

## **A Rich Set of Options for Sorting for Jungian Type**

The Association for Psychological Type is an organization dedicated to the appropriate use of psychological type. As a way of thinking about gathering information and making decisions, personality type provides a useful and practical perspective on differences. The creation of the Association was initially driven by the interest in the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® tool. While the MBTI® instrument is the legacy tool for psychological type, a number of other tools are now available to assess type. The purpose of this article is to explore how these various sorting tools may be of value to the members of the Association. Because of the ubiquitous nature of awareness in our Association of the MBTI® instrument I have not spent a great deal of time discussing its characteristics; however, a summary of characteristics are reviewed in various ways to show the comparison of these psychological type tools.

The tools for consideration are (in historical order):

**Golden Personality Type Profiler® (GPTP)** is published by Pearson (formerly Harcourt Brace). This is an instrument with 126 items. Dr. John Golden is a psychologist from a long line of family members who have been involved with psychological type. His mother, Sally Golden, was the first treasurer of the Association, and his father sponsored work in the 1980s for the development of Form K, or the Extended Analysis Report of the MBTI® tool. Dr. Golden focused on type development factors in addition to the type preferences. He relied on psychological research which relates a fifth dimension (Tense-Calm) tied to type development. The *Golden Personality Type Profiler®* provides a four letter type and sixteen facet scales, and a fifth dimension with two additional facet scales. The report provides detailed information on each preference, the facets, and various applications of the behaviors as leaders, team members, and for personal development.

The *Golden Personality Type Profiler®* scoring system uses a seven point rating system, thus *avoiding dichotomous votes*. The *Golden Personality Type Profiler®* provides data on all of the responses, not just of the clarity of the preference, and shows degrees of relative preference selection. For many critics of dichotomous items in personality assessment, this strategy addresses those critics and is reflective of what most people experience as a continuum of behavior. The publisher has produced a very user friendly manual that shows the supporting reliability and validity data are available. Focusing more on whole type and factor analysis to show the validity of the types, the manual summarizes key studies to date across a variety of career areas. The interpretative report is available for \$22.00; the manual is free as an online download.

**Majors Personality Type Indicator™ (MPTI)** is published by 16types.com. This is a 52 item instrument. Dr. Mark S. Majors, the developer of this tool is a counseling psychologist with extensive psychometric experience that includes data analysis on the 1994 Strong Interest Inventory, the MBTI® Form M, as well as the development of the IRT scoring. He was coauthor for the new MBTI® Form Q Manual. Mark is also the developer of the Majors Occupational Environment Measure™ (MajorsOEM™) and co-developer of the Interstrength® X-Styles Assessment, and has been central to the psychometric development of the Breckenridge Type Indicator, the first scientifically sound measure of the Enneagram personality model.

Two special features of the MPTI™ tool are related to the item weighting and type clarification process. These are described as follows:

### **Differential Intensity Weighting™**

The MajorsPTI™ does not use a forced choice format for item responses. Instead, the MajorsPTI™ uses levels of similarity to provide clarity of results. By using graduated response scales (somewhat like me, very like me), not only do you receive information about a choice decision (direction), you also have knowledge of the level of similarity between the person and the response (intensity). This new form of scoring is called Differential Intensity Weighting (DIW). The addition of levels in the response format (and the corresponding DIW scoring) of the MajorsPTI™ adds new information that improves the precision of identifying the individual's natural preferences.

### **Type Precision Module™**

In addition to the unique scoring method, the MajorsPTI™ is introducing the Type Precision Module—a clarification step, when necessary, to ensure the accuracy of the instrument and to further help your clients get to best-fit-type. If a client's preferences are still unclear as reported by the instrument, a second “also read” type will be created for the client to explore.

The *Majors PTI Manual* straightforwardly presents the underlying psychometric principles and methods used in item selection, scale analysis, and report accuracy. Unlike most manuals, Majors outlines ethical issues in using assessment tools, and his in particular.

A feature that some practitioners will find beneficial is the absence of numbers or “scores” on the three available reports (type, cognitive style, interactional style). When you need to focus on content and descriptions without numbers being a distraction, the reports of this tool are very usable. The cost is \$7.95 per report; the manual is free from the publisher.

**Psychological Type Indicator** which is published by HRD Press. This is a 116 item tool that provides a four letter type. The information is largely a mimic of the MBTI® instrument. I inquired with CPP, Inc. regarding the legality of the publication's near total replication of the MBTI® structure and was informed that HRD Press was within its rights. Somewhat troubling is the absence of reference to any researcher or main author. The manual may be purchased from HRD Press (\$49.95). The manual is lacking in details and presents virtually no data on item selection. Other than a passing reference to a correlational study with “another personality type instrument”, there is no real validity data. On the face of it, the items look reasonable enough, though the lack of supporting psychometric data leaves the practitioner in doubt about how robust this tool may be.

Scoring is a straightforward counting of item selection for each preference. The cost is \$75.00 per packet of five inventories.

All of the instruments are compared on a variety of dimensions as noted in the following tables.

**Table 1: Basic Tool Characteristics**

Characteristic	MBTI®	GPTP®	MPTI™	PTI
Number of items	93 for Form M 143 for Form Q	126 items	52 items	116
Number of Scales	4 letter type for Form M Add 20 Facets with Form Q	4 letter type, 16 facets, a fifth scale with two additional facets related to confidence and optimism.	4 letter type (no subscales)	4 letter type (no subscales)
Report(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic Profile</li> <li>• Step II Profile</li> <li>• Interpretative Reports</li> <li>• Career Report</li> <li>• Team Report</li> <li>• Step 1 self-scorable</li> </ul>	On-line report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretative Report which includes career, team, leadership and personal development guidance and materials.</li> <li>• Team Report</li> </ul>	On-line reports are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type Preferences</li> <li>• Cognitive Processes</li> <li>• Interaction Styles</li> </ul> Self-scorable available	Pencil paper booklet or on-line report

The variation in the number of items between the different tools reflects item construction, report complexity (e.g. indicating facets), and assessment goal. For example, the Golden Personality Type Profiler® intentionally seeks to tap into a fifth dimension, Tense-Calm, which provides insights into current situational stressors and development factors. A review of the item content reveals that the MBTI® repeats 30% of the terms or phrases, while the other tools do not. (For example, the word pair Reasonable-Compassionate is replicated three times on Form M and no such parallel exists with either the GPTP® or MPTI™.) While this may increase reliability, it reduces the overall information that could be available.

**Table 2: Reliability and Validity Summary**

Characteristic	MBTI®	GPTP®	MPTI™	PTI
Reliability (ranges)	Alpha: .89-.93  Test-Retest: .83-.93	Alpha: .87-.93  Test-Retest: .88-.95	Alpha: .89-.95  Test-Retest: .88-.92	Alpha: No Data Available  Test-Retest: No Data Available
Validity (methods)	Correlations with other tools; factor analytic studies; experimental studies.	Correlations with other tools; factor analytic studies.	Correlations with other tools such as the MBTI® assessment	Correlations with other type tools. (No specificity as to which tools used).

Given the published data, the MBTI®, GPTP®, and MPTI™ instruments report essentially the same internal reliability, test-re-test reliability, and similar validity strategies. The MBTI® tool is built on the assumption of a dichotomous variable (sort one direction or the other), while the other tools use a rating system (from descriptive to very descriptive). The MBTI® tool suggests that the theory is dichotomous, thus the items should be. On this logic, the Item Response Analysis used for the 1998 revision is built on a basic sorting method. The other test developers have taken the view that while the theory is dichotomous (Extraversion at one end and Introversion at the other), the best measurement takes into account the range of behaviors rather than forcing an either-or choice. The HRD Press PTI also uses a dichotomous response set but the manual provides no evidence for reliability.

The MBTI® instrument has fifty years of various research studies on which it bases claims for validity. The vast majority of these studies are correlational, which verifies the robust nature of the preferences. All three tools report factor analytic studies, which confirm the underlying structure of the tools. The GPTP® and MPTI™ tools focus on evidence of type dynamics, and though early in their histories, there is every reason to believe that evidence will build over time that these tools are measuring the same theoretical framework. The HRD Press PTI manual provides no supporting data.

**Table 3: Access, Cost, and Support for Scoring**

Characteristic	MBTI®	GPTP®	MPTI™	PTI
Cost	Web: \$300 set up fee, \$195 annual maintenance fee, plus per administration fee; manual \$90	Web: no set up fee, no annual fee, \$22.95 per report. Manual, free.	Web: no set up fee, no annual fee, on-line reports at \$7.95 Manual, free	Package of 5 is \$75.00 Manual \$49.95  (Web access is noted but not currently supported)
Other	Interpretative Booklets available from the publisher, CPP, Inc.	Interpretative Booklet available from the publisher, Pearson Talent Assessment.	Interpretative Booklets available from the publisher, 16types.com	Interpretative Booklets available from the publisher, HRD Press.

The MBTI® provides a full range of instruments: paper and web delivery. With the pencil-paper tool, you have to decide if you want a computer report or to hand-score the answer sheet. Web administration is available after setting up an account (\$300 plus \$195 annual fee). The Golden Personality Type Profiler® and the Majors Personality Type Indicator® are web administered and scored tools for which there are no set up fees or annual maintenance fees.

**Summary Observations**

Users of psychological type have the opportunity to select the tool that is most appropriate for their various audiences. For example, the *Golden Personality Type Profiler®* is an outstanding tool to use in coaching, especially with the optimism and confidence facets that allow type development exploration. The *Majors Personality Type Indicator™* is an outstanding option when you do not need scores or feel that numbers will derail your audience, and this has the advantage of being the most cost effective. My lack of confidence in the soundness of the HRD *Personality Type Indicator* and supporting data provides me with little to recommend regarding its use. Of course, some audiences may be accustomed to the MBTI® instrument and prefer both its report formats and scoring methods.

At last count, there are hundreds of self-awareness questionnaires on personality type that can be accessed through the web. Other than those noted in this article, I have had difficulty gaining access to data related to the way items were selected, reliability and validity established, or additional evidence regarding the utility of these tools. While a very good case can be made that a knowledgeable user of personality type doesn't really need an inventory to aid another person in understanding his or her type, when a tool is useful, the practitioner has three viable options given the evidence to date: MBTI® tool, Golden Personality Type Profiler®, and the Majors Personality Type Indicator®.

Fortunately, as practitioners we have three solid assessment tools to use in our work with personality type. Useful for very different audiences and purposes, we need to carefully consider the virtues of our options as outlined above and align our choices with client needs. When considering which tool to use, consider the following suggestions:

**Table 4: Application Considerations**

Issue	MBTI®	GPTP®	Majors PTI™	PTI
Basic introduction of type	X	X	X	X
Web access and scoring	X	X	X	
Multiple reports	X	X	X	
Four letter type with Facets	X	X		
Four letter type without numbers			X	
Development Focus with Additional Factors		X		
Four letter type with transparent response patterns on all scales		X		

Members of the Association for Psychological Type have a rich tool set from which to select the instrument and report that works best with their audiences. The psychometric strength of three tools, the MBTI®, Golden Personality Type Profiler®, and Majors Personality Type Indicator™ can be ascertained by reviewing the manuals of all three tools, which have been summarized in the tables above. As our goal is the practical and appropriate use of psychological type, members can now consider a range of reliable and valid tools to meet the needs of their clients and customers.