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Personality Preferences, Tutoring Styles, and Implications for Tutor Training

Thomas C. Thompson

Despite all the time and energy invested in tutor training programs, some tutors seem to have a hard time letting go of ineffective tutoring practices or adapting to particular writing center policies. For instance, Victoria and Pete both work at a writing center which has a strict policy prohibiting tutors from writing anything on student papers. Victoria has a constant struggle to avoid breaking that policy because, as she explains, "I think with a pencil in my hand." Pete, however, has no such problem since he is not inclined to write on papers anyway. Likewise, some tutors are comfortable listening quietly while students talk about their papers or their writing processes, while others see frequent interruptions—say, to complete the student's sentence or to summarize an incomplete idea—as a normal way to converse.

Though no single perspective can fully account for all the behaviors in an activity as complex as tutoring, any perspective which can contribute to our understanding merits study. One such perspective is that of personality type theory, a theory which maintains that our personality preferences—our ways of interacting with the world and making decisions—influence many of our behaviors. Although personality type theory may help account for only a small portion of our behaviors, even that small bit of data could help tutors (and tutor trainers) to understand individual preferences for certain tutoring styles over others and perhaps to recognize biases that might otherwise go unnoticed. My goal here is to highlight a few of the ways personality preferences can influence tutoring styles and to argue that including a discussion of personality type theory in tutor training can help tutors become more aware of ways their preferred tutoring styles may match or clash with the preferred learning styles of their clients. A detailed explanation of
Personality Type Theory

Type theory, developed by the Swiss psychologist Carl Jung and later extended by Katherine Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers, holds that “much seemingly random variation in behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent, being due to basic differences in the way individuals prefer to use their perception and judgment” (Myers and McCaulley 1). In other words, behavior is a function, to a certain extent, of the way an individual takes in information and makes decisions based on that information. Type theory also postulates that behavior reflects the source of an individual’s energy and his or her way of managing the environment. For each of those four dimensions—source of energy, way of taking in information, way of making decisions, and way of managing the environment—an individual tends to act in an habitual manner, and that manner can be categorized along a continuum between two opposite and complementary ways of acting. Although all individuals can (and indeed, must) use a variety of ways of acting, type theory holds that they tend to prefer certain ways of acting and that they become more adept at those ways through constant use. Following are brief descriptions of each of the four pairs of personality dimensions identified by Jung and later by Briggs and Myers.

Extraversion and Introversion

The two dimensions of personality that Jung describes in greatest detail are opposite sources of energy: extraversion and introversion. (Type theorists follow Jung’s spelling of “extraversion.”) Jung describes an extravert (that is, someone with a preference for extraversion) as someone whose “whole consciousness looks outward, because the essential and decisive determination always comes from outside” (334). Extraverts look outward for energy: they thrive on interacting with the world around them and tend to jump right into tasks, figuring out what to do next as they go along. Faced with a writing task, an extravert is likely to begin by talking to someone about the task before actually putting words to paper. Barry Maid, an extravert, describes his own writing style this way:

I flit from office to office talking to anyone who will put up with me and, to use a colleague’s phrase, I “vampirishly suck energy” from all my colleagues. Once I reach the point when I feel ready to begin composing, I return to my own office, sit down, and all of a sudden words just start to pour out. That’s extravert writing. (3)

Likewise, extraverted tutors are likely to be comfortable talking about writing because they often talk about their own writing.
Introverts, on the other hand, tend to draw energy from the inner world of thoughts and ideas. They are generally slower to act than extraverts since they may want to think through an entire task before taking any observable action. Because of their extensive mental planning, introverts are more likely than extraverts to be “first draft, last draft” writers—not because they don’t write multiple drafts, but because they write several drafts in their heads before committing any words to paper. Introverted tutors may be less inclined than extraverts to talk about writing processes, but they may be more adept at teasing out the implications of ideas expressed in a paper since they are generally more practiced at reflection.

Sensing Perception and Intuitive Perception

Sensing perception and intuitive perception describe different ways of taking in information. Sensing perception focuses attention on data gathered by the senses—sight, hearing, taste, touch, and smell. People who habitually favor sensing perception (i.e., sensing types) tend to gather data in an orderly, step-by-step fashion and are likely to develop keen powers of observation and a good memory for facts and details. Sensing students may write essays filled with details but with few (or no) attempts to summarize those details; they may also prefer to follow a linear writing process in which they complete each step before moving on to the next one.

Intuitive perception, on the other hand, focuses attention on patterns and possibilities suggested by the data rather than on the data themselves. People who habitually favor intuitive perception (i.e., intuitive types) attend to the whole picture rather than to its parts and are likely to become good at grasping abstract or symbolic relationships; they may even consider an emphasis on sense experience to be unnecessary or annoying. For example, describing her reaction to a class activity that involved eating an apple and recording the sensory experience, one of my sensing students wrote, “I was amazed that something as mundane as eating an apple could be of some educational value! I enjoyed it!” An intuitive student in the same class, however, described the same activity as “contrived and pointless,” while another intuitive student simply wrote, “Step-by-step activities bore me.” Whereas sensing students may write essays long on details but short on summaries, intuitive students are more likely to write essays filled with claims that go unsupported. As tutors, sensing types are likely to be good at listening for (or reading) details mentioned by a student; intuitive types are likely to be better at completing a picture for which a student has verbalized only the beginning pieces.

Thinking Judgment and Feeling Judgment

Thinking judgment and feeling judgment describe different approaches to making decisions. Thinking judgment relies on logical connections to sort out the facts and draw conclusions. People who prefer to use thinking
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Judgment are likely to use cause-and-effect reasoning and to base their decisions on objective criteria or principles; their decisions tend to be both impersonal and impartial.

Feeling judgment, on the other hand, weighs the relative values of issues under consideration; people who use it are likely to focus as much on the personal values associated with a problem as on the possible causes that might explain it. Feeling judgment is not equivalent to emotional judgment; it is as reasonable and rational as thinking judgment, but it uses a different standard of measure. Thinking judgment uses a standard of true/false or just/unjust, but feeling judgment uses a standard of valued/unvalued. Faced with a decision to be made, a thinking type is likely to ask, “What’s fair?”; a feeling type is likely to ask, “What matters most to me and to the people affected by my decision?”

In a discussion of learning styles, George Jensen notes that two ways these preferences may be reflected in writing processes are in topic selection and audience awareness. Thinking types tend to choose topics which are intellectually interesting, but allow them to maintain an emotional distance, while feeling types are more likely to be bored by topics they see as “dry” (i.e., topics they don’t value). Likewise, thinking types are likely to focus more on the logical force of their arguments alone while feeling types may organize their writing by anticipating audience response to each successive point (196). Tutors who prefer thinking judgment may spend more time helping students work on the logical force of the arguments presented in their papers whereas tutors who prefer feeling judgment may spend more time helping students anticipate audience reactions to those arguments.

Judging and Perceiving

Although Jung discusses only three pairs of personality preferences, Briggs and Myers identify a fourth: judging and perceiving. These preferences describe opposite ways of managing (or organizing) one’s environment. People who prefer to use a judging function—judging types—tend to have planned, organized lifestyles. When possible, judging types prefer to have plans and stick to them. They tend to seek closure once they have enough information to make a decision and may even force closure before collecting adequate data on which to base a decision. As writers, judging types may stop data collection prematurely, so when they show up at a writing center, they may have papers that state conclusions based on inadequate evidence. As tutors, they may view the text in hand as essentially “closed” and may focus more on polishing it than on generating new information or trying out different methods of development.

People who prefer to use a perceiving function—perceiving types—tend to have flexible, spontaneous lifestyles. Because they like to stay attuned to incoming information and to keep their options open, they tend to resist closure. As writers, perceiving types may generate papers filled with
information—some of it interesting but unnecessary—and they may have trouble cutting out extraneous data or drawing conclusions based on the data already collected. As tutors, they may be good at turning students back to the problem in an effort to come up with new approaches or new solutions, but they may be so open to new information that they have difficulty staying on task to complete a particular agenda.

A preference for a given process does not imply an inability to use the complementary process: extraverts also use introversion, and sensing types also use intuition. Instead, a type preference is rather like right- or left-handedness: we expect to use both hands, but we tend to reach first with the preferred hand, and using the less-preferred hand can sometimes require extra effort. In the writing process, for example, students must use both a perceiving process (to collect data) and a judging process (to draw conclusions based on that data); however, those who are more interested in data collection and devote more of their time and energy to that part of the process necessarily have less time and energy to devote to drawing conclusions, an activity at which they may therefore be less adept. A major benefit of learning about type theory is that it can prevent teachers and students from assuming that their way of doing something is the only (or the only correct) way.1

Personality Preferences: Clues to Behaviors

An increasing body of scholarship is providing support for connections between personality preferences and teaching and learning behaviors implied by personality type theory, many of which may be useful to teachers of writing.2 In one such study, Marti Singer found that thinking types received higher reading comprehension scores than feeling types when the reading material was expository but lower scores when the reading material was narrative. She suggests that thinking types may be more skilled at working with material presented in the formal, logical style of exposition while feeling types may be more skilled at working with material presented in the more personal style of narrative. Tutors who prefer thinking judgment might thus need to devote extra energy to attending to the affective component of a student’s narrative paper (which they might otherwise overlook), while those who prefer feeling judgment might use extra care to attend to a student’s logic when discussing an expository paper.

A dissertation by Stanislaus Sobczyk suggests that teachers give higher grades to students with whom they have common preferences than to students with different preferences. Specifically, he found that intuitive teachers gave significantly higher grades to intuitive students than to sensing students, that judging teachers gave higher grades to judging students than to perceiving students, and that intuitive-thinking teachers gave higher grades to intuitive-thinking students than to students with any other combination of preferences. This phenomenon should not be surprising since people with similar preferences are more likely to “speak the same
language” than people with different preferences. The implication for the tutor is that a particularly “difficult” student may not be “difficult” at all but may simply be approaching the writing task from a perspective other than the tutor’s; the tutor who understands different approaches is less likely to try to force the student into a single (“correct”) approach, and is more likely to be able to understand and work with the student’s preferred approach.

Elizabeth Murphy reports that teachers tend to formulate questions that appeal to their own preferences—for example, that sensing types ask questions that require attention to detail, intuitive types ask questions that require synthesis of many ideas, thinking types ask questions that require analysis, and feeling types ask questions that require attention to audience response. Further, she notes that many teachers claim to have trouble answering questions posed by people with opposite preferences (81). Murphy’s work suggests that tutors would do well to attend to their own styles of asking questions lest their questions appeal only to their own preferences.

A thorough review of the relevant literature, like a thorough explanation of type theory, is beyond the scope of this essay. My point is simply that empirical evidence exists to support the connections between personality preferences and specific behaviors reasonably hypothesized by type theory. The following descriptions of the tutoring styles of three tutors illustrate some of those connections.

**Tutoring Styles: Three Tutors at Work**

Each of the following descriptions is based on interviews with the tutor and transcripts of four tutorials—two sessions with each of two different students. It is important to note that, although people with the same combination of preferences can be expected to have certain characteristics in common, personality type is not deterministic. Rather, the utility of type theory comes from its power to explain the ways people process and use information. To the degree that people with the same preferences exercise those preferences, they “tend to have in common whatever qualities result from the exercise of those preferences. The interests, values, needs, and habits of mind that naturally result tend to produce a recognizable kind of person” (Myers and McCaulley 19). The type formula thus describes a “recognizable kind of person” and only partly describes any given individual. Thus, the description of Dan’s tutoring style is not intended as a description of a “typical ENTP” tutoring style (although his tutoring style probably shares much in common with the styles of many other ENTPs); the point of describing Dan’s style is to show some of the ways that intuitive perception and thinking judgment may show up in tutoring sessions.

The purpose of these descriptions is therefore not to offer a list of specific ways that each preference will be reflected in every tutor’s style—in fact, no such list is possible, since a personality preference is only one of many influences on tutoring styles, and type theory is only one of many lenses
through which to examine the psychology of personality—rather, my goal is
to offer examples of some of the ways that various personality preferences can
be reflected in tutoring practices. My larger goal is to show how knowledge
of these possible influences can be useful to tutors as they work with students
whose preferences may be different from their own.

Dan (ENTP)

Dan prefers extraversion, intuition, thinking, and perception. As men-
tioned earlier, intuitives tend to look at the whole first and the parts (maybe)
later. Dan illustrated this tendency early in one of his conferences, when he
said to the student, "OK, I'll read the whole [paper], and then we'll see how
it fits together—I thought you had a good plan to put it together. Then we
can just go through the parts." With a preference for intuition, he wants to
look at the whole paper to see how it fits together; details can wait for later.
In fact, he described it as "antiproductive" to try to focus on details in a thirty-
minute conference. Describing his typical conference, he said, "I try to focus
on the ideas. That's what keeps [students] interested, too... talking about
their ideas and what they're writing about." (Note, too, that Dan is an
extravert, and extraverts often work best by talking. Dan likes to talk with
his students about their work.)

His tendency to address major issues before addressing details was clear
in his conference with a Spanish-speaking student who had numerous
questions about diction and grammar issues. Dan, who also speaks Spanish,
would switch between English and Spanish to keep the conversation mov-
ing—again, the conference was mostly conversation—but delayed talking
about specifics of translation until major issues had been discussed. For
instance, for an assignment that required the student to include specific
literary devices in her writing, Dan checked off each requirement as it was
met but saved structural questions for later: "So you've got the big part: scene,
dialogue, a little description. That's nice. We'll talk about the sentence
stuff—you know, the English things—later." That isn't to say that Dan
didn't eventually get to the details, but rather that he consciously avoided
interrupting a discussion with an explanation of grammar and mechanics.
Such attention to "big picture" issues can often be a strength of intuitives.

Dan's thinking judgment seemed to show up most clearly in his
businesslike approach to his conferences. Myers' general description of
ENTPs says that thinking judgment "also makes ENTPs rather objective in
their approach to their current project and to the people in their lives" (22).
In Dan's case, the goal seemed to be to bring out as much information as
possible for analysis during the allotted conference time. Again, that isn't to
suggest that Dan's conferences were in any way unfriendly but that he tended
to keep discussions focused on issues immediately relevant to the assignments
at hand—in contrast, say, to Amy, a feeling type who readily discussed a
variety of issues not directly related to the writing at hand.
Dan's method of analyzing writing and pointing out areas in need of work also seemed to reflect his thinking judgment. When he asked questions, for example, they tended to be rather matter-of-fact, objective inquiries. For instance, he asked early in one conference, "What are you supposed to do with this?" In another conference, he began by asking, "What class is this for?" Then he clarified the terms of the assignment as the student listed them. As he explained later, he wanted to be certain that he understood all the requirements of the assignment so he could tell how well the student was meeting those requirements.

The requirements of the assignment provide an external criterion by which he could make objective evaluations in contrast to the more subjective criteria implied by such questions as "Which parts did you like best?" or "How well did you accomplish your goals?" Some of Dan's other responses during the conferences were "What did you do here?"; "I don't understand what these two groups are"; "What have you done with [this part]"; and "OK, so what you're saying is [this]." He regularly stopped to paraphrase or clarify what the student said. These requests for clarification were not unusual, but, unlike the conferences by the other tutors, Dan's conferences were noticeably devoid of questions such as "How did you like this?" or "Do you feel good about what you've done so far?" Such value-laden questions would be, for Dan, simply irrelevant to the goals of the conference.

Kathy (ENFP)

Like Dan, Kathy prefers extraversion, intuition, and perceiving, but while he prefers thinking judgment, she prefers feeling. This difference was clear in her answer to my question regarding her "typical" conference. Although Dan had no problem describing his typical conference, Kathy's immediate reaction was, "There's not a typical person; how can there be a typical conference?" Rather than considering the common characteristics of conferences, she considered the unique characteristics of individuals. Whereas Dan began his conferences with questions about the assignment at hand, both Kathy and Amy (the third tutor, also a feeling type) tended to begin with small talk. They seemed to want to spend time building rapport with their students before getting down to the business at hand. In fact, Kathy described her "strongest and weakest points" with respect to conferencing as, "I care about them—and I care about them." In other words, she thought that her personal interest in her students, though a strength, could also distract her from focusing on whatever piece of writing was under discussion.

One preference that did show up in similar ways for both Kathy and Dan was a preference for perceiving, a likely factor in a problem both she and Dan expressed: "I very rarely get done in thirty minutes." In Kathy's case, the way to handle that problem was not to spend time reviewing. In her words, "I don't summarize; I figure that someone can remember thirty minutes' worth
of work.” And, at least for the four conferences taped, the transcripts showed little evidence of closure; Kathy’s conferences simply ended when time ran out.

**Amy (ISFJ)**

Amy, with preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling and judging, did use reviews and summaries. In that respect, her judging orientation shows up in contrast to Dan and Kathy’s perceiving orientation. Following the usual small talk in one conference, Amy shifted into the “business” part of the conference with, “When we last talked . . .”; in another, her transition was, “When I talked with you last. . . .” Before beginning to work with new data, she reviewed the closure of the previous session. She also closed each session with a review, making sure that both she and the student reached closure. Consider the following closing comment:

> Alright. We went through it with a fine-toothed comb this time and you’ve learned, I think, some real good things about taking out extra wordage, being concise, avoiding repetition, and what you’re gonna find is a much more coherent and cohesive essay because of it. That’s a very good editing process that you just went through with yourself; being able to approach your own writing that critically is very important, and it improves your writing tremendously.

By enumerating the various skills the student had worked on, Amy created a sense of completion for the conference. According to Myers, judging types “like to make decisions, come to closure, and then carry on. People with a preference for judging prefer to be structured and organized and want things settled” (6). As Amy explained, her summaries and reviews tie each conference to the next; they provide both closure and continuity.

Another difference between Amy and the others is her preference for sensing. This preference seemed evident in her attention to detail. Whereas Dan focused on the “big part” first and the details later, Amy would begin with the details that would eventually add up to make the “big part.” For instance, when one client cited “word choice” as a problem but said she had used a thesaurus to improve certain passages, Amy immediately said, “Show me some places where you did that—what the original word was.” In general, she worked from the parts to the whole, rather than from the whole to the parts. Her attention to detail is evident in comments that value precision of wording: “Much better, because it’s condensed and it’s more concise”; “I think this is more precise word choice here. Good”; and “You took out some repetition. Great.”

Although Amy’s preferences are exactly the opposite of Dan’s, she does have one preference in common with Kathy: her preference for feeling. In contrast to Dan’s style of analyzing the writing and pointing out areas for the student to work on, Amy probed students for their general responses to their
writing. She said that students sometimes “know something might be wrong with the paper . . . like they felt uncomfortable about it—they weren’t happy with what they had even though they didn’t know why. Or they felt comfortable with it—they were proud of what they had done.” She said she usually tries to stay away from technical terms, letting students fix whatever doesn’t sound right without necessarily attaching a name to the problem.

Myers says that “ISFJs show their feeling preference in their contacts with the world. They are kind, sympathetic, tactful, and genuinely concerned; traits that make them very supportive to persons in need” (21). For Amy, this concern showed up when she discovered that a student had written about a personal problem for an assignment and that the problem had since been resolved. She first asked if the student minded talking about the particular problem (“Is that going to be a problem for you [to discuss this case]?”), then assured her that they had the option of discussing something else. If Dan focused on getting the job done, Amy focused on making the student comfortable.

**Implications for Tutor Training: So What?**

The brief descriptions above mention only a few of the connections between personality preferences and tutoring styles, but even those few have implications for tutor training. For example, Dan, the thinking type, preferred to have rather businesslike conferences; Kathy and Amy, the feeling types, preferred to begin with small talk. Dan might have trouble building rapport with a feeling student, however, unless he recognized that some students find rapport-building a necessary first step of the conference. Likewise, Kathy and Amy might annoy thinking students by wasting time (in the student’s view) on chit-chat; recognizing the student’s attitude, the informed tutor could skip the small talk and get straight to work.

That’s not to suggest, though, that writing centers should regularly give the MBTI to clients, or, worse yet, that tutors should try to guess their students’ preferences. Guessing incorrectly and trying to tutor “for” particular preferences could do more harm than ignoring preferences altogether. However, as Maurice Scharton and Janice Neuleib suggest, while “guessing about type is dangerous . . . so is tutoring without knowledge of type” (202). That is, they suggest that although it is inappropriate for tutors to try to guess the type preferences of their students, it would be extremely appropriate to make tutors aware that different students may have different approaches to learning and that the preferred styles of the tutor and the client, may sometimes clash. Another benefit of acquainting tutors with type theory is that it can help them understand their own preferred processes (both of writing and of tutoring), so they can be better prepared to spot biases that may creep into their tutoring styles. Finally, tutors who understand their own type preferences and the potential strengths and weaknesses of those
preferences can improve their own effectiveness as tutors by working from their strengths.

In *Personality and the Teaching of Composition*, George Jensen and John DiTiberio offer a variety of strategies for reaching students with different personality preferences. For example, they suggest that extraverts work best when allowed to talk (out loud) about their writing, while introverts may work best when provided with an agenda beforehand so they have time to plan what they want to say. Sensing students generally attend better when discussions begin with concrete facts and examples, while intuitive students generally attend better when discussions begin with theories or inferences. Students who prefer thinking judgment also typically prefer to keep conversations logical and rational, but those who prefer feeling judgment are more likely to want to engage in small talk before getting down to business. Finally, judging students tend to view a completed draft as finished, so they generally want to focus on ways to improve the next draft, but perceiving students, who tend to view all drafts as ongoing, are more willing to focus on ways to improve a current draft, even if it has already been graded (113-14). Teaching tutors about personality differences and giving them such strategies for reaching students with different preferences can give tutors a broader array of tools with which to work and can thus make them more effective.

My goal for this essay—and my answer to the question, "So what?"—is not to say that tutors should learn their personality preferences so they can use this or that strategy when working with this or that type of student; rather, I want to encourage writing center directors to become familiar with type theory as a useful tool for helping students understand the variety of writing processes they are likely to encounter in tutoring sessions. The basic concepts of type theory and some strategies for reaching students with a variety of preferences can be covered in a few sessions during a tutor training program. A number of resources, such as Isabel Myers' *Introduction to Type*, Gordon Lawrence's *People Types & Tiger Stripes*, and Judith Provost's *Strategies for Success: Using Type To Do Better in High School and College* can provide additional information for interested tutors. For writing center directors, a more thorough knowledge of type theory and its applications might be in order, and some writing center directors might want to become qualified to administer the MBTI to their tutors as part of tutor training. (In fact, many writing centers already use the MBTI this way.) A number of organizations such as the Association for Psychological Type (APT) offer training programs throughout the year at locations around the country; for people unable to attend a training program, most large schools have someone (usually in a counseling center) who can administer the MBTI for tutor training.

Personality type theory is certainly not the only theory relevant to teaching and learning styles nor is it comprehensive. (It does not, for
example, address the visual-aural-kinesthetic modes of learning nor does it specifically address right-brain/left-brain issues.) It is but one of many lenses through which to view the teaching and learning processes, but it is one which can provide large returns for relatively little investment. One need not have a degree in psychology to understand and apply the basic concepts, and even a simple understanding of those concepts can have immediate and positive results on teaching effectiveness. Further, unlike some learning-style theories, personality type theory can be applied beyond just the teacher-student context; it can also be useful for understanding a variety of interpersonal relationships within a writing center (including director-staff and staff-tutor interactions) and can be useful for designing both tutor recruitment and tutor training programs.3

Notes

1To make type theory practical, Isabel Myers developed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a self-report, paper-and-pencil instrument designed to identify the respondent’s preferences on each of the four scales described earlier: Extraversion or Introversion, Sensing or iNtuition, Thinking or Feeling, and Judging or Perceiving (or E-I, S-N, T-F, and J-P). This instrument was developed over many years of testing and has gone through a number of revisions. The form most commonly used today (and the one administered to the tutors described in this essay) is Form G which has 126 items. A respondent’s answers to those items generate a four-letter type formula, or score, which is a shorthand way of referring to that person’s combination of preferences.

Possible Combinations of Type Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
<th>INFJ</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>INTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the reliability and the validity of the MBTI have been heavily researched with generally favorable results. Isabel Myers and Mary McCaulley’s Manual to accompany the MBTI devotes a whole chapter to discussing its reliability and another to its validity, citing a battery of statistical analyses and other studies.

Because it is a psychological instrument, however, it is not available to the general public. Many college and university counseling centers can administer the MBTI to interested individuals, but knowing someone’s MBTI score is less important than understanding the concepts behind that score—at least with respect to using type theory in a writing center. In fact, many practitioners warn against giving the MBTI to students as a matter of
course lest those scores become labels for students or that teachers or tutors be tempted to teach only to a given student's preferred dimensions at the expense of the less-preferred (but also important) dimensions.

2Dissertations Abstracts International lists more than 500 dissertations over the last ten years using the MBTI, and a bibliography maintained by the Center for Applications of Psychological Type lists over 2100 articles, books, papers and other items testing or using the MBTI.

3For more information about personality type theory, contact: Association for Psychological Type, 9140 Ward Parkway, Kansas City, MO 64114, Phone: 816/444-3500; Center for Applications of Psychological Type, 2815 NW 13th St, Suite 401, Gainesville, FL 32609, Phone: 800/777-2278.
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