Technical Brief for the

MBTI® FORM M ASSESSMENT

Bahasa Indonesia

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 document summarizes the initial measurement properties of a translation of the MBTI Form M assessment developed for use in Indonesia. To that end, it examines the reliability of the Bahasa Indonesia translation of the MBTI Form M assessment, reports on type distribution in a Bahasa Indonesia sample, 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.

BAHASA INDONESIA SAMPLE

Following the translation of the MBTI assessment into Bahasa Indonesia, a sample of participants was obtained for this study. The participants in this sample completed the MBTI®—Global Research version of the assessment, which contains all the items in the U.S. version of Form M and Form Q as well as all the items in the pan-European Step I and Step II assessments. It is important to note that this Indonesian 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 Indonesian population. The data reported in this document should be used for psychometric information purposes only.

Sample Description

This sample is composed of 93 individuals who each completed the MBTI®—Global Research version of the assessment in Bahasa Indonesia (a number of cases were removed due to omitted items or duplication). 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 included 59% women and 41% men. Respondents' ages ranged from 19 to 57 years (mean = 32.9, SD = 8.2); 88% were employed full-time or part-time, 10% were students, and 2% did not provide their current employment status. Of those who were employed and reported their general line of work, 24% were working in education, training, and library occupations; 14% in business and financial operations; 14% in office and administrative support; 11% in production occupations; and the remainder in various fields. Of those who were employed and reported organizational level, 26% were nonsupervisory, 23% supervisory, 15% management, 11% entry level, 10% executive, and 2% top executive.

As shown in Table 1, the most frequently occurring types for this sample are ISTJ (22.6%) and ESTJ (17.2%). The least common types are ISFJ, ESFJ, and ENFJ (1.1% each).

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, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998).

TABLE 1. TYPE DISTRIBUTION IN THE BAHASA INDONESIA SAMPLE			
SENSING		**INTUITION**	
Thinking	Feeling	Feeling	Thinking
ISTJ *n* = 21 22.6%	**ISFJ** *n* = 1 1.1%	**INFJ** *n* = 2 2.2%	**INTJ** *n* = 9 9.7%
ISTP *n* = 8 8.6%	**ISFP** *n* = 3 3.2%	**INFP** *n* = 3 3.2%	**INTP** *n* = 5 5.4%
ESTP *n* = 6 6.5%	**ESFP** *n* = 3 3.2%	**ENFP** *n* = 3 3.2%	**ENTP** *n* = 5 5.4%
ESTJ *n* = 16 17.2%	**ESFJ** *n* = 1 1.1%	**ENFJ** *n* = 1 1.1%	**ENTJ** *n* = 6 6.5%

Judging / Perceiving / Perceiving / Judging

INTROVERSION / EXTRAVERSION

Note: N = 93.

RELIABILITY OF THE FORM M PREFERENCES

The internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach's alphas) for the Bahasa Indonesia sample and the U.S. National Representative Sample are reported in Table 3. The reliabilities of the four dichotomies are good for the Indonesian sample, and are generally in line with those reported in the *MBTI® Manual* (Myers et al., 1998). However, the alpha is somewhat lower for the Thinking–Feeling (T–F) dichotomy compared to the U.S. National Representative Sample.

TABLE 2. MBTI® PREFERENCE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE BAHASA INDONESIA SAMPLE AND THE U.S. NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE				
	Bahasa Indonesia Sample (N = 93)		U.S. National Representative Sample (N = 3,009)	
Preference	n	%	n	%
Extraversion (E)	41	44.1	1,483	49.3
Introversion (I)	52	55.9	1,526	50.7
Sensing (S)	59	63.4	2,206	73.3
Intuition (N)	34	36.6	803	26.7
Thinking (T)	76	81.7	1,210	40.2
Feeling (F)	17	18.3	1,799	59.8
Judging (J)	57	61.3	1,629	54.1
Perceiving (P)	36	38.7	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 BAHASA INDONESIA SAMPLE AND THE U.S. NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE		
	Bahasa Indonesia Sample	U.S. National Representative Sample
Dichotomy	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha
E–I	.88	.91
S–N	.88	.92
T–F	.83	.91
J–P	.90	.92

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

PREDICTION RATIOS

Prediction ratios measure the likelihood that a person choosing a certain response will in fact have that preference (Myers et al., 1998). Prediction ratios for the Bahasa Indonesia sample are reported in Table 4. While some ratios are lower than desirable, they are generally in line with prediction ratios for other international samples (Schaubhut & Thompson, 2010a; Schaubhut & Thompson, 2010b).

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 Bahasa Indonesia sample.

TABLE 4. PREDICTION RATIOS FOR THE BAHASA INDONESIA SAMPLE

Item Code	ESTJ Prediction Ratio	INFP Prediction Ratio	Item Code	ESTJ Prediction Ratio	INFP Prediction Ratio
EI1	.74	1.00	SN16	.75	.63
EI2	.66	.75	SN17	1.00	.66
EI3	.69	.77	SN18	.66	.84
EI4	.80	.79	SN19	.61	.60
EI5	.76	.71	SN20	.82	.66
EI6	.70	.75	SN21	.66	.71
EI7	.79	.68	SN22	.71	.62
EI8	.76	.81	SN23	.71	.55
EI9	.52	.57	SN24	.83	.68
EI10	.72	.87	SN25	.65	.58
EI11	.77	.67	SN26	.74	.57
EI12	.66	.75	TF1	.83	.67
EI13	.57	.85	TF2	.55	.61
EI14	.62	.86	TF3	.70	.68
EI15	.74	.79	TF4	.77	.78
EI16	.90	.79	TF5	.81	.76
EI17	.72	.96	TF6	.76	.88
EI18	.64	.76	TF7	.55	.64
EI19	.92	.64	TF8	.68	.67
EI20	.84	.61	TF9	.76	.90
EI21	.51	.87	TF10	.76	.65
SN1	.55	.63	TF11	.56	.60
SN2	.85	.64	TF12	.93	.85
SN3	.69	.70	TF13	.56	.56
SN4	.72	.58	TF14	.76	.66
SN5	.71	.57	TF15	.76	.88
SN6	.67	.57	TF16	.70	.61
SN7	.67	.60	TF17	.69	.86
SN8	.73	.65	TF18	.65	.82
SN9	.85	.72	TF19	.73	.68
SN10	.92	.74	TF20	.72	.65
SN11	.54	.60	TF21	.92	.73
SN12	.59	.66	TF22	.59	.74
SN13	.86	.59	TF23	.56	.95
SN14	.83	.57	TF24	.58	.77
SN15	.87	.61			

(cont'd)

	TABLE 4. PREDICTION RATIOS FOR THE BAHASA INDONESIA SAMPLE *CONT'D*					
Item Code	ESTJ Prediction Ratio	INFP Prediction Ratio		Item Code	ESTJ Prediction Ratio	INFP Prediction Ratio
JP1	.64	.75		JP12	.56	.58
JP2	.68	.69		JP13	.88	.84
JP3	.82	.88		JP14	.78	.88
JP4	.72	.88		JP15	.71	.78
JP5	.60	.94		JP16	.79	.83
JP6	.65	.78		JP17	.73	.75
JP7	.70	.79		JP18	.71	.79
JP8	.65	.74		JP19	.65	.74
JP9	.73	.95		JP20	.71	.92
JP10	.75	.87		JP21	.71	.74
JP11	.69	.83		JP22	.83	.79

The results are presented in Table 5. These results should be interpreted with caution, as the sample size was quite small for conducting this type of analysis. The shaded cells indicate that factor 1 is S–N, factor 2 is J–P, factor 3 is E–I, and factor 4 is T–F. The four-factor structure produced by this analysis shows that the Bahasa Indonesia MBTI Form M items are measuring their intended constructs, the four dichotomies.

	TABLE 5. FACTOR ANALYSIS ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX FOR THE BAHASA INDONESIA SAMPLE								
Item Code	Factor 1 (S–N)	Factor 2 (J–P)	Factor 3 (E–I)	Factor 4 (T–F)	Item Code	Factor 1 (S–N)	Factor 2 (J–P)	Factor 3 (E–I)	Factor 4 (T–F)
EI1	.02	−.22	.72	.07	EI12	.00	−.10	.46	.02
EI2	−.11	.07	.48	.04	EI13	−.13	.02	.55	.06
EI3	−.06	.00	.51	−.08	EI14	−.12	−.03	.55	.00
EI4	.03	−.04	.51	−.03	EI15	.01	.00	.58	.23
EI5	.12	−.11	.45	−.15	EI16	−.02	−.22	.67	.17
EI6	.07	−.14	.47	.22	EI17	.03	.03	.66	.02
EI7	.21	−.20	.26	.07	EI18	.12	.00	.43	−.10
EI8	−.07	−.07	.59	−.08	EI19	.07	−.09	.58	−.01
EI9	.03	−.22	.06	−.36	EI20	−.22	.11	.40	.19
EI10	.05	−.03	.69	.00	EI21	.04	−.02	.72	.09
EI11	−.21	−.35	.46	.15					

(cont'd)

Item Code	Factor 1 (S–N)	Factor 2 (J–P)	Factor 3 (E–I)	Factor 4 (T–F)	Item Code	Factor 1 (S–N)	Factor 2 (J–P)	Factor 3 (E–I)	Factor 4 (T–F)
SN1	.32	.00	.12	.04	TF11	−.27	−.21	.04	.35
SN2	.69	.23	.11	.08	TF12	.02	.05	.22	.69
SN3	.44	.20	.04	−.03	TF13	.16	.47	−.20	.14
SN4	.50	.20	−.09	−.01	TF14	.09	.41	−.11	.37
SN5	.51	.16	−.16	−.17	TF15	.35	.00	.04	.57
SN6	.47	.18	−.15	.10	TF16	.30	.14	−.08	.37
SN7	.49	.01	−.02	−.10	TF17	−.11	.36	−.13	.50
SN8	.67	.09	.09	.30	TF18	.22	.25	−.01	.52
SN9	.61	.19	−.04	−.12	TF19	−.02	−.19	−.07	.56
SN10	.56	−.10	−.03	−.05	TF20	−.09	.18	.25	.44
SN11	.17	−.13	.20	.24	TF21	.06	−.07	.04	.64
SN12	.42	.05	.13	−.02	TF22	.08	−.07	−.21	.56
SN13	.73	−.03	−.09	−.12	TF23	−.09	−.01	−.06	.34
SN14	.62	.18	−.12	−.01	TF24	−.03	−.02	.19	.30
SN15	.55	−.05	−.09	.04	JP1	.02	.49	.03	−.08
SN16	.37	−.05	−.09	.07	JP2	−.16	.42	−.07	−.01
SN17	.59	−.12	.00	.13	JP3	.26	.63	−.03	.04
SN18	.47	.08	.13	.11	JP4	.06	.65	−.01	.06
SN19	.31	−.10	.14	−.08	JP5	−.13	.26	.06	.24
SN20	.69	.20	.02	.10	JP6	.05	.50	−.13	−.19
SN21	.58	−.09	.12	.22	JP7	−.11	.68	.02	−.11
SN22	.63	.25	−.03	.12	JP8	.06	.37	−.20	.04
SN23	.54	.26	.11	−.02	JP9	−.02	.72	−.13	.22
SN24	.58	.13	−.07	.13	JP10	.18	.67	−.17	.12
SN25	.47	−.10	−.03	.11	JP11	.05	.56	−.16	.27
SN26	.55	−.20	−.16	−.14	JP12	.30	.20	.04	.26
TF1	.05	.18	.15	.40	JP13	.32	.72	.09	.10
TF2	.17	.08	.16	−.01	JP14	.26	.65	.08	.22
TF3	.05	.16	.02	.48	JP15	.03	.57	−.16	.01
TF4	.24	−.01	.15	.50	JP16	.06	.59	−.07	.21
TF5	−.15	.08	.02	.65	JP17	.15	.52	−.03	.02
TF6	.20	.00	.07	.60	JP18	−.04	.66	−.11	−.03
TF7	−.14	.16	.03	.41	JP19	−.22	.50	−.23	.04
TF8	.39	.06	−.19	.36	JP20	.13	.55	.21	.06
TF9	.05	.28	−.02	.52	JP21	.09	.52	.02	.01
TF10	.13	−.15	.08	.32	JP22	.22	.59	.11	.13

CONCLUSION

While the sample reported here is relatively small, it demonstrates that the translation and measurement properties of the MBTI Form M assessment are adequate. Therefore, this translation of the MBTI Form M assessment can be used with individuals who are literate in Bahasa Indonesia. As the MBTI assessment continues to grow, larger and more diverse samples will become available and the measurement properties of the MBTI Form M assessment 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.* Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

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

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

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

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