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DEFINITION MIXED METHODS

- Mixed methods research is a research design with philosophical assumptions as well as methods of inquiry. As a methodology, it involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative data in a single study or series of studies. Its central premise is that the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems that either approach alone.

- Creswell and Plano Clark (2007: 5)
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Mixed Methods
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• Editors: Ros Cameron & Xanthe Golenko

• Part A: Foundations of Mixed Methods Research Designs and Features

• Part B: Discipline and Sub-Discipline specific utility of Mixed Methods Research Designs

• Part C: Innovations in Mixed Methods Research Designs and Data Analysis Techniques
The aim of the *Handbook of Mixed Methods Research in Business and Management* will be to provide an essential resource for anyone interested in the contemporary, emerging, and evolving practice of mixed methods research and scholarship. It is anticipated that the *Handbook of Mixed Methods Research in Business and Management* will offer foundational mixed methods research (MMR) design concepts and considerations, as well as coverage of MMR across a variety of business and management disciplines and sub-disciplines together with a section dedicated to innovative MMR designs and analytical techniques.
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COMMON ISSUES

- Paradigmatic issues
- Development of basic definitions and new set of language
- Data integration attempts can be problematic - integration rules
- Logistics - researcher has to be competent in both QUAN & QUAL and extensive resources required – Methodologically Trilingual
- Superficial claims to the use of mixed methods

- Rigorously defend methodological choices
- Explicitly document methodological congruence
RESEARCH CHOICES AND THE RESEARCH PROCESS

‘ONION’

Source: Saunders et al. (2012)
Multiple Method designs:
When more than one method or more than one worldview is used

Mixed Method designs

Mixed method research:
use QUAL & QUAN data collection & analysis in either parallel or sequential phases. Mixing occurs at the methods stage of the study

Multimethod research:
RQs are answered by using 2 data collection procedures or research methods each of which is from the same QUAL or QUAN tradition

Mixed model research:
Is mixed in many or all stages of the study (RQs, methods, data collection & analysis & inference process)

SOURCE: ADAPTED FROM TEDDLIE AND TASHAKKORI (2003, P. 11)
BASIC TYPOLOGY

Source: Saunders et al. (2012: 165)
HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE- MMR

- ‘Paradigmatic wars’- catalyst
- Short History-early 1980’s
- Rejects the ‘either or’ approach
- ‘Quiet’ revolution-resolve tensions
- Third methodological movement

Tashakkori & Teddlie (2003)

- Last ten years research methods texts have begun to address Mixed Methods
- Authorities emerging in the area
HISTORY OF MIXED METHODS RESEARCH

CRESWELL AND PLANO CLARK (2007)

- **Formative period (1950s-1980s)**
- **Paradigm debate period (1970s-late 1990s)**
- **Procedural development period (late 1980s-2000)**
- **Advocacy as a separate design period (2000+)**
THIRD METHODOLOGICAL MOVEMENT

- Growing body of trans-disciplinary literature.

- Prominent research methodologists/authorities from across discipline fields are emerging and guiding the commentary and the movements’ momentum.

- ‘...today, we see cross-cultural international interest, interdisciplinary interest, publication possibilities, and public and private funding opportunities for mixed methods research’ (Creswell and Plano Clark 2007: 18).
Mixed Methods Research
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OBSSR convened a Working Group of 19 individuals (see Appendix A. NIH Working Group on Developing Best Practices for Mixed Methods Research (31 KB) to review a preliminary draft of "best practices". This Group was comprised of experienced scientists, research methodologists, and NIH health scientists. These individuals were selected because of their expertise in NIH investigations, their specific knowledge of mixed methods research, and their experience in the scientific review process. The composition of the Working Group was diverse with members representing fields such as public health, medicine, mental health professions, psychology, sociology, anthropology, social work, education, and nursing. This Working Group met in late April 2011, and reviewed and made recommendations for the final document presented in this report.
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**PARAGDIGMATIC ISSUES**

- **Ontology:**
  - Philosophical study of the nature of reality
  - Worldview

- **Epistemology:**
  - Philosophy/theory about the nature and scope of knowledge
  - Questions what knowledge is and how it can be acquired and the extent of its validity and limits
Several authors propose pragmatism as the best paradigm for justifying MMR:

- Pragmatism supports the use of both QUAL & QUAN in same study & rejects incompatibility stance.

- Pragmatic researchers consider the RQ to be more important than either the method or paradigm that underlies it the method-"dictatorship of the RQ".

- Pragmatists rejects forced choice between postpositivism & constructionism with regards to logic, epistemology etc.

- Methodological decisions depend on the RQ and stage of the study.

- Pragmatism is very practical and applied.

- Teddlie & Tashakorri (2003:21)
PARAGDIMGOMATIC ISSUES IN MMR

- **A-paradigmatic stance**: methods & paradigms independent of each other
- **Incompatibility thesis**: MMR research is impossible (purists)
- **Complementary thesis**: MMR possible BUT must be kept separate to ensure strengths of each paradigm (situationalists)
- **Single paradigm thesis**: a single paradigm should serve foundation of MMR
- **Dialectic thesis**: MMR engages in multiple sets of paradigms & their assumptions. All paradigms are valuable but are only partial worldviews. Reject the selection of one paradigm over another.
- **Multiple paradigm thesis**: multiple paradigms may serve MM research. Difference between this & dialectic is choose one type of paradigm for a particular study over another.

(Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigmatic Stances</th>
<th>Position taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-paradigmatic stance</td>
<td>This stance states that methods &amp; paradigms are independent of each other. For many applied studies in real world settings, paradigms are unimportant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive theory stance</td>
<td>Theoretical orientations relevant to the research being undertaken (e.g. critical race theory, attribution theory) are more important than philosophical paradigms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary strengths stance</td>
<td>MMR is possible only if the different methods are kept as separate as feasibly possible so that the strength of each paradigm is maintained (situationalists).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple paradigms</td>
<td>Multiple paradigms may serve as the foundation for MMR. In some MMR designs a single paradigm does not apply and so multiple paradigms may serve MMR. The difference between this &amp; the dialectic stance is the researcher chooses one type of paradigm for a particular study over another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialectic stance</td>
<td>MMR engages in multiple sets of paradigms and their assumptions. All paradigms are valuable but are only partial worldviews. This stance rejects the selection of one paradigm over another and assumes all paradigms offer something. Multiple paradigms in a single study contributes to a better understanding of the phenomenon being studied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single paradigm stance</td>
<td>A single paradigm should serve foundation of MMR. This stance was initially formulated to provide the philosophical foundation for MMR—sometimes referred to as the “alternate paradigm stance’ (Greene 2007). Examples include: pragmatism; critical realism and; transformative paradigm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the level of paradigms, DP is a metaparadigm because it carefully listens to multiple paradigms and provides a metaparadigmatic standpoint. The idea of DP for research is to (a) dialectically listen, carefully and thoughtfully, to different paradigms, disciplines, theories, and stakeholder and citizen perspectives; (b) combine important ideas from competing paradigms and values into a new workable whole for each research study or program evaluation; (c) explicitly state and “pack” the approach with stakeholders’ and researchers’ epistemological and social-political values to guide the research (including the valued ends one hopes for and the valued means for getting there); (d) conduct the research ethically; (e) facilitate dissemination and use of research findings (locally and more broadly); and (f) continually, formatively evaluate and improve the outcomes of the research-and-use process (e.g., Is the research having the desired societal impact?). In short, DP is a change theory, and it requires listening, understanding, learning, and acting.
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Abstract
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Deadline for manuscript submissions: 31 July 2020.
Sample of accounting journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Scimago Quartile Ranking</th>
<th>Scimago 2018 Citations per Document (2 years)/ Journal Impact Factor (Thomson Reuters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Organizations and Society (AOS)</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>3.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Accounting Review (BAR)</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>3.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Perspectives on Accounting (CPA)</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>3.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Accounting Literature (JAL)</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Accounting Research (MAR)</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>5.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Total # Articles</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Qual</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Qual</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Column labels: Total # Articles | Conceptual | Qual | Mixed | Conceptual | Qual | Mixed | Total
### Prevalence study

#### Table 2
Prevalence Frequencies by Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Total Health Research Articles</th>
<th>Mixed Methods Explicit</th>
<th>Mixed methods</th>
<th>Total Mixed Methods</th>
<th>Qualitative only (QUAL)</th>
<th>Quantitative only (QUAN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JHM</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>14 (1%)</td>
<td>25 (15%)</td>
<td>39 (24%)</td>
<td>18 (11%)</td>
<td>107 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHR</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>19 (5%)</td>
<td>24 (6%)</td>
<td>43 (11%)</td>
<td>98 (26%)</td>
<td>236 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMS</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMR</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>12 (5%)</td>
<td>20 (8%)</td>
<td>32 (13%)</td>
<td>76 (31%)</td>
<td>136 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHM</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>30 (30%)</td>
<td>63 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1020</strong></td>
<td><strong>46 (5%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>79 (8%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>125 (12%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>222 (22%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>673 (66%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Describe the **justification** for using a mixed methods approach to the research question

2. Describe the **design** in terms of the **purpose, priority and sequence of methods**

3. Describe **each method** in terms of **sampling, data collection and analysis**

4. Describe where **integration** has occurred, how it has occurred and who has participated in it

5. Describe any **limitation** of one method associated with the presence of the other method

6. Describe any **insights** gained from mixing or integrating methods

---
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KNOW YOURSELF BETTER THROUGH MBTI PERSONALITY TEST

PROFESSOR ROS CAMERON  30TH NOVEMBER 2021
CO_CONVENOR ANZAM MMR SIG
ONLINE QUIZ

1. MBTI/16 Personalities

Long before we had online personality tests, psychoanalyst Carl Jung speculated about personality types, particularly the concepts of introversion and extroversion.

Many of the personality tests you’ll find today are based on Jung’s research and ideas, but also use outside influences to create their own unique testing rubrics and determine outcomes.

The most popular personality test that draws heavily from Jungian psychology is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) test.

While the official, MBTI-branded version of the test is paid, there is a free version available that many people find to be just as helpful: the 16 Personality Types test.

• [https://www.16personalities.com/free-personality-test](https://www.16personalities.com/free-personality-test)
MBTI
MYERS BRIGGS PERSONALITY TYPE INDICATOR

INTJ
THE ARCHITECT
IMAGINATIVE
STRATEGIC
PLANNERS

INTP
THE LOGICIAN
INNOVATIVE
CURIOUS
LOGICAL

ENTJ
THE COMMANDER
BOLD
IMAGINATIVE
STRONG-WILLED

ENTP
THE DEBATER
SMART
CURIOUS
INTELLECTUAL

INFJ
THE ADVOCATE
QUIET
MYSTICAL
IDEALIST

INFP
THE MEDIATOR
POETIC
KIND
ALTRUISTIC

ENFJ
THE PROTAGONIST
CHARISMATIC
INSPIRING
NATURAL LEADERS

ENFP
THE CAMPAIGNER
ENTHUSIASTIC
CREATIVE
SOCIALE

ISTJ
THE LOGISTCIAN
PRACTICAL
FACT-MINDED
RELIABLE

ISFJ
THE DEFENDER
PROTECTIVE
WARM
CARING

ESTJ
THE EXECUTIVE
ORGANIZED
PUNCTUAL
LEADER

ESFJ
THE CONSUL
CARING
SOCIAL
POPULAR

ISTP
THE VIRTUOSO
BOLD
PRACTICAL
EXPERIMENTAL

ISFP
THE ADVENTURER
ARTISTIC
CHARMING
EXPLORERS

ESTP
THE ENTREPRENEUR
SMART
ENERGETIC
PERCEPTIVE

ESFP
THE ENTERTAINER
SPONTANEOUS
ENERGETIC
ENTHUSIASTIC
OPPOSITE WAYS TO DIRECT AND RECEIVE ENERGY

Source: Introduction to Myers-Briggs® Type
## TYPICAL E–I DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People with a preference for EXTRAVERSION may</th>
<th>People with a preference for INTROVERSION may</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk more, show energy and enthusiasm</td>
<td>Reflect more, be quieter, keep enthusiasm inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to questions immediately</td>
<td>Reflect before responding to questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupt</td>
<td>Wait for space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide nonverbal information—gestures, etc.</td>
<td>Be more contained, harder to read (reactions are inside)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**E–I DIFFERENCES**

**People who prefer EXTRAVERSION**
- Direct their energy and attention outward
- Focus on the outside world of people and activity

**People who prefer INTROVERSION**
- Direct their energy and attention inward
- Focus on their inner world of ideas and experiences

*We all use both preferences, but usually not with equal comfort or confidence.*

*Source: Introduction to Myers-Briggs® Type*
### HOW PEOPLE DIRECT AND RECEIVE ENERGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>People who prefer EXTRAVERSION</th>
<th>People who prefer INTROVERSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are energized by</td>
<td>Are energized by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interacting with</td>
<td>opportunity to reflect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are sociable and</td>
<td>Are private and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>contained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to communicate</td>
<td>Prefer to communicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by talking</td>
<td>in writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work out ideas by</td>
<td>Work out ideas by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talking</td>
<td>reflecting on them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People who prefer EXTRAVERSION</th>
<th>People who prefer INTROVERSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have broad interests in many things</td>
<td>Focus in depth on a few interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn best through doing or discussing</td>
<td>Learn best by reflection, mental “practice”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readily take initiative in work and relationships</td>
<td>Take initiative selectively—when the situation or issue is very important to them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OPPOSITE WAYS TO TAKE IN INFORMATION

SENSING OR INTUITION
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# S–N DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People who prefer SENSING</th>
<th>People who prefer INTUITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on present realities,</td>
<td>Focus on future possibilities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verifiable facts, and experience</td>
<td>the big picture, and insights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We all use both, but we typically prefer and trust one more than the other.
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## HOW PEOPLE TAKE IN INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People who prefer SENSING</th>
<th>People who prefer INTUITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on what is real and actual</td>
<td>Focus on patterns and meanings in whatever is presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe and remember specifics</td>
<td>Remember specifics when they relate to a pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust experience</td>
<td>Trust inspiration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HOW PEOPLE TAKE IN INFORMATION

People who prefer SENSING

- Use a step-by-step approach when gathering information
- Focus on facts and details they observe in their current environment

People who prefer INTUITION

- Focus on the implications, meanings, and future possibilities in a situation
- Focus on ways to develop something new, different, and interesting based on current information
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OPPOSITE WAYS TO DECIDE AND COME TO CONCLUSIONS

THINKING OR FEELING
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### T–F DIFFERENCES

**People who prefer THINKING**

- Like to decide things by looking at the logical consequences of their choice or action

**People who prefer FEELING**

- Like to decide things by considering what’s important to them and to others involved

Both approaches are rational and we use both, but usually not with equal ease.
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## HOW PEOPLE MAKE DECISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People who prefer THINKING</th>
<th>People who prefer FEELING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step back to get an objective view</td>
<td>Step in to identify with those involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td>Empathize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use cause-and-effect reasoning</td>
<td>Are guided by personal and social values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve problems with logic</td>
<td>Assess impacts of decisions on people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### HOW PEOPLE MAKE DECISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People who prefer THINKING</th>
<th>People who prefer FEELING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strive for an objective standard of truth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strive for understanding, harmony, and positive interactions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are reasonable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Are compassionate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can be “tough-minded”</strong></td>
<td><strong>May appear “tenderhearted”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are fair—want everyone treated equally</strong></td>
<td><strong>Are fair—want everyone treated as an individual</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OPPOSITE WAYS TO APPROACH THE OUTSIDE WORLD

JUDGING

OR

PERCEIVING
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# J–P DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People who prefer JUDGING</th>
<th>People who prefer PERCEIVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use their T or F preference to decide and take action as soon as possible based on available information</td>
<td>Use their S or N preference to gather more and more information before deciding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May feel frustrated when others insist on gathering more information before deciding</td>
<td>May feel frustrated when others insist on deciding before all the information is available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We all use both preferences, but usually not with equal comfort.

Source: Introduction to Myers-Briggs® Type
# HOW PEOPLE APPROACH THE OUTSIDE WORLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People who prefer JUDGING</th>
<th>People who prefer PERCEIVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize their lives</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Casual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodical</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## HOW PEOPLE APPROACH THE OUTSIDE WORLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People who prefer JUDGING</th>
<th>People who prefer PERCEIVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make short- and long-term plans</td>
<td>Adapt, change course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to have things decided</td>
<td>Like to keep things loose and are open to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to avoid last-minute stress</td>
<td>Find last-minute pressures energizing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Introduction to Myers-Briggs® Type*
PROFESSOR ROS CAMERON
HTTPS://RESEARCH.TORRENS.EDU.AU/EN/PERSONS/ROS-CAMERON