

MBTI® Step II Results of Community Leaders: Differences and Similarities of Caucasian, Hispanic and American Indian Leaders

Jean M. Kummerow, Nicole Krause, & Nancy Schaubhut
CPP, Inc.

Community leaders from small towns and reservations in the state of Minnesota took the MBTI Step II instrument as part of an eight day leadership training program. Results were available on Caucasian (N = 1078), American Indian (N = 152) and Hispanic (N = 25) participants. The modal type for all three groups was ENFP although there were participants from each of the sixteen types. The least frequent type for Caucasians was ISFP; for American Indians, INTP, and for Hispanics, INTJ, INFJ and ISFP. Only one type, ISFP, showed significant differences when ethnic group comparisons were made using SSRs; American Indians were more likely ISFP than Caucasians. Facet results were also quite diverse with all categories of Step II facet scores (right pole, midzone and left pole) represented on every facet. Over 50% of the participants in all three ethnic groups endorsed the Initiating, Expressive, Active, and Planful facet poles. Over 50% of the Caucasians also endorsed the Gregarious and Logical facet poles. The Enthusiastic pole was chosen by more than 50% of the Caucasians and Hispanics. More than 50% of the American Indians and Hispanics endorsed the Experiential pole. Very few statistical differences were apparent between Step II facet results of the ethnic groups. Caucasians scored more toward Logical than American Indians. American Indians scored more toward Casual than Caucasians. Hispanics scored more Accommodating than either Caucasians or American Indians. Community leaders appear to have a great deal in common with one another as well as a diversity of styles.

The mission of the Blandin Foundation in Grand Rapids, Minnesota is to strengthen rural communities in the state, and particularly their home community. One route to doing so is to develop local leadership in those communities. Since 1985, the Foundation has been offering a Community Leadership Program to communities who apply to participate. Since 2000, a version of the program has been offered explicitly to Reservation Community Leaders. The program focuses on using three core competencies to develop healthy communities: Framing, Developing Social Capital and Mobilization. The intervention is a five day retreat followed three months later by a two day workshop; it closes with a one day workshop about six months after the original

retreat. Twenty-four community members at a time are chosen by the local community to be delegates; if the community is too small to supply 24, communities are clustered together geographically. The program has received outstanding evaluations from external evaluators throughout its history. Communities and individuals are strengthened as a result of participation. For more information on the program go to www.blandinfoundation.org. and see the book *Handbook for Community Leadership* (Krile, 2006).

One competency of the program is developing social capital—the “value” invested in the relationships between people. A part of social capital is an individual’s personality style. Understanding that style and those of others can help people

develop social capital and take advantage of strong ties (those whom the person knows well and who often see the world in a similar way) and of weak ties (those whom the person does not know well, but who may bring in some differences). The MBTI® tool is a natural to help people understand themselves and others and take advantage of both their strong and weak ties. Since 2004, the Step II version has been used, in part because so many participants are already familiar with Step I results.

All participants take Step II through the Skillsone website. They also receive “homework” that involves reading/reviewing *Introduction to Type® in Organizations* so that they arrive with some familiarity with type concepts and also a self-assessment of their type. The nearly three hour module delivering Step II uses the PowerPoint slides from *Working with MBTI Step II Results* (Kummerow & Quenk, 2005) with some modifications, examples, activities and hand-outs appropriate to community leadership. Each participant also meets one-on-one with a “coach” for 1 ½ hours during that week where individual questions on type are answered, applications of type to community leadership are discussed, and an additional description of their “best fit” type is given. This is the one page copy of their type description from *Introduction to Type* (Myers & Kirby, 2005). The Foundation has a license from CPP to reproduce those pages.

For those unfamiliar with Step II, it is available from Form Q of the MBTI questionnaire (Quenk et al, 2001). Clients are not only scored for their Step I preferences, but also for twenty facets (five per dichotomy) of

how they express those preferences. Each facet represents a specific “behavioral expression” of the type preference. Names are assigned to the two poles to capture that behavioral expression. Just like Step I results, Step II results also have no “good” or “bad” connotations. Scores are presented in three categories: left pole (scores of 2-5) toward E, S, T, and J facet poles; right pole (scores of 2-5) toward I, N, F, and P facet poles; and midzone (scores of 0 or 1 to either side of the midpoint) which represent no clear preference for a pole and a situational use of either pole depending on circumstances. Table 1 is an overview of the facets.

An additional unique feature of Step II is its expanded decision-making styles section. The first two facets on Thinking-Feeling represent the ideal and actual decision-making styles. While respondents still have a Thinking or a Feeling preference overall, six possible expressions emerge on Step II: (1) Logical (T) – Reasonable (T); (2) Empathetic (F) – Compassionate (F); (3) Empathetic (F) – Reasonable (T); (4) Logical (T) – Compassionate (F); (5) Midzone with underlying Feeling; and (6) Midzone with underlying Thinking.

Participants in the Blandin Community Leadership Program from January 2004 through November 2007 are included in this analysis. The sample includes not only program delegates but those on the alternate list in case the delegate drops out. Alternates easily substitute for the delegates. The sample ranges in age from 20-80; most are ages 35-55. The aim is to have equal male and female participation, although at this point there are more females in the sample

since more women apply and are on the alternate replacement list; there are 614 men and 682 women in the sample. Wide varieties of educational levels also are present; most have at least some college education, but a few have not graduated from high school and a few more have doctorates. Delegates represent a wide variety of occupations including executives, homemakers, postal carriers, bankers, city employees, teachers, ministers, construction workers, store clerks, farmers, doctors, small business owners, etc. Very few hold elected public office since community leadership is much broader than governmental positions. Foundation staff members are also included in the sample since their Step II records are on the Skillsone site; they are encouraged to participate in their communities and they do!

Participants are invited to indicate their ethnicity on the Skillsone site, and most do. The Foundation also maintains records with ethnicity. These lists were cross checked so that all those who indicated membership in Hispanic and American Indian groups are included. There were not enough participants from African American and other ethnic groups to analyze separately. Rural Minnesota, while it is diversifying, still has a rather homogenous population. Thus Step IIs are available on the ethnic groups of 1078 Caucasians, 152 American Indians, and 25 Hispanics, as well as the overall sample of 1302. The majority of the American Indians in this sample are Ojibwe (Chippewa), although the Sioux (Dakota) are also represented.

CPP Research Staff analyzed the data. They provided overall type information, information on the facets and out of preference results, and the decision-making styles. They compared the results of three groups: Caucasians, Hispanics and American Indians.

Self-selection ratios were calculated to compare the frequency of American Indians to Caucasians in each of the types. Tests of statistical significance were available only in cases where five or more participants were available in a type category; subsequently, Hispanics were not included in this analysis and two types, i.e., INFJ and INTP, were excluded in the comparison between American Indians and Caucasians. To examine mean differences on facet scores and decision-making styles, univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were calculated.

When available, the data from the US national sample upon which the Step II instrument was derived is included (Quenk et al, 2001); that sample represents the best "general population" sample we have available. Because of the way that data was collected and stored, statistical analyses using that data for comparison purposes were not conducted. However, one cannot help but note some differences (using the "eyeballing" technique) between that sample and the facet results of the community leaders.

Table 2 indicates both the overall types of the participants and their ethnic group identification. There is a good representation of all the types underscoring the belief that community leaders come with all types of personalities. Community leadership, however, is more

attractive to some types than to others. The overall modal type as well as for each ethnic group is ENFP. This type is often described as interested in possibilities for people, and this leadership program certainly provides it. The least frequent type overall and for Caucasians is ISFP. The least frequent type for the American Indian group is INTP. For the Hispanics, three types do not appear: ISFP, INTJ, and INFJ. Self-selection ratios calculated for American Indians and Caucasians revealed significantly more American Indians who are ISFP than in the comparison group of Caucasians. No other types showed any statistically significant results between ethnic groups.

Table 3 provides the average scores on each of the twenty facets for each of the ethnic comparison groups plus the US national sample. You'll note that in general the four columns related to the community leaders are remarkably similar. Greater differences are apparent between the US national (general) sample and the community leaders regardless of ethnicity.

As shown in Table 4, significant differences were found among the groups for three of the 20 facets at the $p < .05$ level. In addition to showing the mean scores of the significant differences, the percentage of respondents scoring toward the left pole, the midzone and the right pole are shown.

Significant mean differences were found between American Indians and Caucasians on the Logical-Empathetic facet; the analysis of the results shows that Caucasians scored significantly more toward the Logical

side than the American Indians who also scored, on the average, toward that pole. Looking at the placement of scores, 51.6% of the Caucasians score toward the left or Logical pole compared with 38.2% of the American Indians. The American Indians score 35.5% at the midzone compared with 22.4% of the Caucasians. They both score nearly equally toward the right pole of Empathetic. Cultural descriptions of Caucasians in North America often include an emphasis on objective, rational, linear thinking (Sue and Sue, 1990). Their greater scores in that direction seem to reflect this pattern.

There is also a significant mean difference between these two groups on the Systematic-Casual facet. Caucasians score toward the left or Systematic pole and the midzone while American Indians score toward the right or Casual pole more than the other two placement categories. Over 42% of the American Indian pole score toward Casual, compared with just over 30% of the Caucasians. Over 40% of the Caucasians score toward Systematic, while the American Indians have over 33% in that category. There is an American Indian saying, "There are two plans for every day. There's my plan and then there's the mystery's plans." Perhaps this is reflective of the Casual pole.

In addition, significant mean differences were found between American Indians and Hispanics and Caucasians and Hispanics on the Questioning-Accommodating facet. American Indians score the most toward Questioning and Hispanics, the most toward Accommodating. Over 48% of the Hispanics score toward Accommodating and only

16% toward Questioning. Again, cultural studies suggest that Hispanics value harmony with family (Sue and Sue, 1990) and perhaps by extension here with community, and thus favor an Accommodating stance.

Examining the categories of the facet results (left pole, midzone and right pole), it appears that community leaders have a lot in common with one another even when their ethnicity is different. Although we are not presenting the data in this paper, every facet category on every facet for every ethnic group is represented in our sample; again community leaders express their personalities in a variety of ways. The most frequently occurring result for Caucasians is 60.3% in the Initiating category and the least frequent, 21.2% in the Critical category. For American Indians, the most frequent is 53.5% Active and Experiential and the least frequent category, 19.1% Reflective. For Hispanics, 56.5% are in the Planful category and only 16% in the Contained and Questioning categories.

Table 5 indicates the facets which were endorsed by over 50% of any of the groups. The majority of participants in all three ethnic groups endorsed Initiating, Expressive, Active, and Planful categories. These are characteristics we likely associate with community leaders. They initiate social interactions, express themselves out loud, value face to face interactions (think of the meetings they attend), and plan their leisure activities (which often include community volunteer efforts). Those characteristics unique to Caucasians include Gregarious and Logical. It is probable that Caucasians join more formal community groups, whereas

the relationships more likely develop for Hispanics and American Indians through family and tribal groups. We've discussed above the Caucasian culture's bent toward Logical. The Enthusiastic pole was chosen more by Caucasians and Hispanics, two cultures that often show their enthusiasm through outward energy. The American Indians and Hispanics endorsed the Experiential pole suggesting perhaps that hands-on learning was their preferred style.

Another way of studying the community leaders is through examining the facets that are out-of-preference. Out-of-preference means that the underlying preference is on the opposite side of the facet result, for example an Introvert who is Expressive. Typically Introverts score on the Contained side, but on Step II it is possible to have a score on the opposite side of one's preference. Out-of-preference scores may be indications of the development of behaviors related to the preference that is less preferred by the individual; the opposite facet category from what would be "expected" is endorsed. Setting an arbitrary cut score of 12%, we examined the results for out-of-preference facets in all of the groups including the general population sample. As shown in Table 6, the pattern of out-of-preference results is not always the same as that of the US national sample. However, when community leaders of different ethnicities are out-of-preference, it is often on the same facet and in similar amounts. More Introverted community leaders seem to have developed (or at least endorse) Extraverted facets, particularly related to the Expressive and Active styles of communication. More Sensing

community leaders seem to be using their Original and Conceptual sides. Thinking Types who are community leaders often are using their Accommodating and Accepting sides, perhaps indicating a desire for harmony and an openness to different ideas. Feeling community leaders often develop their Questioning side. It appears that many Judging types in community work wait for their Pressure-prompted part to move them to action. Many Perceiving types seem to have developed some Methodical ways of handling their projects.

Table 7 indicates the decision-making styles of the various groups. For a point of comparison, data from the US national (general) sample is included. The community leadership groups are more similar to one another at least in the Logical-Reasonable and Empathetic-Compassionate styles than to the US national sample. When mean comparisons were made between American Indians, Caucasians, and Hispanics, no significant differences were found.

Limitations of the study include a very small sample of Hispanics as well as a potentially narrow range of leadership, in that these are community leaders in one particular geographic location, the state of Minnesota. It would be interesting to compare these leaders with those in organizational settings.

Results of the study suggest that individuals who participate in the Blandin Community Leadership Program appear remarkably similar to one another both in the diversity of types and facets they have as well as in more frequent types and patterns

of facet responses. Significant differences were found between ethnic groups on only three of the twenty facets and no significant differences were found on the six decision-making styles. Caucasian leaders score more toward Logical in their decision making. American Indians score more toward Casual in their life styles. Hispanics score more toward Accommodating than their Caucasian and American Indian counterparts. None of these differences is surprising when examining what is known about those particular cultures. Thus, regardless of ethnicity, community leaders were more alike one another than they were different.

Differences in facet scores and decision-making categories between community leaders and a general population sample do appear more noticeable. Although not statistically tested, one cannot help but note far greater differences between the general population as represented by the US national sample and the community leaders than found among the ethnic subgroups. This may suggest that while Blandin Community Leaders encompass a broad range of types, the ways in which they express these types and the approaches they take to make decisions may sometimes be different from the general population. Community leaders do come in all shapes and sizes and all types and facets.

Acknowledgements. The authors wish to thank the Blandin Foundation for access to the data and the CPP Research Department for data analysis.

Hirsh, S.K. & Kummerow, J.M. (1998). *Introduction to Type in Organizations (3^d edition)*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc..

Krile, J.M. (2006). *The Community Leadership Handbook*. St. Paul, MN: Fieldstone Alliance.

Kummerow, J.M. & Quenk, N.L. (2005). *Working with MBTI Step II Results*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Myers, I.B. & Kirby, L.K. (1998). *Introduction to Type (6th edition)*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Myers, I. M., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI® Manual*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Quenk, N. L, Hammer, A. L., and Majors, M. S. (2001). *MBTI Step II Manual*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Sue, D. W. and Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the Culturally Different*. New York: John Wiley.

Table 1. Preferences and Facets

<i>Extraversion</i>	ENERGY	<i>Introversion</i>
Initiating	Ways to connect with others	Receiving
Expressive	Communicating feelings & thoughts	Contained
Gregarious	Depth & breadth of relationships	Intimate
Active	Communication & learning mode	Reflective
Enthusiastic	Level & kind of energy	Enthusiastic
<i>Sensing</i>	PERCEPTION	<i>Intuitive</i>
Concrete	Focus of attention	Abstract
Realistic	How information is used	Imaginative
Practical	How ideas are handled	Conceptual
Experiential	Ways of making meaning	Theoretical
Traditional	Value of traditions	Original
<i>Thinking</i>	JUDGMENT	<i>Feeling</i>
Logical	Ideal decision-making	Empathetic
Reasonable	Actual decision-making	Compassionate
Questioning	Ways to handle differences	Accommodating
Critical	Outlook toward differences	Accepting
Tough	Manner of carrying out the decision	Tender
<i>Judging</i>	LIFESTYLE	<i>Perceiving</i>
Systematic	General organization & flow	Casual
Planful	Handling leisure activities	Open-ended
Early Starting	Handling time pressure & deadlines	Pressure-Prompted
Scheduled	Uses of routines & schedules	Spontaneous

Table 2. Type Table by Ethnic Group Membership and Self-Selection Ratios using the Caucasian group as base population

ISTJ				ISFJ				INFJ				INTJ			
Overall	A I	C	H	Overall	A I	C	H	Overall	AI	C	H	Overall	A I	C	H
<i>n</i> = 115 8.8%	<i>n</i> = 16 10.5%	<i>n</i> = 92 8.5%	<i>n</i> = 3 12.0%	<i>n</i> = 77 5.9%	<i>n</i> = 13 8.6%	<i>n</i> = 57 5.3%	<i>n</i> = 3 12.0%	<i>n</i> = 34 2.6%	<i>n</i> = 3 2.0%	<i>n</i> = 30 2.8%	<i>n</i> = 0 0%	<i>n</i> = 52 4.0%	<i>n</i> = 7 4.6%	<i>n</i> = 45 4.2%	<i>n</i> = 0 0%
	SSR = =1.2		SSR = 1.4		SSR = 1.7		SSR = 2.3		SSR = .7		SSR = 0		SSR = 1.1		SSR = 0
ISTP				ISFP				INFP				INTP			
Overall	A I	C	H	Overall	A I*	C	H	Overall	AI	C	H	Overall	A I	C	H
<i>n</i> = 52 4.0%	<i>n</i> = 6 3.9%	<i>n</i> = 42 3.9%	<i>n</i> = 1 4.0%	<i>n</i> = 35 2.7%	<i>n</i> = 9 5.9%	<i>n</i> = 24 2.2%	<i>n</i> = 0 0%	<i>n</i> = 59 4.5%	<i>n</i> = 8 5.3%	<i>n</i> = 46 4.3%	<i>n</i> = 1 4.0%	<i>n</i> = 48 3.7%	<i>n</i> = 1 .7%	<i>n</i> = 43 4.0%	<i>n</i> = 1 4.0%
	SSR = 1.0		SSR = 1.0		SSR = 2.7*		SSR = 0		SSR = 1.2		SSR = .9		SSR = .2		SSR = 1.0
ESTP				ESFP				ENFP				ENTP			
Overall	A I	C	H	Overall	A I	C	H	Overall	AI	C	H	Overall	A I	C	H
<i>n</i> = 71 5.5%	<i>n</i> = 9 5.9%	<i>n</i> = 60 5.6%	<i>n</i> = 1 4.0%	<i>n</i> = 72 5.5%	<i>n</i> = 11 7.2%	<i>n</i> = 59 5.5%	<i>n</i> = 1 4.0%	<i>n</i> = 143 11.0%	<i>n</i> = 18 11.8%	<i>n</i> = 114 10.6%	<i>n</i> = 4 16.0%	<i>n</i> = 116 8.9%	<i>n</i> = 9 5.9%	<i>n</i> = 101 9.4%	<i>n</i> = 2 8.0%
	SSR = 1.1		SSR = .7		SSR = 1.3		SSR = .7		SSR = 1.1		SSR = 1.5		SSR = .6		SSR = .9
ESTJ				ESFJ				ENFJ				ENTJ			
Overall	A I	C	H	Overall	A I	C	H	Overall	AI	C	H	Overall	A I	C	H
<i>n</i> = 121 9.3%	<i>n</i> = 15 9.9%	<i>n</i> = 103 9.6%	<i>n</i> = 3 12.0%	<i>n</i> = 112 8.6%	<i>n</i> = 12 7.9%	<i>n</i> = 94 8.7%	<i>n</i> = 1 4.0%	<i>n</i> = 87 6.7%	<i>n</i> = 6 3.9%	<i>n</i> = 75 7.0%	<i>n</i> = 2 8.0%	<i>n</i> = 108 8.3%	<i>n</i> = 9 5.9%	<i>n</i> = 93 8.6%	<i>n</i> = 2 8.0%
	SSR = 1.0		SSR = .3		SSR = .9		SSR = .5		SSR = .6		SSR = 1.1		SSR = .7		SSR = .9

Note. * $p < .05$, A I = American Indian, C = Caucasian, H = Hispanic. $N = 1302$. SSRs were computed using Caucasians as comparison group.

Table 3. Average of Step II Facets for each sample

Facet	<i>National Sample</i>	Overall Sample	Caucasian	American Indian	Hispanic
<i>Extraversion-Introversion Facets</i>					
Initiating (-) Receiving (+)	<i>-.11</i>	-1.52	-1.61	-1.06	-1.24
Expressive (-) Contained (+)	<i>-.02</i>	-1.41	-1.54	-.91	-1.32
Gregarious (-) Intimate (+)	<i>.28</i>	-.89	-.92	-.86	-0.24
Active (-) Reflective (+)	<i>-.17</i>	-1.44	-1.48	-1.33	-1.2
Enthusiastic (-) Quiet (+)	<i>.12</i>	-1.07	-1.16	-.48	-1.04
<i>Sensing-Intuition Facets</i>					
Concrete (-) Abstract (+)	<i>-.78</i>	.29	.32	-.09	0.04
Realistic (-) Imaginative (+)	<i>-1.07</i>	.54	.58	.24	-0.8
Practical (-) Conceptual (+)	<i>-.84</i>	.16	.14	.13	-0.12
Experiential (-) Theoretical (+)	<i>-1.60</i>	-.10	-.01	-.76	-0.48
Traditional (-) Original (+)	<i>-1.06</i>	.30	.32	.02	0.08
<i>Thinking-Feeling Facets</i>					
Logical (-) Empathetic (+)	<i>.28</i>	-.87	-.99	-.30	-0.76
Reasonable (-) Compassionate (+)	<i>.29</i>	-.69	-.77	-.34	-0.08
Questioning (-) Accommodating (+)	<i>.46</i>	.23	.24	-.10	1.88
Critical (-) Accepting (+)	<i>1.11</i>	1.47	1.55	1.01	1.44
Tough (-) Tender (+)	<i>.62</i>	-.32	-.28	-.59	0.2
<i>Judging-Feeling Facets</i>					
Systematic (-) Casual (+)	<i>-.51</i>	-.33	-.47	.23	0.8
Planful (-) Open-ended (+)	<i>-.14</i>	-.79	-.82	-.61	-0.84
Early Starting (-) Pressure Prompted (+)	<i>-1.62</i>	.20	.19	.32	-0.36
Scheduled (-) Spontaneous (+)	<i>-1.21</i>	-1.09	-1.15	-.84	-1.08
Methodical (-) Emergent (+)	<i>-.95</i>	-.49	-.44	-.76	0.08

Note. National Sample *N* = 1,378; Overall Sample *N* = 1,302; Caucasian Sample *N* = 1,078; American Indian Sample *N* = 152; Hispanic Sample *N* = 25

Table 4. Significant Ethnic Differences on Facets

Facet	Group	Mean	% Left pole	% Midzone	% Right pole
Logical (-) Empathetic (+)	Caucasian	-.99	51.6	22.4	26.1
	American Indian	-.30	38.2	35.5	26.3
Systematic (-) Casual (+)	Caucasian	-.47	40.5	29.3	30.1
	American Indian	.23	33.6	24.3	42.1
Questioning (-) Accommodating (+)	Caucasian	.24	39.9	29.8	30.3
	American Indian	-.10	45.4	31.6	23.0
	Hispanic	1.88	16	36	48

Note. $p < .05$

Table 5. Facet poles held by over 50% of Community Leaders

Facet	Ethnic Group
Initiating (E)	Caucasian American Indian Hispanic
Expressive (E)	Caucasian American Indian Hispanic
Gregarious (E)	Caucasian
Active (E)	Caucasian American Indian Hispanic
Enthusiastic (E)	Caucasian Hispanic
Experiential (S)	American Indian Hispanic
Logical (T)	Caucasian
Planful (J)	Caucasian American Indian Hispanic

Table 6. Out-of-Preference Facets with over 12% in Category

Out-of-Preference Facet	<i>National Sample %</i>	Overall Sample %	Caucasian %	American Indian %	Hispanic %
E-I Facets					
Intimate E	<i>12.4</i>				12.5
Initiating I			12.1		
Expressive I		16.5	17.4	17.5	
Gregarious I		16.3	16.1		
Active I		16.5	14.2	27.0	
Enthusiastic I	<i>12.5</i>				
S-N Facets					
Conceptual S		12.4	12.2	15.4	
Original S		13.1	13.2	12.1	15.4
Experiential N	<i>12.1</i>				25.0
T-F Facets					
Accommodating T	<i>33.3</i>	22.7	22.5	19.4	38.5
Accepting T	<i>26.0</i>	37.0	38.7	33.3	15.4
Logical F			13.4		
Questioning F	<i>23.3</i>	30.7	29.3	36.3	
Critical F	<i>13.3</i>			12.5	
J-P Facets					
Casual J				14.8	14.3
Open-ended J	<i>12.8</i>				
Pressure-prompted J		21.4	21.9	19.8	
Emergent J			18.8		21.4
Early starting P	<i>42.2</i>	15.6	16.4		
Methodical P	<i>26.2</i>	20.6	20.7	19.7	

Table 7. Decision-Making Styles

Decision-Making Category	<i>National Sample</i>	Overall Sample	Caucasian	American Indian	Hispanic
Logical and Reasonable	<i>26.9</i>	44.7	45.9	39.5	44.0
Empathetic and Compassionate	<i>36.1</i>	21.0	20.3	24.3	20.0
Logical and Compassionate	<i>3.2</i>	3.0	3.2	2.0	4.0
Empathetic and Reasonable	<i>4.9</i>	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.0
Midzone Feeling	<i>19.6</i>	19.7	19.1	21.7	20.0