

# This is Australia

## Update on the MBTI Australian Data Archive Project

Ian L Ball

Manager, Psychological Type Research Unit  
Deakin University

The intention of this research note is to provide an update on the Data Archive Project as at August 2002.

Since my last report there have been additions to the Data Archive which increase its diversity and possible representativeness. While the Archive still reflects that the majority of people who take the MBTI come from managerial and professional groups, recent additions have tended to compensate with some sizeable numbers in less-skilled categories of the Australian Standard Classification of Occupations (ASCO 2e).

The material below comes from MBTI Form G profiles contributed by MBTI practitioners across Australia. Gender differences in preferences are still a feature of the data.

Males (n=9255)		Females (n=8033)		
E	I	E	I	n.s.
44.7%	55.3%	44.1%	55.9%	
S	N	S	N	***
57.4%	42.6%	54.1%	45.9%	
T	F	T	F	***
78.6%	21.4%	41.6%	58.4%	
J	P	J	P	***
66.5%	33.5%	59.6%	40.4%	

There is no statistical difference in the **E–I** preferences reported by males and females. Both genders tend to show a consistent marked preference for *introversion*.

The main difference is on the **T–F** preferences. There are gender-linked directional differences: the majority of males show a strong preference for *thinking*, whereas most females tend to show a marked preference for *feeling*. (\*\*\*) indicates that this result would be obtained less than one time in a thousand by chance factors alone.)

There are also statistically different differences on **S–N** and **J–P** preferences, as shown in the table below.

In the case of **S–N**, males in the Archive show a stronger preference for *sensing* than do females, but the difference is in the same direction.

For **J–P** the preferences are clearer, with *judging* being more preferred. This is stronger for males than for females.

Looking at the type tables, these differences in preferences are reflected in the frequencies in which the MBTI types are reported. Comparing the two tables shows that there are quite different proportions reported by males and females in each of the sixteen comparisons.

Type table for Australian males (n = 9255)

ISTJ 21.9%	ISFJ 4.1%	INFJ 2.7%	INTJ 9.2%
ISTP 5.2%	ISFP 1.9%	INFP 3.4%	INTP 6.8%
ESTP 4.4%	ESFP 1.2%	ENFP 3.8%	ENTP 6.7%
ESTJ 16.0%	ESFJ 2.6%	ENFJ 1.7%	ENTJ 8.4%

Type table for Australian females (n = 8033)

ISTJ 10.1%	ISFJ 13.9%	INFJ 6.1%	INTJ 5.1%
ISTP 2.7%	ISFP 5.3%	INFP 8.5%	INTP 4.1%
ESTP 2.5%	ESFP 3.9%	ENFP 8.4%	ENTP 5.0%
ESTJ 7.7%	ESFJ 8.0%	ENFJ 4.3%	ENTJ 4.3%

The following table details type preferences by gender, in descending order. ISTJ is the most frequent for males, and ISFJ the most frequent for females.

There is basically no correlation between the male order and the female order, but it can be seen that the differences between the most frequent and least frequent codes reported by males are larger than those reported by females. Whereas the top two codes for males account for 37.9% of all males, the top two codes for females only account for 24.0% of females.

Type preferences by gender (ranked)

	Males	%	Females	%	
1	ISTJ	21.9	ISFJ	13.9	***
2	ESTJ	16.0	ISTJ	10.1	***
3	INTJ	9.2	INFP	8.5	***
4	ENTJ	8.4	ENFP	8.4	***
5	INTP	6.8	ESFJ	8.0	***
6	ENTP	6.7	ESTJ	7.7	***
7	ISTP	5.2	INFJ	6.1	***
8	ESTP	4.4	ISFP	5.3	***
9	ISFJ	4.1	INTJ	5.1	***
10	ENFP	3.8	ENTP	5.0	***
11	INFP	3.4	ENFJ	4.3	***
12	INFJ	2.7	ENTJ	4.3	***
13	ESFJ	2.6	INTP	4.1	***
14	ISFP	1.9	ESFP	3.9	***
15	ENFJ	1.7	ISTP	2.7	***
16	ESFP	1.2	ESTP	2.5	***

Further donations of MBTI profiles information would be greatly appreciated, in order to create a more diverse Data Archive.

More information on these type tables is available from:

Ian Ball  
19 Peacedale Grove  
Nunawading VIC 3131