

## **Ethnic and Gender Differences in Best-Fit Type**

**Nicole A. Herk, Richard C. Thompson, &  
Nancy A. Schaubhut**

This study examined the potential impact of ethnicity and gender on the MBTI®Complete's verification process by looking at the congruence of best-fit type and reported type. Results indicate that the relationship was fairly consistent across ethnic and gender subgroups. Additionally, rates of agreement were found to be comparable to those reported by previous researchers.

In recent years, a number of studies have been conducted on the validity of the verification process used for the Myers Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®) assessment. This verification process, which is a key component of the assessment, enables participants to reflect upon their placement into a type category and identify whether it is their best fit, i.e., best-fit type (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998). Myers et al. (1998) posit that one's true type may not be revealed through a measurement device alone; therefore participants take part in a verification process where they are given detailed information on their reported type and alternative type descriptions to determine their best-fit type. Studies conducted on this process have revealed rates of agreement between reported type (i.e., the type reported by the indicator) and best-fit type (i.e., the type selected by participants) ranging from 62% (Kummerow, 1988) to 85% (Hammer & Yeakley, 1987).

Research has also been conducted to examine the efficacy of the online verification process included in the MBTI®Complete. The MBTI®Complete

offers an interactive learning session which discusses the theory of type and provides activities similar to those found in a person-to-person interpretation. In looking at the rate agreement between reported type and best-fit type using this method, similar results (i.e., 76% agreement rate) have been found (Krause & Thompson, 2008).

However, few studies have examined whether individual differences, such as differences in ethnicity or gender, impact the verification process. As such, the current study investigates the potential impact of ethnicity and gender on the MBTI®Complete's verification process by looking at the congruence of best-fit and reported types in a large, heterogeneous sample. Additionally, the rate of agreement will be compared to rates previously found through the traditional person-to-person process. If rates are similar across ethnic and gender subgroups, and comparable to other reported rates, further evidence will be provided in support of the online verification process.

## *Overview of the MBTI® Assessment*

The MBTI® assessment, based upon Carl Jung's theory of psychological type (Jung, 1921/1971), centers on the belief that differences among people are not random, but rather can be explained by variations in their underlying psychological types. These psychological types are determined through an individual's natural preferences for four sets of dichotomies including Extraversion-Introversion, Sensing-Intuition, Thinking-Feeling, and Judging-Perceiving. According to Jung's theory, Extraverts draw energy from the outside world of people, activities, things, whereas Introverts draw energy from one's inner world of ideas, emotions, and impressions. The Sensing-Intuition dichotomy pertains to how an individual takes in information or what they pay attention to. Those who prefer Sensing take in information through the five senses, noticing what actually exists, while those who prefer Intuition take in information through a "sixth sense" and notice what might be. The Thinking-Feeling dichotomy deals with the ways in which individuals make decisions. A preference for Thinking suggests that an individual organizes and structures information to decide in a logical, objective way, while a preference for Feeling suggests that an individual organizes and structures information to decide in a personal, values-based way. Finally, the Judging-Perceiving dichotomy pertains to what you present to the world, the lifestyle a person adopts. Individuals with a preference for Judging often prefer living a planned and organized life. In contrast, individuals with a preference

for Perceiving prefer living a more spontaneous and flexible life.

While people possess and use qualities for both poles of each dichotomy, the MBTI® assessment identifies the most preferred pole of the dichotomy, the pole used to respond first, most often, and most comfortably (Myers et al., 1998). Thus, based on responses to the assessment, a numerical score is obtained and preferences for each of the four dichotomies are identified. Taken together, the interaction of these four preferences make up one's overall type reported type by the indicator. As there are 16 possible combinations of preferences, there are in turn 16 possible types. The sorting of people into the 16 type categories allows for the identification of interests, values, needs, and habits that are common among people with similar preferences and overall type (Myers, et al., 1998).

Upon completion of the assessment, participants also take part in a verification process to determine their best-fit type. This process is done with the help of a trained professional who works with a participant to facilitate a deeper understanding of preferences and type. In this process, the participant has a chance to verify which type is their most accurate description. This verified, or best-fit type, become the type from which all future uses of the information are based. Thus, a collaborative approach in which respondents are provided with an interpretation and asked to verify results is essential to completing the MBTI® assessment.

While this process has traditionally been done person-to-person, the MBTI®Complete now offers an online, interactive learning session which does not require the use of a professional. Rather, participants are provided with details on the four preference pairs. Characteristics commonly associated with each preference are given, as well as a description of how preferences are behaviorally exhibited. Participants are presented with a series of questions to check their understanding of each of the four dichotomies; incorrect responses are explained. Based upon this information, participants are asked to select which preferences they believe to be their best-fit, as well as which type is their overall best-fit type. This interactive process provides a great deal of information to evaluate both the effectiveness of the interpretation, as well as the participant's understanding of type.

### *Ethnic and Gender Differences*

According to Jung, type is predispositioned within human beings and thus, a universal attribute (Jung, 1923). As hypothesized by Kirby, Kendall, & Barger (2007), "type defines inborn predispositions for using one's mind, while culture establishes the ways in which those predispositions can be expressed appropriately in behavior" (p. 2). While culture may not lead to differences in type (Kirby et al., 2007), research has shown that there are often differences in type distributions and/or facet scores among various ethnic groups. In a recent paper presented at the Sixth Psychological Type and Culture Symposium, (Kummerow,

Krause, & Schaubhut, 2008), findings indicated that while the modal reported type (ENFP) was the same across three ethnic subgroups, significant differences were found on the Step II facets. Additionally, Hammer and Mitchell (1996) found that Introversions, Intuition and Perceiving were more common among Caucasians than African Americans and Hispanics. However, Sensing and Thinking were more common among African Americans, while Extraversion, Feeling and Judging were more common among Hispanics. Understanding differences such as those reported by Kummerow et al. (2008) and Hammer and Mitchell (1996) are extremely important in helping individuals of diverse ethnic backgrounds properly self-assess best-fit type (Nash, 2008).

Gender has also been a topic of discussion within the type community, as slight differences between females and males in preferences and overall type have been found. Results for the current National Representative Sample, reported in the MBTI® Manual (Myers et al., 1998) indicate such differences on Extraversion – Introversions, Sensing – Intuition and Perceiving – Judging. Specifically, Introversions, Intuition, and Perceiving were more common among males. Likewise, Extraversion, Sensing, and Judging were more common among females (Myers et al., 1998). Larger differences yet were found between males and females on the Thinking/Feeling dichotomy as 56.5% of males and 24.5% of females in the National Representative Sample indicated a preference for Thinking. Similarly, 43.5% of males indicated a

preference for Feeling, opposed to the 75.5% of females (Myers et al., 1998). This breakdown of preferences is consistent with that reported by Hammer and Mitchell (1996) when using the Form G. Differences found on the T-F scale are expected as research continuously indicates that females prefer Feeling over Thinking, or have a tendency to respond as such (Myers et al., 1998). This has been supported cross-culturally in translated versions of the assessment as well (e.g., Spanish – Inclán, 1986; Greek – Fitopoulos, 1996; Japanese – Ohsawa, 1968).

Although individual differences in reported type have received empirical attention, only two known studies have examined best-fit type in terms of gender (Bathurst, 2000; Walck, 1992) and no known studies to date have investigated the impact of ethnicity on the rate of agreement between reported type and best-fit type. Given this lack of research, the current study will examine the impact of participant ethnicity and gender on this relationship by assessing the rate of agreement between reported type and best-fit type in samples varied in ethnicity (i.e., African American, Asian, Caucasian, Indian, and Latin) and gender.

## Method

### *Participants.*

Participants included 8,836 individuals (52.4% female, 47.6% male) who took the MBTI® Form M assessment. Of these, 7,113 (80.5%) were Caucasian, 505 (5.7%) were Asian, 478 (5.4%) were African American, 395 (4.5%)

were Latin, and 345 (3.9%) were Indian – origins of Indian subcontinent. The average age of participants was 38.79 ( $SD = 11.10$ ) years. Participants reported taking the assessment for a variety of reasons, including: training purposes (46.7%), personal growth (38.4%), career counseling (6.4%), education (4.3%), and employment testing (2.3%). The majority of participants (84.9) reported being employed full-time.

### *Procedure.*

Participants took the MBTI® Form M through an online, electronic administration called the MBTI®Complete. Data was collected from March of 2007 to August of 2008.

## Results

Table 1 illustrates the number of and percent of individuals, separated by ethnicity, in each of the 16 various types for both reported type and best-fit type. As shown, ISTJ was the most frequently reported type for African Americans, Caucasians and Latinos, while the most frequently reported type for Asians and Indians was ESTJ. For all ethnic groups, however, ISTJ was most frequently selected as participant's best-fit type.

Preferences within each dichotomy for reported type and best-fit type are shown in Table 2. Results show that a greater proportion of African Americans, Caucasians, Indians, and Latinos indicated a preference for Extraversion, while a greater proportion of Asians indicated a preference for Introversion.

In addition, more African Americans, Asians, Indians, and Latinos indicated a preference for Sensing, while more Caucasians were found to have a preference for Intuition. Finally, Thinking, and Judging were preferred over Feeling and Perceiving, for all ethnic groups.

Regarding best-fit type preferences, a larger proportion of Caucasians, Indians, and Latinos selected Extraversion as their best-fit, while more African Americans and Asians selected Introversion as their best-fit. A preference for Sensing was indicated more frequently as being best-fit among African Americans, Asians, and Latinos while Intuition was selected more frequently among Caucasians and Indians. However, similar to that found for reported type, all ethnic groups indicated a preference for Thinking and Judging when verifying their best-fit type.

Table 3 illustrates the rate of agreement between reported type and best-fit type for each of the five ethnic groups. As shown, rates of agreement ranged from 68.0% (African Americans) to 73.6% (Caucasians). Chi-square analyses were conducted to assess whether the number of matches between reported type and best-fit type for each preference pair were related to ethnicity. Results indicate that a significant relationship was found on the S-N dichotomy ( $\chi^2(4) = 11.30, p < .05$ ). As shown in Table 4, African Americans (83.1%) were the least likely to have a match between their reported type preference and best-fit type preference on S-N. However, as statistical testing

does not measure importance (Vacha-Haase & Thompson, 2004, p.473), effect sizes were used to judge the practical significance of the results (Kirk, 1996). The effect size found for this relationship was small,  $\phi = .04$ , according to Lipsey (1990). For all other preference pairs E-I ( $\chi^2(4) = 6.09, p > .05$ ). T-F ( $\chi^2(4) = 9.33, p > .05$ ), and J-P ( $\chi^2(4) = 4.08, p > .05$ ), no significant relationships were found.

The same analyses were conducted to examine differences between females and males. Similar to Table 1, Table 5 illustrates the number of and percent of females and males in the in each of the 16 various types for both reported type and best-fit type. As shown, ISTJ was the most common reported type for males, while ENFP was the most common reported type for females. In contrast, ISTJ was most commonly selected as best-fit for both females and males upon completion of the verification process.

Preferences within each dichotomy for reported type and best-fit type are shown in Table 6. For reported type, Extraversion, Sensing, Feeling, and Judging were more common among females, while Extraversion, Intuition, Thinking and Judging were more common among males. For best-fit type however, Extraversion, Intuition, Feeling and Judging were more common among females, while Introversion, Intuition, Thinking, and Judging were more common among males.

Table 7 illustrates the rate of agreement between reported type and best-fit type for both females and males. Females were found to have a rate of agreement

of 71.7% on all four preferences, while males had a 74.2% rate of agreement. In conducting chi-square analyses, a significant relationship was found between the reported type/best-fit type match and gender on the T-F dichotomy ( $\chi^2(1) = 9.32, p < .01$ ). As shown in Table 8, females (89.3%) were less likely than males (91.2%) to have a match between their reported type preference and best-fit type preference on T-F. Again the effect size found for this relationship was small,  $\phi = .03$  (Lipsey, 1990). For all other preference pairs E-I ( $\chi^2(1) = 1.20, p > .05$ ), S-N ( $\chi^2(1) = 1.03, p > .05$ ), and J-P ( $\chi^2(1) = 1.52, p > .05$ ), no significant relationships were found.

## Discussion

While the relationship between reported type and best-fit type has been examined by a number of researchers, the question of whether ethnicity or gender play a role in the verification of type has been far less explored. This study sought to examine this issue by comparing the rate of agreement of reported and best-fit type among five ethnic groups and between males and females. Results indicate that the relationship between reported and best-fit type was fairly consistent across ethnic subgroups. Agreement rates are as followed: 73.6% for Caucasians, 72.5% for Asians, 70.1% for Indians, 69.6% for Latinos, and 68.0% for African Americans. Similarly, results were fairly consistent between females and males as females had a 71.7% agreement rate and males had a 74.2% agreement rate. The overall rate of

agreement between reported type and best-fit type was 72.9%.

In looking at the frequency of reported type/best-fit type matches in terms of both ethnicity and gender, consistent results were found for all but two preference pairs. Specifically, significant relationships were found between the reported type/best-fit type match and ethnicity on the S-N preference pair and the reported type/best-fit type match and gender on the T-F preference pair. African Americans were least likely to have a match on the S-N preference and females were less likely to have a match on the T-F preference. While no known research has been conducted on best-fit type and ethnicity, the relationship on the T-F preferences in the current study is similar to that reported by Bathurst (2000) who found that changes on the T-F dichotomy were influenced by the gender of the participants. Past studies have also indicated that changes on the T-F dichotomy, specifically changes from T to F, are the most prevalent (Bathurst, 2000; Kummerow, 1988; Walck, 1992). It should be noted however, that while significant relationships were found on two preference pairs, both relationships have very small effect sizes (Lipsey, 1990).

Overall, the rate of agreement found in the current study between reported type and best-fit type is consistent with those previously reported (Bathurst, 2000; Hammer & Yeakley, 1987; Kummerow, 1988; Walck, 1992). This suggests that the type being reported by the indicator is, in large part, an

accurate reflection of one's true type (Hammer & Yeakley, 1987). Moreover, rates of agreement were comparable across all ethnic and gender subgroups. A consistent percentage of matches were also found on the reported type/best-fit type relationship across most all ethnic and gender groups and matches found were deemed to have small effect sizes (Lipsey, 1990). Thus, these results suggest that neither ethnicity nor gender play a substantial role in the verification one's true type.

MBTI®Complete's automated, computerized feedback component, as well as potential subgroup differences that may emerge in the verification process.

It should be noted that previous rates of agreement were found using a face-to-face verification process. The current study utilized the MBTI®Complete's online interpretation and verification process rather than the traditional method. As the relationship between reported type and best-fit type was similar to that found by previous researchers, these results lend credit to the use of interactive, computerized interpretations in providing results of reported type and verifying best-fit type. The use of computerized interpretations may offer a more systematic approach to conveying reported type results and explanations of other alternative type descriptions. Accuracy in this interpretation process must remain a top priority in demonstrating the validity of the assessment.

Taken together, the results found in this study provide further support for the validity of the MBTI® assessment and lend credit to the online interpretation and validation sessions used in the MBTI®Complete. Additional research, however, should be conducted to examine the efficacy of the

## References

- Bathurst, J. (2000). The relationship between reported type and best-fit type: Evidence for administrator bias? *Journal of Psychological Type*, 54, 5-11.
- Fitopoulos, L. (1996). The translation and standardization of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®) into the Greek language. *Masters Abstracts International*, 35 (06), 1904. (UMI No. AAGMM-19888)
- Hammer, A. L. & Mitchell, W. D. (1996). The distribution of MBTI® types in the US by gender and ethnic group. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 37, 2-15.
- Hammer, A. L., & Yeakley, Jr., F. R. (1987). The relationship between "true type" and reported type. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 13, 52-55.
- Inclan, A. F. (1986). The development of the Spanish version of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Form G. (1986). *Journal of Psychological Type*, 11, 35-46.
- Jung, C. G. (1923). *Psychological types: The psychology of individuation* (H. G. Baynes, Trans). London: Kegan Paul and New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. (Original work published 1921)
- Kirby, L. K., Kendall, E., & Barger, N. J. (2007). *Type and culture: Using the MBTI® instrument in international applications*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.
- Kirk, R.E. (1996). Practical significance: A concept whose time has come. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56, 746-759.
- Kummerow, J. M. (1988). A methodology for verifying type: research results. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 15, 20-25.
- Kummerow, J. M., Krause, N., & Schaubhut, N. (2008, January). Step II results of community leaders: Differences and similarities of Caucasian, Hispanic, and Native American Indian leaders. Paper presented at the Psychological Type and Culture Symposium, Honolulu, HI.
- Krause, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2008). Efficacy of electronic administration and interpretation of personality measures. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association 116<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference, Boston MA
- Lipsey, M. (1990). *Design Sensitivity: Statistical Power for Experimental Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, p.54-58.
- Myers, I. M., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI® Manual*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.
- Nash, S. M. (2008). Best-fit type in the US and the UK: One type, two cultures. *Bulletin of Psychological Type*, (31)3, 35-36.
- Ohsawa, T. (1968). *The report on the Japanese translation and examination of the MBTI®*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Vacha-Haase, T., & Thompson, B.



- (2004). How to estimate and interpret various effect sizes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 473-481.
- Walck, C. L. (1992). The relationship between indicator type and "true type": Slight preferences and the verification process. *Journal of Psychological Type, 23*, 17-21.

Table 1  
*Reported and Best-Fit Type Distribution by Ethnicity*

	<b>ISTJ</b>					<b>ISFJ</b>					<b>INFJ</b>					<b>INTJ</b>				
	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin
Reported Type	17.2	17.6	11.6	15.7	14.4	5.6	5.3	4.7	2.0	6.8	2.9	3.8	3.4	1.7	1.0	4.6	6.9	5.1	5.5	2.5
Best-Fit Type	14.9	16.2	12.0	15.1	12.7	7.3	6.9	5.3	3.8	6.6	2.1	5.5	3.4	2.9	1.8	8.8	9.1	7.9	6.7	6.3
	<b>ISTP</b>					<b>ISFP</b>					<b>INFP</b>					<b>INTP</b>				
	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin
Reported Type	6.5	3.4	4.5	4.6	4.6	3.6	2.0	2.9	2.0	4.3	3.3	5.5	6.7	6.4	2.8	4.0	6.5	7.1	8.4	5.6
Best-Fit Type	4.2	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.1	2.2	3.9	4.1	5.1	6.7	4.2	7.9	7.2	6.1	4.0	4.8	4.5	5.8	2.0
	<b>ESTP</b>					<b>ESFP</b>					<b>ENFP</b>					<b>ENTP</b>				
	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin
Reported Type	6.3	3.8	4.9	4.3	8.9	4.2	1.8	3.5	3.5	4.1	8.2	4.6	10.2	7.8	6.3	6.7	4.4	8.6	9.6	8.1
Best-Fit Type	4.4	2.4	3.8	2.9	6.1	3.8	2.8	3.7	3.8	5.6	8.2	5.1	9.5	8.4	6.3	6.7	4.4	8.6	9.6	9.4
	<b>ESTJ</b>					<b>ESFJ</b>					<b>ENFJ</b>					<b>ENTJ</b>				
	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin	African Amer.	Asian	Cauca.	Indian	Latin
Reported Type	13.8	18.2	10.9	15.9	13.2	5.2	5.3	4.8	2.3	5.8	4.0	3.4	4.6	2.9	3.5	4.0	7.5	6.5	7.2	8.1
Best-Fit Type	10.9	13.1	9.0	11.6	10.6	4.0	6.5	4.6	2.6	5.3	5.4	4.2	5.2	3.2	4.3	5.6	8.9	6.7	8.7	8.1

Note. Numbers indicate percentage in each ethnic group. African American  $N = 478$ , Asian  $N = 505$ , Caucasian  $N = 7,113$ , Indian  $N = 345$ , Latin  $N = 395$ .

Poster presented at the XVIII Biennial Association for Psychological Type International Conference, Dallas, TX, August 5-August 9, 2009.

Please do not reference without permission from the first author, nherk@cpp.com

MBTI, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, and Myers-Briggs are registered trademarks of the MBTI Trust, Inc.

Table 2  
*Reported and Best-Fit Type Distribution by Ethnicity*

Preference		African American		Asian		Caucasian		Indian		Latin	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
E	Reported Type	250	52.3	247	48.9	3841	54.0	185	53.6	229	58.0
	Best-Fit Type	234	49.0	239	47.3	3638	51.1	175	50.7	220	55.7
I	Reported Type	228	47.7	258	51.1	3272	46.0	160	46.4	166	42.0
	Best-Fit Type	244	51.0	266	52.7	3475	48.9	170	49.3	175	44.3
S	Reported Type	298	62.3	290	57.4	3404	47.9	174	50.4	245	62.0
	Best-Fit Type	251	52.5	272	53.9	3286	46.2	164	47.5	220	55.7
N	Reported Type	180	37.7	215	42.6	3709	52.1	171	49.6	150	38.0
	Best-Fit Type	227	47.5	233	46.1	3827	53.8	181	52.5	175	44.3
T	Reported Type	301	63.0	345	68.3	4209	59.2	246	71.3	258	65.3
	Best-Fit Type	284	59.4	316	62.6	4025	56.6	221	64.1	233	59.0
F	Reported Type	177	37.0	160	31.7	2904	40.8	99	28.7	137	34.7
	Best-Fit Type	194	40.6	189	37.4	3088	43.4	124	35.9	162	41.0
J	Reported Type	274	57.3	344	68.1	3671	51.6	184	53.3	219	55.4
	Best-Fit Type	282	59.0	356	70.5	3846	54.1	188	54.5	220	55.7
P	Reported Type	204	42.7	161	31.9	3442	48.4	161	46.7	176	44.6
	Best-Fit Type	196	41.0	149	29.5	3267	45.9	157	45.5	175	44.3

*Note.* African American *N* = 478, Asian *N* = 505, Caucasian *N* = 7,113, Indian *N* = 345, Latin *N* = 395.

Table 3

*Rate of Agreement Between Reported Type and Best-Fit Type by Ethnicity*

Agreement on	African American		Asian		Caucasian		Indian		Latin	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
0 preferences	1	.2	1	.2	7	.1	0	0	0	0
1 Preferences	13	2.7	13	2.6	129	1.8	9	2.6	7	1.8
2 Preferences	44	9.2	35	6.9	466	6.6	28	8.1	34	8.6
3 Preference	95	19.9	90	17.8	1279	18.0	66	19.1	79	20.0
4 Preferences	325	68.0	366	72.5	5232	73.6	242	70.1	275	69.6

Note. African American *N* = 478, Asian *N* = 505, Caucasian *N* = 7,113, Indian *N* = 345, Latin *N* = 395.

Table 4

*Match Between Reported and Best-Fit Type on Preference Pairs by Ethnicity*

		Match Between Reported and Best-Fit Type		No Match Between Reported and Best-Fit Type	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
E-I	African American	432	90.4	46	9.6
	Asian	465	92.1	40	7.9
	Caucasian	6604	92.8	509	7.2
	Indian	313	90.7	32	9.3
	Latin	364	92.2	31	7.8
S-N	African American	397	83.1	81	16.9
	Asian	441	87.3	64	12.7
	Caucasian	6265	88.1	848	11.9
	Indian	299	86.7	46	13.3
	Latin	342	86.6	53	13.4
T-F	African American	427	89.3	51	10.7
	Asian	452	89.5	53	10.5
	Caucasian	6441	90.6	672	9.4
	Indian	310	89.9	35	10.1
	Latin	340	86.1	55	13.9
J-P	African American	430	90.0	48	10.0
	Asian	459	90.9	46	9.1
	Caucasian	6516	91.6	597	8.4
	Indian	309	89.6	36	10.4
	Latin	366	92.7	29	7.3

*Note.* African American *N* = 478, Asian *N* = 505, Caucasian *N* = 7,113, Indian *N* = 345, Latin *N* = 395.

Table 5  
*Reported and Best-Fit Type Distribution by Gender*

	<b>ISTJ</b>		<b>ISFJ</b>		<b>INFJ</b>		<b>INTJ</b>	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Reported Type	10.7	14.6	7.0	2.3	4.3	2.0	4.0	6.3
Best-Fit Type	11.0	14.3	8.1	2.6	4.3	2.3	6.5	9.5
	<b>ISTP</b>		<b>ISFP</b>		<b>INFP</b>		<b>INTP</b>	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Reported Type	3.3	5.8	3.2	2.6	6.9	5.6	4.6	9.4
Best-Fit Type	2.6	5.5	4.0	3.6	8.4	6.6	2.5	6.6
	<b>ESTP</b>		<b>ESFP</b>		<b>ENFP</b>		<b>ENTP</b>	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Reported Type	4.3	6.0	4.5	2.3	11.5	7.2	6.4	10.3
Best-Fit Type	2.9	4.8	4.4	2.9	10.3	7.5	6.5	10.4
	<b>ESTJ</b>		<b>ESFJ</b>		<b>ENFJ</b>		<b>ENTJ</b>	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Reported Type	10.5	13.2	7.0	2.4	6.1	2.5	5.7	7.4
Best-Fit Type	8.8	10.3	6.8	2.3	6.9	3.0	6.0	8.0

*Note.* Numbers indicate percentage in each ethnic group. Female *N* = 4,626, Male *N* = 4,210.

Table 6  
*Reported and Best-Fit Type Preferences by Gender*

Preference		Female		Male	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
E	Reported Type	2590	56.0	2162	51.4
	Best-Fit Type	2436	52.7	2070	49.2
I	Reported Type	2036	44.0	2048	48.6
	Best-Fit Type	2190	47.3	2140	50.8
S	Reported Type	2337	50.5	2074	49.3
	Best-Fit Type	2249	48.6	1944	46.2
N	Reported Type	2289	49.5	2136	50.7
	Best-Fit Type	2377	51.4	2266	53.8
T	Reported Type	2287	49.4	3072	73.0
	Best-Fit Type	2167	46.8	2912	69.2
F	Reported Type	2339	50.6	1138	27.0
	Best-Fit Type	2459	53.2	1298	30.8
J	Reported Type	2557	55.3	2135	50.7
	Best-Fit Type	2699	58.3	2193	52.1
P	Reported Type	2069	44.7	2075	49.3
	Best-Fit Type	1927	41.7	2017	47.9

*Note.* Female *N* = 4,626, Male *N* = 4,210.

Table 7  
*Rate of Agreement Between Reported Type and Best-Fit Type by Gender*

Agreement on	Female		Male	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
0 preferences	5	0.1	4	0.1
1 Preferences	85	1.8	86	2.0
2 Preferences	327	7.1	280	6.7
3 Preference	893	19.3	716	17.0
4 Preferences	3316	71.7	3124	74.2

*Note.* Female *N* = 4,626, Male *N* = 4,210.



Table 8

*Match Between Reported and Best-Fit Type on Preference Pairs by Gender*

		Match Between Reported and Best-Fit Type		No Match Between Reported and Best-Fit Type	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
E-I	Female	4268	92.3	358	7.7
	Male	3910	92.9	300	7.1
S-N	Female	4070	88.0	556	12.0
	Male	3674	87.3	536	12.7
T-F	Female	4130	89.3	496	10.7
	Male	3840	91.2	370	8.8
J-P	Female	4214	91.1	412	8.9
	Male	3866	91.8	344	8.2

*Note.* Female *N* = 4,626, Male *N* = 4,210.