

MBTI, FIRO-B, and NAFTA: Psychological Profiles of Not-So-Distant Business Neighbors

T. Noel Osborn
TEAM, Inc.

Diana B. Osborn
TEAM, Inc.

Brian Twillman
Twillman Associates

By combining results from the MBTI and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation--Behavior (FIRO-B), it can be shown that Mexican managers tend to be more S, T, and J than their US and Canadian neighbors to the north. This knowledge is timely and can be used by executives from the three countries to ensure greater collaboration.

Abstract

This paper reviews similarities and differences in executive and managerial personality profiles among partners in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)—Canada, the United States, and Mexico—as measured by the MBTI and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation—Behavior (FIRO-B). The results indicate that Mexican managers are more STJ than their neighbors to the north and more expressive of interpersonal behaviors. The results of these comparisons may prove useful to public- and private-sector executives seeking to understand better the styles of their prospective trading partners.

On January 1, 1994, an important economic event occurred on the American continent. On that date, three of its most significant neighbors joined in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), thus forming a partnership that makes them the largest economic trading unit in the world. With this act, some 375 million people joined economic destinies in what has become the most substantial economic unification ever attempted in the Western Hemisphere.

Of course, there is an economic gap between the partners. The common market formed by Canada, the United States, and Mexico places neighbors with significantly different economic structures and, especially in the case of Mexico, differing economic levels, in situations requiring direct and open trading relationships. The per capita Gross Domestic Product figures of Canada and the United States are fairly close, about \$20,000 and \$22,000, respectively. Mexico's Gross Domestic Product per capita is under

20% of its neighbors, at about \$3,700 per person (1994 IMF data in 1992 US Dollars).

In addition to the economic differences, there are social and cultural differences. Riding (1985) detailed many of the differences between the US and Mexico: "Two neighbors . . . separated by language, religion, race, philosophy and history" (IX). Although Canadians are frequently assumed (by US nationals, at least) to be similar to Americans, there are many differences as well. For instance, Canada is largely bilingual and suffers from something of an identity crisis between its two principal cultural heritages, British and French. In general, Canadians are more reserved than their neighbors to the south and may be more formal than expected by both Americans and Mexicans (Harris & Moran, 1991).

In this paper, we will address issues of cultural diversity extending across all three of the NAFTA partners, as identified and expressed by personality type measures. The specific interactions examined in

Table 1. Sample Demographics.

| | CANADA (Niagara) N = 3,798 | UNITED STATES (CCL)* N = 21,659/31,024 | MEXICO (TEAM) N = 1,019 |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Organizational Level | | | |
| Executive | 20% | 21 / 21% | 11% |
| Upper Middle | 35 | 39 / 36 | 40 |
| Middle | 35 | 30 / 29 | 38 |
| First | 8 | 3 / 3 | 10 |
| Other/Hourly | 2 | 6 / 10 | 1 |
| Education | | | |
| High School | 19% | 13 / 14% | 7% |
| Associate/Bachelor | 45 | 44 / 43 | 62 |
| Masters/Ph.D. | 28 | 43 / 43 | 31 |
| Other/Missing | 8 | — | — |
| Age | 42 | 41 | 36 |
| Sex | | | |
| Male | 77% | 72 / 70% | 84% |
| Female | 23 | 28 / 30 | 16 |
| Organizational Type | | | |
| Business/Industrial | 40% | 75 / 73% | 90% |
| Educational | <1 | 8 / 9 | 1 |
| Military/Government | 57 | 8 / 8 | 2 |
| Other/Non-profit | 2 | 10 / 11 | 7 |

*CCL demographics are for a subset of FIRO-B/MBTI takers, some of whom did not complete biodata information. Actual figures vary between these numbers.

this paper are those involving professional business people. The indicators chosen are popular measures of how people process information and make decisions as measured by the MBTI (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), and how they interrelate with others as revealed by the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation--Behavior (FIRO-B; Schutz, 1955). Hofstede (1980) and Trompenaars (1993) have asserted that culture is "collective mental programming" and "a system of shared meanings." We have argued elsewhere (Osborn & Osborn, 1986, 1993) that psychological measures are useful indicators for understanding these differences in mental programming and shared meaning across cultural boundaries. We affirm that measures such as the MBTI and the FIRO-B offer valuable insights into the interactions between cultures as well as among personalities within a given culture, as we will demonstrate here.

Method

The first two authors of this paper are principals

of *Tecnologia Administrativa Moderna* (TEAM), *Sociedad Civil*, a Network Associate of the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL). Since 1980, TEAM has collected personality and style information on Latin American executives, while conducting leadership programs in conjunction with CCL. This may be the largest data bank on personality and style information for Mexican business people developed to date. A large and similarly structured sample of US executives from CCL has been added to the MBTI and FIRO-B segments of this data bank. TEAM's sister organization in Canada, the Niagara Institute (also a CCL Network Associate), provided information on a similar group of Canadian executives. The attendees of these training programs have participated in courses such as the Leadership Development Program (LDP), Managing for Commitment (MFC), and Working with Others (WWO).

The data from these samples are similar, except as noted below. (See Table 1.)

- The average age of subjects in the US and Canadian samples is 40-45. Mexican attendees are

younger.

- Educational levels are similar for all three samples. Over 70% have college training or beyond. The US sample contains more participants with postgraduate training than the Canadian and Mexican samples.

- All samples are primarily composed of men. The vast majority of our executive training populations are male, although the CCL sample includes a larger percentage of women.

- Most executives in all the samples, approximately 70%, come from middle- and upper-middle management.

- Except for the Niagara Institute, the great majority are managers in private industry. Considerably more managers in the Canadian sample come from government, reflecting Niagara's greater public-sector focus. Eighty-two percent of the Canadian sample were participants in English language programs, whereas the remainder participated in French.

It might be argued that leadership development program data are biased toward higher performance managers and hence atypical of the general business population. This may be true, but consider the following: All data reflect not only public (open) program enrollments but also contract (closed) programs that all three institutions offer. In the case of the Mexican data, approximately 70% of the participants are from closed programs, representing a broad spectrum of managers across management levels of our clients. It is also true that nearly all our client organizations are larger institutions (more than 300 employees) and are connected either directly or indirectly to international enterprises. Although this suggests somewhat elite data samples for all three countries, these are the kinds of people with whom international negotiators from the other countries are likely to interact in their cross-cultural dealings. We believe that these managerial populations are particularly useful for cross-cultural analysis.

Results and Discussion

Tables 2 through 4 present the MBTI data. These are followed by Selection Ratio Type Tables (SRTTs), Tables 5 through 7. The largest is the United States sample, which is used as a base to compare the Canadian and Mexican samples in Tables 5 and 6, respectively. Table 7 compares Canadian and Mexican samples. Table 8 provides a view of the distributions for each of the four axes, including significance levels.

Significant differences existed between the Canadian and the United States managers on three of the four axes. The Canadian sample is significantly more introverted, sensing, and thinking than the US sample. The Mexican sample was similar to the US sample on the E-I scale, but significantly more

sensing, thinking, and judging than either the US or the Canadian samples. The Canadian managers were significantly more introverted than either of their neighbors. To be fair, our conclusions about the latter may be tempered somewhat by the minority participation of French managers in the Canadian sample. Although his data cover only college students, Casas (1990) reported considerably higher extraversion among French Canadians, with as many as 80% Es in his sample of 870. However, English Canadian students measured just over 50% extraverts, similar to the sample reported here.

In terms of temperament, the Mexican sample was by far the most SJ ("Traditionalists") at 66%, whereas the US was the least at 44%. The Mexican sample was likewise the least NT ("Visionaries") at 25%, whereas the US and Canadian samples both came out at 37-38% NT. SPs ("Diplomats") were close to the same in all samples at about 9-10%, but the NFs ("Catalysts") were fewer in the Canadian sample (10% vs. 13%) and virtually nonexistent in the Mexican group.

In sum, the Mexican sample was far more STJ than either of its neighbors to the north: 65% compared to 33% for the US sample and 38% for the Canadian group. This is revealed by the SRTT analysis, where significant differences ($p = .001$) appeared in the STJ cells in both CCL/TEAM (Table 5) and Niagara/TEAM (Table 7) data. Thus, it was not surprising that NTPs, SFPs, and (I)NFJs in the Mexican sample were the most underrepresented, compared to both the US and Canadian samples.

These results are similar to those we have reported elsewhere, replicating results for other US and Mexican samples. In every case, Mexican managers in our samples scored more STJ than their US counterparts (Osborn & Osborn, 1986, 1990, 1993).

Note should be made of the test validity of the MBTI. The currently accepted version of the MBTI in Spanish is the translation of Form G performed by Albert Inclan (1986). Inclan's validity study was carried out with just over 200 bilingual Hispanics living in the United States. Although there is a concern as to whether monolingual Spanish speakers in Latin America will interpret the test items the same as bilinguals in the United States, TEAM's experience with this Spanish version over a 10-year period has supported Inclan's validity findings. Participants in our training programs report a high degree of correspondence, usually 75-80%, of perceived and reported type on at least three of the four axes, which is consistent with other writers and practitioners.

It should also be noted that there are only about half as many top executives, percentage-wise, in the Mexican sample as in either the US or Canadian samples. This may influence the percentage of intuitives occurring in the Mexican sample, since in other data

Table 2. Type Distribution of Canadian Managers
(Source: Niagara Institute, 1993).

N = 3,798 + = 1% of N

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| ISTJ n = 832 (21.9%) +++++ | ISFJ n = 111 (2.9%) +++ | INFJ n = 62 (1.6%) ++ | INTJ n = 447 (11.8%) +++++ | E | n = 1716 (45.2%) |
| | | | | I | n = 2082 (54.8%) |
| | | | | S | n = 2015 (53.1%) |
| | | | | N | n = 1783 (46.9%) |
| | | | | T | n = 3142 (82.7%) |
| | | | | F | n = 656 (17.3%) |
| | | | | J | n = 2588 (68.1%) |
| | | | | P | n = 1210 (31.9%) |
| | | | | Pairs and Temperaments | |
| ISTP n = 175 (4.6%) +++++ | ISFP n = 47 (1.2%) + | INFP n = 92 (2.4%) ++ | INTP n = 316 (8.3%) +++++ | IJ | n = 1452 (38.2%) |
| | | | | IP | n = 630 (16.6%) |
| | | | | EP | n = 580 (15.3%) |
| | | | | EJ | n = 1136 (29.9%) |
| | | | | ST | n = 1745 (45.9%) |
| | | | | SF | n = 270 (7.1%) |
| | | | | NF | n = 386 (10.2%) |
| | | | | NT | n = 1397 (36.8%) |
| ESTP n = 148 (3.9%) ++++ | ESFP n = 39 (1.0%) + | ENFP n = 138 (3.6%) ++++ | ENTP n = 255 (6.7%) +++++ | SJ | n = 1606 (42.3%) |
| | | | | SP | n = 409 (10.8%) |
| | | | | NP | n = 801 (21.1%) |
| | | | | NJ | n = 982 (25.9%) |
| | | | | TJ | n = 2248 (59.2%) |
| | | | | TP | n = 894 (23.5%) |
| | | | | FP | n = 316 (8.3%) |
| | | | | FJ | n = 340 (9.0%) |
| ESTJ n = 590 (15.5%) +++++ | ESFJ n = 73 (1.9%) ++ | ENFJ n = 94 (2.5%) +++ | ENTJ n = 379 (10.0%) +++++ | IN | n = 917 (24.1%) |
| | | | | EN | n = 866 (22.8%) |
| | | | | IS | n = 1165 (30.7%) |
| | | | | ES | n = 850 (22.4%) |
| | | | | ET | n = 1372 (36.1%) |
| | | | | EF | n = 344 (9.1%) |
| | | | | IF | n = 312 (8.2%) |
| | | | | IT | n = 1770 (46.6%) |

| Jungian Types (E) | | Jungian Types (I) | | Dominant Types | |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|------------|
| n | % | n | % | n | % |
| E-TJ | 969 25.5% | I-TP | 491 12.9% | Dt. T | 1460 38.4% |
| E-FJ | 167 4.4% | I-FP | 139 3.7% | Dt. F | 306 8.1% |
| ES-P | 187 4.9% | IS-J | 943 24.8% | Dt. S | 1130 29.8% |
| EN-P | 393 10.3% | IN-J | 509 13.4% | Dt. N | 902 23.7% |

T. Noel Osborn,
Diana B. Osborn, and Brian Twillman,
MBTI, FIRO-B, and NAFTA:
Psychological Profiles of
Not-So-Distant Business Neighbors.

Table 3. Type Distribution of US Managers
 (Source: Center for Creative Leadership, 1985-1992).
 N = 37,549 + = 1% of N

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| ISTJ n = 6399 (17.0%) +++++ | ISFJ n = 1286 (3.4%) +++ | INFJ n = 696 (1.9%) ++ | INTJ n = 3771 (10.0%) +++++ | E | n = 20192 (53.8%) |
| | | | | I | n = 17357 (46.2%) |
| | | | | S | n = 18485 (49.2%) |
| | | | | N | n = 19064 (50.8%) |
| | | | | T | n = 29033 (77.3%) |
| | | | | F | n = 8516 (22.7%) |
| | | | | J | n = 25638 (68.3%) |
| | | | | P | n = 11911 (31.7%) |
| | | | | Pairs and Temperaments | |
| ISTP n = 1268 (3.4%) +++ | ISFP n = 466 (1.2%) + | INFP n = 1002 (2.7%) +++ | INTP n = 2469 (6.6%) +++++ | IJ | n = 12152 (32.4%) |
| | | | | IP | n = 5205 (13.9%) |
| | | | | EP | n = 6706 (17.9%) |
| | | | | EJ | n = 13486 (35.9%) |
| | | | | ST | n = 14833 (39.5%) |
| | | | | SF | n = 3652 (9.7%) |
| | | | | NF | n = 4864 (13.0%) |
| | | | | NT | n = 14200 (37.8%) |
| | | | | SJ | n = 14994 (39.9%) |
| | | | | SP | n = 3491 (9.3%) |
| | | | | NP | n = 8420 (22.4%) |
| | | | | NJ | n = 10644 (28.3%) |
| | | | | TJ | n = 21035 (56.0%) |
| | | | | TP | n = 7998 (21.3%) |
| | | | | FP | n = 3913 (10.4%) |
| | | | | FJ | n = 4603 (12.3%) |
| | | | | IN | n = 7938 (21.1%) |
| | | | | EN | n = 11126 (29.6%) |
| | | | | IS | n = 9419 (25.1%) |
| | | | | ES | n = 9066 (24.1%) |
| | | | | ET | n = 15126 (40.3%) |
| | | | | EF | n = 5066 (13.5%) |
| | | | | IF | n = 3450 (9.2%) |
| | | | | IT | n = 13907 (37.0%) |

| Jungian Types (E) | | Jungian Types (I) | | Dominant Types | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| n | % | n | % | n | % | | | |
| E-TJ | 10865 | 28.9% | I-TP | 3737 | 10.0% | Dt. T | 14602 | 38.9% |
| E-FJ | 2621 | 7.0% | I-FP | 1468 | 3.9% | Dt. F | 4089 | 10.9% |
| ES-P | 1757 | 4.7% | IS-J | 7685 | 20.5% | Dt. S | 9442 | 25.1% |
| EN-P | 4949 | 13.2% | IN-J | 4467 | 11.9% | Dt. N | 9416 | 25.1% |

T. Noel Osborn,
 Diana B. Osborn, and Brian Twillman,
 MBTI, FIRO-B, and NAFTA:
 Psychological Profiles of
 Not-So-Distant Business Neighbors.

Table 4. Type Distribution of Mexican Managers
 (Source: TEAM, 1989-1993).
 N = 1,019 + = 1% of N

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| ISTJ n = 294 (28.9%) +++++ | ISFJ n = 3 (0.3%) | INFJ n = 3 (0.3%) | INTJ n = 84 (8.3%) +++++ | E n = 558 (54.8%) | I n = 461 (45.2%) |
| ISTP n = 43 (4.2%) ++++ | ISFP n = 1 (0.1%) | INFP n = 1 (0.1%) | INTP n = 32 (3.2%) +++ | S n = 763 (74.9%) | N n = 256 (25.1%) |
| ESTP n = 46 (4.5%) +++++ | ESFP n = 3 (0.3%) | ENFP n = 1 (0.1%) | ENTP n = 42 (4.1%) ++++ | T n = 1003 (98.4%) | F n = 16 (1.6%) |
| ESTJ n = 370 (36.3%) +++++ | ESFJ n = 3 (0.3%) | ENFJ n = 1 (0.1%) | ENTJ n = 92 (9.0%) +++++ | J n = 850 (83.4%) | P n = 169 (16.6%) |
| | | | | Pairs and Temperaments | |
| | | | | IJ n = 384 (37.7%) | IP n = 77 (7.6%) |
| | | | | EP n = 92 (9.0%) | EJ n = 466 (45.7%) |
| | | | | ST n = 753 (73.9%) | SF n = 10 (1.0%) |
| | | | | NF n = 6 (0.6%) | NT n = 250 (24.5%) |
| | | | | SJ n = 670 (65.8%) | SP n = 93 (9.1%) |
| | | | | NP n = 76 (7.5%) | NJ n = 180 (17.7%) |
| | | | | TJ n = 840 (82.4%) | TP n = 163 (16.0%) |
| | | | | FP n = 6 (0.6%) | FJ n = 10 (1.0%) |
| | | | | IN n = 120 (11.8%) | EN n = 136 (13.3%) |
| | | | | IS n = 341 (33.5%) | ES n = 422 (41.4%) |
| | | | | ET n = 550 (54.0%) | EF n = 8 (0.8%) |
| | | | | IF n = 8 (0.8%) | IT n = 453 (44.5%) |

| Jungian Types (E) | | Jungian Types (I) | | Dominant Types | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-------------------|------|----------------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| n | % | n | % | n | % | | | |
| E-TJ | 462 | 45.3% | I-TP | 75 | 7.4% | Dt. T | 537 | 52.7% |
| E-FJ | 4 | 0.4% | I-FP | 2 | 0.2% | Dt. F | 6 | 0.6% |
| ES-P | 49 | 4.8% | IS-J | 297 | 29.1% | Dt. S | 346 | 34.0% |
| EN-P | 43 | 4.2% | IN-J | 87 | 8.5% | Dt. N | 130 | 12.8% |

T. Noel Osborn,
 Diana B. Osborn, and Brian Twillman,
 MBTI, FIRO-B, and NAFTA:
 Psychological Profiles of
 Not-So-Distant Business Neighbors.

Table 5. Type Distribution of Mexican Data Base (TEAM 1989-93) and SRTT Comparison with Base Population Norms Taken from US Sample (CCL 1985-92).
 N = 1,019 + = 1% of N I = Selection Ratio Index *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ISTJ n = 294 (28.9%) I = 1.69*** +++++ | ISFJ n = 3 (0.3%) I = 0.09 | INFJ n = 3 (0.3%) I = 0.16*** | INTJ n = 84 (8.2%) I = 0.82 +++++ | E 558 (54.8%) I = 1.02 | I 461 (45.2%) I = 0.98 |
| | | | | S 763 (74.9%) ***I = 1.52 | N 256 (25.1%) ***I = 0.49 |
| | | | | T 1003 (98.4%) ***I = 1.27 | F 16 (1.6%) ***I = 0.07 |
| | | | | J 850 (83.4%) ***I = 1.22 | P 169 (16.6%) ***I = 0.52 |
| | | | | Pairs and Temperaments | |
| ISTP n = 43 (4.2%) I = 1.25 +++++ | ISFP n = 1 (0.1%) I = 0.21** | INFP n = 1 (0.1%) I = 0.04 | INTP n = 32 (3.1%) I = 0.48*** +++ | IJ 384 (37.7%) ***I = 1.16 | IP 77 (7.6%) ***I = 0.55 |
| | | | | EP 92 (9.0%) ***I = 0.51 | EJ 466 (45.7%) ***I = 1.27 |
| | | | | ST 753 (73.9%) ***I = 1.87 | SF 10 (1.0%) ***I = 0.10 |
| | | | | NF 6 (0.6%) ***I = 0.05 | NT 250 (24.5%) ***I = 0.65 |
| | | | | SJ 670 (65.6%) ***I = 0.65 | SP 93 (9.1%) I = 0.98 |
| | | | | NP 76 (7.5%) ***I = 0.33 | NJ 180 (17.7%) ***I = 0.62 |
| | | | | TJ 840 (82.4%) ***I = 1.47 | TP 163 (16.0%) ***I = 0.75 |
| | | | | FP 6 (0.6%) ***I = 0.06 | FJ 10 (1.0%) ***I = 0.08 |
| | | | | IN 120 (11.8%) ***I = 0.56 | EN 136 (13.4%) ***I = 0.45 |
| | | | | IS 341 (33.5%) ***I = 1.33 | ES 422 (41.4%) ***I = 1.72 |
| | | | | ET 550 (54.0%) I = n.a. | EF 8 (0.6%) I = n.a. |
| | | | | IF 8 (0.6%) I = n.a. | IT 840 (82.4%) I = n.a. |
| ESTP n = 46 (4.5%) I = 1.39* +++++ | ESFP n = 3 (0.3%) I = 0.21** | ENFP n = 1 (0.1%) I = 0.22 | ENTP n = 42 (4.1%) I = 0.51*** +++++ | | |
| ESTJ n = 370 (36.3%) I = 2.29*** +++++ | ESFJ n = 3 (0.3%) I = 0.08 | ENFJ n = 1 (0.1%) I = 0.03 | ENTJ n = 92 (9.0%) I = 0.69 +++++ | | |

| Jungian Types (E) | | | Jungian Types (I) | | | Dominant Types | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-------|-------------------|------|-------|----------------|------|-------|-----|------|------|
| n | % | Index | n | % | Index | n | % | Index | | | |
| E-TJ | 462 | 45.3 | n.a. | I-TP | 75 | 7.4 | n.a. | Dt. T | 537 | 52.6 | n.a. |
| E-FJ | 4 | 0.4 | n.a. | I-FP | 2 | 0.2 | n.a. | Dt. F | 6 | 0.6 | n.a. |
| ES-P | 49 | 4.8 | n.a. | IS-J | 297 | 29.1 | n.a. | Dt. S | 346 | 34.0 | n.a. |
| EN-P | 43 | 4.2 | n.a. | IN-J | 87 | 8.5 | n.a. | Dt. N | 130 | 12.8 | n.a. |

T. Noel Osborn,
 Diana B. Osborn, and Brian Twillman,
 MBTI, FIRO-B, and NAFTA:
 Psychological Profiles of
 Not-So-Distant Business Neighbors.

Table 6. Type Distribution of Canadian Data Base (Niagara 1993) and SRTT Comparison with Base Population Norms Taken from U.S. Sample (CCL 1985-92).
N = 3,798 + = 1% of *N* *I* = Selection Ratio Index **p* < .05 ***p* < .01 ****p* < .001

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| ISTJ <i>n</i> = 832 (21.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.29*** +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ + | ISFJ <i>n</i> = 111 (2.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.85 ++ | INFJ <i>n</i> = 62 (1.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.88 ++ | INTJ <i>n</i> = 447 (11.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.17*** +++++ +++++ ++ | E 1716 (45.2%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.84 I 2082 (54.8%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.19 | |
| ISTP <i>n</i> = 175 (4.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.36*** +++++ | ISFP <i>n</i> = 47 (1.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.00 + | INFP <i>n</i> = 92 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.91 ++ | INTP <i>n</i> = 316 (8.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.27*** +++++ +++ | S 2015 (53.1%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.08 N 1783 (47.0%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.92 | T 3142 (82.7%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.07 F 656 (17.3%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.76 |
| ESTP <i>n</i> = 148 (3.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.20* +++++ | ESFP <i>n</i> = 39 (1.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.72* + | ENFP <i>n</i> = 138 (3.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.72*** +++++ | ENTP <i>n</i> = 255 (6.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.83** +++++ ++ | J 2588 (68.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.00 P 1210 (31.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.00 | |
| ESTJ <i>n</i> = 590 (15.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.98 +++++ +++++ +++++ + | ESFJ <i>n</i> = 73 (1.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.53*** ++ | ENFJ <i>n</i> = 94 (2.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.74** +++ | ENTJ <i>n</i> = 379 (10.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.76*** +++++ +++++ | | Pairs and Temperaments |
| | | | | IJ 1452 (38.2%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.18 IP 630 (16.6%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.20 EP 580 (15.3%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.86 EJ 1136 (29.9%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.83 | |
| | | | | ST 1606 (42.3%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.16 SF 409 (10.8%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.73 NF 801 (21.1%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.78 NT 982 (25.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.97 | |
| | | | | SJ 1606 (42.3%) ** <i>I</i> = 1.06 SP 409 (10.8%) ** <i>I</i> = 1.16 NP 801 (21.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.94 NJ 982 (25.9%) ** <i>I</i> = 0.91 | |
| | | | | TJ 2248 (59.2%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.06 TP 894 (23.5%) ** <i>I</i> = 1.11 FP 316 (8.3%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.80 FJ 340 (9.0%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.73 | |
| | | | | IN 917 (24.4%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.14 EN 866 (22.8%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.77 IS 1165 (30.7%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.22 ES 850 (22.4%) * <i>I</i> = 0.93 | |
| | | | | ET 1372 (36.1%) <i>I</i> = n.a. EF 219 (5.7%) <i>I</i> = n.a. IF 312 (8.2%) <i>I</i> = n.a. IT 1770 (46.6%) <i>I</i> = n.a. | |

| Jungian Types (E) | | | Jungian Types (I) | | | Dominant Types | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-------|-------------------|------|-------|----------------|------|-----------|------|------|------|
| <i>n</i> | % | Index | <i>n</i> | % | Index | <i>n</i> | % | Index | | | |
| E-TJ | 939 | 24.7 | n.a. | I-TP | 491 | 12.9 | n.a. | Dt. T1460 | 38.4 | n.a. | |
| E-FJ | 167 | 4.4 | n.a. | I-FP | 139 | 3.7 | n.a. | Dt. F | 306 | 8.1 | n.a. |
| ES-P | 187 | 4.9 | n.a. | IS-J | 943 | 24.8 | n.a. | Dt. S1130 | 29.8 | n.a. | |
| EN-P | 393 | 10.3 | n.a. | IN-J | 509 | 13.4 | n.a. | Dt. N902 | 23.7 | n.a. | |

T. Noel Osborn,
Diana B. Osborn, and Brian Twillman,
MBTI, FIRO-B, and NAFTA:
Psychological Profiles of
Not-So-Distant Business Neighbors.

Table 7. Type Distribution of Mexican Database (TEAM 1989-93) and SRTT Comparison with Base Population Norms Taken from Canadian Sample (Niagara 1993).
 N = 1,019 + = 1% of N I = Selection Ratio Index *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| ISTJ n = 294 (28.9%) I = 1.32*** +++++ | ISFJ n = 3 (0.3%) I = 0.10 | INFJ n = 3 (0.3%) I = 0.18** | INTJ n = 84 (8.2%) I = 0.70** +++++ | E 558 (54.8%) ***I=1.21 | I 461 (45.2%) ***I=0.83 |
| ISTP n = 43 (4.2%) I = 0.92 +++++ | ISFP n = 1 (0.1%) I = 0.08** | INFP n = 1 (0.1%) I = 0.04 | INTP n = 32 (3.1%) I = 0.38*** +++ | Pairs and Temperaments | |
| ESTP n = 46 (4.5%) I = 1.16 +++++ | ESFP n = 3 (0.3%) I = 0.29** | ENFP n = 1 (0.1%) I = 0.03 | ENTP n = 42 (4.1%) I = 0.61*** +++++ | IJ 384 (37.7%) I=0.99 | IP 77 (7.6%) ***I=0.46 |
| ESTJ n = 370 (36.3%) I = 2.34*** +++++ | ESFJ n = 3 (0.3%) I = 0.15 | ENFJ n = 1 (0.1%) I = 0.04 | ENTJ n = 92 (9.0%) I = 0.90 +++++ | EP 92 (9.0%) ***I=0.59 | EJ 466 (45.7%) ***I=1.53 |
| | | | | ST 753 (73.9%) ***I=1.61 | SF 10 (1.0%) ***I=0.14 |
| | | | | NF 6 (0.6%) ***I=0.06 | NT 250 (24.5%) ***I=0.67 |
| | | | | SJ 670 (65.8%) ***I=0.55 | SP 93 (9.1%) I=0.85 |
| | | | | NP 76 (7.5%) ***I=0.35 | NJ 180 (17.7%) ***I=0.68 |
| | | | | TJ 840 (82.4%) ***I=1.39 | TP 163 (16.0%) ***I=0.68 |
| | | | | FP 6 (0.6%) ***I=0.07 | FJ 10 (1.0%) ***I=0.11 |
| | | | | IN 120 (11.8%) ***I=0.49 | EN 136 (13.4%) ***I=0.59 |
| | | | | IS 341 (33.5%) I=1.33 | ES 422 (41.4%) ***I=1.85 |
| | | | | ET 550 (54.0%) I=n.a. | EF 8 (0.8%) I=n.a. |
| | | | | IF 8 (0.8%) I=n.a. | IT 453 (44.5%) I=n.a. |

| Jungian Types (E) | | | Jungian Types (I) | | | Dominant Types | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-------|-------------------|------|-------|----------------|------|-------|-----|------|------|
| n | % | Index | n | % | Index | n | % | Index | | | |
| E-TJ | 462 | 45.3 | n.a. | I-TP | 75 | 7.4 | n.a. | Dt. T | 537 | 52.7 | n.a. |
| E-FJ | 4 | 0.4 | n.a. | I-FP | 2 | 0.2 | n.a. | Dt. F | 6 | 0.6 | n.a. |
| ES-P | 49 | 4.8 | n.a. | IS-J | 297 | 29.1 | n.a. | Dt. S | 346 | 34.0 | n.a. |
| EN-P | 43 | 4.2 | n.a. | IN-J | 87 | 8.5 | n.a. | Dt. N | 130 | 12.8 | n.a. |

T. Noel Osborn,
 Diana B. Osborn, and Brian Twillman,
 MBTI, FIRO-B, and NAFTA:
 Psychological Profiles of
 Not-So-Distant Business Neighbors.

Table 8. Dichotomous Preference Distributions and Comparisons between Canadian, US, and Mexican Samples.

| | | CAN/US | CAN/MEX | US/MEX | | |
|--------------------------|-----|--------|---------|--------|-----|-----|
| Canadian Managers | | | | | | |
| E | 45% | I | 55% | * | * | N/A |
| S | 53% | N | 47% | * | * | N/A |
| T | 83% | F | 17% | * | * | N/A |
| J | 68% | P | 32% | | * | N/A |
| US Managers | | | | | | |
| E | 54% | I | 46% | * | N/A | |
| S | 49% | N | 51% | * | N/A | * |
| T | 77% | F | 23% | * | N/A | * |
| J | 68% | P | 32% | | N/A | * |
| Mexican Managers | | | | | | |
| E | 55% | I | 45% | N/A | * | * |
| S | 75% | N | 25% | N/A | * | * |
| T | 98% | F | 2% | N/A | * | * |
| J | 85% | P | 17% | N/A | * | * |

**p* < .001

Table 9. Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation—Behavior (FIRO-B) Data for Canadian, US, and Mexican Samples.

| | | Canadian Managers (N = 3,798) | | |
|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------|---------|-----------|
| | | INCLUSION | CONTROL | AFFECTION |
| Expressed | | 3.8 | 4.4 | 3.1 |
| | <i>sd</i> | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.9 |
| Wanted | | 2.7 | 3.0 | 4.7 |
| | <i>sd</i> | 3.1 | 1.8 | 2.1 |
| | | American Managers (N = 29,722) | | |
| | | INCLUSION | CONTROL | AFFECTION |
| Expressed | | 3.9 | 4.7 | 3.4 |
| | <i>sd</i> | 2.1 | 2.6 | 2.1 |
| Wanted | | 3.1 | 3.1 | 4.9 |
| | <i>sd</i> | 3.2 | 1.9 | 2.2 |
| | | Mexican Managers (N = 1,019) | | |
| | | INCLUSION | CONTROL | AFFECTION |
| Expressed | | 4.4 | 5.6 | 4.6 |
| | <i>sd</i> | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.7 |
| Wanted | | 3.5 | 2.5 | 5.1 |
| | <i>sd</i> | 3.0 | 1.8 | 2.5 |

there is some evidence of increased intuition at higher organizational levels. For example, CCL data repeatedly shows increasing percentages of Ns as management levels increase. However, in our Mexican sample, the percentage of Ns actually decreased with increases in executive ranks.

The FIRO-B (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Indicator--Behavior) was developed by Schutz (1955). Schutz postulated that all interpersonal behavior is classifiable into 3 categories: inclusion (how comfortable we are with social interaction); control (our needs for rank or place and for assuming responsibility); and affection (needs for intimacy with others). In turn, these needs are defined by how much we express inclusion, control, and affection to others and how much we want these behaviors from others. We believe that these behaviors go to the heart of relationships among people within and across cultures, and TEAM has always included the FIRO-B in its development programs.

The instrument used in Spanish is TEAM's translation of the standard protocol, as authorized by Consulting Psychologists Press (CPP). Although the FIRO-B has been extensively validated and normed in English in the US, as far as we know, it has never been formally validated in the Spanish language. TEAM's Spanish version is reported by CPP to be the only authorized translation.

Turning to the FIRO-B data (Table 9), there are some differences between the Canadian and US samples: The US figures are slightly higher in all six cells, and all differences are statistically significant. However, in samples as large as the ones reported, even small differences can be significant. To filter out this statistical overstatement, we used an additional criterion established by Center for Creative Leadership researchers (Nilsen & Campbell, 1993; Van Velsor, Taylor, & Leslie, 1993), using comparisons of absolute differences and standard deviations: If there is statistical significance and at least 1/3 of a standard deviation of difference between the measures, then we take the difference as "discrepant."

Table 10. Meaningful FIRO-B Comparisons.

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| Canada/US | Inclusion | Control | Affection |
| Expressed | | | |
| Wanted | | | |
| Canada/Mexico | Inclusion | Control | Affection |
| Expressed | | * | * |
| Wanted | | | |
| US/Mexico | Inclusion | Control | Affection |
| Expressed | | * | * |
| Wanted | | | |

* $p < .001$, > 0.33 average discrepancy.

Campbell and Van Velsor (Nilsen & Campbell, 1993; Van Velsor et al., 1993) have used 1/2 standard deviation as a cutoff comparison point. Campbell suggested that among practitioners, 1/3 standard deviation may be enough to detect difference in individuals and groups. For example, this equates to about five or more IQ points or some 30 points or more on the College Boards. In our data, expressed control as compared between Canadian/Mexican and US/Mexican groups differed by .48 and .35 standard deviation units, respectively. Expressed affection in the same sample order differed by .65 and .52 standard deviation units, respectively.

Using this criterion, there are discrepancies in the US/Mexican and in the Canadian/Mexican measures. In both cases, Mexican managers are higher in expressed control and expressed affection.

These measures are again consistent with our earlier data on smaller US and Mexican managerial subsamples. The figures suggest an increased level of interpersonal expression, more "outerness" in Latin American managers' behavior toward others, especially in control and affection. Together, the combination of control scores, higher expressed and lower wanted, reinforces a portrait of Mexico's more authoritarian business culture. Of course, this stereotype is not universal, but authors such as Riding (1985) point to the absolute authority of the father figure that traditionally extends to the larger society, making organizational and political authority more palatable, even in the face of lower wanted control. It is also worth noting that preferred styles in all FIRO-B cells increase from north to south, echoing the stereotypes of the "cool" Northerner of British and French heritage, compared to the "warmer" Latins, with the United States in between.

Concerning correlations between the MBTI and the FIRO-B, Myers and McCaulley (1985) reported strong relationships between extraversion and both expressed inclusion and expressed affection. This was confirmed by Schnell, Hammer, Fitzgerald, Fleenor, and Van Velsor (1994), for managerial samples. The same tendency is also borne out in our data; as extraversion increases, "north to south," expressed inclusion and expressed affection also rise. Moreover, the MBTI *Manual* (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) also lists correlations between expressed control and the TJ preferences. These are also consistent with our findings of increased proportions of TJs when Canadian managers and US managers are compared to Mexican managers (but not when Canadian and US managers are compared to each other).

Conclusions and Implications for the Practitioner

What do these personality differences mean to

the success of the NAFTA treaty? Any individual application of general personality profiles becomes stereotypical and may lead us astray. But in general terms, we believe these measures are borne out in the executive groups we train and may be useful in business dealings among members of different cultures.

First, with the exception of the E-I measures, Mexican managers exhibit more areas of difference from Canadian and US managers than their northern neighbors differ from each other. Although Canadians may like to think of themselves as different from Americans—and in many ways they are—the relative similarities among executives from both groups in information processing and interpersonal styles as measured here are important.

It is not news that both northern neighbors find Mexicans different from themselves, and the context of the NAFTA negotiations has been replete with economic expressions of this difference. When dealing with Mexican business and government officials, it is important to be aware of personality aspects. For example, as pronounced SJs, Mexican managers are likely to be more accepting of traditional values. One of these values is distrust of foreigners, particularly of North Americans (from the United States) who, as Riding (1985) and other authors have pointed out, are perceived to have “invaded” or “violated” Mexico on repeated occasions. For example, Riding cited the incursion of US Marines into Mexico in 1849, and we remember the refrain from the Marine Corps hymn, “From the Halls to Montezuma (Moctezuma) . . .” If NAFTA means an “invasion” of foreign capital, especially from Canada and the United States, there may be social repercussions even if local elites accept this investment. It can also be perceived as “typical” foreign intrusion or “imperialism” for the United States to attempt to regulate ecological conditions in Mexico. “Sovereignty” is an extremely important concept to Mexicans, especially high control SJs, and any threat to Mexico’s autonomy may be rejected out of hand.

In our own work, our audiences have shown more sensing behaviors: Most of our manager participants are trained as engineers, accountants, and finance specialists. These make up the overwhelming majority of Mexican executives, with relatively few liberal arts types, even in the areas of marketing and human resources, the usual areas where intuition is found. Canadian and US executives may find their Mexican counterparts very close to the ground on many issues: fact-oriented and present-focused, as well as proud and sensitive to criticism—all STJ traits. We have worked with organizations whose management structure, even at the top level, tested over 80% STJ. Moreover, even in other-than-technical areas, the Mexican educational system seems to orient its students toward the “book solution” or to what the

professor (authority) says. Likewise, business development, or creative problem solving in general, may be delegated upward to top management. In any case, our experience and our data indicate that the SJ approach may limit the horizons of Mexican executives in searching for innovative solutions to old problems and overlooking long-range implications in favor of current realities.

The extreme T focus among Mexican managers may also be problematic, although US and Canadian executives possess this tendency as well. But the Mexican business culture can be very firm-minded and critical, even at the secretarial levels. We have previously reported the tendency for Mexican secretaries and administrative assistants to be just as TJ as their bosses (Osborn & Osborn, 1990).

This thinking approach may cause concern to those of us who postulate the importance of an other-centered leadership approach, with a refocus on internal and external clients and their needs and values. If empathic behaviors are not practiced, it may be even more difficult to productively negotiate across cultural boundaries, where sensitivity to differences is even more critical.

Turning to the FIRO-B data, an increased level of interpersonal behavior is a characteristic of our Mexican training groups, compared to other North American groups. This translates into our increased efforts to relate personally to participants, including more one-on-one time, and more time invested in cocktail hour and other social events. In order for us to make the impact we want in our programs, we have to enter into close and sustained interpersonal contact.

For the same reason, US and perhaps even Canadian executives may find they have to invest more time and effort in getting to know their Mexican colleagues personally. If the introversion scores of Canadian managers are any further indication, they especially may have to express more “outer” conversational processes. Time (and budget) must be provided for social interaction. For example, long business lunches and dinners are typical, and very little direct business may be discussed at the table. One of the reasons for this increased interpersonal contact lies in the Mexican (and Latin American) “*desconfianza*” syndrome. For reasons buried in the development of social and legal systems inherited from the Iberian peninsula, others are generally not trusted until one establishes a personal relationship, involving knowing family and other background, educational experiences, etc. Riding (1985) and others have written about this syndrome. For example, Loehr and Powelson (1981) have detailed the “economics of mistrust”; Trompenaars (1993) handled the concept in his “specific-diffuse” relationship dimension.

For the same reasons, it may take longer to establish working relationships across international lines between Mexican executives and their northern counterparts, particularly if the Northerners venture into Mexican cultural territory with time limits for getting business done. Interpersonal relationship time may be more important than clock time.

The matter of expressed control deserves some consideration. Of the interpersonal measures, this may be the most difficult for northern neighbors to adapt to, in the face of demands for empowerment and the compression of the organizational pyramid, both of which run counter to standard Latin culture.

The typical Mexican and Latin American organization is more hierarchical and highly dependent on the top decision-maker. In a US or Canadian organization, frequently the best way to get things done is to find the mid-level managers who have their hands on the controls. However, in Latin cultures, a larger number of matters must be sent upward for decision. This makes "powering down" a more difficult proposition, if that is the espoused goal of the northern partner. Canadian and US organizations must face the possible practical refusal of Mexican partners to release power downward, especially if this seems to threaten their need for control.

In summary, the personality measures we have obtained indicate that the Mexican business "culture" may be considerably different from what US and Canadian executives are accustomed to. Many Mexican managers may be more oriented toward interpersonal attention and active maintenance of relationships, but at the same time more traditionalist, less visionary, more thinking or analytical, and less apparently empathic. They may also be more oriented toward top-down decision making, with an inherent respect for rules and for authority roles.

We have found all of these tendencies in our leadership development programs. But what we have also found is a profound respect throughout the continent for the value of cooperation and the need for going beyond national boundaries for economic growth. We believe the latter will prevail and that personality differences will only add to the overall diversity and competitiveness of North American partners as they reap the benefits of becoming good—and less distant—neighbors.

References

- Casas, E. (1990). The development of the French version of the MBTI in Canada and in France. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 20, 3-15.
- Harris, P., & Moran, R. (1991). *Managing cultural differences* (3rd ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. London: Sage Publications.

Inclan, A. (1986). The development of the Spanish version of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Form G. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 11, 35-46.

Loehr, W., & Powelson, J. P. (1981). *The economics of development and distribution*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Nilsen, D., & Campbell, D. P. (1993). Self-observer rating discrepancies: Once an overrater, always an overrater? *Human Resource Management*, 32, 265-281.

Osborn, T. N., & Osborn, D. B. (1986). Leadership training in a Latin context. *Issues and observations*, 6(2). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Osborn, T. N., & Osborn, D. B. (1990). Leadership in Latin American organizations: A glimpse of style through personality measures. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 449-454). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Osborn, T. N., & Osborn, D. B. (1993). Style and personality differences between United States and Latin American executives. *Proceedings of psychological type and culture—East and West: A multicultural research symposium* (pp. 261-273). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Riding, A. (1985). *Distant neighbors, a portrait of the Mexicans*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Schnell, G., Hammer, A., Fitzgerald, C., Fleenor, J., & Van Velsor, E. (1994). Relationships between the MBTI and the FIRO-B: Implications for their joint use in leadership development. *Conference proceedings of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and leadership: An international research conference* (pp. 177-188). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Schutz, W. C. (1955). *FIRO. A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture*. London: The Economist Books.

Van Velsor, E., Taylor, S., & Leslie, J. (1993). An examination of the relationships among self-perception accuracy, self-awareness, gender, and leader effectiveness. *Human Resource Management*, 32, 249-263.

Contact

T. Noel Osborn, Ph.D.
TEAM, Inc.
12000 Network Blvd., Suite 100
San Antonio, TX 78249

(210) 641-7733

* * *