

Correlating the Newly Revised Strong Interest Inventory with the MBTI

**Jenny M. Merriam, Richard C. Thompson, David A. C. Donnay,
Michael L. Morris, & Nancy A. Schaubhut
CPP, Inc**

With an 80 year history, the Strong Interest Inventory® (SII) assessment is distinguished as a one of the finest career development tools available. Since its initial inception, it has been updated and revised a number of times to maintain its validity in changing times. In late 2004, the newly revised Strong Interest Inventory became available. The new version broadened the item content of the General Occupational Themes (GOT), updated and expanded the number of Basic Interest Scales (BIS), added a Personal Style Scale (PSS), and incorporated a number of new occupational scales reflecting changes in the world of work. This study examines the relationships between the newly revised Strong assessment, and another commonly used assessment in career counseling, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI) assessment.

Both the Strong and the MBTI are used individually and jointly

in career counseling situations (Katz, Joyner, & Seaman, 1999). According to Isaacson & Brown (2002), "the MBTI and SII are two of the most frequently administered instruments in college counseling centers". Using the two instruments in combination can benefit career counselors by providing more detail and a unique understanding of one's future career potential. These assessments provide insight into improving an individual's fit within a chosen career and the common personality types of individuals within a certain occupation. A closer look at how the MBTI and SII scales relate can provide additional support of their combined use for any purpose.

Previous research has found rather consistent relationships between the 1994 SII and the MBTI. Tables 1 and 2 summarize some of the reported relationships between the GOT and PSS scales from the 1994 Strong and the MBTI preference

pairs. It is important to continue this research with the newly revised Strong to prove continued construct validity, reliability, and utility.

Method

Participants

This study includes the largest known sample of participants who have completed both the newly revised SII and the MBTI Form M assessments.

Assessments were completed between January 3rd and August 7th, 2005 and were drawn from an archival database. From an initial set of 8,854 cases, participants were randomly selected to create three equal gender groupings; full-time college students ($N = 2,252$), full-time working adults ($N = 1,738$), and part-time working adults ($N = 732$).

This resulted in a total of 4,722 US participants with complete data; 2,361 males and 2,361 females. The average age of participants was 27.46 years old ($SD = 10.52$). On an item where participants could indicate all that apply, 72% percent of the sample reported being white/Caucasian, 9% Hispanic/Latino/Latina, 9% Asian/Pacific Islander, 6% African

American/black, 2% Indian, 1% Native American, 1% Middle Eastern, and 2% other. Of the reasons accounted for taking the assessments, 43% percent of participants reported for career counseling purposes, 25% for educational purposes, 23% for personal growth, 8% for training, and 1% for employment testing purposes. The summarized results of participants' MBTI type are presented in Table 3.

Measures

The standardized GOT, BIS, and PSS scores from the newly revised SII and the MBTI Form M preference pairs (E-I, S-N, T-F, and J-P) are used in this study.

Results

Correlations were computed between the GOTs, BISs, PSSs, and each of the MBTI preference pairs for each of the samples (full-time college students, full-time working adults, and part-time working adults). Following a prior convention (Myers, et al., 2003), relationships between the GOTs and the PSSs with MBTI preferences are summarized in Table 4. The table includes the corresponding preference pair(s) for significant correlations equal to or above the .20 level. The

table shows a great deal of consistency across the three samples, which indicates that the patterns of relationships are likely to be generalizable. For example, Realistic interests tend to correlate with the Thinking preference from the MBTI across samples. There are small deviations in some of the current findings as compared to previous studies, which can generally be explained as the result of the modifications made to the newly revised Strong. For example, prior work showed the relationship with Risk Taking/Adventure as largely correlated with the Perceiving preference. When considering the changes made to the Risk Taking PSS, specifically to include taking financial and emotional risks, as well as physical risks, it stands to reason that Thinking is more related to Risk Taking now than in the past.

Discussion

In sum, even with a few minor differences in the correlations of these instruments, the basic pattern of the relationship remains constant. Where there were changes made to the SII, the correlations reflected the shift in a way we would expect.

Therefore, these studies result in support for the continuous validity and the practical utility of using the newly revised SII with the MBTI.

References

- Healy, C.C. (2000). Interpreting the Myers-Briggs type indicator to help clients in understanding their Strong Interest Inventory. Journal of Career Development, 26(4), 295-308.
- Kahn, J.H., Nauta, M.M., Gailbreath, R.D., Tipps, J., & Chartrand, J.M. (2002). The utility of career and personality assessment in predicting academic progress. Journal of Career Assessment, 10(1), 3-23.
- Katz, L., Joyner, J.W., & Seaman, N. (1999). Effects of joint interpretation of the Strong Interest Inventory and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in career choice. Journal of Career Assessment, 7(3), 281-297.
- 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®. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Tuel, B.D., & Betz, N.E. (1998).
Relationships of career self-
efficacy expectations to the
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and
the Personal Style Scales.
Measurement & Evaluation in
Counseling & Development,
31(3), 150-163.

Table 1

1994 SII GOT Scales	MBTI Preferences			
	<i>Tuel & Betz, 1998</i> n = 180	<i>Myers et al., 1998</i> n = 197	<i>Myers et al., 1998</i> n = 245	<i>Healy, 2000</i> n = 370
Realistic	__T_	__T_	__P	__T_
Investigative	__T_	__T_	__	__T_
Artistic	_N__	_N__	_NFP	_N_P
Social	E_F_	E_F_	E_F_	E_F_
Enterprising	E__	__S_	E__	E__
Conventional	__T_	_S_J	_S_J	_STJ

Table 2

1994 SII PSS Scales	MBTI Preferences		
	<i>Kahn et al., 2002</i> n = 674	<i>Myers et al., 1998</i> n = 197	<i>Myers et al., 1998</i> n = 245
Work Style	E_F_	E_F_	E_F_
Learning Style	_N__	_N__	_N__
Leadership Style	E__	E__	EN__
Risk Taking/ Adventure	__P	ENTP	_N_P

Table 3

ISTJ 383 9.0%	ISFJ 286 6.7%	INFJ 142 3.3%	INTJ 127 3.0%
ISTP 195 4.6%	ISFP 226 5.3%	INFP 346 8.1%	INTP 231 5.4%
ESTP 240 5.6%	ESFP 298 7.0%	ENFP 581 13.6%	ENTP 276 6.5%
ESTJ 314 7.4%	ESFJ 284 6.9%	ENFJ 193 4.5%	ENTJ 137 3.2%

Table 4

Strong Interest Inventory

Summary of Correlations with the MBTI scales

<i>General Occupational Themes</i>		FT College Student n = 2252	FT Working n = 1738	PT Working n = 732	Type Summary <i>r</i> • .20**
Realistic	E-I	.03	.02	.04	_T_
	S-N	.03	-.02	.08*	
	T-F	-.22**	-.29**	-.24**	
	J-P	.16**	.06*	.14**	
Investigative	E-I	.13**	.09**	.12**	_T_
	S-N	.13**	.13**	.13**	
	T-F	-.19**	-.24**	-.23**	
	J-P	-.04	-.04	-.02	
Artistic	E-I	-.01	-.09**	-.02	_N_
	S-N	.50**	.48**	.52**	
	T-F	.18**	.19**	.12**	
	J-P	.13**	.14**	.09*	
Social	E-I	-.16**	-.22**	-.18**	E_F_
	S-N	.08**	.12**	.12**	
	T-F	.28**	.27**	.23**	
	J-P	-.08**	-.02	-.09*	
Enterprising	E-I	-.29**	-.35**	-.30**	E__
	S-N	-.04	.06*	.05	
	T-F	-.14**	-.13**	-.06	
	J-P	-.03	-.01	-.04	
Conventional	E-I	.04*	.06*	.07*	_STJ
	S-N	-.19**	-.22**	-.16**	
	T-F	-.25**	-.23**	-.20**	
	J-P	-.14**	-.20**	-.17**	

Table 5

Strong Interest InventorySummary of Correlations with the MBTI scales

<i>Personal Style Scales</i>		FT College Student n = 2252	FT Working n = 1738	PT Working n = 732	Type Summary $r \geq .20^{**}$
Work Style	E-I	-.35**	-.37**	-.35**	E_F_
	S-N	-.02	.04	.01	
	T-F	.37**	.40**	.39**	
	J-P	-.07**	.00	-.09*	
Learning Environment	E-I	-.01	-.10**	-.02	_N__
	S-N	.42**	.48**	.40**	
	T-F	-.07**	-.03	-.07	
	J-P	-.03	.01	-.11**	
Leadership	E-I	-.43**	-.44**	-.44**	EN__
	S-N	.17**	.25**	.22**	
	T-F	-.13**	-.11**	-.11**	
	J-P	-.03	-.00	-.09*	
Risk Taking	E-I	-.14**	-.15**	-.14**	__TP
	S-N	.05*	.08**	.11**	
	T-F	-.22**	-.23**	-.19**	
	J-P	.22**	.16**	.20**	
Team Orientation	E-I	-.31**	-.35**	-.31**	E___
	S-N	.02	.09**	.05	
	T-F	.01	-.02	.04	
	J-P	-.04*	-.06**	-.13**	

Table 6

		FT College Student n = 2252	FT Working n = 1738	PT Working n = 732	Type Summary <i>r</i> • .20**
<i>Basic Interest Scales</i>					
Mechanics and Construction	E-I	.09**	.08**	.08*	_T_
	S-N	.05*	-.00	.09*	
	T-F	-.24**	-.33**	-.29**	
	J-P	.11**	.01	.11**	
Computer Hardware and Electronics	E-I	.15**	.12**	.12**	_T_
	S-N	-.02	-.09**	.01	
	T-F	-.24**	-.32**	-.29**	
	J-P	.04*	-.05*	.02	
Military	E-I	.00	-.05*	.02	_T_
	S-N	-.07**	-.09**	-.05	
	T-F	-.23**	-.27**	-.22**	
	J-P	.06*	-.01	.04	
Protective Services	E-I	-.04	-.06**	-.06	---
	S-N	.01	-.03	.03	
	T-F	-.10**	-.11**	-.12**	
	J-P	.14**	.10**	.12	
Nature and Agriculture	E-I	.02	.05*	.06	---
	S-N	.13**	.09**	.17**	
	T-F	-.02	-.06	-.05	
	J-P	.11**	.06*	.13**	
Athletics	E-I	-.19**	-.20**	-.20**	E__
	S-N	-.10**	-.07**	-.02	
	T-F	-.02	-.08**	.01	
	J-P	.07**	.03	.09*	
Science	E-I	.12**	.07**	.11**	_T_
	S-N	.13**	.12**	.15**	
	T-F	-.18**	-.24**	-.22**	
	J-P	.02	-.02	.03	
Research	E-I	.05*	.06*	.09*	_T_
	S-N	.11**	.15**	.12**	
	T-F	-.29**	-.29**	-.31**	
	J-P	-.13**	-.14**	.16**	
Medical Science	E-I	.03	-.01	.00	---
	S-N	.01	.03	.05	
	T-F	-.04*	-.06*	-.07	
	J-P	-.04	-.01	.01	

Mathematics	E-I	.11**	.08**	.12**	_T_
	S-N	-.06*	-.04	-.07	
	T-F	-.28**	-.34**	-.27**	
	J-P	-.11**	-.14**	-.12**	
Visual Arts and Design	E-I	.04	.00	.05	_N_
	S-N	.42**	.38**	.46**	
	T-F	.14**	.10**	.06	
	J-P	.13**	.11**	.12**	
Performing Arts	E-I	-.09**	-.16**	-.07	_NF_
	S-N	.42**	.40**	.44**	
	T-F	.22**	.22**	.19**	
	J-P	.10**	.12**	.09*	
Writing and Mass Communication	E-I	-.01	-.05*	.02	---
	S-N	.37**	.37**	.36**	
	T-F	.03	.09**	-.04	
	J-P	.02	.02	-.10*	
Culinary Arts	E-I	-.24**	-.27**	-.19**	E__
	S-N	.15**	.16**	.17**	
	T-F	.19**	.12**	.17**	
	J-P	.01	.03	.01	
Counseling and Helping	E-I	-.13**	-.17**	-.16**	_F_
	S-N	.14**	.17**	.16**	
	T-F	.31**	.31**	.27**	
	J-P	-.05*	.02	-.06	
Teaching and Education	E-I	-.11**	-.20**	-.14**	E_F_
	S-N	.11**	.16**	.15**	
	T-F	.23**	.20**	.16**	
	J-P	-.04	.00	-.07	
Human Resources and Training	E-I	-.26**	-.30**	-.30**	E__
	S-N	.00	.08**	.05	
	T-F	-.01	.02	.02	
	J-P	-.15**	-.11**	-.16**	
Social Sciences	E-I	-.03	-.08**	-.02	_N_
	S-N	.23**	.30**	.25**	
	T-F	-.02	.02	-.04	
	J-P	-.04	.03	-.06	
Religion and Spirituality	E-I	-.05*	-.08**	-.02	_F_
	S-N	.10**	.11**	.10**	
	T-F	.21**	.19**	.19**	
	J-P	-.06**	-.02	-.10*	

Healthcare Services	E-I	-.04*	-.08**	-.04	---
	S-N	-.05*	-.06*	-.02	
	T-F	.09**	.13**	.08*	
	J-P	-.02	-.01	.04	
Marketing and Advertising	E-I	-.25**	-.30**	-.25**	E__
	S-N	.02	.10**	.12**	
	T-F	-.08**	-.07**	-.04	
	J-P	-.03	-.01	-.04	
Sales	E-I	-.21**	-.27**	-.20**	E__
	S-N	-.15**	-.07*	-.05	
	T-F	-.11**	-.11**	-.05	
	J-P	-.01	-.02	.01	
Management	E-I	-.18**	-.22**	-.24**	E_T_
	S-N	-.12**	-.06*	-.06	
	T-F	-.20**	-.16**	-.14**	
	J-P	-.11**	-.13**	-.11**	
Entrepreneurship	E-I	-.12**	-.15**	-.11**	_T_
	S-N	.07**	.13**	.08*	
	T-F	-.22**	-.16**	-.15**	
	J-P	.03	.04	-.01	
Politics and Public Speaking	E-I	-.26**	-.29**	-.26**	ENT_
	S-N	.16**	.26**	.23**	
	T-F	-.23**	-.20**	-.21**	
	J-P	-.01	.05	-.04	
Law	E-I	-.15**	-.15**	-.12**	_T_
	S-N	.01	.08**	.09*	
	T-F	-.22**	-.18**	-.17**	
	J-P	-.05*	-.02	-.06	
Office Management	E-I	.02	.03	.05	_S_J
	S-N	-.21**	-.24**	-.19**	
	T-F	-.06**	-.01	-.04	
	J-P	-.19**	-.22**	-.21**	
Taxes and Accounting	E-I	.06**	.09**	.09*	_STJ
	S-N	-.21**	-.19**	-.17**	
	T-F	-.30**	-.33**	-.25**	
	J-P	-.18**	-.22**	-.19**	
Programming and Information Systems	E-I	.16**	.12**	.14**	_T_
	S-N	.06**	-.03	.05	
	T-F	-.21**	-.24**	-.22**	
	J-P	.00	-.10**	-.06	
Finance and Investing	E-I	-.10**	-.08**	-.05	_T_
	S-N	-.13**	-.08**	-.07*	
	T-F	-.36**	-.35**	.28**	
	J-P	-.06**	-.12**	-.13**	

Poster presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Conference, New Orleans, LA., August 2006. Please do not reference without permission from rthompson@cpp.com.

MBTI and Strong are registered trademarks of CPP, Inc.

Page -