# Technical Brief for the

# MBTI® FORM M and FORM Q ASSESSMENTS

## Afrikaans

Nancy A. Schaubhut
Richard C. Thompson

**cpp** 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 initial measurement properties of a translation of the MBTI Form M and Form Q assessments developed for areas of South Africa where Afrikaans is understood. To that end, it examines the reliability of the Afrikaans translation of the MBTI Form M and Form Q assessments, reports on type distribution in a sample of participants who completed the instrument in Afrikaans, and provides comparisons with the U.S. National Representative Sample (NRS) to examine similarities and differences between the groups. The MBTI assessment has a long history in South Africa and has been demonstrated to work well with English speakers (Taylor & Yiannakis, 2007; Van Zyl & Taylor, 2011). This project extends it to Afrikaans.

## 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.

# AFRIKAANS SAMPLE

Following the translation of the MBTI assessment into Afrikaans, a sample of participants was obtained for this study. It is important to note that this Afrikaans research 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 Afrikaans. The data reported in this technical brief should be used for psychometric information purposes only.

## Sample Description

This sample is composed of 505 individuals who each completed the MBTI®—Global Research version of the assessment in Afrikaans. 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 is comprised of 72% women and 28% men. Respondents' ages ranged from 18 to 81 years (mean = 38.6, *SD* = 11.0); 92% were employed full-time or part-time, 2% were students, 1% were retired, and 5% were either not working for income or did not provide their current employment status. Of those who were employed and reported their general line of work, 20% were working in life, physical, and social sciences; 18% in business and financial operations; 11% in healthcare support; 9% in office and administrative support; and the remainder in various fields. Of those who were employed and reported organizational level, 40% were supervisory, 28% entry level, 13% management, 12% nonsupervisory, and 8% executive. All respondents reported their country of origin and residence as South Africa.

As shown in Table 1, the most frequently occurring type for this sample is ISTJ (16.0%), followed by ESTJ and INTP (each 8.5%). The least common types are ISFP (2.6%) and ESFP (3.0%). Self-selection ratios (SSRs) were computed by comparing the percentage of each type in the Afrikaans sample to that in the U.S. National Representative Sample (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998). In this sample, INTJs are more than three times more prevalent than in the U.S. population. On the other hand, ISFPs and ESFPs are less common in the Afrikaans sample than in the U.S. sample. Again,

## TABLE 1. TYPE DISTRIBUTION IN THE AFRIKAANS SAMPLE

| | SENSING | | INTUITION | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Thinking | Feeling | Feeling | Thinking | |
| | **ISTJ**<br>*n* = 81<br>16.0%<br>SSR = 1.38 | **ISFJ**<br>*n* = 28<br>5.5%<br>SSR = 0.40 | **INFJ**<br>*n* = 21<br>4.2%<br>SSR = 2.77 | **INTJ**<br>*n* = 34<br>6.7%<br>SSR = 3.21 | Judging — INTROVERSION |
| | **ISTP**<br>*n* = 26<br>5.1%<br>SSR = 0.95 | **ISFP**<br>*n* = 13<br>2.6%<br>SSR = 0.29 | **INFP**<br>*n* = 32<br>6.3%<br>SSR = 1.44 | **INTP**<br>*n* = 43<br>8.5%<br>SSR = 2.58 | Perceiving |
| | **ESTP**<br>*n* = 19<br>3.8%<br>SSR = 0.87 | **ESFP**<br>*n* = 15<br>3.0%<br>SSR = 0.35 | **ENFP**<br>*n* = 39<br>7.7%<br>SSR = 0.95 | **ENTP**<br>*n* = 39<br>7.7%<br>SSR = 2.41 | Perceiving — EXTRAVERSION |
| | **ESTJ**<br>*n* = 43<br>8.5%<br>SSR = 0.98 | **ESFJ**<br>*n* = 32<br>6.3%<br>SSR = 0.52 | **ENFJ**<br>*n* = 19<br>3.8%<br>SSR = 1.50 | **ENTJ**<br>*n* = 21<br>4.2%<br>SSR = 2.31 | Judging |

*Note: N* = 505.

since this Afrikaans research 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 2. MBTI® PREFERENCE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE AFRIKAANS SAMPLE AND THE U.S. NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Afrikaans Sample (N = 505) | | U.S. National Representative Sample (N = 3,009) | |
| Preference | n | % | n | % |
| Extraversion (E) | 227 | 45.0 | 1,483 | 49.3 |
| Introversion (I) | 278 | 55.0 | 1,526 | 50.7 |
| Sensing (S) | 257 | 50.9 | 2,206 | 73.3 |
| Intuition (N) | 248 | 49.1 | 803 | 26.7 |
| Thinking (T) | 306 | 60.6 | 1,210 | 40.2 |
| Feeling (F) | 199 | 39.4 | 1,799 | 59.8 |
| Judging (J) | 279 | 55.2 | 1,629 | 54.1 |
| Perceiving (P) | 226 | 44.8 | 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 AFRIKAANS SAMPLE AND THE U.S. NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Afrikaans Sample | U.S. National Representative Sample |
| Dichotomy | Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha |
| E–I | .92 | .91 |
| S–N | .91 | .92 |
| T–F | .90 | .91 |
| J–P | .92 | .92 |

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

## RELIABILITY OF THE FORM M PREFERENCES

The internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach's alphas) for the Afrikaans sample and the U.S. National Representative Sample are reported in Table 3. The reliabilities of the four dichotomies are good for the Afrikaans sample, and are very similar to those reported in the *MBTI® Manual* (Myers et al., 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 Afrikaans sample are reported in Table 4.

## TABLE 4. PREDICTION RATIOS FOR THE AFRIKAANS SAMPLE

| Item Code | ESTJ Prediction Ratio | INFP Prediction Ratio | Item Code | ESTJ Prediction Ratio | INFP Prediction Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EI1 | .80 | .98 | SN16 | .73 | .72 |
| EI2 | .82 | .65 | SN17 | .80 | .64 |
| EI3 | .79 | .80 | SN18 | .78 | .79 |
| EI4 | .82 | .73 | SN19 | .68 | .62 |
| EI5 | .81 | .68 | SN20 | .82 | .80 |
| EI6 | .82 | .82 | SN21 | .77 | .82 |
| EI7 | .79 | .62 | SN22 | .86 | .67 |
| EI8 | .76 | .81 | SN23 | .90 | .60 |
| EI9 | .67 | .93 | SN24 | .86 | .77 |
| EI10 | .78 | .84 | SN25 | .79 | .57 |
| EI11 | .70 | .93 | SN26 | .69 | .61 |
| EI12 | .70 | .92 | TF1 | .78 | .74 |
| EI13 | .68 | .76 | TF2 | .75 | .70 |
| EI14 | .90 | .68 | TF3 | .75 | .82 |
| EI15 | .82 | .71 | TF4 | .82 | .67 |
| EI16 | .83 | .63 | TF5 | .78 | .75 |
| EI17 | .79 | .97 | TF6 | .73 | .79 |
| EI18 | .72 | .81 | TF7 | .74 | .84 |
| EI19 | .93 | .67 | TF8 | .72 | .72 |
| EI20 | .75 | .78 | TF9 | .73 | .64 |
| EI21 | .77 | .80 | TF10 | .74 | .58 |
| SN1 | .72 | .74 | TF11 | .72 | .58 |
| SN2 | .78 | .75 | TF12 | .65 | .83 |
| SN3 | .79 | .78 | TF13 | .77 | .69 |
| SN4 | .68 | .66 | TF14 | .91 | .70 |
| SN5 | .66 | .75 | TF15 | .82 | .81 |
| SN6 | .84 | .61 | TF16 | .79 | .73 |
| SN7 | .77 | .62 | TF17 | .75 | .87 |
| SN8 | .79 | .82 | TF18 | .71 | .86 |
| SN9 | .84 | .73 | TF19 | .67 | .80 |
| SN10 | .85 | .65 | TF20 | .72 | .71 |
| SN11 | .75 | .70 | TF21 | .72 | .76 |
| SN12 | .70 | .83 | TF22 | .74 | .75 |
| SN13 | .75 | .78 | TF23 | .60 | .75 |
| SN14 | .85 | .71 | TF24 | .68 | .69 |
| SN15 | .83 | .69 | | | |

*(cont'd)*

TABLE 4. PREDICTION RATIOS FOR THE AFRIKAANS SAMPLE *CONT'D*

| Item Code | ESTJ Prediction Ratio | INFP Prediction Ratio | Item Code | ESTJ Prediction Ratio | INFP Prediction Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| JP1 | .75 | .80 | JP12 | .67 | .83 |
| JP2 | .73 | .84 | JP13 | .67 | .89 |
| JP3 | .79 | .90 | JP14 | .58 | .85 |
| JP4 | .75 | .77 | JP15 | .78 | .83 |
| JP5 | .72 | .70 | JP16 | .88 | .80 |
| JP6 | .75 | .73 | JP17 | .82 | .79 |
| JP7 | .73 | .78 | JP18 | .76 | .77 |
| JP8 | .83 | .70 | JP19 | .62 | .73 |
| JP9 | .76 | .95 | JP20 | .79 | .86 |
| JP10 | .77 | .76 | JP21 | .68 | .73 |
| JP11 | .63 | .91 | JP22 | .83 | .72 |

## 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 Afrikaans sample. The results are presented in Table 5. The shaded cells indicate that factor 1 is S–N, factor 2 is E–I, factor 3 is J–P, and factor 4 is T–F. The four-factor structure produced by this analysis shows that the Afrikaans MBTI Form M items are measuring their intended scales, the four dichotomies.

**TABLE 5. FACTOR ANALYSIS ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX FOR THE AFRIKAANS SAMPLE**

| Item Code | Factor 1 (S–N) | Factor 2 (E–I) | Factor 3 (J–P) | Factor 4 (T–F) | Item Code | Factor 1 (S–N) | Factor 2 (E–I) | Factor 3 (J–P) | Factor 4 (T–F) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EI1 | −.08 | .75 | −.04 | .05 | EI12 | .01 | .65 | −.10 | −.10 |
| EI2 | −.05 | .56 | −.06 | .11 | EI13 | −.08 | .53 | −.02 | .00 |
| EI3 | −.08 | .64 | .03 | .04 | EI14 | .02 | .60 | −.13 | −.07 |
| EI4 | .01 | .61 | .02 | −.09 | EI15 | .17 | .60 | −.12 | −.09 |
| EI5 | .12 | .60 | −.09 | −.14 | EI16 | .06 | .52 | −.13 | −.07 |
| EI6 | −.01 | .67 | −.07 | .05 | EI17 | −.05 | .70 | −.06 | −.02 |
| EI7 | −.11 | .49 | .07 | −.11 | EI18 | −.01 | .61 | .07 | −.08 |
| EI8 | −.06 | .65 | −.02 | −.10 | EI19 | −.01 | .61 | −.01 | −.08 |
| EI9 | −.12 | .58 | −.03 | −.16 | EI20 | −.07 | .62 | −.05 | .06 |
| EI10 | −.04 | .70 | −.05 | −.10 | EI21 | −.05 | .66 | −.08 | .01 |
| EI11 | −.12 | .67 | −.06 | −.11 | | | | | |

*(cont'd)*

| Item Code | Factor 1 (S–N) | Factor 2 (E–I) | Factor 3 (J–P) | Factor 4 (T–F) | Item Code | Factor 1 (S–N) | Factor 2 (E–I) | Factor 3 (J–P) | Factor 4 (T–F) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SN1 | .56 | −.01 | .05 | .09 | TF11 | .10 | .02 | −.12 | .28 |
| SN2 | .53 | .02 | .20 | .25 | TF12 | .12 | .06 | .05 | .53 |
| SN3 | .62 | −.08 | .11 | −.03 | TF13 | .21 | −.21 | .14 | .51 |
| SN4 | .43 | .04 | .05 | −.04 | TF14 | .01 | −.19 | .04 | .60 |
| SN5 | .45 | −.07 | .09 | −.04 | TF15 | .10 | −.05 | .03 | .69 |
| SN6 | .47 | −.02 | .05 | .01 | TF16 | .08 | −.04 | .04 | .62 |
| SN7 | .39 | −.06 | .15 | −.19 | TF17 | −.04 | −.07 | .02 | .67 |
| SN8 | .64 | .00 | .22 | .09 | TF18 | .27 | −.01 | .06 | .60 |
| SN9 | .59 | −.05 | .17 | .19 | TF19 | −.10 | .03 | .14 | .52 |
| SN10 | .57 | −.05 | .01 | −.05 | TF20 | .06 | −.06 | .08 | .47 |
| SN11 | .55 | −.02 | .11 | .11 | TF21 | .13 | −.02 | −.02 | .55 |
| SN12 | .58 | .08 | .17 | −.04 | TF22 | .14 | −.12 | .01 | .54 |
| SN13 | .57 | .07 | .18 | .24 | TF23 | −.05 | .08 | .15 | .37 |
| SN14 | .57 | −.05 | .16 | .19 | TF24 | −.01 | −.05 | −.03 | .45 |
| SN15 | .63 | −.08 | .03 | .01 | JP1 | .15 | −.06 | .64 | .01 |
| SN16 | .50 | −.12 | .12 | .23 | JP2 | .06 | −.11 | .68 | −.05 |
| SN17 | .55 | .02 | .01 | .16 | JP3 | .14 | −.02 | .72 | .06 |
| SN18 | .66 | .00 | .15 | .06 | JP4 | .33 | −.03 | .55 | −.16 |
| SN19 | .37 | .00 | .09 | −.07 | JP5 | .07 | −.01 | .56 | .00 |
| SN20 | .67 | −.02 | .14 | .21 | JP6 | .12 | −.17 | .57 | −.02 |
| SN21 | .66 | −.01 | .13 | .14 | JP7 | .15 | .06 | .60 | .04 |
| SN22 | .51 | −.06 | .26 | .00 | JP8 | .03 | −.07 | .59 | .03 |
| SN23 | .47 | −.08 | .20 | −.04 | JP9 | .20 | −.08 | .72 | .12 |
| SN24 | .70 | .01 | .09 | −.01 | JP10 | .23 | −.28 | .50 | .23 |
| SN25 | .37 | −.09 | .00 | .12 | JP11 | .20 | −.04 | .55 | .19 |
| SN26 | .35 | −.05 | .22 | −.29 | JP12 | .25 | −.09 | .46 | .18 |
| TF1 | .06 | −.05 | .16 | .54 | JP13 | .22 | −.03 | .61 | .08 |
| TF2 | −.01 | −.17 | .05 | .50 | JP14 | .29 | −.05 | .38 | .13 |
| TF3 | .03 | −.10 | .07 | .68 | JP15 | .07 | −.12 | .70 | −.02 |
| TF4 | .04 | .13 | .11 | .56 | JP16 | .13 | −.05 | .72 | −.03 |
| TF5 | −.18 | −.10 | .02 | .58 | JP17 | .08 | −.02 | .72 | .06 |
| TF6 | .03 | .01 | .04 | .59 | JP18 | .21 | −.29 | .55 | .09 |
| TF7 | −.07 | −.08 | −.10 | .66 | JP19 | .02 | .10 | .44 | .03 |
| TF8 | .14 | .01 | −.05 | .55 | JP20 | .29 | .01 | .64 | −.02 |
| TF9 | −.01 | −.14 | .07 | .42 | JP21 | .02 | −.02 | .55 | .06 |
| TF10 | .14 | −.04 | −.15 | .29 | JP22 | .27 | −.04 | .59 | .04 |

## 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 dichotomies, 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 dichotomies there are five facets, yielding a total of 20 facets (see Table 6). 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.

Internal consistency reliabilities for each facet are reported in Table 6 for the Afrikaans sample and the U.S. National Representative Sample. The Afrikaans sample alphas range from .38 (Questioning–Accommodating) to .84 (Initiating–Receiving and Scheduled–Spontaneous). Overall, some of this sample's alphas are slightly lower

### TABLE 6. MBTI® FORM Q FACET INTERNAL CONSISTENCY RELIABILITIES FOR THE AFRIKAANS SAMPLE AND THE U.S. NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE

| Dichotomy | Afrikaans Sample Cronbach's Alpha | U.S. National Representative Sample Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|---|---|
| *E–I Facets* | | |
| Initiating–Receiving | .84 | .85 |
| Expressive–Contained | .79 | .79 |
| Gregarious–Intimate | .74 | .60 |
| Active–Reflective | .66 | .59 |
| Enthusiastic–Quiet | .74 | .72 |
| *S–N Facets* | | |
| Concrete–Abstract | .79 | .81 |
| Realistic–Imaginative | .77 | .79 |
| Practical–Conceptual | .58 | .67 |
| Experiential–Theoretical | .75 | .83 |
| Traditional–Original | .73 | .76 |
| *T–F Facets* | | |
| Logical–Empathetic | .82 | .80 |
| Reasonable–Compassionate | .72 | .77 |
| Questioning–Accommodating | .38 | .57 |
| Critical–Accepting | .51 | .60 |
| Tough–Tender | .80 | .81 |
| *J–P Facets* | | |
| Systematic–Casual | .78 | .74 |
| Planful–Open-Ended | .83 | .82 |
| Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted | .78 | .70 |
| Scheduled–Spontaneous | .84 | .82 |
| Methodical–Emergent | .66 | .71 |

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

than those of the U.S. National Representative 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 (Quenk, Hammer, & Majors, 2004; Schaubhut, 2008; Schaubhut & Thompson, 2010a; Schaubhut & Thompson, 2010b). Reliabilities for nine other translations can be found in the *MBTI® Step II™ Manual,* European edition (Quenk et al., 2004). Items comprising facet scales with lower alphas, such as Critical–Accepting and Questioning–Accommodating, were evaluated for potential translation problems. Since none was apparent, from a reliability perspective these facet scales may not work as well in this culture.

## CONCLUSION

The analyses reported here with an initial Afrikaans sample demonstrate that the translation and measurement properties of the assessment are adequate. Therefore, translation of the MBTI Forms M and Q can be widely used with individuals who understand Afrikaans. 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.* 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.

Taylor, N., & Yiannakis, C. (2007). *South African MBTI® Form M data supplement.* Johannesburg, South Africa: Jopie van Rooyen & Partners.

Van Zyl, C. J., & Taylor, N. (2011). *The psychometric properties of the MBTI® Form M in South Africa.* Johannesburg, South Africa: Jopie van Rooyen & Partners.