



# Israel (Hebrew) 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)

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

## CONTENTS

---

Introduction	1
The MBTI® Model	2
Description of the Hebrew Sample	2
MBTI® Type and Preference Distributions	2
MBTI® Global Step I™ Assessment Results for the Hebrew Sample	3
Relationships Between MBTI® Global Step I™ and Form M 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
MBTI® Global Step II™ Assessment Results for the Hebrew Sample	6
Relationships Between MBTI® Global Step II™ and Form Q 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 Hebrew is read and understood. To that end, it reports on type and preference distributions in a sample of people in Israel who completed the global research version (GRV) of the MBTI assessment in Hebrew (i.e., the Hebrew sample) and explores similarities and differences between the Hebrew sample and the global sample. Additionally, this technical brief examines the reliability and validity of the Hebrew translations of the MBTI Global Step I and Step II assessments. For more information on the global sample and construction and translation of the global assessments, see chapter 7 of 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 HEBREW SAMPLE

Following the translation of the MBTI GRV into Hebrew, a sample of participants was obtained through the Hebrew distributor, Levy Consulting. It is important to note that this Hebrew 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 Hebrew. The data reported in this technical brief should be used for psychometric information purposes only.

The Hebrew sample is composed of 465 individuals who each completed the MBTI GRV in Hebrew. 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 Hebrew sample, 60% are women and 39% are men; 1% did not report gender. Respondents' ages range from 16 to 77 years (mean = 38.0; standard deviation = 11.0).

### MBTI® Type and Preference Distributions

Table 2 is the MBTI type table for the Hebrew sample. As shown in the table, the most frequently occurring type for this sample is ESTJ (15.5%), followed by ISTJ (14.2%).

Table 1 | Demographic summary: Hebrew sample

Demographic	Sample %
<b>Age</b>	
Mean age: 38 years	—
<b>Gender</b>	
Female	60
Male	39
No response	1
<b>Employment status</b>	
Working full-time	76
Working part-time	9
Student	5
Retired	2
Not working for income	1
None of the above / no response	7
<b>Occupational level</b>	
Entry level	23
Nonsupervisory	2
Supervisor	21
Management	23
Executive	11
No response / not applicable	20
<b>Job type</b>	
Business and financial operations	19
Life, physical, and social sciences	14
Education, training, and library	13
Computer and mathematical	7
Architecture and engineering	6
Community and social services	6
Transportation and materials moving	5
Personal care and services	4
Office and administrative support	4
Legal	3
Sales and related	3
Other	6
No response / not applicable	13
<b>Country of residence</b>	
Israel	99
Other	1

Note: N = 465. Percentages may not total 100% due to the rounding of decimals.

The least common types are ESFP (2.6%), INFJ (2.8%), and ISFP (2.8%).

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

Table 2 | Reported MBTI® type distribution: Hebrew sample

Sensing		Intuition			
Thinking	Feeling	Thinking			
<b>ISTJ</b> n = 66 14.2%	<b>ISFJ</b> n = 29 6.2%	<b>INFJ</b> n = 13 2.8%	<b>INTJ</b> n = 25 5.4%	Judging	Introversion
<b>ISTP</b> n = 22 4.7%	<b>ISFP</b> n = 13 2.8%	<b>INFP</b> n = 16 3.4%	<b>INTP</b> n = 27 5.8%		
<b>ESTP</b> n = 24 5.2%	<b>ESFP</b> n = 12 2.6%	<b>ENFP</b> n = 30 6.5%	<b>ENTP</b> n = 30 6.5%	Judging	Extraversion
<b>ESTJ</b> n = 72 15.5%	<b>ESFJ</b> n = 32 6.9%	<b>ENFJ</b> n = 18 3.9%	<b>ENTJ</b> n = 36 7.7%		

Note: N = 465. Percentages may not total 100% due to the rounding of decimals.

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

Preference	Hebrew sample		Global sample	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Extraversion (E)</b>	254	54.6	7,251	43.2
<b>Introversion (I)</b>	211	45.4	9,522	56.8
<b>Sensing (S)</b>	270	58.1	11,321	67.5
<b>Intuition (N)</b>	195	41.9	5,452	32.5
<b>Thinking (T)</b>	302	64.9	9,128	54.4
<b>Feeling (F)</b>	163	35.1	7,645	45.6
<b>Judging (J)</b>	291	62.6	8,021	47.8
<b>Perceiving (P)</b>	174	37.4	8,752	52.2

Note: Hebrew sample, N = 465; global sample, N = 16,773.

## MBTI® GLOBAL STEP I™ ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR THE HEBREW 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 Form M preference pair results: Hebrew sample

Preference pair	Global Step I™ and Form M preference pair results	
	Correlation between continuous scores	Agreement rate (%)
<b>E-I</b>	.97	95
<b>S-N</b>	.96	94
<b>T-F</b>	.98	97
<b>J-P</b>	.95	93
<i>Overall agreement rate for whole types</i>		81

Note: N = 465.

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

Correlations between MBTI Global Step I and Form M preference pair results for the Hebrew sample are shown in table 4. The agreement rate is 81%, higher than the 60% agreement rate between Form G and Form M reported in the 1998 *MBTI® Manual* (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer).

## Global Step I™ Preference Pair Intercorrelations

Intercorrelations of Global Step I preference pair continuous scores in the Hebrew sample are shown in table 5 below the diagonal. The highest correlation is between the S–N and J–P preference pairs. The next highest is between S–N and T–F. These correlations are similar to those found for the global sample, shown in table 5 above the diagonal. The Hebrew sample findings are 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 Hebrew sample and the global sample are reported in table 6. The reliabilities of the four preference pairs are good for the Hebrew 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 Hebrew sample. The results are presented in table 7. The shaded cells indicate that factor 1 is S–N, factor 2 is E–I, factor 3 is T–F, and factor 4 is J–P. The first factor is the one that accounts for the most variance in this sample. The four-factor structure produced by this analysis shows that the MBTI Global Step I items translated into Hebrew are measuring their intended constructs, the four preference pairs.

Table 5 | Intercorrelations of Global Step I™ preference pair continuous scores: Hebrew 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	–.10	.20	–	.23
J–P	.00	.50	.18	–

Note: Correlations for the Hebrew sample ( $N = 465$ ) 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 pairs: Hebrew and global samples

Sample	N	Cronbach’s alpha			
		E–I	S–N	T–F	J–P
Hebrew	465	.88	.88	.88	.87
Global	16,773	.89	.87	.89	.88

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

Item code	Factor 1 S-N	Factor 2 E-I	Factor 3 T-F	Factor 4 J-P	Item code	Factor 1 S-N	Factor 2 E-I	Factor 3 T-F	Factor 4 J-P
<b>EI1</b>	-.06	.44	-.16	.07	<b>TF1</b>	.15	-.06	.57	.05
<b>EI2</b>	.00	.75	-.02	-.06	<b>TF2</b>	-.01	-.15	.60	-.04
<b>EI3</b>	.00	.63	.06	-.02	<b>TF3</b>	-.13	.05	.42	.15
<b>EI4</b>	-.04	.55	-.05	-.09	<b>TF4</b>	.46	-.20	.27	.17
<b>EI5</b>	-.06	.58	.02	.02	<b>TF5</b>	-.07	.11	.50	.03
<b>EI6</b>	-.05	.63	-.04	.05	<b>TF6</b>	.12	-.10	.35	-.10
<b>EI7</b>	-.07	.59	-.03	.01	<b>TF7</b>	-.07	.00	.58	-.05
<b>EI8</b>	-.04	.55	.02	.07	<b>TF8</b>	.08	.06	.62	.02
<b>EI9</b>	.00	.58	-.10	-.07	<b>TF9</b>	-.06	-.06	.57	.11
<b>EI10</b>	.07	.38	-.06	.13	<b>TF10</b>	.07	-.09	.48	.21
<b>EI11</b>	-.05	.48	-.07	.07	<b>TF11</b>	.11	-.03	.48	-.10
<b>EI12</b>	-.09	.45	-.13	-.03	<b>TF12</b>	.04	-.18	.40	.13
<b>EI13</b>	-.18	.36	.22	.06	<b>TF13</b>	-.10	.03	.45	-.08
<b>EI14</b>	-.25	.39	-.16	-.06	<b>TF14</b>	.12	-.11	.64	.07
<b>EI15</b>	-.19	.31	.16	-.05	<b>TF15</b>	.19	-.14	.41	-.02
<b>EI16</b>	-.08	.32	-.14	.01	<b>TF16</b>	.22	-.06	.55	.04
<b>EI17</b>	-.05	.48	-.05	.07	<b>TF17</b>	.25	-.12	.52	.07
<b>EI18</b>	.07	.62	.05	.08	<b>TF18</b>	.06	-.07	.58	-.08
<b>EI19</b>	.04	.48	.06	.05	<b>TF19</b>	.12	.02	.62	.10
<b>EI20</b>	.00	.45	.01	-.09	<b>TF20</b>	-.07	.08	.54	.00
<b>EI21</b>	-.01	.58	-.02	.10	<b>TF21</b>	.02	-.08	.42	-.09
<b>EI22</b>	-.18	.54	-.08	.03	<b>TF22</b>	-.16	.17	.50	.02
<b>EI23</b>	-.05	.67	-.08	-.11	<b>TF23</b>	.14	-.02	.58	.10
<b>EI24</b>	-.02	.69	.08	.05					
					<b>JP1</b>	.28	-.09	.18	.49
<b>SN1</b>	.66	-.08	.11	.08	<b>JP2</b>	.50	-.10	-.04	.30
<b>SN2</b>	.54	-.02	.04	.16	<b>JP3</b>	.10	.16	.16	.52
<b>SN3</b>	.51	-.10	.22	.12	<b>JP4</b>	.19	-.01	.42	.34
<b>SN4</b>	.39	-.02	-.23	.20	<b>JP5</b>	.13	.01	.02	.56
<b>SN5</b>	.42	-.05	-.12	.37	<b>JP6</b>	.15	.09	-.09	.49
<b>SN6</b>	.39	.04	.15	.15	<b>JP7</b>	-.03	.12	.16	.48
<b>SN7</b>	.36	-.03	.00	.01	<b>JP8</b>	.07	.07	-.10	.38
<b>SN8</b>	.52	.02	-.04	.14	<b>JP9</b>	.20	-.02	-.08	.48
<b>SN9</b>	.27	.05	.15	.21	<b>JP10</b>	.19	-.04	.09	.54
<b>SN10</b>	.48	.01	.16	.10	<b>JP11</b>	.13	.11	-.02	.48
<b>SN11</b>	.36	.02	.30	.12	<b>JP12</b>	.08	.04	.03	.65
<b>SN12</b>	.62	-.12	-.05	.15	<b>JP13</b>	.13	-.11	.26	.34
<b>SN13</b>	.47	-.03	-.03	.04	<b>JP14</b>	.10	-.04	.14	.61
<b>SN14</b>	.47	-.18	-.05	-.03	<b>JP15</b>	.13	.05	.10	.49
<b>SN15</b>	.61	.01	-.14	.14	<b>JP16</b>	.35	-.06	.02	.53
<b>SN16</b>	.47	.07	.19	.12	<b>JP17</b>	.19	.00	.02	.53
<b>SN17</b>	.58	-.07	.17	.20	<b>JP18</b>	.15	.10	.02	.46
<b>SN18</b>	.51	-.11	-.11	.28	<b>JP19</b>	.04	.01	.01	.51
<b>SN19</b>	.65	-.04	.08	.10	<b>JP20</b>	.21	-.11	-.04	.66
<b>SN20</b>	.48	-.21	.05	.16	<b>JP21</b>	.07	-.08	-.10	.47
<b>SN21</b>	.45	-.01	.17	.19					
<b>SN22</b>	.50	.00	.14	-.03					
<b>SN23</b>	.35	-.03	.00	.10					
<b>SN24</b>	.52	-.10	-.03	.18					

Note: N = 465.

## MBTI® GLOBAL STEP II™ ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR THE HEBREW 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 Form Q Facet Results

The Global Step II assessment replaces the Form Q assessment and the European Step II assessment. Table 8 presents the relationships between MBTI Global Step II and Form Q facet results for the Hebrew sample. All of the correlations are strong, except for Questioning–Accommodating, indicating that practitioners should review the changes to this scale for the Global form and be cautious applying their knowledge of this scale from previous forms.

### 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 Hebrew sample and the global sample. The Hebrew sample alphas range from .55 (Critical–Accepting) to .81 (Scheduled–Spontaneous). Overall, this sample’s alphas are similar to those of the global sample.

### Validity of Global Step II™ Results

Reported here as evidence of the validity of the Hebrew 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

Table 8 | Relationships between Global Step II™ and Form Q facet results: Hebrew sample

Global Step II™ facet	Correlation between Global Step II™ and Form Q facet results
<b>E–I facets</b>	
Initiating–Receiving	.98
Expressive–Contained	.98
Gregarious–Intimate	.98
Active–Reflective	.87
Enthusiastic–Quiet	.98
<b>S–N facets</b>	
Concrete–Abstract	.96
Realistic–Imaginative	1.00
Practical–Conceptual	.82
Experiential–Theoretical	.96
Traditional–Original	.96
<b>T–F facets</b>	
Logical–Empathetic	.94
Reasonable–Compassionate	.93
Questioning–Accommodating	.41
Critical–Accepting	.81
Tough–Tender	.98
<b>J–P facets</b>	
Systematic–Casual	.93
Planful–Open-Ended	.98
Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted	.95
Scheduled–Spontaneous	.92
Methodical–Emergent	.97

Note: N = 465.

to as an out-of-preference score and defined as a facet score from –2 to –5 when a respondent has a preference 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 in the Hebrew sample of out-of-preference facet scores for each preference pair 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”

Table 9 | Intercorrelations of Global Step II<sup>™</sup> facets: Hebrew sample

Global Step II <sup>™</sup> facet	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.	
<b>E-I facets</b>																					
1. Initiating–Receiving	–																				
2. Expressive–Contained	.71	–																			
3. Gregarious–Intimate	.64	.58	–																		
4. Active–Reflective	.75	.59	.58	–																	
5. Enthusiastic–Quiet	.64	.59	.56	.63	–																
<b>S–N facets</b>																					
6. Concrete–Abstract	–.09	–.07	–.06	–.08	–.20	–															
7. Realistic–Imaginative	–.09	–.14	–.08	–.13	–.25	.68	–														
8. Practical–Conceptual	–.10	–.06	–.11	–.13	–.20	.60	.69	–													
9. Experiential–Theoretical	–.02	–.02	.09	–.01	–.06	.66	.55	.46	–												
10. Traditional–Original	–.08	–.04	–.05	–.08	–.12	.54	.56	.65	.41	–											
<b>T–F facets</b>																					
11. Logical–Empathetic	–.12	–.19	–.08	–.08	–.22	.34	.35	.17	.25	.02	–										
12. Reasonable–Compassionate	–.04	–.09	.01	.01	–.10	.28	.24	.08	.20	–.09	.72	–									
13. Questioning–Accommodating	.03	–.06	–.04	.06	–.02	.11	.11	–.06	.06	–.29	.52	.61	–								
14. Critical–Accepting	–.12	–.18	–.19	–.06	–.20	.23	.23	.10	.08	–.06	.55	.63	.74	–							
15. Tough–Tender	.03	–.10	–.02	.08	–.04	.18	.12	–.01	.17	–.21	.55	.65	.71	.66	–						
<b>J–P facets</b>																					
16. Systematic–Casual	–.09	–.09	–.07	–.10	–.18	.52	.54	.45	.38	.57	.36	.24	.11	.19	.14	–					
17. Planful–Open-Ended	.10	.10	.03	.04	.01	.27	.29	.29	.24	.40	.11	.05	–.05	.00	–.01	.61	–				
18. Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted	.04	.01	.06	.02	–.01	.22	.25	.17	.19	.26	.06	.03	.00	.01	–.01	.52	.49	–			
19. Scheduled–Spontaneous	.01	.00	.04	–.02	–.05	.37	.41	.37	.34	.48	.18	.09	.03	.05	.04	.78	.69	.57	–		
20. Methodical–Emergent	.02	.06	.07	–.02	–.06	.22	.29	.20	.20	.28	.11	.06	.01	–.01	–.01	.58	.55	.54	.63	–	

Note: N = 465.



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

Global Step II™ facet	Cronbach's alpha	
	Hebrew sample	Global sample
<b>E–I facets</b>		
Initiating–Receiving	.80	.82
Expressive–Contained	.78	.73
Gregarious–Intimate	.71	.62
Active–Reflective	.64	.64
Enthusiastic–Quiet	.62	.69
<b>S–N facets</b>		
Concrete–Abstract	.70	.74
Realistic–Imaginative	.78	.72
Practical–Conceptual	.69	.66
Experiential–Theoretical	.74	.68
Traditional–Original	.74	.72
<b>T–F facets</b>		
Logical–Empathetic	.80	.80
Reasonable–Compassionate	.72	.76
Questioning–Accommodating	.59	.62
Critical–Accepting	.55	.59
Tough–Tender	.70	.73
<b>J–P facets</b>		
Systematic–Casual	.77	.76
Planful–Open-Ended	.77	.79
Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted	.70	.65
Scheduled–Spontaneous	.81	.80
Methodical–Emergent	.73	.64

Note: Hebrew sample,  $N = 465$ ; global sample,  $N = 16,773$ .

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

Preference pair	Number of out-of-preference facet scores (%)					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>E–I</b>	74	21	5	<1	0	0
<b>S–N</b>	69	27	5	0	0	0
<b>T–F</b>	77	17	4	2	<1	0
<b>J–P</b>	65	27	7	1	0	0

Note:  $N = 465$ . Percentages may not total 100% due to the rounding of decimals.

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

Global Step II™ facet	Preference pair			
	E–I	S–N	T–F	J–P
<b>E–I facets</b>				
Initiating–Receiving	.90	–.12	–.05	.03
Expressive–Contained	.84	–.10	–.15	.02
Gregarious–Intimate	.74	–.08	–.05	.03
Active–Reflective	.83	–.12	–.01	–.01
Enthusiastic–Quiet	.79	–.23	–.14	–.05
<b>S–N facets</b>				
Concrete–Abstract	–.12	.85	.31	.41
Realistic–Imaginative	–.17	.86	.28	.43
Practical–Conceptual	–.14	.81	.08	.38
Experiential–Theoretical	–.02	.70	.23	.35
Traditional–Original	–.09	.77	–.10	.47
<b>T–F facets</b>				
Logical–Empathetic	–.17	.28	.89	.24
Reasonable–Compassionate	–.06	.18	.89	.15
Questioning–Accommodating	.00	.00	.72	.06
Critical–Accepting	–.17	.15	.73	.09
Tough–Tender	–.02	.06	.77	.08
<b>J–P facets</b>				
Systematic–Casual	–.13	.61	.28	.85
Planful–Open-Ended	.09	.35	.06	.81
Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted	.02	.28	.03	.66
Scheduled–Spontaneous	.00	.48	.12	.94
Methodical–Emergent	.00	.30	.05	.71

Note:  $N = 465$ .

(Quenk, Hammer, & Majors, 2001, p. 104). The Hebrew sample correlations are comparable to those reported in the *MBTI® Step II™ Manual* (Quenk et al., 2001) and the *MBTI® Step II™ Manual, European Edition* (Quenk, Hammer, & Majors, 2004). For the Global Step II assessment in Hebrew, the lowest correlation between a facet and its corresponding preference pair is between Early Starting–Pressure-Prompted and J–P.

## CONCLUSION

---

Initial analyses of the Indonesian 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 preference pairs and Global Step II facets. While more research should be conducted, all these analyses show that the Hebrew translations of the MBTI Global Step I and Step II assessments have adequate reliability and validity and are appropriate for use with individuals in Israel who read and understand Hebrew

## 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.
- 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.