Cohen, R. J. & Swerdilik, M. E. (2002). *Psychological Testing and Assessment: An Introduction to Tests and Measurement*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Christensen, C. M. (2010). How Will You Measure Your Life? *Harvard Business Review* (July/August) 46-51.
- Davis, M., Anderson, M. & Curtis, M. (2001) Measuring Ethical Ideology in Business Ethics: A Critical Analysis of the Ethics Position Questionnaire. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 32, 35-53.
- Drucker, P. (2007). "Managing Oneself." *The Essential Guide to Leadership* (pp. 15-30) Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review.
- Eagleman, D. (2011). The Brain on Trial. *The Atlantic* 30 (1), 112-122.
- Fleming, J. (1985) A Suggested Approach to Linking Decision Styles with Business Ethics *Journal of Business Ethics* 4, 137-144.

- Forsyth, D. (1980) A Taxonomy of Ethical Ideologies *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39 (1), 175-184.
- Forsyth, D. & Berger, R. (1982) The Effects of Ethical Ideology on Moral Behavior *The Journal of Social Psychology* 117, 53-56.
- Forsyth, D., O'Boyle, E. & McDaniel, M.. (2008) East Meets West: A Meta-Analytic Investigation of Cultural Variations in Idealism and Relativism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83, 813-833.
- Gardner, W, L. & Martinko, M. J. (1996). Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to Study Managers: A Literature Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management* 22 (1) 45-83.
- Gryskiewicz, N. D. & Tullar W. L. (1995). "The Relationship Between Personality Type and Creativity Style Among Managers." *Journal of Psychological Type*, 32, 30-35.
- GS Consultants (2009). *MBTI Certification Program for Educators and Career Counselors*; Lake Tahoe, NV.
- Hirsch, S. K. & Kummerow, J. (2003). *Introduction to type in organizations* (4th, ed.) Mountain View, CA: Davies-Black.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological Types*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kendall, B. & Carr, S. (1997) Using the MBTI with management simulations. In C.
- Fitzgerald & L. K. Kirby (Eds.), *Developing leaders: Research and applications in psychological type and leadership behavior* (pp 361-380). Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Killen, D. & Williams, G.. (2009). *Introduction to Type and Innovation*. Mountain View CA: CPP, Inc.
- Kleiser, S., Sivadas, E. Kellaris, J. & Dahlstrom, R. (2003) Ethical Ideologies: Efficient Assessment and Influence on Ethical Judgments of Marketing Practices. *Psychology & Marketing* 20 (1), 1-21.
- Korn, M. & Light J. (June 7, 2011). "On the Lesson Plan: "Soft Skills" Business Courses Aim to Prepare Students for Management Roles". *Wall Street Journal*; (B8 & 10).
- Kritz, G. & Arsenault, P. (2004). An exploratory investigation of the influence of extraversion on brand attitude formation. *Proceedings of Marketing in the Century Ahead, The Atlantic Marketing Association Conference*, 488-497.
- LaBarbera, P. A., Weingard, P., & Yorkston, E. A. (1998). "Matching the Message to the Mind: Advertising Imagery and Consumer processing Styles." *Journal of Advertising Research*. (September/October), 29-43.
- McIntyre, R and Capen, M. (1993) A Cognitive Type Perspective on Ethical Questions *Journal of Business Ethics* 12, 629 – 634.
- McIntyre, R., Capen, M., and Minton, A. (1995) Exploring the Psychological Foundations of Ethical Positions in Marketing *Psychology & Marketing* 12 (6) 569 – 584.
- Myers, I. B. (1998). *Introduction to Type*, 6th Ed. Mountain View: CA; CPP, Inc.

Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L. & Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI Manual: a guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs type indicator*. 3rd Ed. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Myers, K. & Kirby, L. (1995). *Introduction to Type: Dynamics and Development*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Osborn, T. N., Osborn, D. B. & Twillman, B. (1996). MBTI, FIRO-B and NAFTA: Psychological Profiles of Not-So-Distant Business Neighbors. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 36, 3-15.

Osland, J. S., Kolb, D. A., Rubin, I. M., & Turner, M. E. (2007). *Organizational Behavior: An experiential approach*, 8th Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Perri, D. Callanan, G., Rotenberry, P. & Oehlers, P. (2009) Education and Training in Ethical Decision Making: Comparing Context and Orientation *Education and Training* 51 (1): 70-83.

Podolny, J. M. (2009). The Buck Stops (and Starts) at Business School. *Harvard Business Review*. (June); 62-67.

Quenk, N. L. (2000). *Essentials of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Assessment*. New York: Wiley & Sons.

Reiter, N. (2007) Work Life Balance: What DO You Mean? *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 43 (2), 273-294.

Shane S. (2010). *Born Entrepreneurs, Born Leaders: How Your Genes Affect Your Work Life*. New York: Oxford Press.

Stumpf, S. A. & Mullen, T. P. (1992). *Taking Charge: Strategic Leadership in the Middle Game*. Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Steenhaut, S. & van Kenhove. P. (2006) An Empirical Investigation of the Relationships among a Consumer's Personal Values, Ethical Ideology and Ethical Beliefs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 64, 137-155.

Quenk, N. L. (2000). *Essentials of Myers-Briggs Indicator Instrument*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; New York: New York.

APPENDIX: THE ETHICAL POSITION QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL BELIEFS

NAME & ID _____

Instructions: Below is a series of statements designed to allow you to indicate the extent of which you agree with each statement. In answering, use the following response scale and write the number corresponding to your level of agreement with each statement in the space provided beside that statement.

Completely Largely Moderately Slightly Neither agree Slightly Moderately Largely Completely
disagree disagree disagree disagree nor disagree agree agree agree agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

- _____ 1. A person should make certain that their actions never intentionally harm another even to a small degree.
- _____ 2. Risks to another should never be tolerated, irrespective of how small the risks might be.
- _____ 3. The existence of potential harm to others is always wrong, irrespective of the benefits to be gained.
- _____ 4. One should never psychologically or physically harm another person.
- _____ 5. One should not perform an action which might in any way threaten the dignity and welfare of another individual.
- _____ 6. If an action could harm an innocent other, it should not be taken.

- _____ 7. Deciding whether or not to perform an act by balancing the positive consequences of the act against the negative consequences of the act is immoral.
- _____ 8. The dignity and welfare of people should be the most important concern in any society.
- _____ 9. It is never necessary to sacrifice the welfare of others.
- _____ 10. Moral actions are those which closely match the ideals of the most “perfect” action.
- _____ 11. There are no ethical principles that are so important that they should be a part of any code of ethics.
- _____ 12. What is ethical varies from one situation to another.
- _____ 13. Moral standards should be seen as being individualistic; what one person considers to be moral may be judged to be immoral by another person.
- _____ 14. Different types of moralities cannot be compared to “rightness.”
- _____ 15. Questions of what is ethical for everyone can never be resolved since what is moral or immoral is up to the individual.
- _____ 16. Moral standards are simple personal rules which indicate how a person should behave, and are not to applied in making judgments of others.
- _____ 17. Ethical considerations in interpersonal relations are so complex that individuals should be allowed to formulate their own individual codes.
- _____ 18. Rigidly codifying an ethical option that prevents certain types of actions could stand in the way of better human relations and adjustments.
- _____ 19. No rule concerning lying can be formulated; whether a lie is permissible or not permissible totally depends upon the situation.

____ 20. Whether a lie is judged to be moral or immoral depends upon the circumstances surrounding the action.

Adapted from Forsyth, D. 1980. A taxonomy of ethical ideologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39(1):175-184.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Peter Oehlers is an Associate Professor of Accounting at West Chester University. He received his DBA from Louisiana Tech University and is a CPA and a CMA. His research interests are in the areas of ethical ideology, identity theft, and cost allocation.

Paul Arsenault is the Chair and Professor of Marketing at West Chester University. He received a Ph.D. from Temple University in Psychology. His research interests are in the areas of personality, leadership, innovation and consumer behavior.

