PACIFIC MOH STAFF WORKSHOP ON PERSONALITIES

FACILITATOR INSTRUCTION SHEET

Background

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is a personality assessment tool that categorizes individuals into 16 personality types based on preferences in four dimensions. This workshop outline developed by the James Cook University Outreach Team and PacMOSSI adapts the MBTI approach for simple use by Pacific Ministry of Health staff and teams, especially those involved in vector surveillance and control.

Expected outcomes
- Improved awareness of individual personality attributes
- Improved awareness of differences in personalities across the team
- Improved awareness of the impact of personality on team interactions

Potential applications
- Build a positive self-concept and understand its influence on individuals' life, learning and work
- Learn to apply abilities for building positive and effective working relationships with others
- Learn to identify, monitor, and respond to change and growth
- Develop strategies for responding to circumstances that may impact wellbeing, mental or physical health
- Develop qualities to optimise positive working relations

Activity overview

Facilitator
A facilitator who is familiar with MBTI concepts is preferred, though someone who has undertaken the workshop may also be suitable.

Resources
1. Quiz worksheets with 4 tables
2. Basic presentation
3. Print outs of the 8 cards (enough for each participant)

Time
Core activities can be run over a 1 hour period. Extension activities require one additional hour.

Core activity: Warm-up   (10 minutes)

Instructions to participants
There are two options here. Facilitators should select either one.

INSTRUCT either:

1. Cross your arms as you normally do
2. Now cross them
    the other way
	1. Sign your name
	2. Now sign your name
	    using your other hand

Discussion
EMPHASISE: Each of us is an individual with strengths and weaknesses (or things we might decide we need to improve).
• Everyone here could fold their arms both ways or sign your name. Obviously your preferred way is easier, however just because it is easier one way, doesn't mean that you can't learn to do it another way.

ASK: What did you have to do to fold your arms (sign your name) the other way? How do you think you could improve this?
• Think about it more
• Take more time
• Felt 'weird'
• Isn't done as well

EXPLAIN: We all have our preferred ways of doing things and preferred way of working. Individually it's quite easy for us to just do what works for us, but what about if we are required to work with other people, who might do things a different way. Just because someone does something a different way, it doesn't mean it is the wrong way of doing it.

Core activity: Forming profiles   (20 minutes)

Instructions to participants
GIVE: Each participant the Dichotomy quiz worksheet to complete.

INSTRUCT:
• Place a tick against the one statement they feel suits them for the two choices on each line
• Add the total number of ticks in each column.
• Circle the letter at the bottom of the column with the most number of ticks
• Complete this for all four tables

EXPLAIN:
• There are absolutely no right or wrong answers
• They should choose the statement that they feel suits them best most of the time. Don't worry about specific situations.
• The first choice is usually the right choice – don't overthink it

EMPHASISE: There are no consequences attached to the choices they make

Core activity: Reflecting on profiles   (20 minutes)

Instructions to participants
INSTRUCT: Each participant should collect the cards for the letter they have selected for each table, so that they each have 4 cards:

- One of I (Internaliser) or E (Externaliser)
- One of D (Detail) or B (Big Picture)
- One of L (Logical) or H (Harmony)
- One of S (Structure) or C (Casual)

Discussion
INSTRUCT:
- Go through each personality category and explain and contrast the different personality types with the category.
- Invite one person from each type to read out the description on the card (or in the presentation).

REFLECT:

Internalisers (I) tend to process information privately, prefer written communication, and may need time to reflect before responding. They are valuable for thoughtful analysis and independent work.	*Externalisers (E)* often think aloud, thrive in collaborative settings, and may drive group discussions. They energize teams and help maintain momentum during meetings.	*Balancing these types ensures both thorough internal processing and dynamic group engagement. Teams benefit when space is created for both reflective input and open discussion.*
Detail-oriented (D) individuals excel at managing protocols, ensuring compliance, and following through on logistics—crucial for implementation and surveillance tasks.	*Big Picture thinkers (B)* are future-focused, strategic, and comfortable with ambiguity. They help set vision and navigate policy or reform-level thinking.	*In health ministries, bridging operational precision with strategic foresight is critical. Teams function best when these perspectives inform each other rather than compete.*
Logical (L) types prioritize objectivity, data, and consistency. They're essential in evidence-based policy, evaluation, and technical decision-making.	*Harmony-focused (H)* individuals emphasize team morale, stakeholder engagement, and inclusive practices—especially vital in community health and inter-agency coordination.	*A strong team will value both analytical rigour and relational awareness. Balancing these ensures policies are both sound and socially accepted.*
Structured (S) individuals prefer clear plans, timelines, and defined roles. They bring discipline to processes and ensure accountability.	*Casual (C)* team members are adaptable, spontaneous, and may better handle emergencies or shifting contexts—key during outbreaks or crisis response.	*Combining structure with flexibility allows a Ministry of Health team to operate reliably under routine conditions while staying agile in times of uncertainty.*

SUMMARISE:

- The effectiveness of a Ministry of Health team often depends on how well it integrates diverse personality preferences. Recognizing and valuing different working styles promotes more inclusive collaboration, reduces conflict, and enhances both strategic and operational outcomes. Encouraging psychological safety and adaptive communication strategies can help all personality types contribute their strengths.

ADD EXTENSION ACTIVITIES HERE IF TIME PERMITS

Core activity: Wrap-Up   (10 minutes)

ASK;
- Participants to reflect on what this means for their individual working style
- Participants to reflect on what this means for team dynamics
- What adjustments can be made to their individual style to allow for the preferences of others

EMPHASISE:
- People have preferences for getting things done and participating in the world – there is no better way than the way that suits you
- Being aware of our preferences and those of others helps us to work together better We can develop skills to work outside our preference – it just might be harder and require more thought
- This activity is an indicator of some aspects of our personality – there are other factors that affect how you choose to display your personality

SUMMARISE:
- In a Ministry of Health team, where collaborative decision-making, strategic planning, and operational execution are key, the diversity of personality types can significantly shape team dynamics and effectiveness. Here's a breakdown of how each dimension may influence interactions:

END WORKSHOP

Extension activity structure

If time permits, the following activity can be integrated BEFORE the wrap up session.

EXPLAIN: Now we are going to do some simple activities to illustrate what happens when people are asked to do something using their preferred method. One looks at how you get your energy, the other looks at how you make decisions.

Extension activity: Dengue Outbreak Risk Communications Response (20 - 30 minutes)
(Externaliser / Internaliser)

INSTRUCT:
- Form groups based on preference with internalisers or externalisers together. (There should be up to 6 or 7 per group so make more groups if necessary).
- Participants are to develop a brief risk communications plan for community action during a dengue outbreak. This should outline key steps to take, activities and stakeholders who will be

involved. (Don't worry about budget!). The main components of the plan should be written down.
- 10 minutes only will be allocated to formulate the plan.

OBSERVE: Take note of the following during the activity:
- *Externalisers*: process will have involved a lot of talking over each other, people jumping in to write their ideas up, very quick to get started
- *Internalisers*: process will have involved more thought before writing up the plan, one person talking at a time, discussion about ideas before writing them down

Discussion
FACILITATE:
- At the end of 10 minutes, ask one person from each group to describe their group's action plan.
- Discuss the differences between the plans with the group as a whole.
- Share your observations for the differences in behaviour of the groups as they completed the task.
- Ask what could this mean for individuals and teams in the workplace?
    a) Quiet space versus interactive space for best work
    b) Small team or lone work versus a large teams and interactive work
    c) Adjusting to different communication and interaction styles

Extension activity: **Lost at Sea**   (20 - 30 minutes)
                      (Logical / Harmony)

INSTRUCT:
- Form groups based on preference with Logical preference and Harmony preference together. (There should be up to 4 or 5 per group so make more groups if necessary).
- Participants are to imagine that an MOH response team has been travelling to an outer island by small boat and are not within sight of land when the only boat engine stops working. The group need to devise a response plan and allocate tasks to each team member.
- 10 minutes only will be allocated to formulate the plan.

OBSERVE: Take note of the following during the activity:
- *Logical preferences*:
    - Come up with objective, impersonal criteria for deciding who does what (eg who has the most experience; who will be most credible; who did the most work; who is more qualified etc)
    - Will be more competitive and keen to promote their ideas
    - Accept the criteria set by the boss and problem solve in this context
    - Display body language that is less personal and more competitive
- *Harmony preferences*:
    - Explore what individuals in the group want (e.g. who wants to do what?)
    - Be conciliatory and put themselves in others' shoes ('I don't mind not going if X wants to)
    - Be concerned about the impact of splitting up the team; push back and try to find a way that everyone in the team can go
    - Display open body language and explore individuals' issues

ASK: Participants about the similarities and differences of the processes used. How might this impact on a team?
- Logics might neglect others' feelings
- Logics might think Harmonisers take too long to make decisions
- Harmonisers might feel that Logics are cold-hearted