A Comparison Between
The Birkman Method®
And the
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI®)

Patrick L. Wadlington, Ph.D.
Birkman International, Inc.
2008

Table of Contents

I. Introduction ……..……...…….. 3

II. Theoretical Origins…….... 3

III. Theoretical Basis & Structure ……..…….. 4

IV. Appropriate Uses ……... 9

V. Correlation Studies ……..…….. 9

A. Birkman and FFM ……..……..……... 10

B. Table 1: Birkman Usual Orientation to Step II Facet Scales ..…..... 11

C. Table 2: Birkman Need Orientation to Step II Facet Scales ….…..... 12

D. Table 3: Birkman Usual Preference to Step II Facet Scales ..…..... 13

E. Table 4: Birkman Need Preference to Step II Facet Scales ….…..... 14

F. Table 5: Birkman Other Scales to Step II Facet Scales …….. 15

VI. Summary ……...…….…….…… 16

VII. Additional Information ……... 16

VIII. References …….…….…… 17

IX. About the Author …….…….……..... 18

I. Introduction

The Birkman Method® is based on the theories of Dr. Roger W. Birkman and the work of Dr. Birkman, Dr. Roy B. Mefferd, Jr., and Dr. Timothy G. Sadler. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI®) is based on the theories of Dr. Carl Gustav Jung and the work of Katharine Cook Briggs and her daughter Isabel Briggs Myers. Both The Birkman Method and the MBTI are non-clinical assessments. The technical manuals for both assessments have established and documented face, content, construct (convergent/divergent), and criterion-related validities.

The purpose of this report is to compare The Birkman Method to the MBTI. It is written to describe and compare: theoretical origins, theoretical basis and structure, applications, and how the data obtained from one instrument – in the case of this report the MBTI®Step II – correlates to the data obtained from the other. This report will show that the instruments have fundamentally different foundations and psychometric properties.

II. Theoretical Origins

The Birkman Method®

Roger W. Birkman, Ph.D., began his exploration of individual differences of behavior and perception while a B-17 bomber pilot and pilot instructor for the U.S. Air Force during WW II. His experience with the impact that misperceptions – both visual and interpersonal – had on pilot performance and student learning led him to the study of psychology. By 1950, Birkman had developed a unique method of assessment. His instrument of measurement, called the *Test of Social Comprehension* at that time, was empirically developed from workplace interviewing and observation. The instrument was designed to measure the human characteristics that he saw influence perceptions, behaviors, and motivations in normally functioning adults. “When I was first introduced to existing knowledge in the field of psychological tests and measurement while doing undergraduate work at the University of Houston, the potential contribution which could be made to education, business, and industry captured my imagination and has absorbed much of my thought and effort since” (Birkman 1961). During the 1960’s, the assessment further integrated interests and occupational measurement. This integrated assessment came to be known as The Birkman Method.

The MBTI®

In the early 20th Century, Katherine Myers developed a classification of personality based on her own observations. After reading Psychological Types, The Psychology of Individuation (1921) by Carl G. Jung, Myers realized that she found the person, who for her, best understood human behavior and its development. Katherine's daughter, Isabel Briggs Myers, picked up her mother's ideas and tried to turn them into practical use. During World War II Isabel resolved to do something that might help people understand each other and avoid conflict. She determined to find a way to give individuals access to

their psychological type through the implementation of Jung's theories. This work became her mission for the rest of her life. She created the Type Indicators and spent most of the 50's and 60's validating them, but it wasn't until 1975 that they became an established tool in occupational psychology.

III. Theoretical Basis & Structure

The Birkman Method

During his research, Birkman found that individual perceptions of others were more critical to the true measure of personality than any series of self-reported statements alone. The hypothesis implicit in this theoretical position is that a close relationship exists between individual motives, attitudes and behaviors and how that same individual judges the motives, attitudes, and behaviors of others.

Birkman made two important observations central to his research:

1. Behavior is not determined so much by objective facts as by the particular meanings the individual attaches to these facts.
2. The perceptions of some individuals about "most people" and/or "self" may actually be illusory, irrational, or unreal. Nevertheless, these perceptions are real and reasonable to individuals, and so, influential on their behaviors.

In order to apply his findings, Birkman suggested a new approach to the assessment of personality and social perceptions. He believed that personality and social perception differences were likely to emerge more clearly in a questionnaire measuring both perceptions of self and perceptions of others.

There were two reasons for this new approach. First, Birkman was interested in application rather than academic study. While other researchers studied why respondents behaved the way they did, Birkman identified which behaviors resulted from the respondent's self and other responses making certain that all the core human dynamics were included. Second, Birkman knew he was working on fundamental human factors because much of his work was based on that of leading psychologists of his time (e.g., Cattell), factor analysis, and current studies relating to clinical conditions (schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, depression, etc.). Unique to Birkman was his self-other perceptual orientation focused on *normal functioning adults*. The result of Birkman's work evolved into The Birkman Method.

The Birkman Method includes a self-report questionnaire eliciting responses about perception of self, perception of social context, and perception of occupational opportunities. Scales were developed empirically by comparing self-report item results with descriptions of likes, dislikes, and behaviors provided by third parties (e.g., supervisors, direct reports). Scale development resulted in ten scales describing occupational preferences (Interests), eleven scales describing more effective behaviors

(Usual behaviors), and eleven scales describing interpersonal and environmental preferences or expectations (Needs). A corresponding set of eleven scales were derived to describe less than effective behaviors (Stress behaviors).

The Interest scales describe an expressed motivational construct. Individuals with high scale values tend to prefer to be engaged in activities consistent with the commonly expected responsibilities associated with the Interest scale meaning. The Interest scales do not measure level of expected skill or proficiency with these activities.

Usual behavior is expressed in a variety of situations and is readily observable by others. It is seen most often in the early stages of relationships or when the individual is in unfamiliar or formal social and work circumstances. The Usual behavior scales describe an individual's effective style of dealing with relationships and tasks. These behaviors are typically described as positive or effective in manner (though not necessarily in result). The Usual behavior scales are constructed as bidirectional descriptors of style so that individuals with a low scale value are described as approaching relationships or tasks in one manner and those with a high scale value are described as approaching them in an opposite but equally effective manner. Scale values describe style of behavior not level of effectiveness. The expectations of the observer (observer's Needs) will determine the level of effectiveness.

The Usual behavior scales are derived from the self-description responses from the questionnaire and are known to be influenced by perceptions of social desirability. This is by design and improves the accuracy and utility of results.

Scaling techniques compare self-perception responses against the evenly distributed "most people" percentile scores. Thus, The Birkman Method draws a distinction and comparison between the "socially correct" behaviors (Usual) and how the individual wants to be treated by others (Needs). Further, The Birkman Method, unlike most assessments on the market, does not require any corrective measures – statistical or otherwise – to account for socially desirable responses from questionnaire respondents. The Birkman Method integrates and uses that information as an important part of its methodology.

Needs scales identify which set of conditions predict Needs fulfillment or Needs frustration for the respondent. Although Dr. Birkman could not directly observe another's Needs he was able to identify the positive or negative behaviors associated with Needs fulfillment or frustration. Through interviews with paired associates, spouses, and friends he found that when an individual was in a situation or relationship that proceeded in a manner consistent with Needs (fulfillment) that individual felt good about self, was adaptable, and exhibited positive, productive behavior (Usual behavior). Conversely, Birkman found that individuals tended to exhibit less-than-effective behaviors (Stress behavior) when the individual was in important relationships or situations that proceeded in a manner inconsistent with Needs. The Needs scales are derived from the "most people" responses from the questionnaire. These scales are bidirectional in description like the Usual behavior scales. Birkman created the scales so that individuals with low

scale values needed situations or relationships that demanded one style of response while those with high scale values needed situations and relationships demanding the opposite style of response. No value judgment is attached to either direction; therefore, Needs at both ends of the scale continuum have equal value.

The Needs scales are the statistical anchor for the behavioral Component scales of The Birkman Method (Usual and Stress). It is the anchor because it represents a scale unaffected by social desirability. This is reasonable given the following:

- Needs scales are derived from "most people" responses on the questionnaire. So, they cannot be measuring the inclination to present oneself in a manner that will be viewed favorably by others.

- After aggregating the data from thousands of respondents it has been found that Needs scores are distributed evenly across all possible responses. This lack of "skew" to the distribution suggests that the scales for Needs are less likely influenced by social bias.

Like Usual and Needs scales, the Stress behavior scales are bi-directional where individuals with low scale values tend to act out frustration with one style of ineffective behavior, while individuals with high scale values tend to act out frustration with the opposite but equally ineffective behavior. A striking difference between The Birkman Method and the MBTI is that in the latter, one has to refer to other works (Quenk, 1993) to reveal insights into less-than-productive behaviors and the 16 possible intervention sets to correct them. In contrast, The Birkman Method® integrates these less-than-productive behavioral interventions directly in its reporting.

The Birkman Method is a *trait-based* instrument (e.g., Five-Factor Model, Holland's occupational types) measuring the intensity or quantity of traits. In terms of The Birkman Method, traits are distinguishing qualities or characteristics of a person that endure through the adult years. By definition, traits are a readiness to think or act in a similar fashion in response to stimuli or situations. In general, trait theory assumes that people differ on variables or dimensions that are *continuous*. People are seen to differ in the *amounts* or *quantities* of a characteristic rather than differ in the *quality (*having or not having) of a characteristic.

The Usual, Needs, and Stress scales of The Birkman Method are *continuous* in measurement. This is in contrast to the dichotomous measurement found in the MBTI where the individual is measured as belonging to one category or the other with no measurement of intensity or quantity. Continuous measurement is important because this means The Birkman Method can discriminate between two individuals with similar traits but with observable differences of degree for those traits. The Birkman Method measures differences of kind ("Bill is extraverted while Jane is introverted.") and differences of degree ("Bill is *moderately* extraverted while Jane is *highly* introverted.") The MBTI does not do this and, as you will read in the next section, faces challenges when differentiating between individuals.

The MBTI

Fundamental to the MBTI is C.G. Jung's (1875-1963) theory of psychological type. Jung, the Swiss psychoanalyst and thinker, developed his theory of psychological type based on dichotomies. Building his ideas on the work of others, as well as from his own clinical research, he began in 1913 by describing two psychological types – *extraverts* and *introverts*.

In Jung's theory whether we are introverts or extraverts, we need to deal with the world, inner and outer. Each of us has our preferred ways of dealing with it, ways we are comfortable with and good at. Jung suggested four basic ways, or *functions*:

The first is *sensing*. Sensing means getting information by means of the senses. A sensing person looks and listens when getting to know the world, meaning that it involves perception rather than the judging of information.

The second is *thinking*. Thinking means evaluating information or ideas rationally or logically, meaning that it involves decision making or judging, rather than the simple intake of information.

The third is *intuiting*. Intuiting is a kind of perception that works outside of the usual conscious processes. It is perceptual, like sensing, but comes from the complex integration of large amounts of information, rather than simple seeing or hearing. Jung said it was like seeing around corners.

The fourth is *feeling*. Feeling, like thinking, is a matter of evaluating information, this time by weighing one's overall emotional response.

Jung believed that while both facets of a bi-polar dimension can be present in personality, one is emphasized more than the other. Myers and Briggs added to Jung's theoretical framework above by adding an additional function – *judging / perceiving* – which is also grounded in his theory. With the addition of these came the "16 types."

The MBTI is an *indicator of type*. As such it does not measure the amount of a personality trait as The Birkman Method does. In fact, the MBTI does not measure anything. The MBTI categorizes individuals based on preference or type ("Bill prefers introversion."), but not the strength or degree of preference ("Jane *strongly* prefers extraversion") nor degree of aptitude ("Harry is *good* at thinking"). Thus, the MBTI is not capable of exploring or identifying individuality within the type code itself. This lack of precision within The MBTI could lead to an incorrect "typing".

The lack of precision within the MBTI lies mostly within its statistical structure. As a dichotomous measure of type, one would expect the scores of the MBTI to be distributed bi-modally and not be normally distributed. For example, if you randomly selected 500 people between the ages of 25 and 35, measured their heights, and then drew a graph of

the results it would be expected to have a normal or bell-shaped distribution. Most people would have a height close to the mean, say 5'8".

Some people would be very short while others are very tall, but these extreme scores would occur less than those at the mean, thus creating a bell-shaped curve. Now, what would happen if you divided the sample by gender? When you redraw the data you should get a bimodal distribution, right? Women, on average, are shorter than men; but within each gender there will be a normal distribution of heights. The same thing would be expected to happen for a dichotomous measure such as the MBTI.

To illustrate further, it would be expected that since people are either introverts or extraverts, the results should yield two different curves. One curve would represent all the introverts, and the other, all the extraverts. True, some people may be more extraverted than others, but it would be expected that all the extraverts would be different from all the introverts. What should be found is that there are two normal curves representing the two preferences and that there is little to no overlap of the two curves. This would provide distinction between introverts and extraverts.

The data indicate that there is no evidence of bimodal distribution for the MBTI (Stricker and Ross, 1962). Instead, most people score towards the center, between the two extremes. This means that although one person may score as an E, his or her results may be very similar to those of another person who scores as an I (Pittenger, 1993). Obviously, this has implications for the accurate depiction of type when most people are scoring towards the center where preference of type is not distinct and certain.

In contrast, the scales of The Birkman Method are evenly distributed. In lay terms this means there are equal percentages (%) of the population across the Birkman continuum. In examining the Birkman's reporting method the population is distributed evenly across the five "bandwidths" of behavioral or motivational description, whereby the two bandwidths at either end represent distinct and opposite descriptions, the three bandwidths towards the center represent increasingly blended and less intense descriptions of the two ends of the continuum with the central bandwidth being a "perfect blend" of the continuum ends. This provides reporting that shows distinctive and measurable difference between individuals.

To provide more precision to an individual's preference or type, Kathy Myers and Peter Myers put together a team of experts to develop the MBTI Step II – an extended version of the MBTI. Step II must be interpreted within the context of the Step I four-letter type (Quenk et al., 2001) because it rests on the same theoretical foundation of the MBTI. In the Step II the MBTI preference pairs (dichotomies) are each broken down into five *facets* (see the MBTI Step II Manual for a complete discussion of the facets). This refinement overcomes the lack of measurement on a continuum found in the MBTI.

However, like the MBTI, the Step II is not a trait-based instrument. It is still an indicator of type or preference – albeit with slightly more precision. Importantly, it does not

explore Needs and the behaviors and conditions associated with fulfillment of Needs like The Birkman Method.

With the MBTI the individual respondents are considered the best judge of their own types – not the instrument itself. While the MBTI questionnaire provides a *Reported Type*, this is considered only an indication of the individual's probable overall type. A *Best Fit Process* is used to allow individual respondents to form their own hypothesis as to their overall type and compare these against their Reported Types. If respondents disagree with their Reported Types they may simply change it. Respondents can choose their types regardless of what the report says. In contrast, The Birkman Method does not allow a respondent to change assessment scores. If scores are allowed to be changed based on the respondent's intuition or opinion, then it would follow that the scores would not be considered empirically driven and the validity of the scoring would be questionable.

IV. Appropriate Uses

The Birkman Method can be used in both selection and development applications. The continuous trait-measurements, multi-dimensional properties, and predictive reporting provided by The Birkman Method make it useful in decision making and issues-based activities, such as hiring, selection, conflict resolution, personal development, leadership development, and team building.

The ethical code of practice for MBTI practitioners states that the MBTI can be used in areas such as career counseling, but it should not be used for making recruitment or hiring decisions.

V. Correlation Studies

The following pages are a selection of the correlation tables between The Birkman Method and the MBTI Step II Facet Scales. For a complete comparison please refer to the **2008 Technical Manual for The Birkman Method®**. The Manual is available for purchase from Birkman International, Inc. (800-215-2760; info@birkman.com). Some terminology in the following pages may be unfamiliar even to those trained and Certified in The Birkman Method. Therefore, we begin by connecting the familiar scale terminology with five Orientation scales which, in turn, are aligned with the FFM (Five-Factor Model of Personality).

Five-Factor Model (FFM) Constructs and The Birkman Method Orientation scales.

FFM Constructs	Birkman Orientations
Neuroticism	Emotive Orientation
Extraversion	Social Orientation
Conscientiousness	Process Orientation
Agreeableness	Control Orientation
Openness	Change Orientation

The Birkman Method Orientation scales.

Birkman Orientations	Birkman Scale
Emotive Orientation	Empathy, Thought, Activity
Social Orientation	Esteem, Acceptance
Process Orientation	Structure
Control Orientation	Advantage, Authority
Change Orientation	Change

The comparison also references Preference scales.

Birkman Preference	Birkman Scale
Communication	Esteem
Interaction	Acceptance
Incentive	Advantage

Finally, there is reference to several scales titled *Personal Autonomy* (The Birkman Method Freedom scale) and *Perspective Alignment* (The Birkman Method Challenge scale). These scales are "social environment anchored scales" as opposed to personality scales. The Birkman Method occupational scales along with other derived scales are not compared in this document because they have no equal in the MBTI.

Table 1

Correlation of The Birkman Method *Usual Orientation* scales and MBTI Step II Facet scales.

	The Birkman Method *Usual Orientation* scale				
MBTI Step II Facet scale	EMO	SOC	PRO	CON	CHA
E-I Facet scales					
Initiating-Receiving	**.19**	**-.68**	-.11	**-.13**	-.12
Expressive-Contained	.08	**-.43**	-.03	-.06	-.12
Gregarious-Intimate	**.20**	**-.40**	-.02	-.02	**-.25**
Active-Reflective	**.18**	**-.52**	-.07	-.08	**-.16**
Enthusiastic-Quiet	**.18**	**-.52**	-.03	-.06	**-.24**
S-N Facet scales					
Concrete-Abstract	**.16**	.11	-.11	.07	**.15**
Realistic-Imaginative	**.19**	**.14**	-.12	.08	**.16**
Practical-Conceptual	**.20**	.07	-.07	.04	.06
Experimental-Theoretical	**.16**	.06	**-.16**	.08	**.13**
Traditional-Original	**.22**	**.13**	**-.19**	.07	**.17**
T-F Facet scales					
Logical-Empathetic	**.15**	-.01	-.06	**-.14**	**.15**
Reasonable-Compassionate	**.18**	-.10	-.12	**-.17**	**.14**
Questioning-Accommodating	.01	**-.18**	**.13**	**-.29**	.00
Critical-Accepting	-.07	-.04	-.03	**-.31**	.06
Tough-Tender	**.15**	**-.13**	-.11	**-.15**	**.14**
J-P Facet scales					
Systematic-Casual	**.20**	-.08	**-.38**	.09	.06
Planful-Open-ended	**.20**	**-.14**	**-.43**	.07	.08
Early Starting-Pressure Prompted	**.20**	-.03	**-.40**	.10	**.18**
Scheduled-Spontaneous	**.20**	-.07	**-.39**	**.13**	.09
Methodical-Emergent	**.13**	-.01	**-.34**	**.13**	.08

Notes: EMO=Emotive, SOC=Social, PRO=Process, CON=Control, CHA=Change; N=261; **Bold** indicates a correlation coefficient significant at p<.05. *Source*: 2008 MBTI® / The Birkman Method® study.

The first significant correlation is The Birkman Method Usual Social scale and the MBTI Extraversion facet scales. The correlations range from -.40 to -.68 indicating that the high Social Orientation Usual scale is very similar to the Extraversion facet scales. The second significant correlation is The Birkman Method Process Orientation Usual scale and the MBTI Judging facet scales. The correlations range from -.34 to -.43 indicating that the high Process Orientation Usual scale is very similar to each of the Judging facet scales. The Birkman Method Emotive Orientation Usual scale correlates across almost all of the MBTI facets, possibly indicating the universal applicability of emotion to most aspects of human nature.

Table 2

Correlation of The Birkman Method *Need Orientation* scales and MBTI Step II Facet scales.

	The Birkman Method *Need Orientation* scale				
MBTI® Step II Facet scale	EMO	SOC	PRO	CON	CHA
E-I Facet scales					
Initiating-Receiving	.11	-.09	-.09	-.02	.00
Expressive-Contained	-.02	-.02	-.03	.05	-.02
Gregarious-Intimate	**.22**	**-.21**	-.10	**.17**	.10
Active-Reflective	.10	-.07	-.08	.02	.06
Enthusiastic-Quiet	.12	-.12	**-.13**	.06	.01
S-N Facet scales					
Concrete-Abstract	**.15**	-.02	-.02	**.13**	.04
Realistic-Imaginative	**.14**	.03	-.07	.07	**.13**
Practical-Conceptual	**.20**	**-.14**	**-.13**	**.15**	.07
Experimental-Theoretical	**.15**	-.08	-.10	.07	.02
Traditional-Original	**.18**	-.04	-.10	.11	**.15**
T-F Facet scales					
Logical-Empathetic	**.19**	-.08	-.11	.07	**.23**
Reasonable-Compassionate	**.25**	**-.15**	**-.20**	**.13**	**.23**
Questioning-Accommodating	.04	.04	.03	**-.13**	.04
Critical-Accepting	.07	-.09	.04	-.01	**.18**
Tough-Tender	**.19**	-.13	**-.16**	.09	**.17**
J-P Facet scales					
Systematic-Casual	.12	-.01	-.11	**.21**	**.18**
Planful-Open-ended	.08	.03	**-.16**	.17	.11
Early Starting-Pressure Prompted	.04	.06	-.08	.08	.05
Scheduled-Spontaneous	.10	.04	**-.16**	**.25**	.09
Methodical-Emergent	.07	-.01	-.06	**.15**	.10

Notes: EMO=Emotive, SOC=Social, PRO=Process, CON=Control, CHA=Change; N=261; **Bold** indicates a correlation coefficient significant at p<.05. *Source*: 2008 MBTI® / The Birkman Method® study.

There are few significant correlations between The Birkman Method Needs scales and the MBTI Step II Facet scales. This suggests that the two sets of scales measure different attributes. This is consistent with expectations in that the MBTI measures only self-descriptors, while The Birkman Method is a measure of both self-descriptors and description of others.

Table 3

Correlation of The Birkman Method *Usual* Preference scales and MBTI Step II Facet scales.

	The Birkman Method Usual Preference scale						
MBTI Step II Facet scale	ACT	EMP	THO	COM	INT	INC	AUT
E-I Facet scales							
Initiating-Receiving	**-.22**	**.14**	.12	**.45**	**-.72**	-.08	-.12
Expressive-Contained	**-.13**	.00	**.15**	**.17**	**-.58**	-.01	-.08
Gregarious-Intimate	**-.15**	**.19**	**.13**	**.24**	**-.46**	.02	-.04
Active-Reflective	**-.22**	.11	.09	**.30**	**-.60**	-.01	-.11
Enthusiastic-Quiet	**-.22**	**.14**	.06	**.30**	**-.60**	.01	-.11
S-N Facet scales							
Concrete-Abstract	-.07	**.20**	.08	-.06	.12	.05	.05
Realistic-Imaginative	-.11	**.19**	**.16**	-.06	**.19**	**.13**	.01
Practical-Conceptual	**-.14**	**.18**	**.20**	-.07	.06	.09	-.01
Experimental-Theoretical	.01	**.23**	**.15**	-.03	.08	.08	.06
Traditional-Original	**-.14**	**.22**	**.16**	-.09	**.13**	.10	.02
T-F Facet scales							
Logical-Empathetic	-.09	**.15**	**.14**	.12	.11	-.05	**-.17**
Reasonable-Compassionate	**-.15**	**.15**	**.17**	**.17**	.01	-.06	**-.21**
Questioning-Accommodating	-.02	.00	.01	**.21**	-.10	-.12	**-.32**
Critical-Accepting	.01	-.08	-.09	**.14**	.08	**-.17**	**-.33**
Tough-Tender	**-.14**	.12	.09	**.25**	.03	-.02	**-.20**
J-P Facet scales							
Systematic-Casual	**-.18**	**.16**	**.16**	.12	-.01	**.13**	.02
Planful-Open-ended	**-.20**	**.13**	**.21**	.11	**-.13**	.10	.02
Early Starting-Pressure Prompted	**-.13**	**.20**	**.15**	.04	-.01	.09	.07
Scheduled-Spontaneous	**-.15**	**.19**	**.13**	.05	-.08	.12	.10
Methodical-Emergent	-.06	**.14**	.09	.05	.04	.08	.12

Notes: ACT=Activity, EMP=Empathy, THO=Thought, COM=Communication, INT=Interaction, INC=Incentive, AUT=Authority; N=261; **Bold** indicates a correlation coefficient significant at p<.05. *Source*: 2008 MBTI® / The Birkman Method® study.

The Birkman Method Communication Preference Usual and Interaction Preference Usual (which comprises Social Orientation) correlate highest to the MBTI Extraversion facet scale. The correlation indicates that MBTI Extraversion combines high social interaction with significant amounts of Contained, Intimate, Reflective, and Quiet interactions. This suggests that extraversion may have more complexity than what is commonly attributed to them. Correlations exist between the MBTI Thinking scale and The Birkman Method Authority Preference scale. Correlations range from -.17 to -.33 indicating the Authority Preference scale is associated with the MBTI Logical, Reasonable, Questioning, Critical, and Tough facets. This is consistent with expectations given that Authority Usual is negatively correlated to Agreeableness within the Five-Factor Model of Personality.

Table 4

Correlation of The Birkman Method *Need* Preference scales and MBTI Step II Facet scales.

	The Birkman Method *Need* Preference scale						
MBTI Step II Facet scale	ACT	EMP	THO	COM	INT	INC	AUT
E-I Facet scales							
Initiating-Receiving	-.11	.09	.07	.04	-.12	.08	-.11
Expressive-Contained	-.03	-.06	.00	-.02	-.05	.11	-.04
Gregarious-Intimate	**-.18**	**.21**	.11	**.13**	**-.23**	**.22**	.06
Active-Reflective	-.07	.12	.01	.01	-.11	.09	-.05
Enthusiastic-Quiet	**-.13**	.12	.02	.05	**-.15**	**.13**	-.04
S-N Facet scales							
Concrete-Abstract	-.01	**.18**	**.16**	.04	.00	.09	.12
Realistic-Imaginative	-.06	**.15**	**.14**	.05	.08	.05	.07
Practical-Conceptual	-.12	**.17**	**.22**	**.16**	-.09	.17	.09
Experimental-Theoretical	-.03	**.17**	**.15**	.11	-.03	.06	.05
Traditional-Original	-.06	**.20**	**.17**	.08	.00	.11	.07
T-F Facet scales							
Logical-Empathetic	**-.16**	.18	**.13**	.12	-.03	.08	.04
Reasonable-Compassionate	**-.24**	**.22**	**.15**	**.19**	-.08	**.14**	.07
Questioning-Accommodating	-.07	.02	.01	-.01	.06	-.08	**-.13**
Critical-Accepting	-.10	.04	.04	.08	-.08	-.01	-.01
Tough-Tender	**-.18**	**.18**	.09	**.17**	-.06	.06	.10
J-P Facet scales							
Systematic-Casual	-.10	**.13**	.05	.07	.04	.19	**.16**
Planful-Open-ended	-.07	.08	.04	.01	.06	.16	.12
Early Starting-Pressure Prompted	.08	.12	.01	.01	.10	.05	.09
Scheduled-Spontaneous	-.03	**.16**	-.03	.00	.07	**.25**	**.17**
Methodical-Emergent	-.01	.11	.01	.04	.01	**.14**	.11

Notes: ACT=Activity, EMP=Empathy, THO=Thought, COM=Communication, INT=Interaction, INC=Incentive, AUT=Authority; N=261; **Bold** indicates a correlation coefficient significant at p<.05. *Source*: 2008 MBTI® / The Birkman Method® study.

Two MBTI Step II Facet scales (Gregarious-Intimate and Reasonable-Compassionate) correlate with five of the seven Needs scales from The Birkman Method. The most notable correlates are The Birkman Method Needs scales for Empathy and Thought to the MBTI Intuitive Facet scale. Together these indicate the classical definition of Intuition and the environment it requires, as well as adds to it the complexities of requiring an empathetic environment. The single highest correlation is .25 between the MBTI Spontaneous scale and The Birkman Method Incentive Preference. This may infer that an environment that provides incentive may also promote spontaneous behavior. Also notable is that The Birkman Method Activity Needs correlations are virtually all negative indicating that an environment requiring physical activity may increase MBTI ESTJ preferences.

Table 5

Correlation of The Birkman Method *Other* scales and MBTI Step II Facet scales.

	The Birkman Method Other scale		
MBTI Step II Facet scale	PA: Usual	PA: Need	PEA
E-I Facet scales			
Initiating-Receiving	**.20**	.01	**.24**
Expressive-Contained	.05	-.05	**.17**
Gregarious-Intimate	**.13**	**.21**	-.01
Active-Reflective	**.15**	.04	**.17**
Enthusiastic-Quiet	.12	.06	.12
S-N Facet scales			
Concrete-Abstract	.10	**.21**	-.05
Realistic-Imaginative	.12	**.14**	-.02
Practical-Conceptual	.09	**.19**	**-.14**
Experimental-Theoretical	.10	**.18**	-.04
Traditional-Original	**.15**	**.23**	-.05
T-F Facet scales			
Logical-Empathetic	.08	**.21**	-.12
Reasonable-Compassionate	.08	**.25**	**-.16**
Questioning-Accommodating	-.04	-.01	.01
Critical-Accepting	-.06	.06	**-.14**
Tough-Tender	.09	**.20**	-.10
J-P Facet scales			
Systematic-Casual	**.22**	**.19**	.09
Planful-Open-ended	**.24**	**.14**	**.15**
Early Starting-Pressure Prompted	**.24**	.06	**.18**
Scheduled-Spontaneous	**.23**	**.19**	.11
Methodical-Emergent	**.18**	**.19**	.08

Notes: PA=Personal Autonomy, PEA=Perspective Alignment; N=261; **Bold** indicates a correlation coefficient significant at p<.05. *Source:* 2008 MBTI® / The Birkman Method® study.

This table correlates two non-personality scales from The Birkman Method to the MBTI Step II Facet scales. The Birkman Method scale Personal Autonomy ("PA") has no direct theoretical tie to any MBTI construct. However, from a practical perspective, PA Usual, a contrarian construct, does correlate with all MBTI Perceiving facets. Correlation values range from .18 to .24. Environments that provide Intuitive and Perceiving opportunities also correlate with PA. This suggests that certain environments, combined with certain personal attributes, may increase or decrease contrarian behavior.The most notable characteristic of The Birkman Method scale Perspective Alignment ("PEA") to the MBTI scales is the interspersed correlations. PEA correlates with facets of Introversion, Sensing, Thinking, and Perceiving. Aligned perspectives are correlated with Open-Ended, Pressure Prompted, Receiving, Contained, Reflective, Practical, Reasonable, and Critical facets. This is consistent with aligning, at a personal level, with the diverse attributes of an individual. PEA has no direct MBTI facet scale equivalent.

VI. Summary

Although on the surface both instruments are measures of personality, each goes about measuring personality in distinctly different ways. Whereas The Birkman Method is a trait-based instrument based on empirical research, the MBTI is a type-based instrument based on Jungian psychology. Further, the correlation study within this paper and the more extensive study found within the 2008 Technical Manual for The Birkman Method® reveals that the scales of each instrument are mostly different.

In today's workplace both instruments are currently used for similar individual and group functions, such as coaching, team building, career guidance. However, upon closer review, The Birkman Method is a superior instrument for issues-based work (e.g., conflict resolution), hiring/selection, and when the stakes are higher for determining more precise differences between individuals and groups. The Birkman Method also uniquely incorporates prescriptive data along with descriptive data to directly facilitate self management, interpersonal effectiveness, and work environment support.

VII. Additional Information

For more about The Birkman Method assessment or to purchase a copy of the 2008 Technical Manual for The Birkman Method® please call **(800) 215-2760** or e-mail info@birkman.com. The 2008 Technical Manual contains the complete statistical analysis between The Birkman Method and the MBTI Step I and MBTI Step II. The Technical Manual also covers the full developmental history, theoretical background, reliability and validity, empirical evidence, and norms for The Birkman Method assessment. You may also visit the Birkman website at www.birkman.com for general information about Birkman International, Inc., The Birkman Method® assessment, and other products and services.

For more about the MBTI or MBTI Step II or to obtain a copy of the technical manuals, please visit www.cpp.com.

VIII. References

Birkman, R.W., Elizondo, Fabian, Lee, Larry G., Wadlington, Patrick L., Zamzow, Matt W. (2008). *The Birkman Method® Manual*. Houston, TX: Birkman International, Inc.

Birkman, R.W. (1961). Development of a personality test using social and self-perception inventories. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*, University of Texas, Austin.

Birkman, R.W. (1997). *True Colors*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.

Briggs Myers, Isabel, McCaulley, Mary H., Quenk, Naomi L., Hammer, Allen L. (1998). *A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator®*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Pittenger, David J. (1993). Measuring the MBTI And Coming Up Short. *Journal of Career Planning and Employment*, November, pp. 48–52.

Quenk, Naomi L., Hammer, Allen L., Majors, Mark 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, Naomi L. (1993). *Beside ourselves: Our hidden personality in everyday life*. Palo Alto, CA: CPP, Inc.

Stricker, L.J. & J. Ross. (1964). An Assessment of Some Structural Properties of the Jungian personality Typology. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* Vol. 68, pp. 67-72.

IX. About the Author



Patrick L Wadlington, Ph.D., serves as the Director of Research and Development at Birkman International focusing on psychological measurement and test development. He leads the R&D staff in psychometric services, research initiatives, and client-specific customized solutions. He researches and develops innovative quantitative methods for cognitive, social perception, occupational interest, and personality test development and validation. Dr. Wadlington specializes in integrating classical, item response, and measurement decision test theory to produce web-based computer-adapted testing instruments for personnel selection and Peripheral to the workplace arena, his research themes include developing educational instruments to measure learning disabilities within children and adults, to obtain optimal alignment between teachers' teaching styles and children's learning styles, and to increase job satisfaction and retention of teachers in the public school system.

Patrick received his Ph.D. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology with a minor in Quantitative Psychology/Psychometrics as well as Labor and Industrial Relations from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). He also received his Masters in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at UIUC and his Bachelors in Psychology at Louisiana State University.

Patrick is an active member of numerous professional organizations and a regular presenter at several international conferences each year. These organizations include: Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP), American Psychological Association (APA), Association for Psychological Science (APS), Association of Test Publishers (ATP), Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP), and Association for Research in Personality (ARP). In addition to presentations and panel discussions, Dr. Wadlington has published numerous white papers and articles in psychological and educational peer-reviewed journals including, but not limited: Academic Exchange Quarterly, Journal of Management Information Systems, and Reading Improvement.