



---

# Technical Brief for the MBTI® FORM M AND FORM Q ASSESSMENTS

Latin and North American Spanish

---

Nancy A. Schaubhut  
CPP Research Department



800-624-1765 | [www.cpp.com](http://www.cpp.com)

## INTRODUCTION

The *Myers-Briggs® Type Indicator* (MBTI®) assessment is one of the most commonly used measures of normal personality in the world. Because the instrument is so widely used, the publisher continues to develop translations for use in specific regions. This technical brief summarizes the measurement properties of a translation of the MBTI Form M and Form Q assessments developed for use in Latin and North America, in what is referred to as Latin and North American Spanish (LNAS). To that end, it examines the reliability of the LNAS translation of the MBTI Form M and Form Q assessments, reports on type distributions in LNAS samples, and provides comparisons to the U.S. National Representative Sample to examine similarities and differences between the groups.

## THE MBTI® TOOL

The MBTI assessment uses a typology composed of four pairs of opposite preferences, or dichotomies:

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

It sorts people into one of 16 different groups called personality types. Each type is equally valuable and people inherently belong to one of the groups. This sorting model differentiates the MBTI tool from most other personality assessments, which rely on a trait model. Instruments that assess traits measure how much of a certain characteristic people possess. Unlike the MBTI assessment, trait-based instruments usually consider one end of a trait to be more positive and the other to be negative.

## LNAS SAMPLES

The MBTI assessment was translated for use with Spanish speakers in the western hemisphere into language that can best be described as “business Spanish.” Using this translated assessment, two samples were obtained for this study. The first sample was collected in connection with a limited commercial release of the 93-item Form M

assessment. The participants in the second 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 neither of the LNAS samples is a representative sample; rather, both are samples of convenience. Therefore, no inferences may be drawn about the preferences or the type distribution of the LNAS population. The data reported in this technical brief should be used for psychometric information purposes only.

## Commercial Sample

The respondents in the LNAS commercial sample completed a limited-release version of the 93-item MBTI Form M assessment. Because of the limited release, very little demographic information was collected from these participants. The sample consists of 175 individuals (24% female) who completed the Form M assessment in Latin and North American Spanish. The respondents resided in Mexico and Venezuela, and completed the assessment mainly for training purposes. Ages ranged from 19 to 61 years (Mean = 39.7, *SD* = 8.8).

As shown in Table 1, the most frequently occurring type for this sample is ISTJ (26.9%), followed by ESTJ (25.1%). The least common types are INFJ and INFP (both 0.0%). Self-selection ratios (SSR) were computed by comparing the percentage of each type in the LNAS commercial sample to that in the U.S. National Representative Sample (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998). In this sample, ENTJs are three times more prevalent than we would expect based on their representation in the U.S. population. On the other hand, INFJs and INFPs are much less common in this LNAS sample than in the U.S. sample.

## Research Sample

The second sample is composed of 101 individuals who completed the MBTI®-Global Research Version of the assessment in Latin and North American Spanish. This assessment includes 230 MBTI assessment items and contains within it the current commercial versions of the MBTI assessment (Form M, Form Q, European Step I and Step II). The sample was 53% female and 47% male. Respondents' ages ranged from 18 to 64 years (Mean = 29.3, *SD* = 9.6). Sixty-three percent were employed full-

**TABLE 1. TYPE DISTRIBUTION OF LNAS COMMERCIAL SAMPLE**

SENSING		INTUITION		
Thinking	Feeling	Feeling	Thinking	
<b>ISTJ</b> n = 47 26.9% SSR = 2.32	<b>ISFJ</b> n = 6 3.4% SSR = 0.25	<b>INFJ</b> n = 0 0.0% SSR = 0.00	<b>INTJ</b> n = 8 4.6% SSR = 2.18	Judging
<b>ISTP</b> n = 11 6.3% SSR = 1.16	<b>ISFP</b> n = 5 2.9% SSR = 0.32	<b>INFP</b> n = 0 0.0% SSR = 0.00	<b>INTP</b> n = 4 2.3% SSR = 0.69	Perceiving
<b>ESTP</b> n = 19 10.9% SSR = 2.52	<b>ESFP</b> n = 3 1.7% SSR = 0.20	<b>ENFP</b> n = 2 1.1% SSR = 0.14	<b>ENTP</b> n = 10 5.7% SSR = 1.79	Perceiving
<b>ESTJ</b> n = 44 25.1% SSR = 2.89	<b>ESFJ</b> n = 5 2.9% SSR = 0.23	<b>ENFJ</b> n = 1 0.6% SSR = 0.23	<b>ENTJ</b> n = 10 5.7% SSR = 3.17	Judging
				<b>INTROVERSION</b>
				<b>EXTRAVERSION</b>

**TABLE 2. COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN AND RESIDENCE OF LNAS RESEARCH SAMPLE**

Country of Origin	n	%	Country of Residence	n	%
Chile	25	24.8	Chile	25	24.8
Ecuador	1	1.0	Ecuador	1	1.0
Mexico	72	71.3	Mexico	73	72.3
Peru	1	1.0	Peru	0	0
Puerto Rico	1	1.0	Puerto Rico	2	2.0
United States	1	1.0	United States	0	0

time or part-time, 36% were students, and 1% were retired. Of those who were employed, 19% were working in education, training, and library occupations; 14% in office and administrative support; 13% in business and financial operations; 12% in arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media; and the remainder in various fields. All respondents reported their country of origin and country of residence as the United States, Mexico, or a Latin or South American country. These frequencies and percentages are reported in Table 2.

As Table 3 shows, the most frequently occurring type for this sample is ISTJ (19.8%), followed by ESTJ (18.8%). The

least common types are ISFJ, INFJ, and ENFJ (1.0% each). Self-selection ratios were computed by comparing the percentage of each type in the LNAS sample to that in the U.S. National Representative Sample (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998). In this sample, INTJs are nearly four times more prevalent than we would expect based on their representation in the U.S. population, while ESFJs and ISFJs are much less common among the LNAS sample.

Table 4 shows the type distribution of the combined LNAS commercial and research samples. The most frequently occurring type for the combined group is ISTJ (22.4%),

TABLE 3. TYPE DISTRIBUTION OF LNAS RESEARCH SAMPLE				
SENSING		INTUITION		
Thinking	Feeling	Feeling	Thinking	
<b>ISTJ</b> n = 20 19.8% SSR = 1.71	<b>ISFJ</b> n = 1 1.0% SSR = 0.07	<b>INFJ</b> n = 1 1.0% SSR = 0.66	<b>INTJ</b> n = 8 7.9% SSR = 3.77	Judging
<b>ISTP</b> n = 9 8.9% SSR = 1.65	<b>ISFP</b> n = 4 4.0% SSR = 0.45	<b>INFP</b> n = 4 4.0% SSR = 0.90	<b>INTP</b> n = 7 6.9% SSR = 2.10	Perceiving
<b>ESTP</b> n = 7 6.9% SSR = 1.61	<b>ESFP</b> n = 5 5.0% SSR = 0.58	<b>ENFP</b> n = 4 4.0% SSR = 0.49	<b>ENTP</b> n = 5 5.0% SSR = 1.55	Perceiving
<b>ESTJ</b> n = 19 18.8% SSR = 2.16	<b>ESFJ</b> n = 2 2.0% SSR = 0.16	<b>ENFJ</b> n = 1 1.0% SSR = 0.40	<b>ENTJ</b> n = 4 4.0% SSR = 2.20	Judging
				INTROVERSION
				EXTRAVERSION

**TABLE 4. TYPE DISTRIBUTION OF COMBINED LNAS COMMERCIAL AND RESEARCH SAMPLES**

SENSING		INTUITION		
Thinking	Feeling	Feeling	Thinking	
<b>ISTJ</b> n = 82 22.4% SSR = 1.93	<b>ISFJ</b> n = 11 3.0% SSR = 0.22	<b>INFJ</b> n = 2 0.5% SSR = 0.33	<b>INTJ</b> n = 20 5.5% SSR = 2.62	Judging <b>INTROVERSION</b>
<b>ISTP</b> n = 26 7.1% SSR = 1.31	<b>ISFP</b> n = 15 4.1% SSR = 0.47	<b>INFP</b> n = 11 3.0% SSR = 0.68	<b>INTP</b> n = 17 4.6% SSR = 1.39	Perceiving
<b>ESTP</b> n = 30 8.2% SSR = 1.91	<b>ESFP</b> n = 13 3.6% SSR = 0.42	<b>ENFP</b> n = 11 3.0% SSR = 0.37	<b>ENTP</b> n = 23 6.3% SSR = 1.97	Perceiving <b>EXTRAVERSION</b>
<b>ESTJ</b> n = 76 20.8% SSR = 2.39	<b>ESFJ</b> n = 9 2.5% SSR = 0.20	<b>ENFJ</b> n = 3 0.8% SSR = 0.32	<b>ENTJ</b> n = 17 4.6% SSR = 2.56	Judging

while the least common type is INFJ (0.5%). The self-selection ratios reported in Table 4 were computed by comparing the percentage of each type in the combined LNAS sample to that in the U.S. National Representative Sample.

Table 5 shows the number and percentage of respondents who chose each of the preferences in each LNAS sample. Also included for reference are the number and percentage of each preference in the U.S. National Representative Sample (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998).

## RELIABILITY OF THE FORM M PREFERENCES

The internal consistency reliabilities for the LNAS samples and the U.S. National Representative Sample are reported in Table 6. The reliabilities of the four preference pairs are good for the LNAS samples, and generally are in line with those reported in the *MBTI® Manual* (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998). However, the alpha is somewhat lower for the Sensing–Intuition dichotomy in the LNAS research sample.

**TABLE 5. PREFERENCE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR LNAS AND U.S. NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLES**

PREFERENCE	LNAS Commercial Sample		LNAS Research Sample		U.S. National Representative Sample*	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
Extraversion (E)	94	53.7	47	46.5	1,483	49.3
Introversion (I)	81	46.3	54	53.5	1,526	50.7
Sensing (S)	140	80.0	67	66.3	2,206	73.3
Intuition (N)	35	20.0	34	33.7	803	26.7
Thinking (T)	153	87.4	79	78.2	1,210	40.2
Feeling (F)	22	12.6	22	21.8	1,799	59.8
Judging (J)	121	69.1	56	55.4	1,629	54.1
Perceiving (P)	54	30.9	45	44.6	1,380	45.9

\* Source: Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer (1998).

**TABLE 6. PREFERENCE PAIR INTERNAL CONSISTENCY RELIABILITIES FOR LNAS AND U.S. NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLES**

PREFERENCE PAIR	LNAS Commercial Sample	LNAS Research Sample	U.S. National Representative Sample
	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha*
E-I	.89	.86	.91
S-N	.88	.76	.92
T-F	.87	.88	.91
J-P	.89	.86	.92

\* Source: Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer (1998).

## RELIABILITY OF THE FORM Q FACETS

The MBTI Form Q assessment includes the 93 items that make up the MBTI Form M assessment plus another 51 items that are used only to measure the facets. For each of the dichotomies measured by Form M, there are five facets (see Table 7). The facets describe some of the ways in which each of the preferences can be different. The inclusion of the facets creates a richer and more detailed description of an individual's behavior. Form Q, therefore, measures the same four preference pairs as Form M (E-I, S-N, T-F, and J-P), but also measures 20 facets. The Form M preference pairs are summarized above, and the

remaining analyses, focused on the evaluation of the Form Q facets, are summarized in Table 7.

Internal consistency reliabilities for each facet are reported in Table 7 for the LNAS research sample and the U.S. National Representative Sample. The LNAS commercial sample included only the MBTI Form M assessment, precluding the possibility of examining the facet reliabilities. The LNAS research sample alphas range from .29 (Questioning-Accommodating) to .78 (Logical-Empathetic). Overall, the LNAS sample alphas are slightly lower than those of the U.S. National Sample. This is consistent with the reliabilities that have been found for other translations of the MBTI Form Q (or Step II for Europe) assessment. Reliabilities for nine other translations can be

**TABLE 7. FACET INTERNAL CONSISTENCY RELIABILITIES FOR LNAS RESEARCH SAMPLE AND U.S. NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE**

<b>FACETS</b>	<b>LNAS Research Sample Cronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>U.S. National Representative Sample Cronbach's Alpha*</b>
<b>E-I Facets</b>		
Initiating–Receiving	.76	.85
Expressive–Contained	.69	.79
Gregarious–Intimate	.64	.60
Active–Reflective	.69	.59
Enthusiastic–Quiet	.53	.72
<b>S–N Facets</b>		
Concrete–Abstract	.48	.81
Realistic–Imaginative	.65	.79
Practical–Conceptual	.54	.67
Experiential–Theoretical	.60	.83
Traditional–Original	.43	.76
<b>T–F Facets</b>		
Logical–Empathetic	.78	.80
Reasonable–Compassionate	.65	.77
Questioning–Accommodating	.29	.57
Critical–Accepting	.35	.60
Tough–Tender	.75	.81
<b>J–P Facets</b>		
Systematic–Casual	.70	.74
Planful–Open-Ended	.74	.82
Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted	.58	.70
Scheduled–Spontaneous	.58	.82
Methodical–Emergent	.56	.71

\* Source: Quenk, Hammer, & Majors (2001).

found in the *MBTI® Step II Manual European Edition* (Quenk, Hammer, & Majors, 2004). A review including LNAS-to-English translations of the items on the facet with the lowest reliability, Questioning–Accommodating, revealed no evidence of problems with the LNAS translation.

## CONCLUSIONS

While the samples reported here are relatively small, they demonstrate that the translation and measurement properties of the assessment are adequate. Therefore, the

translation of the MBTI assessment can be widely used with Spanish speakers in the western hemisphere. As the MBTI assessment continues to grow, larger and more diverse samples will become available to the publisher and the measurement properties of the MBTI Forms M and Q will continue to be evaluated.

## REFERENCES

Beuke, C. J., Freeman, D. G., & Wang, S. (2006). *Reliability and validity of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® Form M when translated into traditional and simplified Chinese*

- characters. Paper presented at the fifth Psychological Type and Culture—East and West: A Multicultural Research Symposium, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator®*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.
- 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®*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.
- Quenk, N. L., Hammer, A. L., & Majors, M. S. (2001). *MBTI® Step II manual: Exploring the next level of type with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® Form Q*. 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.