Technical Brief for the

MBTI® FORM M ASSESSMENT

Thai

Nancy A. Schaubhut
Richard C. Thompson

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 initial measurement properties of a translation of the MBTI Form M assessment developed for Thailand. To that end, it examines the reliability of the Thai translation of the MBTI Form M assessment, reports on type distribution in a sample of participants who completed the instrument in Thai, and provides comparisons with the U.S. National Representative Sample 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 *dichotomies*:

- Extraversion (E) or Introversion (I)—where you focus your attention and get energy
- Sensing (S) or Intuition (N)—how you take in information
- Thinking (T) or Feeling (F)—how you make decisions
- Judging (J) or Perceiving (P)—how you deal with the outer world

The MBTI assessment combines an individual's four preferences—one preference from each dichotomy, 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 people possess. 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 SAMPLE

Following the translation of the MBTI assessment into Thai, a sample of participants was obtained for this study.

It is important to note that this Thai sample is not a representative sample; rather, it is a sample of convenience. Therefore, no inferences may be drawn about the preferences or type distribution of the population that understands and uses Thai. The data reported in this technical brief should be used for psychometric information purposes only.

Sample Description

This sample is composed of 168 individuals who each completed the MBTI®—Global Research version of the assessment in Thai. This version of the assessment includes 230 MBTI items and contains the current commercial versions of the MBTI assessment (the Form M, Form Q, and European Step I™ and Step II™ assessments). The sample includes 73% women and 27% men. Respondents' ages ranged from 19 to 60 years (mean = 31.6, *SD* = 9.8); 64% were employed full-time or part-time, 27% were students, 2% were retired, 3% were not working for income, and 4% responded "none of the above" or did not provide their current employment status. Of those who were employed and reported their general line of work, 20% were working in business and financial operations; 20% in education, training and library; 9% in architecture and engineering, 9% in personal care and services; 8% in healthcare practitioner and technical; and the remainder in various fields. Of those who were employed and reported organizational level, 68% were entry level, 17% supervisory, 11% nonsupervisory, 3% management, and 1% executive. All respondents reported their country of origin or residence as Thailand.

As shown in Table 1, the most frequently occurring type for this sample is ISTJ (19.0%), followed by ESTJ (12.5%). The least common types are INTJ (1.2%), ENFP (1.8%), and ENFJ (1.8%). Again, since this Thai sample is not representative of the general population, no inferences should be made about the population's distribution of type.

Table 2 shows the number and percentage of respondents for each preference. Also included for reference are the number and percentage of respondents for each preference in the U.S. National Representative Sample (Myers et al., 1998).

TABLE 1. TYPE DISTRIBUTION IN THE THAI SAMPLE

SENSING		INTUITION	
Thinking	Feeling	Feeling	Thinking
ISTJ *n* = 32 19.0%	**ISFJ** *n* = 19 11.3%	**INFJ** *n* = 6 3.6%	**INTJ** *n* = 2 1.2%
ISTP *n* = 17 10.1%	**ISFP** *n* = 12 7.1%	**INFP** *n* = 5 3.0%	**INTP** *n* = 4 2.4%
ESTP *n* = 17 10.1%	**ESFP** *n* = 8 4.8%	**ENFP** *n* = 3 1.8%	**ENTP** *n* = 4 2.4%
ESTJ *n* = 21 12.5%	**ESFJ** *n* = 11 6.5%	**ENFJ** *n* = 3 1.8%	**ENTJ** *n* = 4 2.4%

Note: N = 168.

RELIABILITY OF THE FORM M PREFERENCES

The internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach's alphas) for the Thai sample and the U.S. National Representative Sample are reported in Table 3. The reliabilities of the four dichotomies are good for the Thai sample and are somewhat lower than those reported in the *MBTI® Manual* (Myers et al., 1998).

TABLE 2. MBTI® PREFERENCE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE THAI SAMPLE AND THE U.S. NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE

Preference	Thai Sample (N = 168)		U.S. National Representative Sample (N = 3,009)	
	n	%	n	%
Extraversion (E)	71	42.3	1,483	49.3
Introversion (I)	97	57.7	1,526	50.7
Sensing (S)	137	81.5	2,206	73.3
Intuition (N)	31	18.5	803	26.7
Thinking (T)	101	60.1	1,210	40.2
Feeling (F)	67	39.9	1,799	59.8
Judging (J)	98	58.3	1,629	54.1
Perceiving (P)	70	41.7	1,380	45.9

Note: Source for the U.S. National Representative Sample is Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, and Hammer (1998).

TABLE 3. MBTI® DICHOTOMY INTERNAL CONSISTENCY RELIABILITIES FOR THE THAI SAMPLE AND THE U.S. NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE

Dichotomy	Thai Sample Cronbach's Alpha	U.S. National Representative Sample Cronbach's Alpha
E–I	.84	.91
S–N	.65	.92
T–F	.77	.91
J–P	.84	.92

Note: Source for the U.S. National Representative Sample is Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, and Hammer (1998).

FACTOR ANALYSIS

Several studies have conducted confirmatory factor analyses of the MBTI assessment to assess the validity of the factors of the MBTI assessment. 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 factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted using the item responses from the Thai sample. The results are presented in Table 4. The shaded cells indicate that factor 1 is J–P, factor 2 is E–I, factor 3 is T–F, and factor 4 is S–N. The four-factor structure produced by this analysis shows that the Thai MBTI Form M items are measuring their intended constructs, the four dichotomies.

TABLE 4. FACTOR ANALYSIS ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX FOR THE THAI SAMPLE

Item Code	Factor 1 (J–P)	Factor 2 (E–I)	Factor 3 (T–F)	Factor 4 (S–N)	Item Code	Factor 1 (J–P)	Factor 2 (E–I)	Factor 3 (T–F)	Factor 4 (S–N)
EI1	.11	.68	−.06	.08	SN13	.39	.06	.05	.37
EI2	.00	.50	.01	−.22	SN14	.07	−.08	.04	.58
EI3	−.02	.28	−.01	−.04	SN15	−.02	.09	−.04	.31
EI4	.01	.48	.07	.20	SN16	−.01	−.02	.46	−.04
EI5	−.12	.53	.05	.18	SN17	−.19	−.04	.05	.33
EI6	−.14	.47	.24	−.06	SN18	.28	.00	.10	−.19
EI7	−.32	.40	.20	.03	SN19	−.09	−.04	.19	.10
EI8	−.19	.57	−.06	.18	SN20	.30	.01	.01	.64
EI9	.12	.30	.07	−.28	SN21	.41	.21	−.24	.10
EI10	.14	.44	−.21	−.07	SN22	.16	−.01	.07	.10
EI11	−.03	.45	−.08	−.18	SN23	.01	−.14	−.15	.39
EI12	−.17	.52	.01	.01	SN24	.05	.08	.11	.21
EI13	.04	.44	.05	−.04	SN25	.07	−.09	.09	.16
EI14	.03	.47	−.07	−.03	SN26	−.25	−.27	.06	.06
EI15	.01	.44	.13	−.30	TF1	.36	.11	.28	−.01
EI16	−.11	.44	−.01	.04	TF2	.28	.01	.40	−.01
EI17	−.10	.60	.06	−.17	TF3	.44	.10	.32	.24
EI18	.32	.46	.03	−.09	TF4	−.12	.22	.15	.28
EI19	−.30	.42	.15	−.08	TF5	.26	−.10	.50	−.10
EI20	.05	.46	−.04	.25	TF6	−.10	.03	.03	.29
EI21	.00	.61	−.11	.08	TF7	−.02	.15	.44	.12
SN1	.32	−.03	−.12	−.12	TF8	.10	−.06	.11	.39
SN2	.28	−.01	.02	.19	TF9	.07	−.03	.20	.08
SN3	.17	.22	−.16	−.07	TF10	.11	−.22	.40	.04
SN4	.15	.07	−.25	.14	TF11	−.15	.19	.21	−.02
SN5	.20	−.09	−.19	.40	TF12	−.14	.19	.45	.20
SN6	.08	.01	.06	.40	TF13	.31	.20	.40	.01
SN7	−.03	−.07	.11	.24	TF14	.01	.25	.24	.27
SN8	.31	−.09	−.16	.22	TF15	.32	−.08	.36	.38
SN9	−.09	−.10	.13	.41	TF16	−.08	−.03	.54	.12
SN10	−.29	−.01	.17	.14	TF17	.27	.09	.52	.06
SN11	.25	.06	.00	−.30	TF18	−.07	.05	.53	.00
SN12	.44	.03	−.39	.03	TF19	.17	−.02	.33	.08

(cont'd)

			TABLE 4. FACTOR ANALYSIS ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX FOR THE THAI SAMPLE *CONT'D*					
Item Code	Factor 1 (J–P)	Factor 2 (E–I)	Factor 3 (T–F)	Factor P (S–N)	Item Code	Factor 1 (J–P)	Factor 2 (E–I)	Factor 3 (T–F)	Factor 4 (S–N)
TF20	.04	.01	.22	.41	JP10	.41	−.10	.48	.00
TF21	.06	.06	.18	.48	JP11	.10	−.02	.44	.24
TF22	−.09	.14	.31	.14	JP12	.15	.03	−.19	.25
TF23	−.15	−.07	.52	.07	JP13	.52	−.03	.08	.12
TF24	.20	.07	−.22	.15	JP14	.31	.14	.39	−.02
JP1	.45	−.07	.16	−.08	JP15	.46	−.05	.08	−.32
JP2	.57	−.02	.04	−.16	JP16	.57	.02	.02	.08
JP3	.54	−.09	−.02	.02	JP17	.52	.01	−.03	.25
JP4	.30	−.03	.25	−.31	JP18	.50	−.02	.29	.25
JP5	.21	.06	−.04	−.17	JP19	.42	−.17	−.06	−.25
JP6	.29	−.01	−.01	.11	JP20	.55	−.10	−.09	.04
JP7	.43	−.09	.31	−.14	JP21	.57	−.06	.07	−.02
JP8	.50	−.19	−.08	.04	JP22	.54	.04	.12	.19
JP9	.46	−.12	.24	−.34					

CONCLUSION

The analyses reported here with an initial Thai sample demonstrate that the translation and measurement properties of the assessment are adequate. Therefore, translation of the MBTI Form M assessment can be widely used with individuals who understand Thai. As the MBTI assessment continues to grow, larger and more diverse samples will become available and the measurement properties of the MBTI Form M 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.

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.