"Enneagram Three Introverts are significantly more likely to be misreported as Extraverts than nonThrees. This is the result of bias present in some but not all MBTI® items that measure Extraversion–Introversion."

The Effect of the Enneagram on Measurement of MBTI® Extraversion–Introversion Dimension

Pat Wyman, M. Ed., LPC

Jay Magidson, PhD
Statistical Innovations Inc.

ABSTRACT

A sample of 500 adults (102 or 20% male, 398 or 80% female) took the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® instrument (MBTI®) Form G individually or in small groups. The participants ranged in age from about 20 to 80, and they had a variety of educational backgrounds. The majority were middle class and Caucasian. The MBTI results were verified through self-validation during one-on-one discussions with a certified MBTI administrator. These participants were also given an oral explanation of the Enneagram in order to determine their Enneagram designation. Individual MBTI questions were analyzed to determine if Enneagram type affected the way a participant answered the questions. Assuming that the self-validation process identified "true" type, the results indicated a clear and significant relationship between an Enneagram type and misreporting of an MBTI preference. This study focuses on one example (E–I) of such misreporting bias and attempts to identify the specific MBTI items responsible.

Note: For the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®) instrument, the eight preference categories are the following: Extraversion (E) versus Introversion (I), Sensing (S) versus Intuition (N), Thinking (T) versus Feeling (F), Judging (J) versus Perceiving (P).

INTRODUCTION

Within-type variation in responses to individual MBTI items may be random or systematic. Random variation is present in all surveys. Various systematic differences have been noted, discussed, studied, and analyzed since the MBTI instrument was developed. Many research articles have addressed this topic, and various tools have been designed to assist in understanding such differences, most notably the MBTI® Step II and the MBTI® Expanded Analysis Report (EAR, no longer in use). Using the Enneagram to understand systematic MBTI type differences has been suggested by several authors, but with little supporting data. Included among these approaches to using the Enneagram with the MBTI tool, is a model of the relationship between the two measures presented in the *Journal of Psychological Type* in a nontechnical application article (Wyman, 1998a).

In addition, there has been some previous study of a statistical correlation between the MBTI instrument and the Enneagram (Flautt 1998; Flautt & Richards, 1997b; Wagner, 1992), with some mention of the different roles the two systems play (Conway, 1996; Flautt, 1998; Wyman, 1997a, 1997b, 1998a, 1998b). In the present study, 10 years of accumulated data have been analyzed statistically, and the results demonstrate that there is a relationship between the MBTI instrument and the Enneagram.

Although Flautt and Richards (1997b) found some correlation between certain MBTI types and the Enneagram types, there was no direct 1:1 correlation. Nonetheless, the implications of the relationship of the two systems are many and varied. Many exciting revelations about the workings of human behavior may be found using these two typing systems together.

A detailed description of the Enneagram is beyond the scope of this article. For greater detail, consult articles and a book by Wyman listed with the references (Wyman, 2001b), as well as works by various Enneagram experts, such as Palmer (1998) and Riso (1990). In short, the Enneagram is a system of nine types, each having a distinct set of characteristics, which appear to be most active in psychological defense. The Enneagram portion of personality dominates during periods of stress, providing coping skills to protect the true self, which is profiled by the MBTI instrument (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998). The focus of the MBTI instrument is more cognitive and rational; it addresses behavior and world-view questions, particularly those related to perception and judgment. The focus of the Enneagram is on the unconscious and addresses motivational questions, particularly those dealing with psychological defense.

Sometimes the characteristics of a person's Enneagram type and MBTI preferences are compatible, allowing for a sense of internal congruence. For instance, all other things being equal, a person with a preference for Extraversion should feel more comfortable being an Enneagram Three than someone with a preference for Introversion (**TABLE 1**). The qualities of Extraversion (Myers, 1992) and Three (**TABLE 2**) are quite compatible. As a working hypothesis, we suggest that among verified Extraverts, the MBTI preference scored for Extraversion might be expected to be *higher* for Threes than for other Enneagram types.

Similar reasoning might suggest that among verified Introverts, the MBTI preference clarity index (pci) score for Introversion might be *lower* for Threes than for other Enneagram types, with the result that some Three Introverts might be misclassified as Extraverts. When a person is both Extraverted and a Three, the Extraversion pci score would be expected to be higher, because there is little within that person pulling the score towards Introversion. However, if a person is a Three with a preference for Introversion, an internal conflict exists. The Introversion part of personality looks inward for energy, whereas the Three looks outward for a sense of self and the adrenaline high associated with achievement (Wyman, 2001b). When taking the MBTI instrument, a person often references various aspects of his or her life to answer the questions. When a stressful situation is referenced, perhaps work or a difficult relationship, it is possible that the Enneagram defense will override the MBTI answer to the question (Wyman, 2001b). If a person is living a

Table 1. Comparison of Enneagram Three With MBTI® Introvert (From Wyman, 2001b).

MBTI Introvert	Enneagram Three
Private	Performer
Quiet	External focus
Reserved	Talker
Inner focus	Not private
Works behind the scenes	Needs people for identity
Listener	"Works" people

highly stressful life, the Enneagram defense may be so completely in charge that it answers the majority of the MBTI questions.

In analyzing the data for this study, we specifically hypothesized that the traits of the Enneagram Three would influence the Extraversion-Introversion score (indicated type) of participants who are Enneagram

Table 2. Characteristics of Enneagram Three (From Wyman, 2001b).

Enneagram Three
Achievement oriented; ambitious
Action oriented
Adaptable
Appearance is important; image conscious
Assertive
Attention seeking
Can compromise values
Charming
Competitive
Disconnected from feelings
Do; busy; overactive
Efficient
End justifies the means
Energetic
Enthusiastic
Failure is not an option
Fears rejection
Future oriented; visionary
Goals
Good communicator
Hates criticism
Inspirational
Manipulates
Motivational
No private life
Organized
Positive
Professionalism
Self-confident
Self-deception
Talks
Team leader
The impossible takes just a little longer

Three types. The purpose of this study was to see whether the data were consistent with our working hypothesis. If the data were found to be consistent, we would then attempt to identify specific MBTI items for which the measurement of the E–I dimension was affected and discuss the ramifications. Next, we provide a statistical model that formalizes the manner in which the influence of the Enneagram Three type on pci scores of the E–I dimension is expected to occur. Although it is not important in determining type whether a pci score is high or low, the effect of the Enneagram on a score becomes important when it changes the type designation such as from Introversion to Extraversion. The model is consistent with both latent trait/item response theory (IRT) as well as latent class (LC) models.

STATISTICAL MODEL FOR DETECTING ITEM-SPECIFIC BIAS

For simplicity of exposition and without loss of generality, we will limit our discussion to MBTI items associated with the E–I dimension that have only two response categories—an Extraverted response and an Introverted response. Let Y_k denote the response to the kth E–I item. The standard "true score" model for measuring F (as used in IRT as well as LC modeling) can be expressed as:

$$Logit(Y_k) = \alpha_k + \beta_k F + \varepsilon_k \qquad (1)$$

where $Logit(Y_k)$ represents the log-odds in favor of an E-response from the kth item, and β_k is the log-odds ratio that yields the item weight for the kth item, α_k is a measure of the item "difficulty" (the higher the value for α_k, the more likely the average respondent would be to choose the Extraverted response), and ε_k is the "measurement error" term representing all variation in item responses other than that caused by F.

F is an unobservable (latent "true score") variable for the E–I dimension. F may contain only two levels (1 = "true" Extravert, -1 = "true" Introvert) as consistent with the latent class (LC) model, or it may be viewed as continuous, as consistent with the item response theory (IRT). For a discussion about the relationship between LC and IRT, see Magidson, 1997.

Regardless of whether F is treated as dichotomous or continuous, the critical assumption required to avoid bias in the estimate of β_k is that the conditional expectation of the error does not depend upon F. Formally,

$$E\ (\varepsilon_k \mid F) = 0 \qquad (1A)$$

which means that the measurement of F must not be confounded with extraneous nuisance factors. As an example of a potential nuisance factor, assume the

Table 3. SRTT Comparison of Enneagram Three Group (*N* = 110) With Total Number of Wyman Clients (*N* = 500).

The Sixteen Complete Types

ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ
n = 5	*n* = 9	*n* = 13	*n* = 3
(4.6%)	(8.2%)	(11.8%)	(2.7%)
I = 0.58	*I* = 0.95	*I* = 1.60*	*I* = 0.59
+ + + +	+ + + + +	+ + + +	+ + +
	+ + +	+ + + +	
		+ +	

ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP
n = 2	*n* = 0	*n* = 31	*n* = 5
(1.8%)	(0.0%)	(28.2%)	(4.6%)
I = 1.52	*I* = 0.00	*I* = 1.41*	*I* = 0.84
+ +		+ + + + +	+ + + + +
		+ + + + +	
		+ + + + +	
		+ + + + +	
		+ + + + +	
		+ + +	

ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP
n = 1	*n* = 0	*n* = 23	*n* = 1
(0.9%)	(0.0%)	(20.9%)	(0.9%)
I = 0.91	*I* = 0.00	*I* = 1.29	*I* = 0.21
+		+ + + + +	+
		+ + + + +	
		+ + + + +	
		+ + + + +	
		+	

ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ
n = 7	*n* = 2	*n* = 5	*n* = 3
(6.4%)	(1.8%)	(4.6%)	(2.7%)
I = 1.33	*I* = 0.30	*I* = 1.14	*I* = 1.14
+ + + +	+ +	+ + + +	+ + +
+			

Dichotomous Preferences

E	42	(38.2%)	*I* = 0.87
I	68	(61.8%)	*I* = 1.10
S	26	(23.6%)	***I* = 0.66
N	84	(76.4%)	***I* = 1.19
T	27	(24.6%)	*I* = 0.78
F	83	(75.5%)	*I* = 1.10
J	47	(42.7%)	*I* = 0.94
P	63	(57.3%)	*I* = 1.05

Pairs and Temperaments

IJ	30	(27.3%)	*I* = 0.96
IP	38	(34.6%)	*I* = 1.24
EP	25	(22.7%)	*I* = 0.85
EJ	17	(15.5%)	*I* = 0.90
ST	15	(13.6%)	*I* = 0.92
SF	11	(10.0%)	***I* = 0.48
NF	72	(65.5%)	****I* = 1.38
NT	12	(10.9%)	*I* = 0.65
SJ	23	(20.9%)	*I* = 0.77
SP	3	(2.7%)	*I* = 0.32
NP	60	(54.6%)	**I* = 1.19
NJ	24	(21.8%)	*I* = 1.19
TJ	18	(16.4%)	*I* = 0.83
TP	9	(8.2%)	*I* = 0.68
FP	54	(49.1%)	*I* = 1.16
FJ	29	(26.4%)	*I* = 1.01
IN	52	(47.3%)	**I* = 1.26
EN	32	(29.1%)	*I* = 1.08
IS	16	(14.6%)	*I* = 0.77
ES	10	(9.1%)	**I* = 0.54
ET	12	(10.9%)	*I* = 0.87
EF	30	(27.3%)	*I* = 0.87
IF	53	(48.2%)	***I* = 1.30
IT	15	(13.6%)	*I* = 0.72

Jungian Types (E)

	n	%	Index
E–TJ	10	9.1	1.26
E–FJ	7	6.4	0.64
ES–P	1	0.9	0.15
EN–P	24	21.8	1.06

Jungian Types (I)

	n	%	Index
I–TP	7	6.4	0.96
I–FP	31	28.2	1.33*
IS–J	14	12.7	0.78
IN–J	16	14.6	1.21

Dominant Types

	n	%	Index
Dt. T	17	15.5	1.12
Dt. F	38	34.6	1.11
Dt. S	15	13.6	0.61*
Dt. N	40	36.4	1.12

N = 000   + = 1% of N   I = Selection Ratio Index   *p<.05   **p<.01   ***p<.001

Pat Wyman and Jay Magidson

The Effect of the Enneagram on Measurement of the MBTI® Dimensions

existence of a second latent variable G. For concreteness, we might think of G representing Gregariousness. Because G is not explicitly included in (1), we include it as part of the error term as follows:

$$\varepsilon_k = \lambda_k G + u_k \qquad (2)$$

where λ_k is a parameter measuring the strength of the relationship between item k and G, and u_k denotes the uniqueness associated with the kth item. Under the structure assumed in (1)–(2) above, it follows that to the extent to which the relationship between G and F causes assumption 1A to be violated, a bias occurs in the estimate for β_k, which affects the measurement of F. The result of the item bias is that the gregarious Introvert will be more likely than the nongregarious Introvert to have an inflated E-preference score caused by high measurement error and thus be more likely to be misreported as an Extravert. According to our working hypothesis, the implications of this model are that Introverted Threes might be expected to be misreported as Extraverts more frequently than nonThrees.

The concept of item bias is not new to the development of the MBTI assessment. Myers expended considerable efforts in testing potential items for demographic biases, and used only those items that were free from such biases. For example, for a T–F item to be free of a gender bias, the probability of selecting the T response must be the same for "T" males and "T" females. Similarly, the probabilities must be the same for "F" males and "F" females. Myers used the selection ratio in testing for such biases. More recently, the IRT model was used in the development of Form M of the MBTI instrument to eliminate items that showed differential item responses with respect to demographic subgroups (Harvey & Hammer, 1999).

Despite the long history of such techniques being used with the MBTI measure, we believe that the research reported here is the first application of testing for the occurrence of item bias associated with non-demographic variables.

METHOD

Participants. Over a 10-year period, 500 predominantly Caucasian adults (20% male, 80% female) were given the MBTI instrument (Form G) and the results self-validated in one-on-one interviews. The participants included in this study were generally entering therapy, ministry, or wanted guidance in spiritual growth, accounting for a type sample (MBTI instrument and Enneagram) inconsistent with that found in a random sample of the population. There were considerably more females than males, more Intuitive than Sensing types, more Feeling than Thinking types, and more Introverts than Extraverts. There was also an uneven representation of Enneagram types, with Twos not appearing in this sample at all.

Procedure. The MBTI results were self-validated on an individual basis using the guidelines outlined in the MBTI manual (Myers et al., 1998). The self-validating sessions were generally from 1 1/2 to 2 hours long. When validating the Extraversion–Introversion dimension, an emphasis was placed on energy source as the defining point of the dimension (Quenk, Hammer, & Majors, 2001). Subsequently, each participant generally spent between 1 1/4 to 1 1/2 hours in individual sessions learning about the Enneagram and its nine types in order to discern Enneagram type in the oral tradition, as recommended by Palmer (1998). The MBTI instrument and Enneagram sessions were generally a week apart.

No Enneagram instrument was used in this process, because it is our opinion that the results of the instruments currently available are influenced by MBTI traits and characteristics. To the best of our knowledge, no currently available Enneagram scoring system is expressly designed to account for the influence of a person's MBTI type on the pattern of responses. As an example, a frequently appearing question in many Enneagram instruments refers to a desire to keep options open. Although the intent is to identify an Enneagram Seven, a nonSeven who is a Perceiving type might be classified mistakenly as a Seven.

RESULTS

The measurement of any given MBTI dimension is imperfect and can be expected to be wrong as much as 25% of the time (Myers & McCaulley, 1985; Myers et al., 1998). If the error term assumption 1A holds true, this kind of misreporting is totally random. On the other hand, if assumption 1A is violated, a systematic bias exists in the measurement of type. Our working hypothesis for this study was that there is an MBTI systematic bias associated with Enneagram type. To begin, we assumed that our self-validation process identifies "true" MBTI type and accurate Enneagram type. Of the study's 500 respondents, the modal Enneagram type was the Three, exhibited by 110 participants (22%). In order to maximize the power of finding such biases, we thus focused on hypotheses associated with Threes.

The standard SRTT profile shows the 110 Threes

compared to all 500 respondents.

Threes were significantly more likely than non-Threes to be Intuitive but did not differ significantly in any of the other MBTI dimensions. In particular, regarding E–I, Wagner (1992) asserted that two-thirds of Threes can be expected to be Extraverted. Our results do not support this assertion, although compared to the general population, our sample appears skewed toward Introverts (56% of our sample self-validated as Introverts).

To check for bias, we examined the scores of all 281 participants who self-validated as Introverts and those who self-validated as Extraverts separately. Among the verified Introverts, Threes were significantly more likely to be misreported by the MBTI preference score (as Extravert) than nonThrees. Among Introverted Threes, 18 of the 68 (28%) were misreported as Extraverts. It is easy to see how this could possibly account for the inaccuracy of about 25% reported by Myers and McCaulley (1985) and inaccuracies ranging from 15% to 32% reported by others (Myers et al., 1998). However, among Introverted nonThrees, only 19 of 213 (9%) were misreported as Extraverts.

Looking more closely at specific questions that determine the E–I score, we find that not all questions contribute to this misreporting bias. Based on our 281 Introverts, we performed 20 separate chi-square tests, one for each of the 20 dichotomous E–I items in Form G of the MBTI instrument. For each test, the null hypothesis was that the probability of choosing the introverted response is the same for Threes as for nonThrees. For 10 of the 20 items, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level. For one additional item, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .10 level (which corresponds to a 1-tailed p-value of .05). For all of these items, Threes were significantly less likely than non-Threes to choose the introverted response.

The 10 items for which the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level are listed below, ranked in order of the p-value. The additional item that provides a marginal p-value was item #40 (not used on Form M)

72. (Not used on Form M) p = .0001

Would you say you
(A) get more enthusiastic about things than the average person, or
(B) get less excited about things than the average person?

3. (Form M: #3) p = .002

Are you usually
(A) a "good mixer," or
(B) rather quiet and reserved?

79. (Form M: #81) p = .003

Are you
(A) easy to get to know, or
(B) hard to get to know?

26. (Not used on Form M) p = .003

Do you usually
(A) show your feelings freely, or
(B) keep your feelings to yourself?

19. (Not used on Form M) p = .01

Do you
(A) talk easily to almost anyone for as long as you have to, or
(B) find a lot to say only to certain people or under certain conditions?

23. (Form M #23) p = .02

Can the new people you meet tell what you are interested in
(A) right away, or
(B) only after they really get to know you?

55. (Not used on Form M) p = .03

Which word appeals to you more?
(A) Speak
(B) Write

77. (Not used on Form M) p = .04

When something new starts to be the fashion, are you usually
(A) one of the first to try it, or
(B) not much interested?

37. (Form M #38) p = .04

Which word appeals to you more?
(A) Reserved
(B) Talkative

10. (Form M #10) p = .05

In a large group, do you more often

(A) introduce others, or

(B) get introduced?

DISCUSSION

Simply by looking at the Enneagram Three descriptors in Table 2, it is easy to see how it is possible that the Enneagram Three part of personality could influence the answers to the 10 questions, causing a verified Introvert to select the Extraverted response. However, through the process of self-validation, the Introverted Three can readily differentiate between the Three's outward focus and adrenaline rush and the Extravert's finding energy externally. Subsequent to the initial rush, Introverted Threes report a significant energy drain after extraverting for extended periods, express a profound discomfort under those circumstances, and long for alone time.

During the one-on-one interviews, Introverted Threes related to, and described in detail, the internal conflict they felt between their preference for Introversion and the Three defense. (**See Table 1**.) Some referred to having a mask or alter ego that was deceptively outgoing that felt false and "not real." Most noted the amount of energy it took to maintain the false front.

In looking at E–I in relation to Three, it is noteworthy that only two questions in the "word pair" section of the MBTI instrument seem to be significantly affected by Enneagram type. This suggests that an accurate response is more likely to be expressed without situational influences that may trigger the Enneagram defense (Wyman, 2001b). The one-on-one interviews seem to support this position.

Although, as stated, there is no direct 1:1 correlation of specific MBTI instrument and Enneagram types, Flautt and Richards' (1997a, 1997b) work shows that there is a high correlation for certain Enneagram types and specific MBTI types. For instance, there is an affinity between an ISTJ and an Enneagram One. The challenge, then, of developing a correct classification for an Enneagram One who is not an ISTJ (or for a nonOne who happens to be ISTJ) is to avoid items that contain a bias associated with the Enneagram One. Although our sample size did not permit a thorough analysis for each affinity, it seems reasonable to believe that the bias caused by Enneagram type may affect certain MBTI classifications more than others.

CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we examined the possibility that some misreporting of MBTI type may be explained by differential item bias associated with an individual's Enneagram type. We found strong evidence that Threes who are Introverts are more likely than nonThree Introverts to be misreported as Extraverts. Certainly there is a need for more detailed analysis of this collection of data to determine which MBTI dimensions are affected by misreporting biases associated with a respondent's Enneagram type. There also needs to be a larger sampling of other Enneagram types as well as a sampling that would be more representative of the population at large. Other implications of our research include the following:

■ The misreporting bias we identify here for the MBTI instrument may well be even more serious for the measurement of Enneagram type in which the items used are similar to many of the MBTI items. Because highly significant correlations have been found between the two typologies (Flautt, 1998), and the MBTI part of personality is more strongly responsive to behavioral questions than the Enneagram part (Wyman, 2001b), there is reason to believe that Enneagram instruments will tend to measure the Enneagram that is most highly correlated with the MBTI type of the respondent. (E.g., nonOnes may tend to be misclassified as Ones if they have a preference for ISTJ.) Therefore, we question the validity of the many current Enneagram instruments, because a valid Enneagram instrument would need to account for MBTI type variations in responses and separate out such confounds.

■ It is possible that the Enneagram effects might be quite congruent with out-of-pattern facet scores used in the MBTI® Step II instrument (Kummerow & Quenk, 2003; Wyman, 2001a), and hence might be useful in the further explanation of such in terms of Enneagram theory as well as the development of additional kinds of patterns.

■ It is hoped that this initial exploration of the relationship between the Enneagram and MBTI instrument scores will demonstrate effectively the need for facilitated self-validation of indicated scores. We suggest that, as long as the MBTI instrument contains such item bias, no understanding of MBTI type is complete without consideration of the Enneagram defense part of personality. In order

to filter out Enneagram influence, the interviewer must be able to determine Enneagram type and to ask questions that the Enneagram part of personality cannot answer or affect. The clear need is to be able to determine both Enneagram and MBTI types simultaneously.

In conclusion, we also wish to emphasize that the validity of the results of this research, and any future research of this kind, hinges on the validity of the self-validation procedures used.

REFERENCES

Conway, E.F. (1996). Interweaving the MBTI and the Enneagram. *Bulletin of Psychological Type 19*(2), 14, 17.

Flautt, T. (1998). MBTI–Enneagram type correlation study results. *Bulletin of Psychological Type, 21*(8), 37–38.

Flautt, T., & Richards, J. (1997a). Preliminary report: MBTI–Enneagram study. *Bulletin of Psychological Type, 20*(2), 39.

Flautt, T., & Richards, J. (1997b). Finding meaning in MBTI and Enneagram type correlations. *Bulletin of Psychological Type, 20*(4), 32–34.

Harvey, R. J., & Hammer, A. L. (1999). Item response theory. *The Counseling Psychologist, 27*(3), 353–383.

Kummerow, J. M., & Quenk, N. L. (2003). *Understanding your MBTI Step II results: A step-by-step guide to your unique expression of type.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Magidson, J. (1997). Type versus trait debate rekindles. *Bulletin of Psychological Type, 20*(4), 40.

Myers, I. B. (1992). *Introduction to type* (5th ed). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

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

Palmer, H. (1991). *The Enneagram: Understanding yourself and the others in your life.* San Francisco: Harper Collins.

Quenk, N. L., Hammer, A. L., & Majors, M. S. (2001). *Step II manual: Exploring the next level of type with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form Q.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Riso, D. R. (1990). *Understanding the Enneagram.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Wagner, J. P. (Speaker). (1992). *Two windows on the self: The Enneagram and the Myers-Briggs* (Cassettes 1–6). Kansas City, MO: Credence Cassettes.

Wyman, P. (1997a). MBTI and Enneagram, Part 1. *Enneagram Monthly, 3*(11), 1, 20–22.

Wyman, P. (1997b). Enneagram and MBTI, Part 2. *Enneagram Monthly, 3*(12), 11–13.

Wyman, P. (1998a). Integrating the MBTI and the Enneagram in psychotherapy: The core self and the defense system. *Journal of Psychological Type, 46*, 28–40.

Wyman, P. (1998b). Trigger points: Using the Enneagram and the MBTI in therapy. *Enneagram Monthly, 4*(2), 1, 20–22.

Wyman, P. (2001a). The Enneagram and the MBTI: Scoring. *Bulletin of Psychological Type, 24*(3), 26–27.

Wyman, P. (2001b). *Three keys to self-understanding: An innovative and effective combination of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® assessment tool, the Enneagram, and inner-child healing.* Gainesville, FL: Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc.

Pat Wyman, LPC (INFJ), has a Master's degree in Education, Counseling from the University of Missouri St. Louis, is qualified for the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®) instrument, is an Inner-Child Therapist in private practice, and a certified hypnotherapist. She is trained in the Enneagram, imaging, and Neurolinguistic Programming. Pat has also served as consultant to various business and ministry groups and has presented workshops for corporate teams, small companies, ministry groups, and retreats. She has presented workshops at the International Enneagram Conference and a variety of MBTI regional and international conferences, including the MBTI Clinical Conference. She has published articles in the *Enneagram Monthly*, *Dream Network Journal*, *Bulletin of Psychological Type*, and the *Journal of Psychological Type*. She is an adjunct faculty member of Rockhaven Ecozoic Center and a former faculty member of the Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc.™ (CAPT®). Her book, *Three Keys to Self-Understanding: An Innovative and Effective Combination of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® Assessment Tool, the Enneagram, and Inner-Child Healing*, is published by CAPT.

Jay Magidson, Ph.D. (INTJ), is founder and president of Statistical Innovations, a Boston consulting, training, and software development firm specializing in segmentation modeling. He has been involved in psychological type research for over 10 years and has coauthored an article on psychological type with the late Mary McCaulley. Widely published in professional journals, his expertise includes both study design and advanced statistical modeling based on log-linear, latent class, and other advanced statistical models. He has taught statistics at Tufts University and Boston University, and for more than 20 years he has conducted workshops with various colleagues on statistical modeling at "Statistical Modeling Week" conferences.

CONTACT

Pat Wyman, M.Ed., LPC.
15620 Manchester Rd., Suite 1
Ellisville, MO 63011
314.941.8790
patwyman@earthlink.net