Technical Brief for the

MBTI® FORM M and FORM Q ASSESSMENTS

Thai

Nancy A. Schaubhut
Richard C. Thompson

800-624-1765 | www.cpp.com

INTRODUCTION

The *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*® (MBTI®) instrument is one of the most commonly used personality assessments in the world. Because administration of the instrument outside the United States is growing rapidly, new translations are continually being developed for use in specific regions. This technical brief summarizes the measurement properties of a Thai translation of the MBTI Form M and Form Q assessments with a Thai sample. To that end, it examines the reliability of the MBTI Form M and Form Q assessments, reports on type distribution in a sample of Thai participants who completed the assessment in Thai, and provides comparisons with the US national representative sample (NRS) used in the *MBTI® Manual* (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998) to examine similarities and differences between the groups.

THE MBTI® ASSESSMENT

The MBTI assessment uses a typology composed of four pairs of opposite preferences, called *preference pairs:*

- Extraversion (E) or Introversion (I)—how you direct and receive energy
- Sensing (S) or Intuition (N)—how you take in information
- Thinking (T) or Feeling (F)—how you decide and come to conclusions
- Judging (J) or Perceiving (P)—how you approach the outside world

The assessment combines an individual's four preferences—one from each preference pair, denoted by its letter—to yield one of the 16 possible personality types (e.g., ESTJ, INFP, etc.). Each type is equally valuable, and an individual inherently belongs to one of the 16 types. This model differentiates the MBTI assessment from most other personality instruments, which typically assess personality traits. Trait-based instruments measure how much of a certain characteristic an individual possesses. Unlike the MBTI assessment, those instruments usually consider one end of a trait to be more positive and the other to be more negative.

THAI TRANSLATION

The Thai translation of the MBTI assessment used in this study was completed following CPP's standard translation process, which is based on industry-standard methods for assessment translation (International Test Commission, 2005). The 230-item global research version (GRV) of the MBTI assessment was first translated into Thai using a double forward process by two independent subject matter experts—working with Potentia, the Thai distributor—who are literate in Thai and English. The translations were then sent to a professional linguist for review and integration into a single translation. The integrated translation was returned to the two translators and iteratively reconciled into a final translation.

THAI SAMPLE

A sample composed of 2,337 Thai respondents who completed the GRV of the MBTI assessment in Thai was obtained for this study. It is important to note that this is not a representative sample, but rather a sample of convenience. Therefore, no inferences may be drawn about the preferences or type distribution of the population of Thailand. The data reported in this technical brief should be used for psychometric information purposes only.

The Thai sample includes 71% women and 29% men. Respondents' ages ranged from 19 to 62 years (mean = 33.0, *SD* = 9.6); 75% were employed full-time or part-time, 19% were students, 1% were retired, 3% were not working for income, and 2% responded "none of the above." All respondents reported their country of origin and/or residence as Thailand. A demographic summary of this sample is presented in Table 1.

Table 2 includes the number and percentage of respondents of each type in the sample. As shown, the most frequently occurring type for this sample is ISTJ (18.8%), followed by ESTJ (16.7%). The least common types are ENFP (1.3%) and ENTP (1.3%). Type distributions for women and men in the Thai sample are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 5 shows the number and percentage of respondents for each preference for the Thai sample as a whole, and separately for each gender. Also included for reference are the number and percentage of respondents for each preference in the US national representative sample (NRS; Myers et al., 1998).

TABLE 1. DEMOGRAPHIC SUMMARY OF THE THAI SAMPLE

Demographic	Sample %
Age	
Mean age: 33 yrs	
Gender	
Female	71
Male	29
Employment Status	
Working full-time	67
Working part-time	8
Not working for income	3
Retired	1
Enrolled as full-time student	19
None of the above	2
Organizational Level	
Entry level	40
Nonsupervisory	7
Supervisory	16
Management	5
Executive	2
Top executive	0
No response	31

Demographic	Sample %
General Line of Work	
Education, training, and library	16
Business and financial operations	14
Personal care and personal service	9
Healthcare practitioner and technical	8
Healthcare support	8
Office and administrative support	8
Architecture and engineering	6
Sales and related	6
Computer and mathematical	3
Life, physical, and social sciences	3
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media	2
Community and social services	2
Food preparation and food service	2
Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance	1
Construction and extraction	1
Farming, fishing, and forestry	1
Legal	1
Military	1
No response	9

Note: N = 240. Due to rounding, percentages may not total 100%.

RELIABILITY OF THE FORM M PREFERENCES

The internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach's alphas) for the Thai sample and the US NRS are reported in Table 6. The reliabilities of the four preference pairs are good for the Thai sample, although somewhat lower than those reported in the *MBTI® Manual* (Myers et al., 1998).

FACTOR ANALYSIS

Several studies have conducted confirmatory factor analyses of the MBTI assessment to assess the validity of its factors. They have indicated that a four-factor model, such as the one theorized and developed by Myers, is the most appropriate and offers the best fit (Harvey, Murry, & Stamoulis, 1995; Johnson & Saunders, 1990). A principal components exploratory

TABLE 2. MBTI® TYPE DISTRIBUTION IN THE THAI SAMPLE

SENSING		INTUITION			
Thinking	Feeling	Feeling	Thinking		
ISTJ *n* = 45 18.8%	**ISFJ** *n* = 23 9.6%	**INFJ** *n* = 5 2.1%	**INTJ** *n* = 4 1.7%	Judging	INTROVERSION
ISTP *n* = 20 8.3%	**ISFP** *n* = 24 10.0	**INFP** *n* = 5 2.1%	**INTP** *n* = 9 3.8%	Perceiving	
ESTP *n* = 20 8.3%	**ESFP** *n* = 8 3.3%	**ENFP** *n* = 3 1.3%	**ENTP** *n* = 3 1.3%		EXTRAVERSION
ESTJ *n* = 40 16.7%	**ESFJ** *n* = 18 7.5%	**ENFJ** *n* = 7 2.9%	**ENTJ** *n* = 6 2.5%	Judging	

Note: $N = 240$.

TABLE 3. MBTI® TYPE DISTRIBUTION IN THE THAI SAMPLE: WOMEN

SENSING		INTUITION			
Thinking	Feeling	Feeling	Thinking		
ISTJ *n* = 31 18.2%	**ISFJ** *n* = 20 11.8	**INFJ** *n* = 3 1.8%	**INTJ** *n* = 0 0.0%	Judging	INTROVERSION
ISTP *n* = 14 8.2%	**ISFP** *n* = 20 11.8%	**INFP** *n* = 3 1.8%	**INTP** *n* = 5 2.9%	Perceiving	
ESTP *n* = 14 8.2%	**ESFP** *n* = 7 4.1%	**ENFP** *n* = 2 1.2%	**ENTP** *n* = 1 0.6%		EXTRAVERSION
ESTJ *n* = 27 15.9%	**ESFJ** *n* = 13 7.6%	**ENFJ** *n* = 6 3.5%	**ENTJ** *n* = 4 2.4%	Judging	

Note: $n = 170$.

TABLE 4. MBTI® TYPE DISTRIBUTION IN THE THAI SAMPLE: MEN

SENSING		INTUITION			
Thinking	Feeling		Thinking		
ISTJ *n* = 14 20.0%	**ISFJ** *n* = 3 4.3%	**INFJ** *n* = 2 2.9%	**INTJ** *n* = 4 5.7%	Judging	INTROVERSION
ISTP *n* = 6 8.6%	**ISFP** *n* = 4 5.7%	**INFP** *n* = 2 2.9%	**INTP** *n* = 4 5.7%	Perceiving	
ESTP *n* = 6 8.6%	**ESFP** *n* = 1 1.4%	**ENFP** *n* = 1 1.4%	**ENTP** *n* = 2 2.9%		EXTRAVERSION
ESTJ *n* = 13 18.6%	**ESFJ** *n* = 5 7.1%	**ENFJ** *n* = 1 1.4%	**ENTJ** *n* = 2 2.9%	Judging	

Note: *n* = 70.

TABLE 5. MBTI® PREFERENCE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE THAI SAMPLE AND THE US NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE (NRS)

	Thai Sample (*N* = 240)		US NRS (*N* = 3,009)		Thai Sample: Women (*n* = 170)		Thai Sample: Men (*n* = 70)	
Preference	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Extraversion (E)	105	43.8	1,483	49.3	74	43.5	31	44.3
Introversion (I)	135	56.3	1,526	50.7	96	56.5	39	55.7
Sensing (S)	198	82.5	2,206	73.3	146	85.9	52	74.3
Intuition (N)	42	17.5	803	26.7	24	14.1	18	25.7
Thinking (T)	147	61.3	1,210	40.2	96	56.5	51	72.9
Feeling (F)	93	38.8	1,799	59.8	74	43.5	19	27.1
Judging (J)	148	61.7	1,629	54.1	104	61.2	44	62.9
Perceiving (P)	92	38.3	1,380	45.9	66	38.8	26	37.1

Note: Source for the US NRS is the *MBTI® Manual* (Myers et al., 1998).

factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted using the item responses from the Thai sample. The results are presented in Table 7. The shaded cells indicate that factor 1 is S–N, factor 2 is T–F, factor 3 is E–I, and factor 4 is J–P. The four-factor structure produced by this analysis shows that the MBTI Form M items in Thai are measuring their intended constructs, the four preference pairs. However, several of the items do not show a strong relationship with the S–N factor. Historically, the S–N scale has been somewhat challenging to measure, and it is possible that the translation into Thai made that even more challenging. As a result, caution should be exercised when interpreting the data.

TABLE 6. MBTI® PREFERENCE PAIR INTERNAL CONSISTENCY RELIABILITIES FOR THE THAI SAMPLE AND THE US NRS

	Cronbach's Alpha	
Preference Pair	Thai Sample	US NRS
Extraversion–Introversion	.83	.91
Sensing–Intuition	.65	.92
Thinking–Feeling	.81	.91
Judging–Perceiving	.85	.92

Note: Thai sample *N* = 240; US NRS *N* = 3,009. Source for the US NRS is the *MBTI® Manual* (Myers et al., 1998).

TABLE 7. FACTOR ANALYSIS ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX FOR THE THAI SAMPLE

Item Code	Factor 1 (S–N)	Factor 2 (T–F)	Factor 3 (E–I)	Factor 4 (J–P)	Item Code	Factor 1 (S–N)	Factor 2 (T–F)	Factor 3 (E–I)	Factor 4 (J–P)
EI1	.05	.05	.64	.05	SN1	.00	–.06	.03	.35
EI2	–.13	–.05	.54	.17	SN2	.39	–.01	.02	.11
EI3	–.09	.06	.31	.16	SN3	.02	–.03	.02	.27
EI4	.14	.11	.35	–.13	SN4	.27	–.21	–.06	–.08
EI5	.11	.09	.53	–.17	SN5	.32	–.18	–.16	–.05
EI6	–.25	.21	.51	.10	SN6	.28	.12	–.01	–.22
EI7	–.39	.12	.31	–.09	SN7	–.12	.08	–.05	.12
EI8	.02	.07	.56	–.26	SN8	.40	–.08	–.12	–.06
EI9	–.06	–.07	.29	.12	SN9	–.11	.24	–.11	.13
EI10	.21	–.13	.43	–.11	SN10	–.46	.22	–.01	.04
EI11	.13	–.07	.45	–.01	SN11	–.01	–.17	–.01	.37
EI12	–.05	–.03	.47	–.23	SN12	.50	–.27	–.01	–.04
EI13	–.03	.13	.47	.17	SN13	.39	–.01	–.02	.03
EI14	.08	–.17	.46	–.06	SN14	.29	.14	–.05	.01
EI15	–.12	.06	.49	.23	SN15	–.12	.18	–.08	.11
EI16	.09	–.05	.50	–.02	SN16	–.03	.45	.09	.10
EI17	–.03	–.07	.66	.09	SN17	–.27	.23	.02	.07
EI18	.07	.06	.43	.25	SN18	.01	.06	–.03	.33
EI19	–.28	.12	.50	.03	SN19	–.16	.28	–.06	.07
EI20	.23	–.06	.37	–.16	SN20	.42	.15	–.06	.01
EI21	.09	–.05	.58	–.03	SN21	.42	–.17	.15	.02

(cont'd)

TABLE 7. FACTOR ANALYSIS ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX FOR THE THAI SAMPLE *(CONT'D)*

Item Code	Factor 1 (S–N)	Factor 2 (T–F)	Factor 3 (E–I)	Factor 4 (J–P)	Item Code	Factor 1 (S–N)	Factor 2 (T–F)	Factor 3 (E–I)	Factor 4 (J–P)
SN22	.13	–.03	.09	.06	TF22	–.07	.44	–.02	.02
SN23	.07	.03	–.23	–.05	TF23	–.12	.55	–.08	–.03
SN24	–.03	.17	–.02	.18	TF24	.26	.03	–.01	–.08
SN25	.17	.04	–.10	.00	JP1	.21	.14	.02	.48
SN26	–.38	.01	–.14	.08	JP2	.29	.08	.06	.55
TF1	.37	.09	.10	.17	JP3	.52	–.07	.02	.38
TF2	.39	.30	.06	.09	JP4	.01	.13	.10	.56
TF3	.51	.35	.07	.07	JP5	.03	.14	.15	.37
TF4	.23	.36	.14	–.32	JP6	.39	–.16	.04	.11
TF5	.09	.42	.03	.30	JP7	.10	.14	.02	.56
TF6	–.09	.29	–.06	.01	JP8	.42	–.03	–.05	.24
TF7	.05	.58	.01	–.11	JP9	.14	.20	.01	.57
TF8	.35	.32	–.12	–.16	JP10	.22	.32	–.01	.49
TF9	.23	.32	.03	–.22	JP11	.04	.50	.01	.25
TF10	–.02	.43	–.24	.13	JP12	.16	–.07	–.05	–.18
TF11	–.17	.18	.17	.05	JP13	.51	.13	.00	.24
TF12	.02	.61	.03	–.13	JP14	.13	.41	.10	.46
TF13	.20	.26	.23	.32	JP15	.16	.00	.04	.59
TF14	.25	.46	.05	–.18	JP16	.53	–.04	.05	.22
TF15	.47	.43	–.06	–.13	JP17	.47	.07	.11	.26
TF16	–.10	.55	.06	.08	JP18	.53	.21	.07	.29
TF17	.15	.56	.07	.20	JP19	.15	–.06	–.13	.41
TF18	–.13	.48	.05	.02	JP20	.50	–.15	.05	.28
TF19	.11	.47	.03	.14	JP21	.52	–.04	.03	.30
TF20	.28	.41	.07	–.37	JP22	.44	.20	.17	.28
TF21	.32	.38	.05	–.38					

Note: $N = 240$.

RELIABILITY OF THE FORM Q FACETS

The MBTI Form Q assessment includes the 93 items that make up the MBTI Form M assessment (measuring the four preference pairs, E–I, S–N, T–F, and J–P) plus another 51 items that are used only to measure the Form Q facets. For each of the four preference pairs there are five facets (see Table 8), yielding a total of 20 facets. These facets help describe some of the ways in which each preference can be different for each individual to create a richer and more detailed description of an individual's behavior. The remaining analyses focus on the evaluation of the Form Q facets.

TABLE 8. MBTI® FORM Q FACET INTERNAL CONSISTENCY RELIABILITIES FOR THE THAI SAMPLE AND THE US NRS

	Cronbach's Alpha	
Form Q Facets	Thai Sample	US NRS
E–I Facets		
Initiating–Receiving	.68	.85
Expressive–Contained	.56	.79
Gregarious–Intimate	.41	.60
Active–Reflective	.60	.59
Enthusiastic–Quiet	.55	.72
S–N Facets		
Concrete–Abstract	.31	.81
Realistic–Imaginative	.49	.79
Practical–Conceptual	.30	.67
Experiential–Theoretical	.26	.83
Traditional–Original	.49	.76
T–F Facets		
Logical–Empathetic	.61	.80
Reasonable–Compassionate	.58	.77
Questioning–Accommodating	.36	.57
Critical–Accepting	.15	.60
Tough–Tender	.73	.81
J–P Facets		
Systematic–Casual	.61	.74
Planful–Open-Ended	.68	.82
Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted	.62	.70
Scheduled–Spontaneous	.64	.82
Methodical–Emergent	.46	.71

Note: Thai sample *N* = 240; US NRS *N* = 3,009. Source for the US NRS is the *MBTI® Manual* (Myers et al., 1998).

Internal consistency reliabilities for each facet are reported in Table 8 for the Thai sample and the US NRS. The Thai sample alphas range from .15 (Critical–Accepting) to .73 (Tough–Tender), and, as the table shows, the reliability estimates for many of the Form Q measures in the Thailand sample are significantly lower than those in the US NRS. The low reliability estimates are a cause for concern, and caution should be used when interpreting the facet results of the Form Q assessment in Thai. At present, it is not clear whether the challenge is cultural difference, a translation issue, or a matter of participants not taking the assessment seriously. Note that the MBTI Form Q (or, for Europe, Step II™) assessment usually works well across a diverse set of international samples and translations, though typically with slightly lower estimates of reliability compared to those in the US NRS (Quenk, Hammer, & Majors, 2004; Schaubhut, 2008; Schaubhut & Thompson, 2010a, 2010b, 2011a, 2011b, 2012, 2013, 2016a, 2016b, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c, 2017d). Reliabilities for nine other translations can be found in the *MBTI® Step II™ Manual,* European edition (Quenk et al., 2004).

CONCLUSION

The analyses reported here with an initial Thai sample demonstrate that the translation and overall measurement properties of the assessment are generally adequate. The Form M assessment performs better than the Form Q assessment and can be used with minimal caution with respondents who reside in Thailand and read Thai. Form Q, however, should be used with caution, and careful attention should be paid to facet results to ensure that they seem accurate for the respondent during interpretation. Over time, as use of the MBTI assessment in Thailand continues to grow, larger and more diverse samples will become available, and the measurement properties of MBTI Forms M and Q in Thai will continue to be evaluated.

REFERENCES

Harvey, R. J., Murry, W. D., & Stamoulis, D. (1995). Unresolved issues in the dimensionality of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator®. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55,* 535–544.

International Test Commission. (2005). *ITC computer-based and Internet delivered testing guidelines.* Granada, Spain: International Test Commission.

Johnson, D. A., & Saunders, D. R. (1990). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® Expanded Analysis Report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 50,* 561–571.

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® instrument.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Quenk, N. L., Hammer, A. L., & Majors, M. S. (2004). MBTI® *Step II™ manual,* European edition. Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A. (2008). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—Latin and North American Spanish.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2010a). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—Simplified Chinese.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2010b). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—Traditional Chinese.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2011a). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—Korean.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2011b). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—Brazilian Portuguese.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2012). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—Afrikaans.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2013). *Technical brief for the MBTI® European Step I™ and Step II™ assessments—Turkish.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2016a). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—Australia.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2016b). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—New Zealand.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2017a). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—India.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2017b). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—Indonesia.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2017c). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—Malaysia.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2017d). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—Singapore.* Sunnyvale, CA: CPP, Inc.

