Technical Brief for the

MBTI® FORM M and FORM Q ASSESSMENTS

Philippines

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 the MBTI Form M and Form Q assessments with a Philippines sample. To that end, it examines the reliability of the the MBTI Form M and Form Q assessments, reports on type distribution in a sample of Philippine participants, and provides comparisons with the US national representative sample (NRS) 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.

THE PHILIPPINES SAMPLE

Historically, the MBTI assessment has been administered in the Philippines using North American English. A sample of Philippine respondents who completed the MBTI Form Q assessment was obtained for this study. It is important to note that this Philippines 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 of the Philippines. The data reported in this technical brief should be used for psychometric information purposes only.

The Philippines sample is composed of 4,202 individuals who each completed the MBTI Form Q assessment, in North American English. The sample includes 52% women and 47% men, 2% not reported. Respondents' ages ranged from 17 to 78 years (mean = 35.0, *SD* = 9.1). All respondents reported their country of origin and country of residence as the Philippines. 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 (27.3%), followed by ESTJ (22.2%). The least common types are INFP (1.7%), ISFP (1.9%), and ENFP (1.9%).

Type tables for women and men in the Philippines sample are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 5 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 US national representative sample (NRS; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998).

TABLE 1. DEMOGRAPHIC SUMMARY OF THE PHILIPPINES SAMPLE

Demographic	Sample %
Age	
Mean age: 35 years	
Gender	
Female	52
Male	47
No response	2
Employment Status	
Working full-time	81
Working part-time	1
Not working for income	1
Retired	1
Enrolled as full-time student	2
Currently seeking employment	1
None of the above / no response	14
Organizational Level	
Entry level	8
Nonsupervisory	19
Supervisory	19
Management	25
Executive	8
Top executive	2
No response	19

Demographic	Sample %
General Line of Work	
Business and financial operations	14
Management	14
Computer and mathematical	11
Office and administrative support	9
Architecture and engineering	7
Education, training, and library	5
Production	5
Sales and related	5
Food preparation and food service	2
Installation, maintenance, and repair	2
Transportation and materials moving	1
Healthcare practitioner and technical	1
Life, physical, and social sciences	1
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media	1
Community and social services	1
Other	2
No response	18

Note: N = 4,202. Due to rounding, percentages may not total 100%.

RELIABILITY OF THE FORM M PREFERENCES

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

TABLE 2. MBTI® TYPE DISTRIBUTION IN THE PHILIPPINES SAMPLE

SENSING		INTUITION			
Thinking	Feeling	Thinking			
ISTJ *n* = 1,147 27.3%	**ISFJ** *n* = 281 6.7%	**INFJ** *n* = 104 2.5%	**INTJ** *n* = 315 7.5%	Judging	INTROVERSION
ISTP *n* = 178 4.2%	**ISFP** *n* = 81 1.9%	**INFP** *n* = 73 1.7%	**INTP** *n* = 133 3.2%	Perceiving	
ESTP *n* = 160 3.8%	**ESFP** *n* = 84 2.0%	**ENFP** *n* = 78 1.9%	**ENTP** *n* = 102 2.4%		EXTRAVERSION
ESTJ *n* = 933 22.2%	**ESFJ** *n* = 178 4.2%	**ENFJ** *n* = 90 2.1%	**ENTJ** *n* = 265 6.3%	Judging	

Note: *N* = 4,202.

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

SENSING		INTUITION			
Thinking	Feeling	Thinking			
ISTJ *n* = 551 25.4%	**ISFJ** *n* = 219 10.1%	**INFJ** *n* = 62 2.9%	**INTJ** *n* = 140 6.5%	Judging	INTROVERSION
ISTP *n* = 79 3.6%	**ISFP** *n* = 46 2.1%	**INFP** *n* = 51 2.4%	**INTP** *n* = 66 3.0%	Perceiving	
ESTP *n* = 87 4.0%	**ESFP** *n* = 61 2.8%	**ENFP** *n* = 45 2.1%	**ENTP** *n* = 35 1.6%		EXTRAVERSION
ESTJ *n* = 430 19.8%	**ESFJ** *n* = 132 6.1%	**ENFJ** *n* = 58 2.7%	**ENTJ** *n* = 105 4.8%	Judging	

Note: *n* = 2,167.

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

SENSING		INTUITION			
Thinking	Feeling		Thinking		
ISTJ *n* = 557 29.5%	**ISFJ** *n* = 56 2.9%	**INFJ** *n* = 39 2.0%	**INTJ** *n* = 171 8.7%	Judging	INTROVERSION
ISTP *n* = 96 4.9%	**ISFP** *n* = 33 1.7%	**INFP** *n* = 22 1.1%	**INTP** *n* = 67 3.4%	Perceiving	
ESTP *n* = 68 3.5%	**ESFP** *n* = 22 1.1%	**ENFP** *n* = 31 1.6%	**ENTP** *n* = 65 3.3%		EXTRAVERSION
ESTJ *n* = 483 24.7%	**ESFJ** *n* = 41 2.1%	**ENFJ** *n* = 32 1.6%	**ENTJ** *n* = 155 7.9%	Judging	

Note: *n* = 1,958.

TABLE 5. MBTI® PREFERENCE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE PHILIPPINES SAMPLE AND THE US NRS

	Philippines Sample (*N* = 4,202)		US NRS (*N* = 3,009)	
Preference	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Extraversion (E)	1,890	45.0	1,483	49.3
Introversion (I)	2,312	55.0	1,526	50.7
Sensing (S)	3,042	72.4	2,206	73.3
Intuition (N)	1,160	27.6	803	26.7
Thinking (T)	3,233	76.9	1,210	40.2
Feeling (F)	969	23.1	1,799	59.8
Judging (J)	3,313	78.8	1,629	54.1
Perceiving (P)	889	21.2	1,380	45.9

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

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

	Cronbach's Alpha	
Preference Pair	**Philippines Sample**	**US NRS**
Extraversion–Introversion	.90	.91
Sensing–Intuition	.85	.92
Thinking–Feeling	.88	.91
Judging–Perceiving	.90	.92

Note: Philippines sample *N* = 4,202; US NRS *N* = 3,009. Source for the US NRS is 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 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 Philippines sample. The results are presented in Table 7. 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 MBTI Form M items in the Philippines are measuring their intended constructs, the four preference pairs.

TABLE 7. FACTOR ANALYSIS ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX FOR THE PHILIPPINES 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	–.05	.70	.03	–.04	SN1	.04	.03	.03	.47
EI2	.05	.57	.08	–.03	SN2	.14	.02	.13	.57
EI3	.05	.51	.03	–.01	SN3	.09	.02	.00	.50
EI4	.07	.50	–.05	.10	SN4	.06	.05	–.04	.39
EI5	.04	.57	–.01	.08	SN5	.01	–.08	–.14	.32
EI6	–.01	.56	.06	–.05	SN6	.09	.00	.07	.29
EI7	–.03	.40	–.03	–.06	SN7	.11	–.01	–.16	.43
EI8	–.02	.69	–.06	.04	SN8	.21	–.01	.10	.40
EI9	–.05	.57	–.14	–.04	SN9	.10	–.07	.12	.59
EI10	–.13	.59	–.04	–.02	SN10	.01	.01	.04	.47
EI11	–.13	.66	.01	–.06	SN11	–.08	–.03	.06	.23
EI12	–.09	.58	.00	–.09	SN12	.01	.01	.02	.41
EI13	–.04	.62	.00	–.01	SN13	.01	–.01	.06	.55
EI14	.06	.54	–.03	.02	SN14	.09	–.04	.18	.64
EI15	.04	.60	.00	.01	SN15	.01	–.08	.01	.43
EI16	.06	.54	.00	.03	SN16	.14	–.06	.14	.42
EI17	.01	.69	.01	.00	SN17	.04	.03	.05	.44
EI18	.06	.55	–.12	.09	SN18	.26	.00	.14	.40
EI19	–.06	.57	.01	–.04	SN19	.04	.00	–.06	.52
EI20	.00	.53	.04	–.08	SN20	.12	.00	.15	.64
EI21	.05	.66	.03	–.05	SN21	.05	.06	.08	.56
					SN22	.13	–.04	.12	.41
					SN23	.05	.04	.05	.49
					SN24	.02	–.09	–.08	.57
					SN25	.05	–.01	.07	.52
					SN26	–.03	–.07	–.27	.24

(cont'd)

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

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)
TF1	.14	–.01	.49	.06	JP1	.63	.00	.02	.04
TF2	.03	–.10	.45	.08	JP2	.60	.07	.00	.07
TF3	.09	–.01	.57	.06	JP3	.65	–.03	.07	.05
TF4	.07	.08	.47	.04	JP4	.58	.04	.03	.12
TF5	.10	–.04	.64	.00	JP5	.51	.06	.01	.05
TF6	.09	.03	.56	.04	JP6	.46	–.02	–.03	.11
TF7	.12	–.05	.56	.00	JP7	.51	.03	.05	.00
TF8	–.04	.02	.44	.03	JP8	.53	–.01	.08	.08
TF9	.01	–.03	.53	–.12	JP9	.63	.00	.07	.13
TF10	.01	–.08	.42	.07	JP10	.56	–.15	.21	.15
TF11	.02	.00	.41	.06	JP11	.50	–.04	.29	–.01
TF12	.05	.10	.52	–.05	JP12	.42	–.01	.22	.06
TF13	.14	–.05	.48	.21	JP13	.59	.00	.04	.21
TF14	.13	.00	.51	.10	JP14	.54	–.09	.22	.12
TF15	.06	–.06	.63	.07	JP15	.60	–.06	.05	.08
TF16	–.01	–.04	.53	.06	JP16	.67	–.05	.12	.08
TF17	.13	–.05	.59	–.01	JP17	.64	.05	.08	.07
TF18	.09	.02	.50	.16	JP18	.65	–.14	.11	.08
TF19	.08	.04	.59	–.02	JP19	.48	.02	.04	.07
TF20	.09	–.08	.54	.08	JP20	.54	.08	.03	.08
TF21	.05	.10	.51	.02	JP21	.46	.00	.14	–.07
TF22	.08	–.04	.50	.04	JP22	.64	.08	.12	.11
TF23	.04	–.03	.46	.08					
TF24	.08	.05	.29	.04					

Note: N = 4,202.

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 PHILIPPINES SAMPLE AND THE US NRS

	Cronbach's Alpha	
Form Q Facets	Philippines Sample	US NRS
E–I Facets		
Initiating–Receiving	.80	.85
Expressive–Contained	.76	.79
Gregarious–Intimate	.66	.60
Active–Reflective	.62	.59
Enthusiastic–Quiet	.71	.72
S–N Facets		
Concrete–Abstract	.62	.81
Realistic–Imaginative	.69	.79
Practical–Conceptual	.42	.67
Experiential–Theoretical	.69	.83
Traditional–Original	.66	.76
T–F Facets		
Logical–Empathetic	.76	.80
Reasonable–Compassionate	.69	.77
Questioning–Accommodating	.42	.57
Critical–Accepting	.42	.60
Tough–Tender	.77	.81
J–P Facets		
Systematic–Casual	.77	.74
Planful–Open-Ended	.78	.82
Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted	.62	.70
Scheduled–Spontaneous	.74	.82
Methodical–Emergent	.56	.71

Note: Philippines sample N = 4,202; 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 Philippines sample and the US NRS. The Philippines sample alphas range from .42 (Practical–Conceptual, Questioning–Accommodating, and Critical–Accepting) to .80 (Initiating–Receiving). Overall, some of this sample's alphas are somewhat lower than those of the US NRS. This is consistent with the reliabilities that have been found for international samples and translations of the MBTI Form Q (or Step II™ for Europe) assessment (Quenk, Hammer, & Majors, 2004; Schaubhut, 2008; Schaubhut & Thompson, 2010a, 2010b, 2011a, 2011b, 2012, 2013, 2016a, 2016b, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c, 2017d, 2017e). 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 Philippines sample demonstrate that the translation and measurement properties of the assessment are adequate. Therefore, the MBTI Forms M and Q can be widely used with individuals who reside in the Philippines. As the MBTI assessment continues to grow, larger and more diverse samples will become available and the measurement properties of the MBTI Forms M and Q 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.

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.

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

