



# Russia (Russian) Technical Brief for the MBTI® Global Step I™ and Step II™ Assessments

Nancy A. Schaubhut  
Richard C. Thompson



+1 800 624 1765 | [www.themyersbriggs.com](http://www.themyersbriggs.com)

Russia (Russian) Technical Brief for the MBTI® Global Step I™ and Step II™ Assessments Copyright 2019 by The Myers-Briggs Company. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, MBTI, Step I, Step II, the MBTI logo, and The Myers-Briggs Company logo are trademarks or registered trademarks of The Myers & Briggs Foundation in the United States and other countries. CPI and CPI 260 are trademarks or registered trademarks of The Myers-Briggs Company in the United States and other countries.

# Russia (Russian) Technical Brief for the MBTI® Global Step I™ and Step II™ Assessments

## CONTENTS

---

Introduction	1
The MBTI® Model	1
Description of the Russian Sample	2
MBTI® Type and Preference Distributions	2
<b>MBTI® Global Step I™ Assessment Results for the Russian Sample</b>	<b>3</b>
Relationships Between MBTI® Global Step I™ and European Step I™ Preference Pair Results	3
Global Step I™ Preference Pair Intercorrelations	4
Reliability of Global Step I™ Results	4
Validity of Global Step I™ Results: Factor Analysis	4
<b>MBTI® Global Step II™ Assessment Results for the Russian Sample</b>	<b>6</b>
Relationships Between MBTI® Global Step II™ and European Step II™ Facet Results	6
Global Step II™ Facet Intercorrelations	6
Reliability of Global Step II™ Results	6
Validity of Global Step II™ Results	6
Conclusion	9
References	9

## INTRODUCTION

---

The *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*® (MBTI®) assessment is one of the most commonly used personality instruments in the world. Because administration of the assessment 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 translations of the MBTI® Global Step I™ and Step II™ assessments developed for areas where Russian is read and understood. To that end, it reports on type and preference distributions in a sample of people who completed the global research version (GRV) of the MBTI assessment in Russian (i.e., the Russian sample), explores similarities and differences between the Russian sample and the global sample, and examines the reliability and validity of the Russian translations of the Global Step I and Step II assessments. For more information on the global sample and construction and translation of the global assessments, see the *MBTI® Manual for the Global Step I™ and Step II™ Assessments* (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 2018).

## THE MBTI® MODEL

---

The MBTI assessment measures a typology composed of four pairs of opposite preferences, or preference pairs:

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

The MBTI assessment combines an individual's four preferences—one preference from each preference pair, denoted by its letter—to yield one of 16 possible personality types (e.g., ESTJ, INFP). Each type is equally valuable, and an individual inherently sorts into 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 trait a person possesses. Unlike the MBTI assessment, those instruments usually consider one end of a scale to signify positive characteristics and the other to signify negative characteristics.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE RUSSIAN SAMPLE

Following the translation of the MBTI GRV into Russian, a sample of participants was obtained through the European distributor, OPP Ltd. It is important to note that this Russian sample is not representative; rather, it is a sample of convenience. Therefore, no inferences should be drawn about the preferences or type distribution of the population that reads and understands Russian. The data reported in this technical brief should be used for psychometric information purposes only.

The Russian sample is composed of 201 individuals who each completed the MBTI GRV in Russian. The MBTI GRV comprises 230 MBTI items, including items from the commercial forms of the MBTI assessment—Form M and Form Q, and European Step I and Step II assessments—that were current at the time the GRV was developed. The Global Step I and Step II assessments contain a subset of the 230 items used on the GRV form.

Table 1 provides demographic data. Of the sample, 63% are women and 37% are men. Participants' ages range from 20 to 69 years (mean = 33.5; standard deviation = 8.3).

### MBTI® Type and Preference Distributions

As shown in table 2, the most frequently occurring type for this sample is ESTJ (23.4%), followed by ENTJ (19.9%). The least common types are ISFP (0.5%), INFP (1.5%), and ESTP (1.5%).

Table 3 shows the number and percentage of participants with each preference. Also included for reference are the number and percentage of participants in the global sample who have each preference.

Table 1 | Demographic summary: Russian sample

Demographic	Sample %
<b>Age</b>	
Mean age: 33.5 years	
<b>Gender</b>	
Female	63
Male	37
<b>Country of residence</b>	
Russia	100
<b>Employment status</b>	
Working full-time	79
Working part-time	1
Other	1
No response	18
<b>Occupational level</b>	
Employee	24
First-level management / supervisor	7
Middle management	13
Upper middle management	12
Senior executive	2
Top level	9
Other	6
No response / not applicable	24
<b>Job type</b>	
Sales, customer service	14
Finance	12
Administrative or secretarial	9
HR, training, guidance	9
Science, engineering	9
Health, social services	6
IT	3
R&D	2
Leisure, personal service	2
Other business services	2
Other private sector	1
Other	9
No response	21

Note: *N* = 201. Percentages in a given category may not total 100% due to rounding of decimals.

Table 2 | Reported MBTI® type distribution: Russian sample

Sensing		Intuition			
Thinking	Feeling	Thinking			
<b>ISTJ</b> n = 31 15.4%	<b>ISFJ</b> n = 6 3.0%	<b>INFJ</b> n = 6 3.0%	<b>INTJ</b> n = 12 6.0%	Judging	Introversion
<b>ISTP</b> n = 5 2.5%	<b>ISFP</b> n = 1 0.5%	<b>INFP</b> n = 3 1.5%	<b>INTP</b> n = 4 2.0%		
<b>ESTP</b> n = 3 1.5%	<b>ESFP</b> n = 4 2.0%	<b>ENFP</b> n = 4 2.0%	<b>ENTP</b> n = 11 5.5%	Judging	Extraversion
<b>ESTJ</b> n = 47 23.4%	<b>ESFJ</b> n = 14 7.0%	<b>ENFJ</b> n = 10 5.0%	<b>ENTJ</b> n = 40 19.9%		

Note: N = 201.

Table 3 | Reported MBTI® preference distributions: Russian and global samples

Preference	Russian sample		Global sample	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Extraversion (E)</b>	133	66.2	7,251	43.2
<b>Introversion (I)</b>	68	33.8	9,522	56.8
<b>Sensing (S)</b>	111	55.2	11,321	67.5
<b>Intuition (N)</b>	90	44.8	5,452	32.5
<b>Thinking (T)</b>	153	76.1	9,128	54.4
<b>Feeling (F)</b>	48	23.9	7,645	45.6
<b>Judging (J)</b>	166	82.6	8,021	47.8
<b>Perceiving (P)</b>	35	17.4	8,752	52.2

Note: Russian sample, N = 201; global sample, N = 16,773.

## MBTI® GLOBAL STEP I™ ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR THE RUSSIAN SAMPLE

The Global Step I assessment contains 92 items used to help determine individuals' personality type. It replaces the Form M assessment and the European Step I assessment and was the outcome of the GRV research.

Table 4 | Relationships between MBTI® Global Step I™ and European Step I™ preference pair results: Russian sample

Preference pair	Global Step I™ and European Step I™ preference pair results	
	Correlation between continuous scores	Agreement rate (%)
<b>E-I</b>	.89	89
<b>S-N</b>	.90	86
<b>T-F</b>	.85	87
<b>J-P</b>	.89	82
<i>Overall agreement rate for whole types</i>		50

Note: N = 201.

## Relationships Between MBTI® Global Step I™ and European Step I™ Preference Pair Results

Correlations between MBTI Global Step I and European Step I™ preference pair results for the Russian sample are shown in table 4. The overall agreement rate for whole types between the Global Step I and European Step I™ assessments was 50%. The agreement rate is reasonably similar to what was seen when Form M replaced Form G in the United States (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998). The European Step I assessment is more strongly related to Form G than to Form M, and thus the overall agreement rate is not unexpected.

## Global Step I™ Preference Pair Intercorrelations

Intercorrelations of Global Step I preference pair continuous scores in the Russian sample are shown in table 5 below the diagonal. The highest correlations are between the S–N and T–F preference pairs and between S–N and J–P. Also notable is the correlation between T–F and J–P. These correlations are similar to those found for the global sample, shown in table 5 above the diagonal. The Russian sample findings are reasonably consistent with those reported for the European Step I assessment in the *European Data Supplement: Russian* (OPP Ltd, 2011) and likewise consistent with those reported for Form M in the *1998 MBTI® Manual* (Myers et al.).

## Reliability of Global Step I™ Results

*Reliability* refers to consistency of measurement. A measure is said to be reliable when it produces a consistent, though not necessarily identical, result. Internal consistency reliability measures the consistency of responses across items in a particular measure for a particular sample. The most commonly used estimator of internal consistency reliability is Cronbach’s alpha (Cronbach, 1951). The internal consistency reliabilities for the Russian sample and the global sample are reported in table 6. The reliabilities of the four preference pairs are good for the Russian sample and are very similar to those reported in the *MBTI® Manual for the Global Step I™ and Step II™ Assessments* (Myers et al., 2018).

## Validity of Global Step I™ Results: Factor Analysis

An instrument is said to be valid when it measures what it has been designed to measure (Ghiselli, Campbell, & Zedeck, 1981; Murphy & Davidshofer, 2005). In several studies, confirmatory factor analyses of the MBTI assessment have been conducted 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 Russian sample. The results are presented in table 7. The four-factor structure produced by this analysis shows that the MBTI Global Step I items translated into Russian are measuring their intended constructs, the four preference pairs.

Table 5 | Intercorrelations of Global Step I™ preference pair continuous scores: Russian and global samples

Preference pair	E–I	S–N	T–F	J–P
E–I	—	–.20	–.15	–.15
S–N	–.16	—	.27	.48
T–F	–.07	.35	—	.23
J–P	.05	.35	.30	—

Note: Correlations for the Russian sample (N = 201) are below the diagonal; those for the global sample (N = 16,773) are above the diagonal.

Table 6 | Internal consistency reliabilities of Global Step I™ preference pair continuous scores: Russian and global samples

Sample	N	Cronbach’s alpha			
		E–I	S–N	T–F	J–P
Russian	201	.83	.83	.84	.86
Global	16,773	.89	.87	.89	.88

Table 7 | Factor analysis rotated component matrix for the Russian sample

Item code	Factor 1 T-F	Factor 2 J-P	Factor 3 E-I	Factor 4 S-N	Item code	Factor 1 T-F	Factor 2 J-P	Factor 3 E-I	Factor 4 S-N
EI1	-.01	.09	.47	-.02	TF1	.57	.06	-.12	.00
EI2	.01	.10	.67	-.07	TF2	.31	.05	-.04	-.06
EI3	-.03	.02	.47	-.05	TF3	.31	.05	-.34	.24
EI4	-.02	-.01	.66	.08	TF4	.40	.12	.11	-.02
EI5	.08	.00	.59	.01	TF5	.35	-.03	-.06	.15
EI6	.18	.07	.57	-.06	TF6	.53	.00	.04	-.12
EI7	-.24	.00	.28	.12	TF7	.53	.16	.09	.00
EI8	.13	.12	.41	-.07	TF8	.53	.24	.10	-.10
EI9	-.24	-.10	.43	.05	TF9	.54	.15	-.17	-.04
EI10	.05	-.03	.27	-.09	TF10	.38	.01	.06	.15
EI11	.12	.07	.41	-.10	TF11	.33	.10	-.09	.20
EI12	-.03	.04	.45	.04	TF12	.43	.01	.11	.13
EI13	.07	-.04	.36	-.02	TF13	.58	.15	-.07	.08
EI14	.19	.12	.33	-.10	TF14	.36	-.10	.06	.13
EI15	-.05	-.09	.34	-.18	TF15	.48	-.05	-.07	.11
EI16	-.35	.03	.32	.10	TF16	.40	.08	-.16	.25
EI17	-.01	-.01	.42	-.05	TF17	.40	-.01	.09	.15
EI18	-.32	.04	.43	.11	TF18	.59	.10	.13	.17
EI19	.02	.08	.43	.11	TF19	.45	-.10	.13	.04
EI20	-.27	-.06	.43	-.06	TF20	.39	.00	.01	.12
EI21	.04	.07	.53	-.02	TF21	.45	.01	.26	.00
EI22	-.12	.02	.51	-.03	TF22	.43	.15	-.08	.13
EI23	-.16	.12	.58	.06					
EI24	.19	.00	.47	-.09	JP1	.17	.50	.01	.24
					JP2	-.02	.31	-.02	.48
SN1	.20	-.01	-.16	.62	JP3	.13	.53	.06	.19
SN2	.10	.14	-.09	.57	JP4	.14	.31	.16	.07
SN3	.15	.16	-.12	.47	JP5	.04	.48	-.03	.07
SN4	-.09	.18	-.05	.21	JP6	-.08	.68	.04	.20
SN5	.12	.21	-.17	.31	JP7	.19	.36	.14	-.02
SN6	.25	.02	.12	.42	JP8	-.02	.47	.09	-.01
SN7	-.21	-.05	.07	.40	JP9	.23	.51	.14	-.14
SN8	.27	.14	-.11	.38	JP10	.12	.43	.04	.24
SN9	.18	.02	.08	.44	JP11	-.02	.57	-.01	.07
SN10	.00	.07	.06	.35	JP12	-.01	.70	.02	.09
SN11	-.12	-.20	-.01	.36	JP13	.37	.31	.12	.20
SN12	.06	.05	-.04	.69	JP14	.20	.67	.01	.02
SN13	-.04	-.05	-.15	.20	JP15	.13	.59	.09	.03
SN14	.01	-.04	-.12	.48	JP16	.03	.36	.10	.45
SN15	-.16	.06	-.20	.45	JP17	.20	.50	.08	-.04
SN16	.19	-.03	.11	.43	JP18	-.10	.64	.06	.06
SN17	.19	-.01	.01	.56	JP19	-.09	.49	-.23	.00
SN18	-.01	.24	-.01	.35	JP20	.14	.65	.07	.09
SN19	.09	.07	-.02	.61	JP21	-.17	.48	-.17	.00
SN20	.03	.13	.02	.11					
SN21	.18	.10	-.20	.46					
SN22	.02	.07	.11	.47					
SN23	.13	.10	-.05	.37					
SN24	.19	.11	-.12	.39					
SN25	.48	.17	-.10	.21					

Note: N = 201.

## MBTI® GLOBAL STEP II™ ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR THE RUSSIAN SAMPLE

The Global Step II assessment includes the 92 items that make up the Global Step I 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 Step II 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 expressed differently and thus create a richer and more detailed description of an individual’s personality. The remaining analyses in this brief focus on the evaluation of the Step II facets.

### Relationships Between MBTI® Global Step II™ and European Step II™ Facet Results

The Global Step II assessment replaces the Form Q assessment and the European Step II assessment. Table 8 presents the relationships between Global Step II and European Step II™ facet results for the Russian sample. Most correlations are quite high. Note that the two lowest correlations occur on the Questioning–Accommodating and Critical–Accepting facet scales (.61 and .72, respectively). The Questioning–Accommodating and Critical–Accepting facet scales on the Global Step II assessment had several changes from the facet scales of the same name on the prior assessment. The changes to these facet scales account for the two lowest correlations in table 8.

### Global Step II™ Facet Intercorrelations

Intercorrelations of Global Step II facets are presented in table 9. Facets within each preference pair correlate more highly with other facets of the same preference pair than with facets of different preference pairs.

### Reliability of Global Step II™ Results

Internal consistency reliabilities for each facet are reported in table 10 for the Russian sample and the global sample. The Russian sample alphas range from .25 (Critical–Accepting) to .78 (Initiating–Receiving; Planful–Open-Ended). In previous studies the Critical–Accepting facet has shown lower alphas in some international samples—for example, Simplified Chinese, .21 (Schaubhut & Thompson, 2010); Indonesian, .22 (Schaubhut & Thompson, 2019a); Latin American Spanish, .35 (Schaubhut, 2008); and Turkish, .36 (Schaubhut & Thompson, 2019b). Therefore, this facet should be interpreted with caution when the Russian translation is used. Overall, however, this sample’s alphas are very similar to those of the global sample.

Table 8 | Relationships between Global Step II™ and European Step II™ facet results: Russian sample

Global Step II™ facet	Correlation between Global Step II™ and European Step II™ facet results
<b>E–I facets</b>	
Initiating–Receiving	.96
Expressive–Contained	.93
Gregarious–Intimate	.99
Active–Reflective	.86
Enthusiastic–Quiet	.96
<b>S–N facets</b>	
Concrete–Abstract	.94
Realistic–Imaginative	1.00
Practical–Conceptual	.82
Experiential–Theoretical	.98
Traditional–Original	.95
<b>T–F facets</b>	
Logical–Empathetic	.94
Reasonable–Compassionate	.95
Questioning–Accommodating	.61
Critical–Accepting	.72
Tough–Tender	.94
<b>J–P facets</b>	
Systematic–Casual	.96
Planful–Open-Ended	.99
Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted	.94
Scheduled–Spontaneous	.89
Methodical–Emergent	.88

Note: N = 201.

### Validity of Global Step II™ Results

Reported here as evidence of the validity of the Russian translation of the MBTI® Global Step II™ assessment are the percentage of out-of-preference facet scores for each preference pair, as well as correlations between preference pairs and facets.

The five facets within each preference pair do not represent the entire conceptual domain of the preference pair. Further, it is not uncommon for individuals to have a facet score on the side opposite that of their preference in a given preference pair. For example, an Extravert may score toward the Intimate pole of the Gregarious–Intimate facet. This apparent inconsistency is referred to as an out-of-preference score and defined as a facet score from –2 to –5 when a respondent has a preference

Table 9 | Intercorrelations of Global Step II™ facets: Russian sample

Global Step II™ facet	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.
<b><i>E–I facets</i></b>																				
1. Initiating–Receiving	—																			
2. Expressive–Contained	.46	—																		
3. Gregarious–Intimate	.55	.44	—																	
4. Active–Reflective	.56	.47	.45	—																
5. Enthusiastic–Quiet	.46	.50	.45	.49	—															
<b><i>S–N facets</i></b>																				
6. Concrete–Abstract	.01	.01	–.04	.00	–.11	—														
7. Realistic–Imaginative	–.07	–.10	–.12	–.14	–.16	.64	—													
8. Practical–Conceptual	–.13	–.09	–.12	–.15	–.14	.54	.66	—												
9. Experiential–Theoretical	.01	.02	–.01	.10	–.06	.54	.44	.26	—											
10. Traditional–Original	–.21	–.09	–.08	–.10	–.25	.43	.46	.60	.22	—										
<b><i>T–F facets</i></b>																				
11. Logical–Empathetic	–.01	–.35	.02	–.13	–.16	.28	.47	.30	.16	.14	—									
12. Reasonable–Compassionate	.06	–.24	.11	.01	–.07	.31	.30	.25	.19	.20	.69	—								
13. Questioning–Accommodating	.20	–.16	.06	.03	–.01	.18	.25	.01	.12	–.15	.52	.44	—							
14. Critical–Accepting	–.07	–.33	–.11	–.15	–.22	.21	.33	.17	.08	.03	.52	.49	.64	—						
15. Tough–Tender	.10	–.19	.02	.06	–.02	.27	.18	.07	.15	.01	.42	.49	.58	.58	—					
<b><i>J–P facets</i></b>																				
16. Systematic–Casual	.02	–.01	.08	.00	–.13	.41	.46	.44	.26	.49	.40	.36	.19	.20	.15	—				
17. Planful–Open-Ended	.08	.06	.04	.07	–.05	.20	.25	.25	.10	.27	.22	.12	.12	.03	.07	.64	—			
18. Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted	–.12	–.07	–.14	–.06	–.14	.13	.14	.24	.07	.31	.11	.05	–.07	–.05	–.07	.43	.52	—		
19. Scheduled–Spontaneous	.07	.01	.06	.02	–.02	.24	.33	.30	.19	.24	.32	.25	.22	.15	.17	.73	.75	.50	—	
20. Methodical–Emergent	.04	–.03	–.03	–.01	.01	.09	.14	.23	.02	.13	.22	.17	.05	.01	–.02	.44	.53	.51	.55	—

Note: N = 201.



Table 10 | Internal consistency reliabilities of Global Step II™ facets: Russian and global samples

Global Step II™ facet	Cronbach's alpha	
	Russian sample	Global sample
<b>E–I facets</b>		
Initiating–Receiving	.78	.82
Expressive–Contained	.64	.73
Gregarious–Intimate	.52	.62
Active–Reflective	.55	.64
Enthusiastic–Quiet	.60	.69
<b>S–N facets</b>		
Concrete–Abstract	.62	.74
Realistic–Imaginative	.71	.72
Practical–Conceptual	.67	.66
Experiential–Theoretical	.69	.68
Traditional–Original	.63	.72
<b>T–F facets</b>		
Logical–Empathetic	.75	.80
Reasonable–Compassionate	.67	.76
Questioning–Accommodating	.49	.62
Critical–Accepting	.25	.59
Tough–Tender	.66	.73
<b>J–P facets</b>		
Systematic–Casual	.71	.76
Planful–Open-Ended	.78	.79
Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted	.74	.65
Scheduled–Spontaneous	.77	.80
Methodical–Emergent	.52	.64

Note: Russian sample, *N* = 201; global sample, *N* = 16,773.

Table 11 | Percentage of reported out-of-preference Global Step II™ facet scores: Russian sample

Preference pair	Number of out-of-preference facet scores (%)					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
E–I	75	20	3	1	0	0
S–N	59	33	8	0	0	0
T–F	78	20	2	0	0	0
J–P	61	26	10	2	0	0

Note: *N* = 201.

Table 12 | Correlations between Global Step II™ facets and preference pairs: Russian sample

Global Step II™ facet	Preference pair			
	E–I	S–N	T–F	J–P
<b>E–I facets</b>				
Initiating–Receiving	.79	–.14	.04	.07
Expressive–Contained	.74	–.06	–.30	.03
Gregarious–Intimate	.69	–.13	.06	.05
Active–Reflective	.74	–.12	–.05	.04
Enthusiastic–Quiet	.73	–.20	–.12	–.03
<b>S–N facets</b>				
Concrete–Abstract	–.03	.80	.34	.25
Realistic–Imaginative	–.11	.85	.43	.33
Practical–Conceptual	–.16	.80	.29	.32
Experiential–Theoretical	.05	.58	.17	.16
Traditional–Original	–.22	.70	.15	.29
<b>T–F facets</b>				
Logical–Empathetic	–.15	.36	.88	.33
Reasonable–Compassionate	–.02	.31	.85	.24
Questioning–Accommodating	.08	.10	.65	.15
Critical–Accepting	–.20	.23	.67	.08
Tough–Tender	.01	.16	.65	.10
<b>J–P facets</b>				
Systematic–Casual	.01	.54	.41	.80
Planful–Open-Ended	.04	.28	.18	.87
Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted	–.14	.25	.04	.61
Scheduled–Spontaneous	.05	.33	.32	.94
Methodical–Emergent	.01	.17	.18	.63

Note: *N* = 201.

for I, N, F, or P; or from 2 to 5 when a respondent has a preference for E, S, T, or J. While it is not unusual to have a number of out-of-preference scores, it is relatively rare to have three or more facet scores out-of-preference for any one preference pair. The percentage of out-of-preference facet scores for each preference pair in the Russian sample is shown in table 11.

Correlations between facets and preference pairs are presented in table 12. The correlation between each facet and its corresponding preference pair is significantly higher than those between the facet and the other three preference pairs. This is “compelling evidence for the theoretical hierarchical structure of the Step II facets in relation to the Step I scales” (Quenk, Hammer, & Majors, 2001, p. 104). The Russian sample correlations are

comparable to those reported in the *MBTI® Step II® Manual* (Quenk et al., 2001), *MBTI® Step II® Manual, European Edition* (Quenk, Hammer, & Majors, 2004), and for the Russian sample in the *European Data Supplement* (OPP Ltd, 2018). For the Global Step II assessment in Russian, the lowest correlation between a facet and its corresponding preference pair is between Experiential–Theoretical and S–N.

## CONCLUSION

Initial analyses of the Russian translations of the MBTI Global Step I and Step II assessments demonstrate that they each have good internal consistency reliabilities that are consistent with those of prior forms of the MBTI assessment (i.e., Form M and Form Q, European Step I and Step II). Validity was established by showing the percentage of out-of-preference facet scores and correlations between Global Step I preferences and Global Step II facets. While more research should be conducted, all these analyses show that the Russian translations of the MBTI Global Step I and Step II assessments have adequate reliability and validity and are appropriate for use with individuals in Russia who read and understand Russian.

## REFERENCES

- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334.
- Ghiselli, E. E., Campbell, J. P., & Zedeck, S. (1981). *Measurement theory for the behavioral sciences*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- 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.
- Murphy, K. R., & Davidshofer, C. O. (2005). *Psychological testing* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- 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* (3rd ed.). Sunnyvale, CA: The Myers-Briggs Company.
- Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (2018). *MBTI® manual for the Global Step I® and Step II® assessments* (4th ed.). Sunnyvale, CA: The Myers-Briggs Company.
- OPP Ltd. (2011). Russian. In *MBTI® Step I® Instrument European Data Supplement* (pp. 253–267). Oxford, England: Author.
- OPP Ltd. (2018). Russian. In *MBTI® Step II® Instrument European Data Supplement* (pp. 217–239). Oxford, England: Author.
- Quenk, N. L., Hammer, A. L., & Majors, M. S. (2001). *MBTI® Step II® manual*. Sunnyvale, CA: The Myers-Briggs Company.
- Quenk, N. L., Hammer, A. L., & Majors, M. S. (2004). *MBTI® Step II® manual, European edition*. Sunnyvale, CA: The Myers-Briggs Company.
- Schaubhut, N. A. (2008). *Technical 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. (2010). *Technical brief for the MBTI® Form M and Form Q assessments—Simplified Chinese*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.
- Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2019a). *Indonesia (Indonesian) technical brief for the MBTI® Global Step I® and Step II® assessments*. Sunnyvale, CA: The Myers-Briggs Company.
- Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2019b). *Turkey (Turkish) technical brief for the MBTI® Global Step I® and Step II® assessments*. Sunnyvale, CA: The Myers-Briggs Company.