SELARAS
Journal of Psychological Studies
Vol.1, No.1, Mei 2025

MBTI Traits and Peer Likability Among Gen Z Students at Yayasan Tunas Bangsa Soposurung (YTBS) Boarding School: A Sociometric Approach

Christina Lumbantoruan
Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia
Corresponding e-mail address: christina.lumbantoruan@uph.edu

Abstract
This study investigated the association between the 16 MBTI personality types, the 4 MBTI groups, and peer perceptions of communication traits, specifically, being pleasant or unpleasant to talk to and being a good or bad listener, among high school students. A total of 320 students at a boarding school in Indonesia participated, providing 825 peer nominations. Chi-square analyses revealed moderate to strong associations between certain MBTI personality types and socially desirable traits, which varied across cohorts. Several personality types, such as Defender, Debater, and Protagonist appeared in both positive and negative peer perceptions. These findings suggest that while personality types may influence peer evaluations, Gen Z's perceptions of conversational and listening skills depend on social norms, context, expectations, and students' ability to adapt their behavior to different audiences. The findings imply a need for training programs to enhace student's self-awareness, empathy, and adaptability to social contexts and expectations.

Keywords: boarding school; communication style; Gen Z; MBTI; peer perception

Abstrak
Penelitian ini menyelidiki hubungan antara 16 tipe kepribadian MBTI, 4 kelompok MBTI, dan persepsi teman sebaya terhadap gaya komunikasi, khususnya apakah seseorang menyenangkan atau tidak untuk diajak bicara serta apakah mereka merupakan pendengar yang baik atau buruk di kalangan siswa sekolah menengah. Sebanyak 320 siswa di sebuah sekolah berasrama di Indonesia berpartisipasi dan memberikan total 825 nominasi teman sebaya. Analisis chi-square mengungkapkan hubungan sedang hingga kuat antara tipe kepribadian MBTI tertentu dan perilaku sosial yang dapat diterima, yang bervariasi antar angkatan. Beberapa tipe kepribadian seperti Defender, Debater, dan Protagonist muncul baik dalam persepsi positif maupun negatif teman sebaya. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa meskipun tipe kepribadian dapat memengaruhi penilaian dari teman sebaya, persepsi Gen Z terhadap keterampilan berdiskusi dan mendengarkan dipengaruhi oleh norma sosial, konteks, harapan sosial, serta kemampuan siswa untuk menyesuaikan diri dengan sifat-sifat yang diinginkan sesuai audiensnya. Implikasi dari studi ini menyoroti pentingnya pelatihan untuk meningkatkan kesadaran diri, empati, dan kemampuan beradaptasi terhadap konteks dan harapan sosial di kalangan siswa.

Kata Kunci: *asrama; gaya komunikasi; Gen Z; MBTI; persepsi teman sebaya*

INTRODUCTION

Personality significantly predicts patterns of individual's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors across different times and settings. Adolescence is a critical stage for identity development and social adjustment; therefore, understanding personality traits and their influence on social relationships and communication skills can greatly benefit young people (Slobodskaya, 2021). One of the most popular personality assessments is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, commonly known as MBTI (Myers et al., 1998). Despite its limited predictive validity and lack of psychometric rigor, the MBTI remains useful for fostering self-reflection and improving team dynamics among students (Vaughans, 2024; Ullah et al., 2024), including those in boarding school.

The MBTI personality classification is based on individual's tendencies along four dimensions: (1) directing and receiving energy externally (Extraversion) vs. internally (Introversion): (2) taking in information through the senses (Sensing) vs. intution (Intuition); making decisions based on logic (Thinking) vs. feelings (Feeling); and (4) approaching the external world using structure (Judging) vs. Flexibility (Perceiving).

The unique combinations of the four MBTI dimensions, Extraversion–Introversion, Sensing–Intuition, Thinking–Feeling, and Judging–Perceiving, produce 16 distinct personality types (Myers et al., 1998). These 16 types are often grouped into four broader personality categories to enhance interpretability, especially in educational and public-facing applications. The "Analysts" category includes INTJ (Architect), INTP (Logician), ENTJ (Commander), and ENTP (Debater), who are typically characterized by strategic thinking and logic-driven decision-making. The "Diplomats" category consists of INFJ (Advocate), INFP (Mediator), ENFJ (Protagonist), and ENFP (Campaigner), who are often described as empathetic, values-oriented, and focused on interpersonal harmony. The "Sentinels" category includes ISTJ (Logistician), ISFJ (Defender), ESTJ (Executive), and ESFJ (Consul), known for their reliability, practicality, and organizational strengths. Lastly, the "Explorers" category comprises ISTP (Virtuoso), ISFP (Adventurer), ESTP (Entrepreneur), and ESFP (Entertainer), who are typically spontaneous, hands-on, and action-oriented individuals. While these groupings are not part of the original MBTI theoretical framework, they are widely used in contemporary MBTI adaptations, such as the NERIS Type Explorer®, to provide a more accessible framework for understanding personality patterns (NERIS Analytics Limited, 2022).

The theoretical framework for this study is grounded in the Person–Environment (P–E) Fit Theory, which emphasizes that human behavior is shaped by the interaction between individual characteristics and environmental conditions. Within this framework, person–person fit refers

to interpersonal compatibility based on shared values, attitudes, or communication styles, which can influence mutual acceptance and rapport (De Cooman & Vleugels, 2022). In this study, interpersonal preferences are measured using a sociometric approach, originally developed by Moreno (1951), which involves peer nominations to assess perceived likability and communication qualities.

Previous studies have demonstrated the relevance of MBTI personality types in enhancing interpersonal skills and communication. Choi and Kim (2020) found that an interpersonal relationship improvement program using MBTI significantly increased self-acceptance, self-esteem, and acceptance of others among professional soldiers, indicating the value of MBTI as a developmental tool in structured group settings. Likewise, Chae (2016) reported that nursing students with NF personality types scored highest in both empathy and communication abilities, with statistically significant differences across MBTI functions and temperaments. These findings support the application of MBTI in exploring individual differences in communication styles and social functioning, areas closely aligned with the current study. However, there is a lack of research focusing specifically on interpersonal acceptance and peer perceptions among Generation Z students in boarding schools, a gap this study aims to address.

This study focuses on Generation Z (Gen Z) grades 10 to 12, born between 2006 and 2009 who are residents in a boarding school. Gen Z generally includes individuals born between 1997 and 2012 (Dimock, 2019), a generation characterized by growing up in a digital, hyperconnected world. While Gen Z students are often proficient in online communication, research suggests they may face challenges in managing face-to-face social interactions, emotional expression, and interpersonal conflict (Szymkowiak et al., 2021). Living in the boarding house requires students to engage in face-to-face social interactions with peers, teachers, and educators (Siswanto, 2024). This unique social setting presents a valuable opportunity to understand Gen Z's perceptions of personality traits that promote positive social interactions with peers in boarding school environment. Studying their perceptions of social interactions in a boarding school setting, where digital access is limited and face-to-face interaction is constant, offers a unique opportunity to explore how this generation adapts to real-life peer communication and social dynamics.

Preliminary discussions with boarding house staff and educators revealed persistent communication challenges among students, as well as between students and their teachers or supervisors. These issues include peer competition, a lack of collaboration, and the formation of unhealthy exclusive groups. According to school personnel, students often exhibit strong personal preferences in their social interactions, expressing likes and dislikes, excluding certain

peers, and forming cliques that isolate others. Such behaviors contribute to a socially fragmented environment that undermines group cohesion and healthy peer relationships.

This study addresses these challenges by examining peer perceptions of who is pleasant or unpleasant to talk to, and who is perceived as a good or poor listener. These variables capture key aspects of interpersonal communication that influence social acceptance and interaction quality in group settings. To explore this phenomenon, students first completed the MBTI personality assessment. The researcher then analyzed how these personality profiles relate to peer perceptions of likability during group discussions. By identifying which personality types are seen as more approachable or better listeners, the study helps deepen understanding of how personality traits shape social dynamics among Gen Z students. The findings offer practical insights for dormitory supervisors and educators in promoting supportive, inclusive, and communicative boarding school environments.

The study was conducted at a boarding school in North Sumatra, Indonesia. The school accepts students from diverse regional, social, and educational backgrounds through a highly competitive academic selection process. Its emphasis on academic excellence and diverse student population make it an ideal setting to assess how Gen Z perceives personality traits and their influence on social interaction. Boarding schools offer a distinctive educational setting where students live and learn in the same environment, leading to continuous peer interaction beyond the confines of the classroom. Unlike day schools, boarding schools intensify social dynamics, amplify peer influence, and provide prolonged opportunities for interpersonal engagement. These conditions make boarding schools particularly well-suited for studying the relationship between personality traits and peer perceptions within real-life social contexts.

This study aims to (1) describe the distribution of MBTI personality types among students batches 33-35 at a boarding school and (2) explore how students perceive the influence of personality types on peer social interactions in terms of their likability in conversation and listening skills. These findings have implications for managing communication methods between students, educators, and supervisors; offering feedback on the types of communication approach needed by students, and contributing to a deeper understanding of how Gen Z students perceive and engage with one another.

The first aim addresses the lack of localized data on personality typologies among Indonesian adolescents, particularly in boarding school settings. Mapping the MBTI distribution by student batch not only contributes to filling a cultural and educational gap in the literature, but also provides boarding schools with valuable insights into cohort-specific personality patterns. This information is essential for understanding differences in students' communication

styles and for designing tailored approaches to enhance peer interaction, classroom dynamics, and dormitory life.

The second aim addresses a key gap in the literature by examining how Gen Z adolescents perceive their peers' likability and listening skills based on personality types. While most prior research focuses on self-reported traits, this study introduces a peer-perception lens through real group interactions. This perspective adds nuance to personality theory and offers practical implications for enhancing peer communication and social cohesion in school settings.

METHOD

Participants

The study involved 320 students (213 males, 107 females) in grades 10 to 12 at Yayasan Tunas Bangsa Soposurung (YTBS) boarding school in North Sumatra, Indonesia. Participants were aged 15-18 years and were full-time residents of the boarding school at the time of data collection. Students were drawn from batces 33 to 35 and came from diverse regional and cultural backgrounds across Indonesia. A total population sampling method was employed, as all eligible students who completed the MBTI assessment and peer perception survey were included in the study. In line with school regulations, students had limited access to digital devices, encouraging traditional modes of communication and face-to-face interaction among peers, teachers, and boarding staff (Martin, Papworth, Ginns, & Malmberg, 2016).

Design

This study employed a quantitative, non-experimental, cross-sectional design to describe the MBTI personality types of students at A boarding school and examine their associations with peer perceptions of communication traits, specifically conversational pleasantness and listening behavior. Data were collected at a single time point using a combination of MBTI personality assessments and structured peer-nomination instruments. This approach enabled the exploration of social perception patterns among Gen Z in the unique context of the boarding school (Abt, 1987).

Procedure

Prior to data collection, informed consent was obtained from all participants and their legal guardians. The research was carried out in three phases: preparation, assessment, and guided group discussion, followed by peer nominations.

Preparation Phase. The study began with a needs assessment through discussions with boarding school staff and students to identify development areas. These discussions revealed a strong need to enhance students' soft skills, particularly communication and peer interaction, to

support positive engagement in the school's multicultural boarding environment. As a result, the research team designed a structured activity using MBTI-based insights to foster peer understanding and improve communication.

Demographic Data and Personality Assessment. Students first completed a Google Form to provide demographic data, including sex and cohort. They then completed the MBTI 16 Personalities Test via the NERIS Type Explorer®, which is accessible online in both English and Indonesian. The research team explained each of the MBTI dimensions to ensure clear and consistent understanding before students completed the test. Upon completion, students submitted a screenshot of their MBTI result via Google Form for verification.

Group Assignment and Guided Discussion. Students were randomly assigned to small discussion groups of 8–10 members using stratified randomization to ensure a variety of MBTI types within each group. Before the discussion, each student wore a name tag displaying only their MBTI type (e.g., INTJ-A, ENFP-T) to preserve anonymity during peer rating. Students were presented with multiple discussion topics, such as planning a trip, organizing a Christmas event, or proposing their own topic, and collectively chose to plan a Christmas event, a familiar and inclusive theme in the school context. Each discussion session lasted approximately 45 minutes and was facilitated by trained research team members. Facilitators guided the conversation, monitored participation, and ensured that all group members had the opportunity to contribute. Each group was also provided with a handout summarizing MBTI personality traits to support awareness and reflection during the discussion.

Peer Nomination. Immediately after the discussion, students completed a structured peer nomination form, where they identified three peers (by personality code only) in each of the following categories: (1) most pleasant to talk to, (2) least pleasant to talk to, (3) most likely to listen, and (4) least likely to listen. This nomination-based approach was used to capture participants' perceptions of their peers' communication traits while minimizing bias by preserving anonymity.

Instrument

The study utilized two instruments: First is the MBTI personality assessment, the **NERIS Type Explorer®**, is a popular adaptation of the traditional MBTI. It consists of 60 forced-choice questions, with 12 items dedicated to each of the four MBTI dimensions: Extraversion (E) vs. Introversion (I), Sensing (S) vs. Intuition (N), Thinking (T) vs. Feeling (F), and Judging (J) vs. Prospecting (P). In addition to these four dichotomies, the NERIS framework includes a fifth dimension, Assertive (A) vs. Turbulent (T), which reflects individuals' self-confidence and emotional reactivity. The NERIS tool consists of 60 forced-choice questions, with 12 questions

assessing each of the four MBTI dimensions. This test is free and accessible online, can be completed in 15 minutes, using simple language, appeals to adolescents and young adults, and is perceived as highly accurate by users. Each item is rated on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." Responses are numerically coded and aggregated for each trait pair. The dominant pole in each dichotomy determines the corresponding letter in the resulting type code. For example, a respondent who scores higher on Intuition than Sensing would receive an "N" in that dimension. The final result is a five-letter personality type (e.g., INFP-T or ESTJ-A), combining the four MBTI dimensions with the additional Identity trait. This scoring approach offers a nuanced view of personality by capturing both cognitive and emotional tendencies (NERIS Analytics Limited, 2022).

The MBTI has been widely applied in educational and developmental contexts. Although it has been critiqued for limited construct and predictive validity, some dimensions show moderate convergence with established personality traits (Capraro & Capraro, 2002). According to a meta-analysis by Capraro and Capraro, the internal consistency of the MBTI varies by dimension but typically demonstrates reliability coefficients between .80 and .87. Given these properties, the MBTI is considered more suitable for promoting self-reflection and understanding interpersonal styles rather than for diagnostic purposes.

Second is the Peer Nomination Questionnaire is a structured form containing questions about peers in their discussion group who are perceived as pleasant or unpleasant to talk to, and good or poor listeners. These nominations capture students' perceptions of their peers' communication skills and effectiveness in social interactions.

The Peer Nomination Questionnaire was developed by the research team to fit the study's specific aims. It consisted of four items asking students to nominate group members who were (a) most pleasant to talk to, (b) least pleasant to talk to, (c) most likely to listen, and (d) least likely to listen during group discussion. The questionnaire was constructed in Bahasa Indonesia and reviewed by two teachers for face validity. A small pilot test with 15 students was conducted to ensure item clarity. Due to the sociometric nature of the tool, it relies on frequency counts rather than scale scoring. The instrument is included in the appendix.

Data Analysis

This study employed a descriptive-analytical approach to examine associations between MBTI personality types and peer ratings of social behaviors among students at a boarding school. Since the data were categorical, statistical associations were assessed using chi-square tests and effect sizes were calculated using Cramér's V (Fienberg, 1979). Bonferroni-adjusted residuals were employed post hoc to identify deviations within specific groups. This method

enabled the identification of meaningful patterns while maintaining alignment with the study's scope. Advanced multivariate analyses were not conducted, as the primary aim of the study was to describe and explore trends rather than predict outcomes or establish causality. The descriptive-analytical approach included the following components: Descriptive Statistics were used to examine the distribution of MBTI personality types by sex and across cohorts. They were also used to summarize peer nominations and identify which of the 16 MBTI personality types were perceived as desirable or undesirable in social interactions across batches. Inferential Statistics assessed the strength and statistical significance of associations between the 16 MBTI personality types and peer perceptions in each category (pleasant/unpleasant to talk to, good/poor listener) using chi-square tests of independence and Cramér's V. Pearson residuals were calculated to examine significant patterns, and Bonferroni corrections were applied to adjust for multiple comparisons. The strength of associations based on Cramér's V was interpreted as negligible (< .10), small (.10 to .20), moderate (.20 to .40), and strong (>.40).

All statistical analyses were conducted using JASP software. Statistical significance was initially set at $p < .05$ and adjusted using Bonferroni correction to a treshold of $p < .0125$.

RESULTS

1. Personality Group Distribution by Sex and Cohort

Descriptive statistics illustrated the distribution of the 16 MBTI personality types and the 4 MBTI groups among boarding school students by sex and cohort. Table 1 summarizes the distribution of the 4 MBTI groups by sex.

Table 1. MBTI Personality Group by Sex

	Sex Label		
4 Personality Group Label	F	M	Total
Analysts (NTs)	41	99	140
Diplomats (NFs)	53	93	146
Explorers (SJs)	8	8	16
Sentinels (SPs)	5	13	18
Total	107	213	320

Remarks: N = Intuitive, T = Thinking, F = Feeling, S = Observant, J = Judging, S = Observant, P = Prospecting. NTs (INTJ, INTP, ENTJ, ENTP). NFs (INFJ, INFP, ENFJ, ENFP). SJs (ISTJ, ISFJ, ESTJ, ESFJ), SPs (ISTP, ISFP, ESTP, ESFP).

Table 1 presents the distribution of MBTI personality groups by sex among 320 students. The sample consisted of 107 females (33.4%) and 213 males (66.6%). The most common personality groups were Diplomats (NFs) and Analysts (NTs), comprising 45.6% and 43.8% of the sample, respectively. In contrast, Explorers (SJs) and Sentinels (SPs) were less prevalent, representing only 5.0% and 5.6% of students. Male students predominated across all personality groups, with the most pronounced difference observed in the Sentinel group (72.2% male). The Explorer group was the most gender-balanced, with an equal number of males and females. This distribution reflects both the sample's gender imbalance and potential sex-related variation in personality preferences. Statistical analysis using the Pearson chi-square test revealed a small and statistically non-significant difference in distribution of the four personality groups between males and females, χ^2 (3, N=320) = 3.85, p = .278, Cramer's V = 0.110.

Table 2. MBTI Personality Types by Sex

	Sex Label		
16 Personality Type	F	M	Total
Adventurer (ISFP)	1	4	5
Advocate (INFJ)	9	14	23
Architect (INTJ)	11	20	31
Campaigner (ENFP)	9	15	24
Commander (ENTJ)	25	69	94
Consul (ESFJ)	2	6	8
Debater (ENTP)	3	5	8
Defender (ISFJ)	3	3	6
Entertainer (ESFP)	2	1	3
Executive (ESTJ)	0	1	1
Logician (INTP)	0	4	4
Logistician (ISTJ)	2	5	7
Debater (ENTP)	4	1	5
Mediator (INFP)	6	5	11
Protagonist (ENFJ)	28	59	87
Virtuoso (ISTP)	1	1	2
Total	106	213	319

Note. Each cell displays the observed counts

Further analysis of the 16 MBTI personality types also showed a small and non-significant difference by sex, χ^2 (15, N = 319) = 15.51, p = .416, Cramer's V = 0.22. One participant's MBTI result was excluded from this analysis due to incomplete or invalid personality code submission, resulting in a sample size of 319 for the 16-type analysis. Pearson residuals for the 16 personality types were within ±2, indicating some sex-reated trends, but not strong enough to suggest meaningful differences in personality distributions between male and female students.

For example, males were more likely to be classified as Commander (ENTJ), Architect (INTJ), and Logician (INTP), while females were more represented among Protagonists (ENFJ) and Mediators (INFP). However, these variations did not reach statistical significance. Overall, the results suggest no significant sex differences in MBTI personality types among male and female students at the boarding school.

The examine the distribution of MBTI personality type across cohorts 33 to 35, a chi-square test was conducted, along with calculations of expected count and Pearson residuals.

Table 3. MBTI Personality Group by Cohort

	Sex Label		
4 Personality Group Label	F	M	Total
Analysts (NTs)	34	64	140
Diplomats (NFs)	34	46	146
Explorers (SJs)	3	9	16
Sentinels (SPs)	12	4	18
Total	83	123	320

Remarks: N = Intuitive, T = Thinking, F = Feeling, S = Observant, J = Judging, S = Observant, P = Prospecting. NTs (INTJ, INTP, ENTJ, ENTP). NFs (INFJ, INFP, ENFJ, ENFP). SJs (ISTJ, ISFJ, ESTJ, ESFJ), SPs (ISTP, ISFP, ESTP, ESFP).

Analysis of the distribution of the four MBTI personality groups across batches showed some variation, with Diplomats (NF) and Analysts (NT) being the most common across all three cohorts. Batch 33 had nearly equal proportions of Analysts (41.0%) and Diplomats (41.0%), with much fewer Sentinels (14.5%) and Explorers (3.6%). Batch 34 was dominated by Analysts (52.0%) followed by Diplomats (37.4%), while Sentinels (9.8%) and Explorers (7.3%) were relatively underrepresented. In contrast, Batch 35 had the highest proportion of Diplomats (57.9%), followed by Analysts (36.8%), with very few Sentinels (1.8%) and Explorers (3.5%). These patterns suggest that while the NT and NF groups consistently make up the majority, the relative proportions between them shift by cohort, possibly reflecting differing trends in personality composition or selection factors across student batches. Explorers (SJs) and Sentinels (SPs) remain the least represented groups in all cohorts.

Table 4. MBTI Personality Types by Cohort

	Batch Label			
16 Personality Type	33	34	35	Total
Adventurer (ISFP)	1	2	2	5
Advocate (INFJ)	9	4	10	23

SELARAS
Journal of Psychological Studies
Vol.1, No.1, Mei 2025

16 Personality Type	Batch Label			Total
	33	34	35	
Architect (INTJ)	8	19	4	31
Campaigner (ENFP)	7	7	10	24
Commander (ENTJ)	21	37	36	94
Consul (ESFJ)	6	1	1	8
Debater (ENTP)	5	2	1	8
Defender (ISFJ)	5	1	0	6
Entertainer (ESFP)	0	2	1	3
Executive (ESTJ)	0	1	0	1
Logician (INTP)	1	2	1	4
Logistician (ISTJ)	0	6	1	7
Debater (ENTP)	2	2	1	5
Mediator (INFP)	3	4	4	11
Protagonist (ENFJ)	15	31	41	87
Virtuoso (ISTP)	0	2	0	2
Total	83	123	113	319

A descriptive analysis of the 16 MBTI personality types across student batches (33 to 35) revealed some consistent trends and a few batch-specific patterns. The most prevalent type across all cohorts was Protagonist (ENFJ) (n = 87), with the highest concentration in Batch 34 (n = 31), followed closely by Batch 35 (n = 41). Commander (ENTJ) was also notably frequent (n = 94), most prominent in Batch 34 (n = 37) and Batch 35 (n = 36). Architect (INTJ) showed a peak in Batch 34 (n = 19), while other types like Advocate (INFJ) and Campaigner (ENFP) were more evenly distributed across batches. In contrast, certain types such as Entrepreneur (ESTP) (n = 1), Virtuoso (ISTP) (n = 2), and Executive (ESTJ) (n = 4) were rare and only appeared in one or two batches. These findings suggest that while some personality types (e.g., ENFJ, ENTJ) are common across cohorts, others occur sporadically, potentially reflecting individual differences or varying environmental influences across batches. Overall, no drastic shifts in personality type distributions were observed between the cohorts.

A more detailed analysis on the 16 MBTI personality types also showed a statistically significant and moderately strong association with cohort, χ^2 (30, N = 319) = 61.07, $p < .001$, Cramer's V = 0.309. One participant's MBTI result was excluded from this analysis due to incomplete or invalid personality code submission, resulting in a sample size of 319 for the 16-type analysis. Pearson residuals showed notable overrepresentations of Consul (residual = +2.716), Defender (residual = +2.752), and Debater (residual = +2.023 in Batch 33. Batch 34 had overrepresentations of Architect (residual = +2.038) and Logician (residual = +2.009). On the contrary, Batch 35 had less than expected Architect (residual = –2.107). These findings suggest

that several MBTI personality types were more prevalent in specific cohorts, reflecting distinct personality distribution across batches.

Given the 16 personality types provided more detailed insight and significant differences emerged only across cohorts but not between sex, further analyses of peer perceptions related to four communication traits were conducted using the 16 MBTI types for Batches 33-35. A Bonferroni correction was applied to control for Type I error across the four tests, resulting in an adjusted significance threshold of $\alpha = .0125$.

2. Peer Perceptions of Pleasantness

Chi-square analysis was employed to examine the association between the 16 MBTI personality types and 527 peer ratings of pleasantness.

Table 5. MBTI Personality and Pleasantness

Pleasant 16PF Types		Batch Label 33	34	35	Total
Adventurer (ISFP)	Expected count	1.262	2.112	3.626	7
	Pearson residuals	-0.233	-0.077	0.196	
Advocate (INFJ)	Expected count	5.228	8.750	15.023	29
	Pearson residuals	0.338	-1.268	0.768	
Architect (INTJ)	Expected count	8.292	13.879	23.829	46
	Pearson residuals	0.246	1.106	-0.989	
Campaigner (ENFP)	Expected count	10.996	18.404	31.600	61
	Pearson residuals	-1.507	0.605	0.427	
Commander (ENTJ)	Expected count	28.121	47.066	80.812	156
	Pearson residuals	-1.154	-0.010	0.688	
Consul (ESFJ)	Expected count	1.262	2.112	3.626	7
	Pearson residuals	0.657	1.299	-1.379	
Debater (ENTP)	Expected count	1.442	2.414	4.144	8
	Pearson residuals	**2.130**	-0.266	-1.053	
Defender (ISFJ)	Expected count	1.442	2.414	4.144	8
	Pearson residuals	**4.628**	-0.910	-2.036	
Entertainer (ESFP)	Expected count	1.082	1.810	3.108	6
	Pearson residuals	-1.040	-0.602	1.073	
Executive (ESTJ)	Expected count	0.361	0.603	1.036	2
	Pearson residuals	**2.730**	-0.777	-1.018	
Logician (INTP)	Expected count	3.245	5.431	9.324	18
	Pearson residuals	0.419	**1.532**	-1.416	

SELARAS
Journal of Psychological Studies
Vol.1, No.1, Mei 2025

Pleasant 16PF Types		Batch Label 33	34	35	Total
Logistician (ISTJ)	Expected count	1.262	2.112	3.626	7
	Pearson residuals	1.547	-0.077	-0.854	
Mediator (INFP)	Expected count	4.326	7.241	12.433	24
	Pearson residuals	1.766	-0.833	-0.406	
Protagonist (ENFJ)	Expected count	25.958	43.446	74.596	144
	Pearson residuals	-1.169	-0.675	**1.205**	
Virtuoso (ISTP)	Expected count	0.721	1.207	2.072	4
	Pearson residuals	0.328	**1.632**	-1.439	
Total	Expected count	95	159	273	527

Remarks: N = Intuitive, T = Thinking, F = Feeling, S = Observant, J = Judging, S = Observant, P = Prospecting.

Table 5 shows a statistically significant and moderate association between personality type and perceived pleasantness, χ^2 (28, N = 527) = 76.87, p < .001, Cramer's V = 0.270. Pearson residuals identified several personality types perceived as pleasant conversation partners, including Defender (residual = +4.628), Executive (residual = +2.730), and Debater (residual = +2.130) in Batch 33. Batch 34 showed a mild preference for conversing with Virtuoso (residual = +1.632) and Logician (residual = +1.532), while Batch 35 somewhat favored Protagonist (residual = +1.205). However, residuals in Batches 34 or 35 did not exceed +2. These findings suggest that the perceptions of pleasantness varied across cohorts, likely reflecting differences in communication style preferences, social norms, and interpersonal expectations.

3. Peer Perceptions of Unpleasantness

A separate chi-square test of independence examined the association between the 16 MBTI personality types and peer ratings of unpleasantness across student cohorts.

Table 6 - Personality and Unpleasantness

Unpleasant 16PF Types		Batch Label 33	34	35	Total
Adventurer (ISFP)	Expected count	1.275	1.686	2.040	5
	Pearson residuals	-1.129	0.242	0.672	
Advocate (INFJ)	Expected count	9.178	12.136	14.686	36
	Pearson residuals	0.601	-2.335	1.648	
Architect (INTJ)	Expected count	9.178	12.136	14.686	36
	Pearson residuals	1.591	1.396	-2.527	

SELARAS
Journal of Psychological Studies
Vol.1, No.1, Mei 2025

Unpleasant 16PF Types		Batch Label 33	34	35	Total
Campaigner (ENFP)	Expected count	8.669	11.462	13.870	34
	Pearson residuals	-0.567	-1.318	1.646	
Commander (ENTJ)	Expected count	14.278	18.878	22.844	56
	Pearson residuals	-1.926	0.258	1.288	
Consul (ESFJ)	Expected count	1.020	1.348	1.632	4
	Pearson residuals	**2.951**	-1.161	-1.277	
Debater (ENTP)	Expected count	7.904	10.450	12.646	31
	Pearson residuals	**3.236**	0.789	-3.275	
Defender (ISFJ)	Expected count	1.530	2.023	2.448	6
	Pearson residuals	1.997	-0.016	-1.564	
Entertainer (ESFP)	Expected count	1.530	2.023	2.448	6
	Pearson residuals	-1.237	0.687	0.353	
Entrepreneur (ESTP)	Expected count	0.510	0.674	0.816	2
	Pearson residuals	0.686	0.397	-0.903	
Executive (ESTJ)	Expected count	2.550	3.371	4.079	10
	Pearson residuals	**2.161**	-0.202	-1.525	
Logician (INTP)	Expected count	5.099	6.742	8.159	20
	Pearson residuals	-1.815	1.255	0.295	
Logistician (ISTJ)	Expected count	1.020	1.348	1.632	4
	Pearson residuals	0.971	-0.300	-0.495	
Mediator (INFP)	Expected count	8.159	10.788	13.054	32
	Pearson residuals	0.645	**2.196**	-2.506	
Protagonist (ENFJ)	Expected count	17.847	23.598	28.555	70
	Pearson residuals	-2.804	-1.358	**3.452**	
Virtuoso (ISTP)	Expected count	0.255	0.337	0.408	1
	Pearson residuals	-0.505	1.142	-0.639	
Total	Expected count	90	119	144	353

Remarks: N = Intuitive, T = Thinking, F = Feeling, S = Observant, J = Judging, S = Observant, P = Prospecting.

The result was statistically significant and indicated a moderate-to-strong association, χ^2 (30, N = 353) = 123.28, p < .001, Cramer's V = 0.418. Pearson residuals revealed several personality types perceived as undesirable conversation partners, including Protagonist (+3.452) in Batch 35 and Debater (residual = +3.236) in Batch 33. In addition, Batch 33 students nominated Consul (residual = +2.951) and Executive (residual = +2.161) as unpleasant to talk to, while Batch 34 found Mediator (residual = +2.196) to be the least pleasant. These findings

suggest divergent and polarized perceptions of undesirable communication traits across cohorts, possibly influenced by group norms, shifting social expectations, or social dynamics unique to each batch.

4. Perceptions of Being Good Listeners

To examine which of the 16 MBTI personality types are perceived as good listeners, a chi-square test was conducted among students across Batches 33–35.

Table 7. Personality and Good Listeners

Good Listener 16PF Types		Batch Label 33	34	35	Total
Adventurer (ISFP)	Expected count	1.586	2.306	3.107	7
	Pearson residuals	-0.466	0.457	-0.061	
Advocate (INFJ)	Expected count	9.065	13.178	17.757	40
	Pearson residuals	1.307	-1.426	0.295	
Architect (INTJ)	Expected count	9.292	13.507	18.201	41
	Pearson residuals	0.560	**1.767**	-1.922	
Campaigner (ENFP)	Expected count	8.159	11.860	15.981	36
	Pearson residuals	-0.756	1.202	-0.496	
Commander (ENTJ)	Expected count	25.610	37.227	50.164	113
	Pearson residuals	-2.097	0.618	0.965	
Consul (ESFJ)	Expected count	1.133	1.647	2.220	5
	Pearson residuals	1.754	0.275	-1.490	
Debater (ENTP)	Expected count	1.813	2.636	3.551	8
	Pearson residuals	**2.367**	-1.007	-0.823	
Defender (ISFJ)	Expected count	2.266	3.294	4.439	10
	Pearson residuals	**3.809**	-0.713	-2.107	
Entertainer (ESFP)	Expected count	0.907	1.318	1.776	4
	Pearson residuals	-0.952	-0.277	0.919	
Entrepreneur (ESTP)	Expected count	0.227	0.329	0.444	1
	Pearson residuals	-0.476	1.168	-0.666	
Executive (ESTJ)	Expected count	0.680	0.988	1.332	3
	Pearson residuals	-0.825	1.018	-0.287	
Logician (INTP)	Expected count	4.306	6.259	8.435	19
	Pearson residuals	**2.744**	0.296	-2.216	
Logistician (ISTJ)	Expected count	0.453	0.659	0.888	2
	Pearson residuals	**2.297**	-0.812	-0.942	

Good Listener 16PF Types		Batch Label 33	34	35	Total
Mediator (INFP)	Expected count	4.533	6.589	8.879	20
	Pearson residuals	0.689	-1.398	0.712	
Protagonist (ENFJ)	Expected count	26.516	38.544	51.939	117
	Pearson residuals	-1.848	-1.054	**2.229**	
Virtuoso (ISTP)	Expected count	0.453	0.659	0.888	2
	Pearson residuals	-0.673	**1.652**	-0.942	
Total	Expected count	97	141	190	428

Remarks: N = Intuitive, T = Thinking, F = Feeling, S = Observant, J = Judging, S = Observant, P = Prospecting.

The result indicated a moderate and statistically significant association, χ^2 (30, N = 428) = 92.99, p < .001, Cramer's V = 0.330. Pearson residuals identified personality types perceived as good listeners, including Defender (residual = +3.809), Logician (residual = +2.744), Debater (residual = +2.367), and Logistician (residual = +2.297) in Batch 33. Batch 35 viewed Protagonist (residual = +2.229) as the least pleasant. Meanwhile, Batch 34 perceived Architect (residual = +1.767) and Virtuoso (residual = +1.652) as good listeners, though their residuals did not exceed +2. Overall, these findings suggest that perceptions of listening skills were influenced by both personality traits and cohort-specific social context.

5. Peer Perceptions of Being Bad Listeners

A chi-square test was also conducted to examine the association between the 16 MBTI personality types and peer perceptions of being bad listeners.

Table 8. Personality and Bad Listerners

Bad Listener 16PF		Batch Label 33	34	35	Total
Adventurer (ISFP)	Expected count	0.567	0.778	0.655	2
	Pearson residuals	-0.753	0.251	0.427	
Advocate (INFJ)	Expected count	7.375	10.116	8.509	26
	Pearson residuals	-0.506	0.907	-0.517	
Architect (INTJ)	Expected count	7.942	10.895	9.164	28
	Pearson residuals	**2.505**	-0.271	-2.036	
Campaigner (ENFP)	Expected count	5.389	7.393	6.218	19
	Pearson residuals	1.986	-1.983	0.314	

SELARAS
Journal of Psychological Studies
Vol.1, No.1, Mei 2025

Bad Listener 16PF		Batch Label 33	34	35	Total
Commander (ENTJ)	Expected count	18.436	25.291	21.273	65
	Pearson residuals	-2.198	-0.058	**2.109**	
Consul (ESFJ)	Expected count	1.702	2.335	1.964	6
	Pearson residuals	**2.528**	-0.873	-1.401	
Debater (ENTP)	Expected count	7.091	9.727	8.182	25
	Pearson residuals	**2.219**	0.408	-2.511	
Defender (ISFJ)	Expected count	1.135	1.556	1.309	4
	Pearson residuals	**2.690**	-1.248	-1.144	
Entertainer (ESFP)	Expected count	0.851	1.167	0.982	3
	Pearson residuals	-0.922	0.771	0.018	
Entrepreneur (ESTP)	Expected count	0.851	1.167	0.982	3
	Pearson residuals	1.246	-0.155	-0.991	
Executive (ESTJ)	Expected count	1.135	1.556	1.309	4
	Pearson residuals	-0.126	1.157	-1.144	
Logician (INTP)	Expected count	3.971	5.447	4.582	14
	Pearson residuals	-1.491	1.094	0.195	
Logistician (ISTJ)	Expected count	1.418	1.945	1.636	5
	Pearson residuals	0.489	0.039	-0.497	
Mediator (INFP)	Expected count	4.822	6.615	5.564	17
	Pearson residuals	0.537	**1.316**	-1.935	
Protagonist (ENFJ)	Expected count	15.033	20.622	17.345	53
	Pearson residuals	-2.846	-0.798	**3.519**	
Virtuoso (ISTP)	Expected count	0.284	0.389	0.327	1
	Pearson residuals	-0.533	0.979	-0.572	
Total	Expected count	78	107	90	275

Remarks: N = Intuitive, T = Thinking, F = Feeling, S = Observant, J = Judging, S = Observant, P = Prospecting.

The analysis revealed a strong and statistically significant association, χ^2 (17, N = 275) = 99.58, p = < .001, Cramer's V = 0.426. Pearson residuals indicated that some MBTI personality types were associated with being perceived as bad listeners, including Defender (residual = +2.690), Debater (residual = +2.219), and Consul (redisual = +2.528) in Batch 33. In Batch 34, Mediator (residual = +1.316) were seen as poor listeners, while Batch 35 nominated Protagonist (redisual = + 3.519) and Commander (residual = +2.109). These findings suggest that personality type meaningfully influence how individuals are perceived in terms of listening ability.

DISCUSSION

This study examined the relationship between demographic factors (sex, cohort), MBTI personality types, and Gen Z students' perceptions of peer conversational and listening behaviors at a boarding school. The findings contribute novel insights into how personality traits interact with social dynamics in adolescent peer interactions in a competitive academic setting.

Consistent with prior studies documenting minimal sex influence on MBTI distribution (e.g., Reevy & Maslach, 2001), this study found no significant association between sex and the 16 MBTI personality types, and the four MBTI groups. These findings reinforce previous research that MBTI preferences are largely independent of biological sex (Schmitt et al., 2016).

However, cohort membership, defined here as academic batch, was found to have a moderate to moderately strong influence on personality profiles. Significant differences were found in both the 4 MBTI personality groups and the 16 MBTI personality types. These findings align with previous studies reporting personality differences across student cohorts (Yu & Zhang, 2021), supporting broader literature on cohort-based personality variation. Additionally, the more granular personality analysis using the 16 MBTI personality types provided a better explanation on differences between cohorts than the 4 MBTI groups, as also reported in other studies (Sivrikova et al., 2019).

The most compelling findings relate to how personality traits were perceived by peers in terms of pleasantness in conversation and listening behavior. Applying the Person–Environment Fit Theory, specifically the person–person fit domain, the study illustrates how students' social preferences reflect perceived compatibility with peers' communication styles and interpersonal traits. According to this theory, individuals experience greater comfort, acceptance, and rapport with those whose traits, values, or behaviors align with their own (De Cooman & Vleugels, 2022). In this study, such alignment appears to influence whom students nominated as pleasant to talk to or as good listeners.

This is particularly relevant for Gen Z students, who are often described as socially aware, emotionally attuned, and valuing authenticity and inclusivity in peer relationships. Their perceptions of likability and listening skills are likely shaped not only by observable communication behavior, but also by how well others reflect these generational values. For example, a peer perceived as a "good listener" may be someone who provides emotional validation and space for diverse opinions, not just someone who remains silent while others speak.

For example, Certain MBTI personality types received positive peer ratings for being pleasant conversationalist, including Defenders (ISFJ), Executives (ESTJ), and Debaters (ENTP)

in Batch 33; Virtuosos (ISTP) and Logicians (INTP) in Batch 34; and Protagonists (ENFJ) in Batch 35. Though residuals in Batches 34 and 35 were below +2, the variation across groups suggests cohort-specific norms shape conversational preferences (Clark et al., 2023).

The six personality types differ in cognitive styles and traits, but they exhibit abilities that enhance social acceptance, such as warmth (ISFJ, ENFJ), structure and clarity (ESTJ), or intellectual stimulation (ENTP, INTP, ISTP). These findings align with previous studies suggesting that extraversion (ESTJ, ENFJ, ENTP), agreeableness (ISFJ, ENFJ), and openness (ENTP, INTP, ISTP) are key predictors of positive social perception (Bartholomeu et al., 2021). Other studies also highlighted the roles of interpersonal sensitivity (ISFJ, ENFJ) and cognitive flexibility (ENTP, INTP, ISTP) in navigating effective social interactions (Yussoff, Ismail, & Althabhawi, 2024).

Conversely, some personality types were perceived as unpleasant across cohorts, including Debaters (ENTP) and Executives (ESTJ) in Batch 33 and Protagonist in Batch 35 (ENFJ). Batch 34 provided a distinct pattern, nominating different personality types for both pleasant and unpleasant. This suggests that peer perceptions are influence not just by personality traits but also cohort-specific norms, expectations, and individual communication styles. For example, students who prefer energetic debate may value Debaters (ENTP), while other students who prefer harmony or reflextive dialogue may dislike them. Similarly, the leadership and clarity of Executives (ESTJ) may appeal to some but was perceived domineering by other who seek equal and empathetic conversations. These findings emphasize the importance of adapting personality traits to social context for greater peer acceptance (Laursen & Veenstra, 2021).

The variability in peer ratings across batches further supports the P–E Fit notion that interpersonal compatibility is context-dependent. Students from different cohorts may prioritize different social norms or communication behaviors, leading to different perceptions of the same personality types. This was also evident in listening behavior ratings. Types like Defenders (ISFJ), Debaters (ENTP), and Protagonists (ENFJ) were nominated both as good and poor listeners, depending on the cohort. Meanwhile, Logicians (INTP) and Logisticians (ISTJ) were more consistently rated as good listeners, possibly due to their calm, attentive demeanor, and minimal conflict style. In contrast, Commanders (ENTJ) and Consuls (ESFJ) were often perceived as poor listeners, potentially because their directive or outcome-driven communication may override reflective listening.

These generational insights underscore the need for educators and school counselors to account for Gen Z students' heightened expectations for mutual respect, inclusion, and emotional

responsiveness in peer dynamics. Interpersonal training that recognizes and addresses these values may be more impactful than one-size-fits-all communication skills programs (Choi & Kim, 2020).

Overall, the findings support the relevance of person–person fit in shaping social perceptions, showing that personality traits do not operate in isolation but in interaction with peer expectations and group norms. Understanding these dynamics can inform peer-group facilitation strategies in educational settings and promote more inclusive, communicative environments tailored to diverse personality preferences.

This research contributes to adolescent well-being by offering insights into how personality traits relate to social acceptance, communication, and peer dynamics, key elements in adolescent psychosocial development. By identifying which traits are associated with being perceived as pleasant or good listeners, the findings can inform educators, counselors, and dormitory supervisors in designing interventions that foster inclusive communication, reduce social fragmentation, and support healthy peer relationships. Such supportive environments are essential for promoting adolescents' emotional security, sense of belonging, and overall well-being in school settings.

CONCLUSION

This study found moderate to strong and statistically significant associations between MBTI personality types and peer perceptions of social behaviors among students in Batches 33-35 at a boarding school. Specific MBTI personality types, such as Defenders (ISFJ), Debaters (ENTP), and Protagonists (ENFJ), were perceived as pleasant conversersationalist and good listeners in certain cohorts, while others like Consuls (ESFJ) and Commanders (ENTJ) were viewed as unpleasant or poor listeners. Notably, some personality types received both positive and negative evaluations across cohorts, underscoring the influence of social context, cohort-specific norms, and individual adaptability in meeting social expectations.

These findings align with the Person–Environment Fit Theory, particularly in the person–person fit domain, which highlights the role of compatibility between individuals' traits, values, and communication styles in shaping social acceptance and interpersonal rapport.

The study also addresses the communication challenges highlighted in the Introduction, such as peer exclusion and lack of collaboration. Schools can use this insight to design programs that promote understanding of diverse communication styles and encourage inclusive peer

interactions. This can help reduce social fragmentation and support adolescent well-being in boarding school settings.

Recommendations

While training in listening and empathy skills is valuable and commonly integrated into educational curricula, the findings of this study suggest that likability and perceived listening behaviors are not determined by skills alone. These perceptions are also influenced by students' inherent personality traits and the degree of compatibility between peers. According to the Person–Environment Fit Theory, particularly the person–person fit domain, social acceptance and rapport are shaped by how well individuals' traits, values, and communication styles align (De Cooman & Vleugels, 2022). Therefore, schools should not only provide communication skills training but also foster personality awareness, respect for diverse interaction styles, and structured opportunities for students to interact with peers of differing personalities. Strategies such as rotating discussion group memberships, guided reflection on interpersonal interactions, and creating safe feedback spaces can help students develop adaptability and mutual understanding. These efforts support a more inclusive, psychologically safe, and socially cohesive school environment, particularly in boarding school contexts where interpersonal dynamics are central to daily life.

The findings suggest that peer perceptions of personality traits vary across student cohorts depending on social norms, contextual expectations, and communication preferences. Educators, counselors, and peer facilitators should tailor their approaches to the cohort-specific norms and social expectations (Yu & Zhang, 2021). Training programs that improve empathetic skills, adaptability, and social awareness to norms and expectations, regardless of personality type, may help students reflect on their communication styles and improve peer interactions. Future studies should explore the specific coversational and listening behaviors associated with favorable and unfavorable personality types using both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Limitations and Future Research

Despite its contribution, this study has several limitations that may impact the outcomes or the interpretation of its findings. First, the study used the MBTI as the primary personality assessment tool, which has been criticized for limited predictive validity and psychometric robustness due to the binary categorization that simplify the spectrum of individual personalities (Furnham, 1996). While widely used in educational and developmental contexts,

its dichotomous nature may not capture the full complexity of adolescent personality traits. Second, peer perceptions were gathered through subjective nominations without justification for the evaluations, limiting the ability to understand the underlying social norms and expectations. This lack of explanation restricts insights into why certain traits were perceived as likable or not. Third, the study did not explore the cohort-specific context, further limiting insight into unique social dynamics and personality shifts. Different academic cohorts may have had varying leadership, group cultures, or event experiences that shaped their interpersonal norms. Additionally, the cross-sectional design limits the ability to explain personality development and adaptability over time.

Another limitation is the possibility that some students may have already known one another prior to the discussion sessions, whether as close friends or as individuals with interpersonal conflicts. These pre-existing relationships may have influenced their peer nominations, regardless of the discussion performance, potentially biasing the data beyond the intended observation of personality-driven social perception.

Future research should consider utilizing alternative personality assessment tools that capture personality on a continuum instead of binary categories (e.g., Big Five Inventory). Such tools may offer greater psychometric validity and allow a more nuanced analysis of individual differences. Qualitative methods (e.g., interviews or focus group discussions) could help unpack the cohort-specific social context, norms, and expectations influencing peer perceptions across cohorts. Longitudinal study may also explain how personality evolve over time during students' stay in the boarding school. Tracking students across semesters could reveal whether interpersonal skills or likability traits shift as they mature or adapt to the boarding school environment. Finally, expanding the sample to include diverse boarding school environments would also enhance the generalizability and cultural relevance of the findings.

REFERENCES

Bartholomeu, D., Montiel, J. M., Couto, G., Bueno, C. H., Garcia, F. H. S., & Pessotto, F. (2021). Social skills and social acceptance in different educational levels: A cross-sectional study. *Psychology, 12*(11), 1886–1899. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2021.1211114

Chae, M.-O. (2016). Empathic ability and communication ability according to Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) personality type in nursing students. *Journal of the Korea Academia-Industrial Cooperation Society, 17*(4), 303–311. https://doi.org/10.5762/kais.2016.17.4.303

Choi, S. W., & Kim, H. S. (2020). Effects of an interpersonal relationship improvement program using MBTI on self-acceptance, self-esteem, and acceptance of others of professional soldiers. *Journal of Korean Academy of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, 29*(1), 64–72. https://doi.org/10.12934/jkpmhn.2020.29.1.64

Clark, L. A., Zeni, C. M., Burt, S. A., Donnellan, M. B., & Neiderhiser, J. M. (2023). Personality and peer groups in adolescence: Reciprocal associations and shared genetic and environmental influences. *Journal of Personality.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12741

De Cooman, R., & Vleugels, W. (2022). Person–environment fit: Theoretical perspectives, conceptualizations, and outcomes. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.377

Dimock, M. (2019, January 17). *Defining generations: Where Millennials end and Generation Z begins*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/

Laursen, B., & Veenstra, R. (2021). Toward understanding the functions of peer influence: A summary and synthesis of recent empirical research. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *31*(4), 889–907. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12606

Moreno, J. L. (1951). *Sociometry, experimental method and the science of society: An approach to a new political orientation* (Pdf ed.). The North-West Psychodrama Association / Lu Lu Press. (Original work published 1951, Beacon House, New York)

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® instrument* (3rd ed.). Consulting Psychologists Press.

NERIS Analytics Limited. (2022). *NERIS Type Explorer® – 16 Personalities*. https://www.16personalities.com

Schmitt, D. P., Long, A. E., McPhearson, A., O'Brien, K., Remmert, B., & Shah, S. H. (2016). Personality and gender differences in global perspective. *International Journal of Psychology*, *51*(1), 45–56. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12265

Siswanto, D. H., Wibowo, W. A., Saputra, Y. D., Rozaq, R. R., Suryatama, H., & Saputra, S. A. (2024). Qualitative study on the dynamics of social interaction between boarding students and

the local community. *International Journal of Scientific Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(*9*), 1275–1288.

Sivrikova, N., Artemyeva, N., Sokolova, N., Moiseyeva, E., Borodina, V., & Terekhov, A. (2019). Features of the personality of the people identifying themselves with different generations. *SHS Web of Conferences, 66*, Article 01003. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20196601003

Slobodskaya, H. R. (2021). Personality development from early childhood through adolescence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 175, 110690. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110690

Szymkowiak, A., Melović, B., Dabić, M., Jeganathan, K., & Singh Kundi, G. (2021). Information technology and Gen Z: The role of teachers, the internet, and technology in the education of young people. *Technology in Society, 65*, Article 101565. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101565

Ullah, A., Uddin, F., Khan, S., & Imran. (2024). Exploring the impact of MBTI personality types on teaching methods. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(*3*), 309–323. https://doi.org/10.55737/qjss.559887544

Vaughans, A. (2024). Enhancing learning through MBTI: Customizing educational strategies to student personality types. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies (EDULEARN24)* (pp. 4960–4963). IATED. https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2024.1215

Yu, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2021). Personality and developmental characteristics of primary school students' personality types. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 693329. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.693329

Yussoff, Y. B., Ismail, S. M., & Althabhawi, N. M. (2024). The impact of cognitive flexibility on navigating personality and learning style differences in higher education. *Pakistan Journal of Life & Social Sciences, 22*(2), Article 21065. https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.000202

SELARAS
Journal of Psychological Studies
Vol.1, No.1, Mei 2025

APPENDIX. Peer Nomination Instrument

1. Tuliskanlah maksimal 3 anggota grup yang paling menyenangkan selama diskusi kelompok.

   a.

   b.

   c.

2. Tuliskanlah maksimal 3 anggota grup yang paling tidak menyenangkan selama diskusi kelompok.

   a.

   b.

   c.

3. Tuliskanlah maksimal 3 anggota grup yang paling mau mendengarkan masukan yang diberikan anggota kelompok.

   a.

   b.

   c.

4. Tuliskanlah maksimal 3 anggota grup yang paling tidak mau mendengarkan masukan yang diberikan anggota kelompok.

   a.

   b.

   c.

Definisi:

1. Menyenangkan untuk diskusi yaitu membuat diskusi terasa nyaman, menarik, atau positif.
2. Mendengarkan masukan yaitu terbuka dan bersedia mendengarkan masukan atau pendapat dari anggota lain.