

Title	Standardization of Mandalay Personality Type Survey
All Authors	Ni Ni Lwin, Thin Thin Maw, Theingi Tun, Min Min Myat, Yu Yu Khaing, Wunna Si Thu Linn
Publication Type	Local Publication
Publisher (Journal name, issue no., page no etc.)	Mandalay University of Distance Education Research Journal, Vol.9, No.1, pg 81-88
Abstract	<p>This study is an attempt to standardize Mandalay Personality Type Survey (MPTS). This scale is an attempt to measure personality, to assess three broad personality dimensions. These dimensions are (1) anti-social type (2) neuroticism and (3) pro-social type. The MPTS contains 180 items, which can be answered in Yes or No form. This scale was constructed by Dr.Htun Than & et al (2005). The reliability of the MPTS is .68 for anti-social, .71 for the neuroticism and .80 for pro-social. The validity of the MPTS is .31 for anti-social, .54 for the neuroticism and .62 for pro-social. The reliability and validity of MPTS is found to be satisfactory. Objectivity is one of the characteristics of a good test. For a test to be objective, it is necessary to assist the reliability, validity of the test and standardize it. By standardizing the test, it can interpret the test results or scores. Thus, the present study is fulfilled this requirement. In this study, 'T score ' was used as norms for MPTS. 'T scores' equivalents for raw scores were presented in table (2). The T scores were classified into five levels. Although there are few limitations in the population sampling for pro-social personality scale, these norms can interpret an evaluation of his or her status in reference to other person. Therefore, these norms can be used for practical purpose in personnel selection.</p>
Keywords	Standardization, Anti-social, Neuroticism, Pro-social
Citation	
Issue Date	2018

STANDARDIZATION OF MANDALAY PERSONALITY TYPE SURVEY

Ni Ni Lwin, Thin Thin Maw, Theingi Tun, Min Min Myat,
Yu Yu Khaing, Wunna Si Thu Linn

Abstract

This study is an attempt to standardize Mandalay Personality Type Survey (MPTS). This scale is an attempt to measure personality, to assess three broad personality dimensions. These dimensions are (1) anti-social type (2) neuroticism and (3) pro-social type. The MPTS contains 180 items, which can be answered in Yes or No form. This scale was constructed by Dr.Htun Than & et al(2005). The reliability of the MPTS is .68 for anti-social, .71 for the neuroticism and .80 for pro-social. The validity of the MPTS is .31 for anti-social, .54 for the neuroticism and .62 for pro-social. The reliability and validity of MPTS is found to be satisfactory. Objectivity is one of the characteristics of a good test. For a test to be objective, it is necessary to assist the reliability, validity of the test and standardize it. By standardizing the test, it can interpret the test results or scores. Thus, the present study is fulfilled this requirement. In this study, ' T score ' was used as norms for MPTS. 'T scores' equivalents for raw scores were presented in table (2). The T scores were classified into five levels. Although there are few limitations in the population sampling for pro-social personality scale, these norms can interpret an evaluation of his or her status in reference to other person. Therefore, these norms can be used for practical purpose in personnel selection.

Keywords: Standardization, Anti-social, Neuroticism, Pro-social

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to standardize the Mandalay Personality Type Survey (MPTS). MPTS was constructed by Dr. Htun Than & et.al in (2005). This scale was an attempt to measure personality to assess three broad personality dimensions. These dimensions are (1) anti-social type (2) neuroticism, and (3) pro-social type. Dr.Htun Than (1997) proposed personality in terms of four stages of dimensions in accordance with the Buddhistic model.

These personality stages can be linked to the western models in the following ways. (1) Physical stage : This is the stage where the individual's actions are most guided by thoughts of physical pleasure. This stage can be linked to the concept of anti-social personality. Although anti-social personality is not a new concept to personality psychology, nevertheless this is addition to the Big Five model and Tellegen model.

-
- 1 Professor, Dr, Department of Psychology, Mandalay University of Distance Education
 - 2 Lecturer, Daw, Department of Psychology, Mandalay University of Distance Education
 - 3 Lecturer, Dr, Department of Psychology, Mandalay University of Distance Education
 - 4 Lecturer, Dr, Department of Psychology, Mandalay University of Distance Education
 - 5 Lecturer, Dr, Department of Psychology, Mandalay University of Distance Education
 - 6 Lecturer, Dr, Department of Psychology, Mandalay University of Distance Education

(2) Emotional stage: This is the stage where the individual's thoughts and actions are dominated by strong negative emotions. This stage can be empirically defined in terms of Tellegen NEM or Big Five neuroticism.

(3) Intellectual stage: This is the stage where individual's actions are largely guided by foresight practical considerations and intellect. This stage can be defined in terms of Tellegen absorption or Big Five openness to experience.

(4) Moral stage: This is the stage where the individual's actions are largely guided by moral considerations and empathetic feelings towards others. This stage can be defined in terms of Big Five agreeableness and conscientiousness or Tellegen constraint factor. This factor has been renamed as pro-social personality. Individuals with positive interpersonal traits are more likely to accrue positive emotional feelings.

Dr. Htun Than (1997) has carried out a study which tested the idea that the above four dimensions are empirically distinct and independent. He assembled relevant trait names or adjectives from vast personality literature to describe each personality dimension. He assembled 17 trait names for the anti-social personality, 21 trait names for the negative emotionality neuroticism, 28 trait names for the intellect, and 33 trait names for the pro-social personality. The total number of trait names for the whole personality domain is 99. The trait names for anti-social personality contain such terms as pleasure-seeking, impulsive, deceitful, cynical, materialistic, greedy etc. The trait names for neuroticism contain such terms as anxiety, self-consciousness, emotionality, frustration, anger, depression, guilt, suspicion etc. The trait list for intellectual contains such terms as philosophical, imaginative, reflective, perceptive, thoughtful, original, liberal, intelligent, knowledgeable etc. The trait list for pro-social personality contains such terms as punctual, scrupulous, law-abiding, polite, empathetic, helpful, cooperative, agreeable, forgiving, responsible, truthful, restraint etc.

Then, the study had a parallel set of data (self-rating and rating by others) in order to check on the comparability of the results. The results suggested that the four proposed domains (anti-social neuroticism, intellect, pro-social) are independent of each other. The inter-correlations among the four personality dimensions were found to be from low to moderate, suggesting that these four dimensions are relatively independent of each other. Being confident on the data, this study sought to develop the personality scales for the three dimensions (namely,

anti-social personality neuroticism, and pro-social personality), which are relatively independent of each other.

Thus, Dr. Htun Than (2005) attempted to develop the personality scales for the three basic dimensions of personality, namely anti-social personality, neuroticism, and pro-social personality. He wrote 60 items for the anti-social personality scale, based upon such traits as pleasure-seeking, materialistic, impulsive, deceitful, cynical, greedy, anger etc. The items for anti-social personality scale are based upon the typical characteristics of psychopathic personality as commonly reported in clinical textbooks. Then, he also wrote 120 items for the neuroticism scale, based on such traits as anxiety, self-consciousness, emotionality, insecurity, frustration, anger, depressive, guilt, suspicious etc. The items for neuroticism scale are based upon the common characteristic of neurotic and psychotic people. This scale can be thought of as a short version of the MMPI scale. This scale corresponds to Tellegen Negative Emotionality or Big Five neuroticism. And then He wrote 60 items for the pro-social personality type, based on such traits as punctual, scrupulous, law-abiding, gentle, empathetic, fair, helpful, kind, agreeable, forgiving, traditional, serious, responsible, truthful, restraint etc. This scale is especially designed to match Tellegen constraint factor and Big Five agreeableness and conscientiousness.

The MPTS was subjected to standard item analysis procedure. According to the item total correlations, 45 items for anti-social personality, 90 items for neuroticism, 45 items for pro-social personality scale were statistically significant at .01 and .05 respectively. All together the final version of the MPTS contains 180 items. The reliability of the MPTS was determined by the method of internal consistency. According to the reliability analysis suggested that .68 for the anti-social personality scale, .71 for the neuroticism scale and .80 for pro-social scale were internally consistent. This value suggests that the test has sufficient reliability to be useful for research purpose as well as for selection purpose.

The validity of the MPTS was checked separately for each personality scale. The validity of the anti-social personality scale was checked by administering the test to a group of 33 people, who are reputed to be violent in their neighborhood. Their scores were compared to those of 53 normal people. The anti-social personality scale correlated .314 with the criterion status. This value is a little bit low, but can be placed at an acceptable level.

The validity of the neuroticism scale was checked by administering the test to a group of 30 psychiatric patients, whose scores were compared to those of 53 normal people. The neuroticism scale correlated .54 with the criterion status. This validity value is satisfactory. The validity of the pro-social scale was checked against the peer group ratings. The test scores of 30 people who are reputed to be very helpful were compared with those of 30 people who are reputed to be not very helpful. The test correlated .62 with the ratings. The pro-social scale was found to be reasonably high in validity.

So, Mandalay Personality Type Survey was developed by Dr. Htun Than & et, in (2005) and was found to be satisfactory for reliability and validity. However, they do not find comparable reference points or norm.

One of the essential characteristics of a good test is to have a well standardized norm of scores. To determine whether a given score is high, average or low with reference to the norm group, we need to have a standardized table of norms for the test. Essentially, psychological test norms represent the test performance of the standardization sample. Without norms, test scores cannot be interpreted. The norms are thus empirically established by determining what a representative group of persons actually do on the test. Any individual's raw score is then referred to the distribution of scores obtained by the standardization sample to discover where he falls in such a distribution.

In psychological test, raw score is meaningless until evaluated in terms of a suitable set of norms. A raw score is the score originally derived from the measurement used one that has not been transformed or modified in any way. If a test is scored initially in terms of the number of correct responses, the raw score is "number right". The original or raw scores are often transformed into another set of scores derived from the originals. An instance of such a transformation would be to give each individual a rank based on his number of correct responses or to score him as "above average", "average", or "below average".

Objectivity is one of the most important requirements of a good test. For a test to be objective, it is necessary to assist the reliability, validity of the test and standardize it. So, by standardizing the MPTS, we can interpret the test results or scores. Thus, we may say that, MPTS is quite promising to use with Myanmar people for personnel selection.

II. Method

2.1 Participants

The sample was made up of (500) university students (250 Female and 250 Male) from Yadanabon University, Mandalay University, Mandalay College, Lashio University , University of Pharmacy and University of Traditional Medicine . The age range of the students is between 17 to 21 years.

2.2 Procedure

The scale was administered to the students in groups in the classroom. The examiners were requested to answer the questions as truthful as possible. The examiners were guaranteed that their responses would be used only for research purpose and kept confidential.

2.3 Measure

Mandalay personality Type Survey (MPTS) was used for this study. This scale was constructed by Dr.Htun Than(deceased) Professor, Department of Psychology, Mandalay University of Distance Education in 2005. This scale contains 45 items for the anti-social personality scale, 90 items for the neuroticism scale and 45 items for the pro-social scale. All together the test contains 180 items or questions, which can be answered in Yes or No form.

III. Results

If we make a certain measurement with a test, it yields the raw scores. But a raw score means very little to us. In order to determine more precisely the individual's exact position with reference to the standardization sample, the raw score is converted into some relative measure. So, we must have any comparable reference points.

A comparable reference point, such as the mean or the median, to interpret raw scores is called " norms". Norms are measures of achievement that represent the typical performance of some designated groups. In addition to the mean or median, there are other kind of norms such as (1) interpreting a raw score in terms of percentage of scores below it, and interpreting a raw score in terms of σ unit (standard deviation unit). The first kind is called ' centile norms' and the second one is called ' Z score norms' or ' standard score norms' . Psychologists usually convert Z scores into other standard scores, such as ' T scores' or ' IQ scores'. In this study, 'T scores' was used as norms for MPTS.

Firstly, we computed the mean (\bar{X}) and standard deviation(SD) of three sub-scale ie, anti-social , neuroticism and pro-social. The mean for anti-social was (\bar{X} =18.99) and standard deviation was (SD= 6.2) and the mean for neuroticism was (\bar{X} =44.5) and standard deviation (SD=14.83) and the mean for pro-social was (\bar{X} =34.04) and standard deviation was (SD= 5.1) respectively. It was shown in table (1).

Table (1): Mean and SD for Mandalay Personality Types Survey

Sub- Scale	\bar{X}	SD
1 Anti-Social	18.99	6.22
2 Neuroticism	44.5	14.83
3 Pro-social	34.04	5.1

Second, the raw score were converted into Z score with the deviation of the respective raw score from the group mean and the standard deviation of the distribution of respective subscale. And then, these Z score were converted into ' T scores' with a mean of (50) and an SD of (10). The sum of ' T scores' represent , respective personality trait for respondents. The conversion of raw scores into ' T scores' for each subscale were presented in table(2).

The ' T scores' were classified into five levels, those falling between T score below 30 (-3 SD) were said to be low level, those falling between T score 31 to 40 (-2 SD) were said to be below average, those falling between T score 41 to 60 (± 1 SD) were said to be average those falling between T score 61 to 70 ($+ 2$ SD) were above average and those falling between 71 and above ($+3$ SD) were High level. It was shown in table 1,2 and 3 respectively.

Table(3): The classification of T scores for anti-social

Classification	Summed T scores	Frequency	Actual Percentage	Theoretical Percentage
High	≥ 71	7	1.4%	4.28%
Above Average	61- 70	68	13.4%	27.18%
Average	41-60	337	67.4%	68.26%
Below Average	31-40	79	15.8%	27.18%
Low	≤ 30	9	1.8%	4.28%

Table(4): The classification of T scores for Neuroticism

Classification	Summed T scores	Frequency	Actual Percentage	Theoretical percentage
High	≥ 71	5	1%	4.28%
Above High	61-70	61	12.2%	27.18%
Average	41-60	354	70.8%	68.26%
Below Average	31-40	62	12.4%	27.18%
Low	≤ 30	18	3.6%	4.28%

Table(5): Classification of T scores for Pro-social

Classification	Summed T scores	Frequency	Actual Percentage	Theoretical Percentage
High	≥ 71	0	0%	4.28%
Above Average	61-70	65	13%	27.18%
Average	41-60	341	68.2%	68.26%
Below Average	31-40	71	14.2%	27.18%
Low	≤ 30	23	4.6%	4.28%

IV. Discussion

The present study is the standardization of the Mandalay Personality Type Survey(MPTS). This scale was developed by Professor Dr.Htun Than & et.al(2005) for personnel selection. Reliability and validity coefficients were satisfactory for MPTS. Reliability of anti-social personality scale is .68, .71 for the neuroticism scale and .80 for pro-social scale. The validity of the MPTS is checked by separately for each personality scale. The validity of anti-social personality scale was .31. This value is a little bit low, but can be placed at an acceptable level. The validity of neuroticism personality scale is .54. The validity of pro-social personality scale is .62 . So, reliability and validity of MPTS assessed by Dr.Htun Than & et al in 2005 is found to be satisfactory. However, it must be standardized , so that it can be used with Myanmar Personnel. Thus, the present study was fulfilled this requirement.

The present study is done with the help of (250) males and (250) females who are selected as standardization sample to establish the norms. The age range of the samples was between 17 to 21 years. In this study, the process for converting a raw score into a T score involves two steps. The first step is to transform the original raw scores into a distribution of Z scores. Second, these Z scores is transformed into a T score. The T scores were classified into five levels.

The range of converted score is from (24) to (81) for anti-social personality scale. For anti-social personality scale, the lowest raw score (3) equivalent for T score(24) and the highest raw score (38) equivalent for T score (81). The range of converted score is from (22) to (79) for neuroticism personality scale. For neuroticism personality scale, the lowest raw score (3) equivalents for T score (22) and the highest raw score (88) equivalents for T score (79). For pro-social personality scale, the range of converted score is from (13) to (70). In this scale, the lowest raw score (15) equivalents for T score(13) and the highest raw score (44) equivalents for T score (70).

Table (3) represents the classification of the T score for anti-social personality scale. When we classified for anti-social personality scale, 1.6% is included in high, those falling between T scores (71) and above, 13.4% is included in above average, those falling between T scores (61) to (70), 67.4% were included in average, those falling between (41) to (60), 15.8% is included in below average, those falling between (31) to (40) and 1.8% is also included in low, those falling between (30) and below. When we compare the classification of the T score for anti-social in theoretical percentages to actual percentages the obtained actual percentages are quite a bit similar. Especially, the obtained actual percentages of average are very similar to theoretical percentages.

Table (4) presents the classification of the T score for neuroticism personality scale. When we classify for neuroticism personality scale, 1% is included in high, those falling between T score (71) and above, 12.2% is included in above average, those falling between T score(61) to (70), 70.88% is included in average, those falling between T score (41) to (60), 12.4% is included in below average, those falling between T score (31) to (40) and 3.6% is included in

low, those falling between T score (30) and below. When we compared the classification of T scores for neuroticism in theoretical percentages to actual percentages, the obtained actual percentage is very similar.

Table (5) presents the classification of the T score for pro-social personality scale. When we classified for pro-social personality scale. 0% is found to be high. There is none of respondents which has high level of pro-social personality scale. There may be normative samples. This samples may inadequately represent the target population's means or standard deviation. This is one of the considerations that led to the development of norms. But, other classification level may accurately estimate the normative samples. 13% is included in above average, those falling between T score (61) to (70), 68.2% is included in average, those falling between T score (41) to (60), 14.2% is included in below average, those falling between T scores (31) to (40) and 4.6% were included in low, those falling between T scores (30) and below. So, these results may represent the normative samples.

When we compare the classification of the T scores for all sub-scale in theoretical percentages to actual percentages, the obtained actual percentages are very similar. So, these norms are regarded as acceptable values.

V. Conclusion

The main purpose of the present study is to standardize the Mandalay Personality Type Survey. The results indicate that there are few limitations in the population sampling for pro-social personality scale. There is none of the respondents which has high level of pro-social personality scale. There may be normative sample. This sample may inadequately represent the target population mean or standard deviation. Although, a large number of representative samples of population need for the standardization of the test, the number of samples were inadequate resources in the study. So, we need to standardize the test with more subjects for reliable norm data.

Although, there are some limitations in this study, the results can be regarded as acceptable values. Thus, these norms can interpret an evaluation of his or her status in reference to other person. Therefore, these norms can be used for practical purposes in personnel selection.

References

- Graham, J.R & Naglieri, J.A Handbook of Psychology. Vol-10. Assessment of Psychology 2003, by John Wiley & sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey.
- Mangal, S.K. Statistics in Psychology and Education 2 nd, ed 2002 by PHI learning private limited, Delhi.
- Htun Than, Dr.(1997). Intercorrelations among personality traits. Unpublished paper, Dept. of Psychology . University of Yangon.

- Htun Than, Dr. (2005) Construction of Mandalay Personality Type Survey. Project Paper. University of Distance Education, Mandalay for the academic year 2004-2005.
- Hall, C.s, et.al. Introduction to theories of Personality, (1985). New York, Wiley.
- Millon, T & lerner, M.J Handbook of Psychology Vol.5. Personality and social Psychology 2003, by John Wiley & sons, Inc, Hoboken, New Jersey.