

Developing Type: A history from Jung to today

Type measurement methods used today are based on the work of C.G.Jung, who commenced developing his theory of psychological types a century ago. He commenced with extraversion–introversion, and over time added the mental activities or functions of sensation, intuition, thinking and feeling. None of these terms were original; Jung provided his own definitions and distinctions. People responded to Jung's ideas from the very start, before the introduction of functions, and placed their own perspective on his work.

This presentation takes a broad but in depth brush to the history of various interpretations and methods associated with Jung's typology up to the present day, commencing with Jung's construction and early use of his type categories, a period of two to three decades. It includes interpretations and explanations of his work by others, whether in general texts and seminars in disparate fields including society, medicine and art.

Measurement (Gray and Wheelwright; Isabel Myers and Katharine Briggs) as a particular cultural and methodological approach to Jung's typology will also be examined. This will include the development a particular language of type from measurement results and associated texts, but also the products and orientation of instrument use and the drift to the use of the term personality type.

Influences from within and without the Jungian field will also be discussed, notably David Keirsey's temperaments (associated with Isabel Myers, but not Jung) and John Beebe's archetypal approach.

It is intended as a brief contribution to the current challenges to the plausibility of type dynamics and development.

Peter Geyer

www.petergeyer.com.au

*Sometimes I get the notion that writers on types
will incline to make distinctions
according to their likes and dislikes*

A.A.Roback (1927)

Constructing a history of psychological type is somewhat like archaeology: you dig up what you can and interpret what you have based on your understanding of the times, the people in it and what was important to them, not what may be important now to anyone. In history, everyone is of their time: Newton the alchemist, rather than a founder of modern science and empirical method.

When Katharine Briggs read C.G. Jung's *Psychological Types* in 1923, she was 48 years old, but had only been eligible to vote in federal US elections since 1920. In her country, more people lived outside towns and cities than in them. Isabel Myers' quotation from Romans for *Gifts Differing* said more about her education and culture than any particular religious belief she may have held.

Those people now credited with pioneering what we now know as psychology and psychoanalysis were classically educated. C.G.Jung's *Red Book* is unreadable without knowledge of classical history, ideas and religion, familiarity with Biblical texts, and the world of early Christianity. The content of this text, of course, tells you about the language of Jung's psyche, as well as his culture and time.

Mostly men, but including more women than currently recognised, they more often, like Jung, came from a medical background and were scientifically inclined from a methodological point of view. For each culture, this had its own meaning: the central European scientific empiricism of Jung differed widely from how it was understood in the United States.

This group would also have been familiar with the four classical humours, moods or temperaments attributed to Hippocrates and Galen and, from literature and other sources, several other ideas about different types of human beings. Jung works his way through some of these in *Psychological Types*. One of his presumptions in doing so is that his readership would have familiarity with what he is writing about and can also appreciate his research methodology, notwithstanding it lacking a laboratory approach to personality.

This general knowledge and cultural appreciation is much less the case today when a copy of *Psychological Types* is picked up by a professional, or a citizen. At the same time we can examine Jung's ideas from our contemporary knowledge and understanding of his psychological types and current science and so gain particular insights not apparent at the time of writing. It's generally agreed, though that this seminal text is not an easy read at any time.

Jung wrote that a stimulus for his typology was to understand the psychologies (i.e. ideas), of Freud and Adler, two of his contemporary rivals, not their types, although he did state, in his allusive way, that Freud's type preferences were probably the opposite of the direction of his ideas, without elaborating on the consequences of such a claim for evaluating the worth of Freud's work.

The post-Jungian James Hillman, following on this line, has argued that Jung's typology should only be about ideas, as he intended, and not about people, as the egalitarian nature of identifying people as types detracts from their uniqueness (1980).

This is curious, given that the literature on psychological types, from Jung's own writings onwards, emphasises types of people, occasionally organisations or cultures. Hillman's view, though, does illustrate the difference between a stimulus and an outcome as well as what happens when an idea comes out into the public domain and people appropriate it for their own reasons.

Jung's interest in types of some sort is evident in his earliest work, on the association experiments and on the unconscious, before his introduction of extraverted and introverted types in 1913, more or less extraverted feeling and introverted thinking in his later formulation, first presented in 1921, with extraversion and introversion being attitudes or orientations and thinking, feeling, sensation and intuition mental functions or activities.

This was the outcome of clinical work, personal experience and many discussions and arguments about the nature and operation of the types and which functions or mental activities are most relevant in what is a psychology of consciousness, archetypes being associated with the unconscious

What did people do with this; what did they think about it?

It wasn't as though Jung was on his own with a typological schema. Roback, in his sardonic way, provides a bulky compendium of the number of ideas about character and temperament extant around the time of *Psychological Types*. Many of these, like those of Kretschmer and Spranger, were physiologically oriented typologies, much like the classical descriptions. These constitutional and organismic perspectives were quite different from Jung's in focus.

June Downey thought that there were similarities between Jung's extraversion and introversion and "the older distinction between motor and sensory types", noted that Jung called these two types "mechanisms" rather than "characters" and preferred to see his types as "descriptive tools, classificatory in function" (1924). Beatrice Hinkle, a translator and associate of Jung, considered 6 types were adequate – three aspects of extraversion and introversion (1923). Journal reviewers Culler and Malamud took different views, the former seeking more experimental/empirical evidence.

Katharine Briggs discarded her own typology work, begun in 1917, and a consequence of meeting her future son-in-law, on reading *Psychological Types* in 1923. She had two magazine articles on type published later in the 1920s, whilst her daughter, Isabel Myers, wrote and published murder mysteries and plays with a typological backdrop, until the onset of Depression times.

Jung elaborated on his typology as part of various seminars and presentations throughout the 1920s and 1930s, predominantly given in English, in which he was fluent.

In approaching the dynamic nature of the types, he stated:

- that the dominant or superior function was conscious and the others unconscious
- that the direction of the unconscious functions was the opposite of the superior function, and
- that these functions were either –
 - all inferior,
 - one inferior and the other two auxiliaries,
 - or that there was one auxiliary and two inferior functions.

In this period, Joan Corrie presented a brief "ABC" of his typology, the poet James Oppenheim wrote somewhat racy about American Types. The Society for Adult Education in Chicago offered study on Jung's ideas, including his typology. Joan Evans interpreted the artistic world with quick and slow extraverts and introverts, the speed having to do, more or less, with thinking or feeling. Another view suggested that the rational judging types were evolutionarily superior to the irrational perceiving types.

J.H. van der Hoop bookended this period with two books interpreting his understanding and use of the psychology of Freud and Jung. His *Conscious Orientation* (1939) became a text for the work of Isabel Myers and Katharine Briggs in developing a type questionnaire, later the MBTI, which they started in 1942. It's unclear what texts and articles were read by the developers of the MBTI at this time

Prior to this time, the only constructs of Jung's that had attempts made at measurement were extraversion and introversion, and much energy was expended on this activity. Sometimes the term *extroversion* was used, a term disliked by Jung, which came into use in journals and translations accidentally i.e. typographically, or because of a different view of grammar. Some researchers preferred William McDougall's interpretation of introversion and extraversion, perhaps as it fitted more easily into contemporary perspectives.

1942 also saw the independent development of the *Gray–Wheelwright Jungian Type Survey* at Stanford University. The Gray–Wheelwright differed from the MBTI in that it had three scales, one each for the attitudes and the two sets of functions, whereas Myers and Briggs constructed a fourth scale to deal with the problem of identifying the auxiliary function. It's instructive to read the different items, with different intentions. The MBTI also had rules for determining type dynamics, whereas the Gray–Wheelwright identified the superior function by the highest score. It's no accident that these attempts at measuring Jung's typology came from the empirically pragmatic USA society.

In addition to measurement, a general text on Jung's psychology appeared at this time, written by Jolan Jacobi, Herbert Read, a translator of Jung, as well as a poet and art critic presented the eight functional types as ways of understanding approaches to art. A book by Virginia Case on type appeared in New York in 1941.

Perhaps the most significant development in the decades immediately following was the Isabel Myers introduction of MBTI items aimed at ascertaining impediments to type development, although the theoretical basis for this development is unclear. It's been suggested that these ideas are implicit in Jung's seminal text.

These items and structure were available in Form C in the 1940s, whilst Form F, available from 1958 as a research instrument with 4 or more additional scales and subscales, now available as a particular interpretation as MBTI Step III. Otto Kroeger also had his own version of this kind of item interpretation using Form G. Isabel Myers' collaboration with Mary McCaulley was centrally about using these insights to help in counselling.

At a later time, the Jungians Mary Loomis and June Singer produced their own inventory, utilising scenarios and eschewing the forced choice of other type instruments as part of their argument that an auxiliary function could be any of the other functions, including the opposite to the dominant.

In some respects, the development of questionnaires changed the approach to ideas about psychological type. Many find it difficult to detach measurement from the theory itself, expecting to find type dynamics and development in questionnaires not constructed for such an interpretation.

Apart from those who used the Gray–Wheelwright in Jungian circles, the MBTI configuration became the default general language for discussing constructs, even those, like David Keirsey, whose approach to personality was non-Jungian and non-measurement oriented, notwithstanding his own quick development of a questionnaire to get his book *Please Understand Me* published.

Keirsey's involvement also helped direct general terminology towards *personality type* rather than psychological type, notwithstanding Jung's much wider view of what personality (essentially for him a *calling*) entailed. Over time, some of Keirsey's followers amalgamated his constitutional perspective with a particular understanding of type dynamics and development.

Isabel Myers essentially followed Jung's perspective on type dynamics, considering the dominant to be in one direction i.e. extraverted or introverted, with the other preferences being in the other direction, differing from him in settling on one explanation of the auxiliary. At one stage, two inferiors are implied in her work, although it's clear she was more interested in the conscious than the unconscious. The MBTI manuals present Jung's original general formulation.

General type publications, the majority not research oriented, have presented explanations and case studies as examples of this particular formulation; in recent times there has been a growing emphasis on a different view of the interaction of type functions.

An alternate view of the direction of type preferences, together with a rudimentary type development came with Harold Grant in *Image to Likeness*, a perspective initially not well received and presented without rationale or published research, although it seems now the default position. Grant thought that the tertiary preference (a newish term; perhaps a consequence of measurement setting out an order of preferences and displacing the notion of a second auxiliary or inferior) was in the same direction as the dominant function. A co-worker, Eleanor Barberousse, has identified the alternation of function orientation as being due to a particular understanding of what was meant by “balance”

Although it might seem counter-intuitive to classical Jungians, this was also the perspective of the Jungian analyst John Beebe, who developed an eight function model out of his own personal and clinical experience, also attaching specific archetypes to each of these 8 functions e.g. the dominant function is always associated with the hero archetype. In this way, aspects of the conscious and unconscious were brought together in a single model. Gary and Margaret Hartzler have developed a questionnaire (FASDI) which aims to identify the use of these functions as skills.

Another Jungian analyst, John Giannini, prefers to see the functions as archetypes in themselves, which seems similar to Diane Martin, who has observed that you can be “high or low” in the same function. Given that each psyche is different, and the unconscious is the focus of these ideas, one should expect a variety of perspectives and approaches to knowledge.

The functions have also been presented as aspects of brain activity, initially from the work of James Newman, who ascribed functions to a left-right brain format, then Walter Lowen, whose systems engineering approach explains the 16 different types, but with different auxiliary functions. Lenore Thomson’s general text *Personality Types*, also used a left brain-right brain distinction.

Against all this is the caveat by Angelo Spoto that perhaps more order is sought in these formulations than might seem reasonable, or appropriate, at least to his understanding of C.G. Jung.

There’s also the various ideas and formulations that can be accessed on the internet, and in journal articles that assert their flexibility by sketchy research about what C.G. Jung actually said about psychological type. Sometimes this is conflating the feeling function with emotion, or seeing it as not rational, leaving that to thinking. Other times measurement is taken too seriously, looking at outcomes of variables rather than the person. Or whether questionnaires adhere to Jung’s ideas, although he thought that measurement tended to focus on the average, or general, which didn’t really address the unique individual.

This paper has sought to broadly sketch the travelling of an idea through time and to provide insight and context for those who interpret and use that idea in the present time.

SOME KEY EVENTS AND PUBLICATIONS

1913	Munich Psychological Congress C.G.Jung speaks on a psychological typology, using and defining the terms <i>extraversion</i> and <i>introversion</i> .	
1914	Alexander F. Shand <i>The Foundations of Character</i>	
1917	Katharine Cook Briggs begins her research into personality. An outcome is 4 types: <i>Social; Thoughtful; Executive; Spontaneous</i> .	
1921	C.G. Jung's <i>Psychologische Typen</i> (Psychological Types)	
1923	<i>Psychological Types</i> published in English translation Beatrice M. Hinkle <i>The Re-Creating of the Individual</i> J.H. van der Hoop <i>Character and the Unconscious</i> Katharine Briggs reads Jung’s <i>Psychological Types</i>	
1925	C.G.Jung’s Seminar on <i>Analytical Psychology</i> [publ.1989] Ernst Kretschmer <i>Physique and Character</i>	
1926	Katharine Briggs <i>Meet Yourself: The Personality Paint Box</i>	<u>New Republic</u>

- 1927 Joan Corrie *ABC of Jung's Psychology*
A.A. Roback *The Psychology of Character*
- 1928 C.G. Jung's Seminar on *Dream Analysis* commences (1928–1930) [publ. 1984]
Katharine Briggs *Up from Barbarism* New Republic
Eduard Spranger *Types of Men*
- 1929 Isabel Briggs Myers *Murder Yet to Come*
- 1931 Grace Adams *Psychology: Science or Superstition*
James Oppenheim *American Types*
- 1933 Roy M. Dorcus *Jung's System of Psychoanalysis Assignment 33 Psychology and Life*
Society for Adult Education Chicago
- 1934 C.G. Jung's Seminar on *Nietzsche's Zarathustra* commences (1934–1939) [publ. 1989]
- 1939 Joan Evans *Taste and Temperament*
J.H. van der Hoop *Conscious Orientation*
- 1941 Virginia Case *Personality*
- 1942 Isabel Briggs Myers and Katharine Cook Briggs commence *Briggs Myers Type Indicator* (later *Myers–Briggs Type Indicator*); copyrighted 1943.
Horace Gray and James Wheelwright *The Jungian Type Survey*
Jolan Jacobi *The Psychology of C.G.Jung*
Herbert Read *Education through Art*
William Sheldon *The Varieties of Temperament*
- 1949 Arthur Laney First thesis using the Briggs-Myers Type Indicator (Laney, 1949).
- 1958 MBTI Form F published.
- 1962 ETS publishes Myers' MBTI Manual for Form F
- 1963 C.G.Jung/Aniela Jaffe *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*
- 1969 Beginning of collaboration between Isabel Myers and Mary McCaulley
- 1971 Marie–Louise von Franz/James Hillman *Jung's Typology*
- 1978 David Keirsey and Marilyn Bates *Please Understand Me*
Research in Psychological Type, later *Journal of Psychological Type* (JPT)
- 1980 James Hillman [1976] *Egalitarian Typologies versus the Perception of the Unique*
Isabel Briggs Myers *Gifts Differing*
- 1982 Walter Lowen *Dichotomies of the Mind*
- 1985 Revised *MBTI Manual* (Second Edition)
Type booklets and general texts from the MBTI publisher, CPP
- 1987 Diane Martin *Jung's Typology and the Cultural Ideal of the Civilized Person*
- 1991 Frances Wright Saunders *Katharine and Isabel*
- 1993 Marie–Louise von Franz *Psychotherapy*
- 1996 Anne Singer Harris *Living with Paradox*
- 1998 David Keirsey *Please Understand Me II*
MBTI Manual (3rd. Edition)
- 2001 Revised MBTI Step II published (Form Q) with Manual.
- 2003 Deirdre Bair *Jung: A Biography*
- 2007 Walter Lowen w. Lawrence Milke *Personality Types: A Systems Science Explanation*
- 2009 MBTI Step III Manual

SOME REFERENCES

- Briggs, Katharine C. (1926) *Meet Yourself: Using the Personality Paint Box* New Republic
(1928) *Up From Barbarism* New Republic
- Case, Virginia (1941) *Your Personality – Introvert or Extravert* Macmillan
- Culler, Elmer (1927) *Book Reviews: Psychological Types, or the Psychology of Individuation by C.G.Jung* The American Journal of Psychology VolXXXVIII October 1927 pp651-654
- Downey, June E. (1924) *Jung's Psychological Types and Will Temperament Patterns* The Journal of Abnormal Psychology and Social Psychology Vol XVIII Number 4 PP354–9
- Groesbeck, C.J. (1978) *Psychological Types in the analysis of the Transference* Journal of Analytical Psychology 23; pp23-53
- Hochheimer, Wolfgang (1969) *The Psychotherapy of C.G. Jung* C.G.Jung Foundation
- Jung, C.G. (1928/1971) *Psychological Types* Princeton
- Jung, C.G. (2009) *Liber Novus The Red Book* W.W. Norton 2009 Philemon Series ed. Sonu Shamdasani
- Kluver, Heinrich (1931) *Do Personality Types exist?* American Journal of Psychiatry Vol 87 pp781-788
- Loomis, Mary and Singer, June (1980) *Testing the bipolar assumption in Jung's Typology* Journal of Analytical Psychology 25; 351-356
- Malamud, William (1924) *Review: Psychological Types, or the Psychology of Individuation by C.G.Jung* The Journal of Abnormal Psychology and Social Psychology Vol XVIII pp167–180
- Meier, C.A. and Wozny, M.A. (1978) *An Empirical Study of Jungian Typology* Journal of Analytical Psychology 23; pp226-230
- Quenk, N.L. (1979) *On Empirical Studies of Jungian Typology* Journal of Analytical Psychology 24; 219-255
- Quenk, N.L. (1987) *The tertiary function* Gainesville Fl. Audiotape
- Richek, Herbert G. and Bown, O.H. (1968) "Phenomenological correlates of Jung's typology" Journal of Analytical Psychology 13 pp57-65
- Richek, Herbert G., van Rhodes, J (1980) *A note on Empirical Adjustment and Jung's Typology* Journal of Analytical Psychology 25 pp357-
- Wheelwright, Joseph (1973) *Psychological Types* Jung Institute of San Francisco
- Witzig, James S. (1978) *Jung's Typology and the classification of the Psychotherapies* Journal of Analytical Psychology 23: pp315-331