

Chapter 2

Jung's Qualitative Personality Theory

*This above all; to thine own self be true.
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.*
==Hamlet, William Shakespeare. 1604

2.1 Introduction

Jung's personality theory, originally a guide for psychoanalysts seeking patterns in clients' psyches, has until now been entirely qualitative and free of numbers. Its quantification to come must be based on and be consistent with this qualitative description. This chapter places this informal set of descriptions on an axiomatic foundation so that typological "principles" can be deduced logically and rigorously as in Euclid's classical geometry. To make this accessible to the non-mathematical reader, the presentation will be kept informal rather than being expressed in the dry theorems and corollaries of high school.

The qualitative theory will be based on three premises called "postulates" from which later principles can be derived. The first two, concerning extraversion and the psychological functions, are explicit and already widely accepted. The third "domain independence" postulate, expressed in Jung's writings only implicitly, will be made explicit here to guide its quantification in the next two chapters.

Only the first two postulates are needed for combining attitudes with functions to generate Jung's personality types, later known in a more general context as "function-attitudes" or "cognitive modes". Jung's typology also includes a second "auxiliary" mode, sometimes undifferentiated with respect to attitude.

The chapter concludes by discussing the Grey–Wheelwrights questionnaire developed by Jung's followers as an attempt at mode identification. Based on only the first two postulates, its coverage of the conscious ego was incomplete for lack of the second attitude pair provided later by Briggs and Myers. An example will illustrate this earlier incompleteness.

2.2 Three Axiomatic Postulates

In what follows, in citations Jung's book *Personality Theory* (1921, 1971) will be abbreviated as "*PT*", usually followed by a page number.

2.2.1 Postulate 1: Extraversion (and Introversion)

To understand and explain their differences in approach to the same problems by his Vienna colleagues Freud and Adler, Jung formulated his famous theory of extraversion and introversion. These opposite variables are examples of “psychological attitudes” and are expressed symbolically as the *E–I* pair.

Postulate 1 *Extraversion* is the flow of psychic energy *outward* toward the exterior world—“an outward turning of libido” (*PT*, p. 427), whereas *introversion* draws psychic energy *towards* one's interior psyche—“an inward turning of libido” (*PT*, p. 452).

You can gain further understanding of these ideas, as well as your own preferences in this regard, by examining the following five questions from p. 10 of the *Teamology* questionnaire (Wilde 2009). If you are so inclined, feel free to circle zero, one or two alternatives for each of the five questions and do the math.

<i>EI1</i>	You are more:	(<i>e</i>) sociable	(<i>i</i>) reserved
<i>EI2</i>	You are more:	(<i>e</i>) expressive	(<i>i</i>) contained
<i>EI3</i>	You prefer:	(<i>e</i>) groups	(<i>i</i>) individuals
<i>EI4</i>	You learn better by:	(<i>e</i>) listening	(<i>i</i>) reading
<i>EI5</i>	You are more:	(<i>e</i>) talkative	(<i>i</i>) quiet

From the qualitative point of view of Postulate 1, you would regard yourself as an extravert if you chose more (*e*)s than (*i*)s, an introvert if you chose more (*i*)s than (*e*)s, and undecided if you chose the same number of each. The quantitative point of view to be developed later would append the positive difference between the numbers of the responses to the attitude identifier. Thus three (*e*)s and two (*i*)s would yield a report of *E1* for this questionnaire (Example 1 for the author, to be continued in [Chap. 4](#)). The score can also be expressed as a percentage of the total, here 20% *E*. If you happen to have your *E–I* score from the *MBTI*, you can multiply it by 100%/30 to get the percentage score. This pair of attitudes is an example of what will be called a “variable (pair)”.

2.2.2 Postulate 2: Psychological Functions

Jung soon realized that extraversion or introversion could change according to whether information was being collected or, having been obtained, was guiding a decision. In the first situation of “perception”, as he called it, he distinguished between two opposite ways of information collection: Sensing versus *iNtuitionS–N*. The *sensing* function *S* “include(s) all perceptions by means of the sense organs” (*PT*, p. 518), whereas the *intuition* function *N* “is perception by means of the unconscious” (*ibid*).

In the second “judgment” situation, he saw two opposite ways of decision-making that he called *Thinking* versus *Feeling* *T–F*. By the *thinking* function *T* Jung means “... intellectual cognition and the forming of logical conclusions”, whereas “*feeling* (*F*) is a function of subjective valuation” (ibid).

To understand these “psychological functions”, you can examine (or even answer) the following two sets of five questions from the teamology questionnaire. First, the perception function questions.

SN1	You prefer the:	(s) concrete	(n) abstract
SN2	You prefer:	(s) fact-finding	(n) speculating
SN3	You are more:	(s) practical	(n) conceptual
SN4	You are more:	(s) hands-on	(n) theoretical
SN5	You prefer the:	(s) traditional	(n) novel

To continue Example 1, the author’s choice of all (*n*)s indicates an “intuitive” preference, scoring 100% *N*.

The judgment function questions follow:

TF1	You prefer:	(t) logic	(f) empathy
TF2	You are more:	(t) truthful	(f) tactful
TF3	You are more:	(t) questioning	(f) accommodating
TF4	You are more:	(t) skeptical	(f) tolerant
TF5	Judges should be:	(t) impartial	(f) merciful

In Example 1, three (*t*)s and two (*f*)s score as 20% *T*, indicating a “thinking” preference. Each pair of functions is called a “variable (pair)”, as was the attitude pair of Postulate 1.

Postulate 2 (1) There exists an opposite pair of psychological functions representing two different ways of collecting information (perception).

(2) There exists another opposite pair of psychological functions representing two different ways of making a decision (judgment).

Jung gave names and letter symbols to these two pairs of functions, something he did NOT do to the corresponding two pairs of attitudes of Postulate 3.

2.2.3 Postulate 3: Perception and Judgment Domains

In *PT* the third postulate is implicit rather than explicit. Rather than being stated in so many words, it has to be inferred from the way Jung organizes, in *PT*’s Chap. X, pp. 330–407, his discussion of the type variables and how they interact.

Postulate 3 The extraversion or introversion attitude energy for information collection (perception) is independent of and usually different from that for decision-making (judgment).

As the preceding subsection noted, Jung did not give names and symbols to the two pairs of attitudes of Postulate 3. To correct this oversight, define the perception attitude pair as *extraverted* versus *introverted perception* (E_p – I_p) and the judgment attitude pair as *extraverted* versus *introverted judgment* (E_j – I_j). These new attitude pairs will facilitate development of the quantitative theory to come, especially in Chap. 4, where in Table 4.1 of Sect. 4.5 they will receive less formal titles.

The word “usually” in the postulate expresses that in rare cases one can actually have the same attitude energies in both situations, a topic discussed in Chaps. 4 and 7. Although such an equality of perception and judgment attitude energies, albeit rare, may surprise some type theorists, the author has known students and a successful corporate executive who comfortably possess such attitudes.

Since only the single E – I attitude of Postulate 1 has been defined so far, another attitude is needed for completeness. Section 2.4.1 will illustrate by example why the variables introduced so far are insufficient for describing a consciousness. The missing attitude, supplied by Briggs and Myers who symbolized it by P – J , will appear in Sect. 2.4.2 to complete the attitude requirement.

Postulate 3 states that the two new attitude pairs E_p – I_p and E_j – I_j must be independent of each other in the sense that changing one should not affect the other. Since the single attitude E – I of Postulate 1 certainly affects the new attitudes, both for perception and for judgment, it must be interacting in some way with the attitude P – J not yet added to the system. In Chap. 4, E – I and P – J will be “decoupled” by systems analysis to produce the independent attitude pairs E_p – I_p and E_j – I_j . Remarkably, it will turn out that the E – I score is actually the net algebraic sum of the two decoupled extraversion/introversion attitude scores, as yet unknown, for E_p – I_p and E_j – I_j .

2.3 Types and Cognitive Modes (Function-Attitudes)

Jung then combined attitudes with functions to obtain his personality *types*. Combination was slightly restricted; the four perceptive types for instance came only from the two perceptive attitudes and functions. Similarly, the four judgment types came only from judgment attitudes and functions, yielding the eight Jungian types displayed in Table 2.1. The descriptive keywords (Wilde 2009, p. 13) are intended to humanize this perhaps overly technical exposition.

John Beebe continually emphasizes that Jung was referring to types of *consciousness*, not types of *people*. The distinction is that although an individual favoring one of the consciousness types is popularly regarded as that type of *person*, she will doubtless experience many other types of *consciousness* during her life. To avoid confusing the two interpretations, *consciousness* types will in

Table 2.1 Jungian types (cognitive modes) with *teamology* keywords

Perception modes			Judgment modes	
<i>Extraverted</i> <i>sensing</i> Se Experiment	<i>Extraverted</i> <i>iNtuition</i> Ne Ideation	–	<i>Extraverted</i> <i>thinking</i> Te Organization	<i>Extraverted</i> <i>feeling</i> Fe Community
<i>Introverted</i> <i>sensing</i> Si Knowledge	<i>Introverted</i> <i>iNtuition</i> Ni Imagination	–	<i>Introverted</i> <i>thinking</i> Ti Analysis	<i>Introverted</i> <i>feeling</i> Fi Evaluation

what follows be called “(cognitive) modes”, whereas *people* types usually will be identified by an adjective such as “Jungian” or “Myers–Briggs” (*MB*) indicating an particular context and type definition. As noted in [Sect. 1.5](#), of [Chap. 1](#) “mode” here is synonymous with the term “function-attitude” favored by many of the eight-function(-attitude) school of typology.

Recognizing this multiplicity of cognitive modes, Jung distinguished between a “principal”, later called “dominant”, mode and a less differentiated or even undifferentiated “subsidiary” or “auxiliary” mode, one being perceptive and the other judgmental. Thus Jung described his own type as “introverted intuition with thinking”, apparently regarding his auxiliary thinking function as being as often extraverted as introverted. This is as far as he would go using only the sort of information available to a Jungian psychoanalyst not using some sort of questionnaire. With this as a model, a “Jungian type” will be henceforth regarded as having a dominant function in a specific attitude, together with an auxiliary function whose attitude may or may not be differentiated.

As discussed in [Sect. 7.3.3](#), of [Chap. 7](#) one of the Type Dynamics rules always determines the auxiliary attitude so that a *TD* type has exactly two modes. The quantitative theory developed in [Chap. 5](#) will generate positive scores for as many as four modes. Even though some of these may not be significant, quantification can represent an expansion of the power of the questionnaire to identify the correct cognitive modes, often more than two.

2.4 Questionnaires

2.4.1 The Jungian Type Survey (Grey–Wheelwrights)

Jung’s qualitative ideas so far go a long way toward identifying a person’s dominant mode after observing only the three pairs *E–I*, *S–N* and *T–F* qualitatively. As an example, take Jung himself. His quiet, scholarly demeanor would read as *Introversion* and *Thinking*, while his powerful imagination would point to *iNtuition* as the dominant function. Putting them together would indicate

introverted intuition (Imagination) with *Thinking* auxiliary, the associated perception attitude being as yet unknown. No further information would appear to be needed for elementary psychoanalytic purposes.

Jung's followers soon sought to augment such clinical estimates with information obtained from a forced-choice questionnaire known as the Grey–Wheelwrights (*GW*) instrument (Wheelwright, Wheelwright and Buehler 1964). However, as foreshadowed in [Sect. 2.2.3](#), the *GW* lacked the second attitude needed for full precision, but the remaining three variable pairs *E–I*, *S–N* and *T–F* could at least give a good idea about the dominant and auxiliary modes in much less time than the consulting room sessions that otherwise would have been needed.

Example 1's scores—20% *E*, 100% *N*, 20% *T*—would have been interpreted by the *GW* as indicating *Extraverted iNtuition* with auxiliary *Thinking* of unknown attitude. Choosing *N* as dominant is based of course on its score (100%), much higher than that for the other function *T* (20%). This bit of mildly quantitative comparative reasoning, foreshadowing the major findings of this book, is completely absent from the analytic *TD* rationale of the famous *MBTI* questionnaire that followed the *GW* and eventually replaced it. Moreover, as would most Jungians of the day (Myers and Myers 1980, pp. 20–21), the Wheelwrights themselves would have assumed the auxiliary attitude to be the same as that of the dominant, i. e., *extraverted (Ej)* for Jung and *introverted (Ij)* for Example 1. Thus the *GW* would have seemed entirely sufficient to determine the dominant and auxiliary modes, attitudes and all. But this was not to be.

2.4.2 The Myers–Briggs Type Indicator (*MBTI*)

Briggs and Myers combined the missing second attitude *P–J* ([Sects. 2.2.3](#) and [2.4.3](#)) with *GW* style questions to develop the *MBTI*, on which Briggs' initial research slightly preceded even Jung's (*ibid*). Surprisingly perhaps, the new attitude doesn't by itself identify the auxiliary attitude as one might expect. This is because the traditional *MBTI* way of identifying the dominant and auxiliary modes involves only the four letter categories, not the response count data. For this reason the rules of what came to be known as Type Dynamics had to be introduced to produce definite conclusions.

The only *TD* rule relevant to the present discussion is “attitude balance”, which states that the dominant and auxiliary attitudes must be opposite. In the examples this characterizes the auxiliary thinking modes as *extraverted* for Jung and *introverted* for Example 1. [Chapter 4](#) will show how to resolve this by finding the *Ej–Ij* score as a combination of the *P–J* and *E–I* quantitative scores. Acknowledging the exceptions noted by the Jungians, even Myers and Myers point out (*ibid*) that attitude balance is not a hard and fast universal rule anyway. For *M* and *M* it seems to have been more a suggestion for “type development”, a topic beyond the scope of this book. [Sections 7.3.3](#) and [7.3.4](#) of [Chap. 7](#) will further examine the logic of the rule and its alleged provenance from Jung himself, here respectfully disputed.

2.4.3 Briggs' *P–J Attitude*

So far the exposition has concerned only what the new and undefined *P–J* attitude pair *does* rather than what it *is*. Recall that to avoid the categorical error of naming these attitudes after the already named “perception” and “judgment” situations, they will be designated here only by the letters “*P*” and “*J*”, pronounced “*pea*” and “*jay*” respectively whenever they need to be referenced verbally (Sect. 7.3 of Chap. 7).

The *P* attitude, here given the more descriptive keyword “flexibility”, involves, in the words of *M and M*, pp. 71–72: spontaneity, open-mindedness, understanding, tolerance, curiosity, zest for experience and adaptability. Its opposite attitude *J*, with keyword “structure”, involves (ibid, pp. 70–71): system, order, planning, sustained effort, decisiveness, authority, opinion and routine.

To understand this second pair of “psychological attitudes”, you may wish to examine (or even answer) the following five questions from the teamology questionnaire.

<i>PJ1</i>	You are more:	(<i>p</i>) casual	(<i>j</i>) systematic
<i>PJ2</i>	You prefer activities to be:	(<i>p</i>) open-ended	(<i>j</i>) planned
<i>PJ3</i>	You work better:	(<i>p</i>) with pressure	(<i>j</i>) without pressure
<i>PJ4</i>	You prefer:	(<i>p</i>) variety	(<i>j</i>) routine
<i>PJ5</i>	You are more:	(<i>p</i>) improvisational	(<i>j</i>) methodical

With some embarrassment, the author must call attention to item *PJ3*, which was inadvertently reversed in the Teamology Questionnaire on p. 20 of (Wilde 2009). Teamologists, take note—this error can throw the final modes scores 10% off!

To continue Example 1, four (*p*)s and one (*j*) score as 60% *P*, indicating a “flexible” preference. You can decide if this flexibility suggests an auxiliary *extraverted* judgment attitude as it would to the Wheelwrights, or an auxiliary *introverted* judgment attitude in accord with the *TD* attitude balance rule. The corresponding auxiliary judgment modes are respectively *Te* Organization and *Ti* Analysis.

Later experience (Myers et al. 1998) has established the correspondences shown in Table 2.2 between the cognitive modes and the personality variables. Notice that *P* occurs just as often in (introverted) judgment modes as in (extraverted) perception modes, and *J* occurs as often in (introverted) perception modes as in (extraverted) judgment modes. This would produce total confusion if *Pea* and *Jay* carried the names originally, and innocently, awarded them by Briggs and Myers. Section 4.3.4 of Chap. 4 will develop a clearer interpretation of *P–J* as distributing extraversion energy between the two domains.

Table 2.2 Cognitive modes with functions, attitudes and *teamology* keywords Briggs attitudes *P–J* in **boldface**

Perception modes		Judgment modes	
<i>Extraverted sensing</i> Se: E, S, P Experiment	<i>Extraverted iNtuition</i> Ne: E, N, P Ideation	– <i>Extraverted thinking</i> Te: E, T, J Organization	<i>Extraverted feeling</i> Fe: E, F, J Community
<i>Introverted sensing</i> Si: I, S, J Knowledge	<i>Introverted iNtuition</i> Ni: I, N, J Imagination	– <i>Introverted thinking</i> Ti: I, T, P Analysis	<i>Introverted feeling</i> Fi: I, F, P Evaluation

Table 2.3 *MBTI* types and assumed cognitive modes

<i>ISTJ</i> Si, Te	<i>ISFJ</i> Si, Fe	<i>INFJ</i> Ni, Fe	<i>INTJ</i> Ni, Te
<i>ISTP</i> Ti, Se	<i>ISFP</i> Fi, Se	<i>INFP</i> Fi, Ne	<i>INTP</i> Ti, Ne
<i>ESTP</i> Se, Ti	<i>ESFP</i> Se, Fi	<i>ENFP</i> Ne, Fi	<i>ENTP</i> Ne, Ti
<i>ESTJ</i> Te, Si	<i>ESFJ</i> Fe, Si	<i>ENFJ</i> Fe, Ni	<i>ENTJ</i> Te, Ni

2.4.4 The Type Table

Although the new attitude *P–J* ultimately will bring much to the quantitative analysis of personality, Myers' really brilliant contribution to personology was her inspiration to write simple type descriptions using both dominant and auxiliary modes associated with the $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 = 16$ four-letter types, henceforth known as the *MB* types. Table 2.3 shows these types together with the dominant and auxiliary cognitive modes associated with them according to the *TD* attitude balance rule.

Each type description had a few words describing the two modes, mostly about the dominant mode. For example, the *ENTP* description corresponding to Example 1's *ENTP* type reads (Myers et al. 1989, p. 21):

ENTP: Quick, ingenious, good at many things. Stimulating company, alert and outspoken. May argue for fun on either side of a question. Resourceful in solving new and challenging problems. But may neglect routine assignments. Able to form one new interest after another. Skillful at finding logical reasons for what they want.

Here the dominant *Extraverted iNtuition* *N*emode contributes the words in **boldface**, the other words coming from the auxiliary mode *Introverted Thinking* *Ti*.

The Myers–Briggs Type Table has the same type arrangement as Table 2.3, with type descriptions instead of cognitive modes. With its elegant simplicity, the easy-to-understand Type Table accounts for much of the runaway popularity of the *MBTI*. At the time it was not realized that there were 16 more types unaccounted for and that many people have preferences and skills related to more than two modes. In a sense, the *MBTI* was running at half speed, as will be demonstrated especially in Chap. 4.

Unintentionally perhaps, the Type Table encouraged the notion that there is little variation in personality among people in the same type category. Counterexamples to this plausible but oversimplified idea abound in the rest of the book.

2.4.5 Other Questionnaires

Several other questionnaires covering the same ground have since appeared. Keirsey and Bates (1978) brought out their “Temperament Sorter” with its ten *E-I* and twenty *S-N*, *T-F* and *P-J* items—70 in all. Their response results can be put on a quantitative basis comparable with the 30-item *MBTI* by using the factor $100\%/10 = 10\%$ for *E-I* and $100\%/20 = 5\%$ for the other three.

With their Steps II and III factor analysis statistical deconstruction of the original *MBTI* instrument, Quenk, Hammer and Majors (2001, 2008) have added items intended to equalize coverage of the four variables. Their quantification factor would be $100\%/5 \times 5 = 4\%$ per item. The Teamology questionnaire used in this section was originally developed for constructing and organizing student design teams, using the twenty Step II “facets”.

2.5 Concluding Summary

This chapter has laid out an informal and incomplete history of what might be called the “qualitative era” of Jungian typology. Its intention was to seek out weak spots capable of being strengthened by the quantitative analysis presented in the rest of the book.

Starting with Jung’s publication of his *Personality Theory*, contemporary with Briggs’ early work with the *P-J* attitude, the chapter sought first to construct an axiomatic basis for the theory. Two postulates seemed complete enough, but the third exposed oversights in the definition and naming of essential attitude variables. But even with one variable unclear, Jung’s original theory was shown sufficient for casual estimation of the dominant mode, and, surprisingly, Briggs’ supplying of the missing *P-J* attitude did not by itself identify the auxiliary attitude definitely. To do the job, an arbitrary “attitude balance” rule had to be employed. The rule conveniently reduced the number of possible two-mode personality types from 32 down to the manageable sixteen of the famous Type Table.

Even more than the introduction of the four-variable *MBTI*, Myers’ simple and well-written Type Table drew international attention to the new qualitative personology. The next chapter sets the stage for its quantitative extension doubling the descriptive power, not only of Jung’s underlying personality theory, but also of the *MBTI* instrument itself.

2.6 Chapter 2 Exercises

- 2-1 This chapter's exercises concentrate on your results on the teamology questionnaire. First, express them as percentages in the *MBTI* order *E-I*, *S-N*, *T-F*, *P-J*.
- 2-2 What would the *GW* instrument predict as your dominant cognitive mode?
- 2-3 How would Jung write your type in terms of dominant and auxiliary?
- 2-4 What would the *GW* instrument predict as your auxiliary function?
- 2-5 What would Grey and the Wheelwrights predict as your auxiliary attitude?
- 2-6 What would Myers and Briggs predict as your auxiliary attitude?
- 2-7 Is your pair of cognitive modes in the Type Table [2.3](#)?
- 2-8 What, if any, *MBTI* 4-letter type would your cognitive modes generate?

Jung's Personality Theory Quantified

Wilde, D.J.

2011, XV, 116 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-0-85729-099-1