

Developing Models and Beliefs: Reviewing Grant, Thompson & Clarke's *Image to Likeness* after 20 years of life and type.

Part II: Type Dynamics and Development

Peter Geyer

If I prophesy an avalanche, would you wait, and call my bluff?..... Peter Hammill
1973

In the least developed adults, all four processes remain childish, so that nothing can be maturely perceived or maturely judged. Even in effective adults, the two least-used processes remain relatively childish, and the effectiveness lies in the two processes which have grown skilled from being preferred and exercised Isabel Briggs Myers 1970

No-one has to be good at everything Isabel Briggs Myers 1980

Ten years ago, I ... might have given the impression that type development runs on a time table and must be achieved by a particular age or not at all. I do not think now that this is true Isabel Briggs Myers 1980

It all fits together I suppose somehow, but there are some things you just can't explain Dion 1972

In the previous issue of the *Review*^{*}, I commenced an analysis of Grant, Thompson and Clarke's *Image to Likeness* (1983) from the perspective of religion, one of its two purposes, the other being type dynamics and development. It was for the latter purpose that I ventured into an Elizabeth Street, Melbourne, religious bookshop, not for personal enlightenment or spiritual direction, however much it might have been needed.

In this second part of my analysis of *Image to Likeness*, I'll be looking at and evaluating its claims about type dynamics and development. Firstly, though, there's some background to cover.

The Rise of Type Dynamics and Development

Type dynamics can be briefly defined as the interaction of type preferences in a systematic, but linear form, according to a person's type code, from most preferred to

^{*} Please note that in that article, *extraverted thinking* should be substituted for *extraverted feeling* in the last paragraph on page 54.

least preferred. The direction of these preferences, either extraverted or introverted, depends firstly on a person's preferred orientation from which a formula follows. Type development refers to when and how these interactions come into an individual's conscious and so begin to become intentionally used, however well, or badly, at the start. The process itself presumes a potential for life-long psychological development for all humans. Both these processes are considered the core of C.G. Jung's theory of psychological types.

When I was first accredited, in the late 1980s, type dynamics and development seemed to be something you had to be aware of, but not necessarily know much about. Certainly you would be wary about mentioning it to workshop participants. In fact, it was generally specifically advised against, as far as I could discover, and that position wasn't restricted to my personal experience of accreditation. This situation seemed to apply here and in the United States, if my memory of statements made by a visiting expert in the early 1990s is correct.

It's different now, of course. It's been ethically mandatory for some years to say something about type dynamics and development when giving feedback to individuals and groups who have taken the MBTI. Type *dimensions* are also now *dichotomies*, a more technically correct term, and one used by Isabel Myers, although the former can still be found, somewhat confusingly, in Form K Expanded Interpretive Reports (they date from 1996), as well as relatively recent psychometric material produced by Oxford Psychologists Press in the UK.

But in 1993, when ACER asked me to redevelop and present their MBTI Accreditation course, type dynamics and development became naturally very important to me, even though I hadn't used it much, other than sporadically in teams, using Sandra Hirsh's recently produced material (1993). Glenda Hutchinson, my initial collaborator in this enterprise, was MBTI accredited by a different person and course, but was in the same boat. So we worked particularly hard at this part of the course, as we wanted to do the best we could.

At that time, one of the dilemmas in teaching this topic was that there were two different versions of type dynamics. The first one, Isabel Myers' version, was inferred from Jung and so it had all the other functions in the opposite attitude to the dominant. Harold Grant's version had the dominant and tertiary in the same attitude. The MBTI *Manual* available at that time (1985) presented Isabel's version and footnoted Grant's.

I discovered later, through various conversations, that Grant apparently claimed his position to have come from Myers herself, which is interesting given the paucity of her written work on the subject. From my reading and research, she seemed more interested in dominant and auxiliary than anything else, rather than the predominantly unconscious functions. This she called *shadow*, not making a connection between that term and the Jungian archetype. Her apparent later acceptance of or agreement with Grant's position just before her death, has been attested to by Kathy Myers, and I believe it should be taken in the context of her lack of interest in "the dark side", as her son Peter has recently put it (2001).

Today, the choice of directions is still offered in the current MBTI *Manual* (1998). The philosophical disagreement still remains, although support for Grant's version has grown exponentially, particularly through the aegis of Gary and Margaret Hartzler and complemented by the work of the Jungian analyst John Beebe. This activity has led to an extremely influential 8 Functions group or school of thought within the Type community. From what I can ascertain, it started from Harold Grant and his model represented in *Image to Likeness*.

Psychological Type theory and *Image to Likeness*

In the first part of this book, the authors set out four models, which they are going to use. The second and third are Jung's "personality types" and a "developmental typology...of four successive stages of development between the ages of six and fifty." The latter model, they acknowledge as being less connected to the Jungian tradition, thus inferring some originality and use of other ideas as well as it being an outcome of experiential research i.e. workshops and retreats they have conducted.

The "personality type" descriptions are brief and enclosed with religious language. The preferences are "endowments", for instance. There's no doubt here that they are gifts from God.

There's also no doubt from the text that the preferences are simply that, nothing else. This means that necessary complexities and difficulties associated with their use are also put aside, other than in the context of spiritual orientation. Perhaps this sort of idea is also the origin of the use of the term "fourth function", rather than the more accurate and realistic "inferior function". At any rate, this has consequences for the developmental model, which we'll look at shortly.

J–P is described in a unique way as Receptive–Responsive. P is described as more "contemplative", J more "shaping", something I would have thought was more an E–I comparison, but perhaps that's part of the authors' experience. I can see "shaping" as having something to do with the outer world, but "contemplative" implies introversion. Perhaps "observing" is meant, which would seem to imply introverts with P more than the extraverts.

Curiously, Judging and Perceiving are also described as "generic functions". No explanation is given as to the use of the term "functions" for something conventionally described as an Attitude, or orientation. I couldn't find words that would explain J–P as relating to the function used in the outer world, which is the conventional point of view, but perhaps that's what is meant.

The "developmental typology" is, as I said earlier, what this book has become known for in the type community, with developmental descriptions of each type provided in an Appendix. The contents of this Appendix have become very influential over time. They seemed to do the rounds in this country for a while, quite often as photocopies, without the book itself. Largely, I think, this was in the absence of other material on type dynamics and development at that time. Now you can buy a standard booklet, or standalone texts, even training exercises.

The Appendix provides 4 developmental periods outlined for each of the functions (Dominant, Auxiliary, Tertiary, Inferior) as ages 6-12; 12-20; 20-35; 35-50. The book itself indicates that these ages are liminal points (the term isn't used) for phases or stages of development. The stages are adapted as taken from "pastoral tradition", but perhaps also classical philosophy and Piaget are in there as well.

The body of the text explains the stages as a series of "gear shifts", smooth or otherwise depending on how familiar you are with the vehicle and how you drive, I suppose. These shifts also alternate the extraverted and introverted attitudes, which has a cog-like feel to it. So you get in the text something like ESTJ=TSNF/EIEI and INFP=FNST/IEIE, identifying the order of preferences and then their orientation. Today, this has been replaced by, for example, Te;Si;Ne;Fi for ESTJ, and so on.

The model has some curiosities, from the certainty of its language (I understand from private sources that Grant took the ages/stages literally, at least in the beginning) to its ending at 50 years of age. In another tradition this might be represented as enlightenment/nirvana, and here the overall spiritual purpose of the book is relevant, given the framework is there "in order to become whole", and it doesn't say "whole in the context of your type".

Indeed, the book doesn't seem to take the view that development is in the context of the dominant. "Preference" here, as mentioned earlier, seems ungrounded as a construct, simply meaning something you pick up as a skill over time, until you're able to engage the preference at will, and presumably in any/the appropriate situation.

Whilst well-meaning, I think this is a misleading presumption. People can deceive themselves as to what type development might be if they take this perspective, or lose themselves in the process. After all, the flipping from one preference to its opposite can be an instance of lack of differentiation, rather than development.

There are also innumerable skills and activities that can be associated with a preference, taking into account here that type isn't necessarily just behaviour, but more the reasons for a behaviour. Attending to facts as a Sensing person (dominant or auxiliary) might not mean wanting to express that in the garden, for instance, or tinkering with machinery. Inferior feeling could be expressed positively in musicianship, or letter writing, or simply a smile rather than a critique.

The stages themselves also call for examination. Whether intended or not, they presume a literality that's at odds with contemporary early childhood development (e.g. Gopnik et al. 2001). Also, whilst puberty is excellent as a proposed liminal point (the basis for the selection of 12 years as a place for "shifting gears"), not enough is known about adolescence and processes like type to say that this is consistently or generally the case. The Jungian-oriented Frankel (1999) for instance reports more confusion than anything else, and Strauch in a general text (2003) tends to emphasise chaos rather than control.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, it would certainly be valuable to examine as to whether children at risk or those diagnosed as ADHD and the like have developed an auxiliary judging function, for instance, or a dominant and auxiliary at all, amidst all the other issues.

Exact dates and times aren't needed for that sort of investigation. They may in fact prove a hindrance, as attending to milestones in such a literal way hasn't been good for either parents or their children. Such generalisations would seem to be in any case opposed to the general theory and approach of psychological types.

Jung wrote that "the developing personality...needs the motivating force of inner or outer fatalities" (1991) and so in the above cases it could be a change of school, change of environment, death of someone, reading a particular book and so on. So there may be too many exceptions to the rule.

Post Image to Likeness

By looking at Grant's model as described in this text, there's a risk of doing it some disservice, particularly as the religious context flavours the writing. It would have been an advantage, therefore, to be able to discuss Grant's ideas with him and see what his presumptions were.

In a public sense, that's been difficult, even in the United States, as he hasn't been a regular presenter at APT International Conferences and I understand has deliberately kept away from those occasions. His appearance at the Minneapolis Conference in 2001, was therefore a surprise. However, he spoke about his view of Katharine Briggs' work in a fairly genial evangelical way, and not of his framework.

It would seem in any case, that the running on his framework has been taken up by others, most particularly Margaret and Gary Hartzler and what might be called the 8 Functions group, which includes Linda Berens, Leona Haas, Dick Thompson and so on. These people have produced books and training materials and have been

predominantly associated at some stage with the Type Resources MBTI Qualifying Program in its various incarnations. In Australia, this is ITDs Accreditation course

Margaret Hartzler (1995) has urged that all MBTI feedback be given starting with an explanation of the functions and that people be introduced to the functions as separate entities at training courses under a general theme of conscious efforts at type development. Grant's model here seems to overlap with the framework proposed by the Jungian analyst John Beebe.

Gary Hartzler (1999) has also reported on research conducted at Type Resources' MBTI Qualifying Programs, where participants were asked to evaluate Grant's development model in the context of their own experience. The outcomes of this action research reportedly supported the model. Hartzler has acknowledged the limitations of choice in arriving at a research method. Additionally there are issues with the reliability of surveys conducted under conditions where the situation and knowledge base of the participants may militate against an objective response (Tourangeau et al

In Australia, Mary McGuinness' introductory type booklet (2004) also uses Grant's timeline categories, whilst Steve Myers' *MTRi* uses an 8-Function framework.

However, there's not universal support for Grant's view. From a religious perspective Peter Richardson counsels against literal acceptance of Grant's developmental model, or any other prescriptive ones for that matter (1994).

Grant is also not referenced in either *Introduction to Type or Introduction to Type Dynamics and Development*, where the differences between Jung's and Myers' view and that of Grant regarding direction of the Tertiary function are left open for choice and his development model is not spoken of at all. In *Beside Ourselves*, Naomi Quenk presents the notion of the Tertiary taking either direction, using Isabel Myers as support for her argument.

Eleanor Corlett and Nancy Millner in *Navigating Midlife* reference both Grant and Beebe as far as the direction of functions goes, but still gives a choice of direction and doesn't refer to the development model at all. Millner's *Creative Aging* does the same thing.

Elizabeth Murphy (1992) has presented an alternative to Grant's developmental model regarding children by suggesting that they may be undifferentiated for the first couple of years of life in which their potential type may be observed, as they haven't learned to behave or compromise their type. But they also seem to test out the functions in some order.

Evaluating Grant

What's intriguing about looking for reference clues for Harold Grant is that when his model is referenced, it's overwhelmingly as sole author of *Image to Likeness*, the others having disappeared somewhere into the mist. I got confused last year by someone mentioning Grant's book, and I thought he had written one other than his co-authorship here. However, I soon found out that this text was the one referred to. Dario Nardi, in a recent discussion on type theory has recently referred to Grant's "co-workers", presumably the other authors (Nardi et al 2004). There's not enough information available or provided in this text to work out how accurate a view this is with respect to co-workers on ideas about type.

So why have Grant's models had the success they have?

Firstly, I think it's because there was no competition other than frameworks by Jung and Myers that were more general and so less specific.

Secondly, Harold Grant's personal status as one of the earlier users of the MBTI is important in terms of influence. This might be largely irrelevant to us in Australia, except that the teachers of the MBTI here have always predominantly (now completely) used American courses as a means of Accreditation

Thirdly, both frameworks are amenable to a training environment where boundaries are tighter than in the world of counselling, for instance, where things are by necessity a little rubbery. The American tendency for quantification is relevant here, particularly as the model overlaps with a measuring tool in the MBTI (See Geyer 1995 for references).

Fourthly, a specific and influential group of actors picked it up and ran with it, doing their own work and encouraging like-minded people with sometimes overlapping ideas like Thompson and Beebe.

Fifthly, you only get accredited or qualified once, and most people use what they've been given, particularly if they're in a world of models like the organisational world. The most complex part of teaching type is the dynamic/development framework and it's not something that is picked up instantaneously. In general, it's not picked up much at all, in my experience and takes years to develop a personal understanding.

As with economic modelling, it's easy to miss Gregory Bateson's famous phrase (successfully co-opted by the NLP movement), that the map is not the territory.

For me one of the key reasons why the Grant models haven't reached universal use is the map/territory dichotomy i.e. both the dynamics and the development frameworks are too prescriptive, so not everyone can fit in. I don't experience my tertiary as introverted sensing, but as extraverted sensing, for instance, so I don't fit the model. I know I'm not the only one. That sort of result is due to life experience and is really no big deal except that it questions a framework that may be unnecessarily rigid, and so misleading.

My experience in teaching type over some years also indicates that type development (a natural process) as stages tend to cover different age groups to that suggested by Grant. Consequently, it's several years since I have referred to Grant's model directly in any of my courses. A tertiary function seems to become of some interest in the very late 20s/early 30s, for instance rather than at 20, whilst mid-life seems to be experienced by people more around 40 or so. 50 seems to be something else altogether. This experience is anecdotal rather than empirical in the literal sense, necessarily so, in my view, as it's individuals talking about their lives in guided discussion rather than attending to a given model.

Finally, there's the question as to whether appropriate research, particularly cross-disciplinary research has been attempted i.e. are the models under discussion compatible with other research into what is known about human beings?

This is an extremely important question for the validity of anything, but particularly in the field of personality where constructs are necessarily correlated. All too often, and one sees this in the Jungian as well as the type community, there's a sense of being right about what one is doing, as opposed to the desire to investigate this rightness and see whether it succeeds or fails. More descriptions of human activities in the context of these and other models aren't what I mean. Discussion in a recent *Bulletin of Psychological Type* (Nardi et al, 2004) indicates that we're a fair distance away from that, unfortunately.

And there may be key difficulties to address that can help or hinder. For instance, is our type, or type in general, related to every bit of communication we're involved in.

This is important because it's usually accepted that the communication function is the extraverted one of the dominant and auxiliary. But is it used all the time?

It's a question raised recently by Carol Schumate (2004) and it leads to the question as to whether we need to construct a type theory of language, amongst other things, to explain the chatterings of both those who are theoretically unconscious, or undifferentiated, and those who are not. There are some people who take delight in dissecting every bit of their own language in terms of Fe, Ni and so forth.

That seems to me to be taking some things too far and it's a distance from where Harold Grant started I suspect. Perhaps some intense research and thought is needed to work out the underlying principles behind the musings and models of type. There are lots of questions seeking answers or understanding. But that's something in the future, and another time, if not place.

SOME REFERENCES

Edwin Barker *Review of From Image to Likeness: A Jungian Path in the Gospel Journey* in MBTI News Vol. 8, No 2, Spring 1986. p28

Eleanor Corlett and Nancy Millner *Navigating Midlife: Using Typology as a guide*
CPP 1993

Dion DiMucci *It All Fits Together* (John Stuart Mitchell Universal/MCA Music/South Hand Music/County Line Music/Skinny Zach Music) from Dion: Sanctuary/Suite for Late Summer Ace CD CDCHD 792 2001 [1972]

Hal Edwards *Review of From Image to Likeness: A Jungian Path in the Gospel Journey* in MBTI News Vol. 8, No 2, Spring 1986. p31

Richard Frankel *The Adolescent Psyche: Jungian and Winnicottian perspectives*
Routledge 1999 [1998]

Peter Geyer *Quantifying Jung: The Origin and Development of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* MSc Thesis, University of Melbourne 1995

Alison Gopnik, Andrew Meltzoff and Patricia Kuhl *The Scientist in the Crib: what early learning tells us about the mind* Perennial 2001

W. Harold Grant, Magdala Thompson, Thomas E. Clarke: *Image to Likeness: A Jungian Path in the Gospel Journey* Paulist Press 1983

- Peter Hammill *Slender Threads* (Hammill Stratsong/Carlin Music) from Peter Hammill: Chameleon in the Shadow of the Night Virgin/Charisma CASCD1067 1989 [1973]
- Gary Hartzler *Reactions to Harold Grant's Type Development Descriptions: An Action Research Project* (presented in a Session entitled *Is the Tertiary Really in the Attitude of the Auxiliary?*) in Proceedings: APT XIII International Conference Scottsdale Az July 13–18 1999 pp299–303. APT 1999
- Gary J. Hartzler, Margaret T. Hartzler *The Eight Jungian Functions in Proceedings: APT XI International Conference* Kansas City Mo. USA July 11-16 1995 pp151-152
- Margaret Hartzler *Type Development: Conscious skills building of the Four Perceiving Functions* in Proceedings: APT XIII International Conference Scottsdale Az July 13–18 1999 pp37-40
- C.G.Jung *Psychological Types* (CW6) Princeton 1971
- C.G.Jung *The Development of Personality* (CW17) Princeton 1991
- Mary McGuiness *You've got Personality: An introduction to the Personality Types described by Carl Jung and Isabel Myers* MaryMacBooks 2004
- Nancy Millner *Creative Aging: Discovering the unexpected joys of later life through personality type* Davies-Black 1997
- Elizabeth Murphy *The Developing Child* Consulting Psychologists Press 1992
- Isabel Briggs Myers *Manual (1962): The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* Consulting Psychologists Press (und.)
- Isabel Briggs Myers *Introduction to Type* (Privately Published)1970
- Isabel Briggs Myers *Introduction to Type* CPP/ACER 1998/1999 Sixth Edition
- Isabel Briggs Myers *Consequences of Psychological Type* Copy # 10 (Privately Published)1970

- Isabel Briggs Myers with Peter Briggs Myers *Gifts Differing* Consulting Psychologists Press [1980]1985
- Isabel Briggs Myers and Mary H. McCaulley: *Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (Second Edition) Consulting Psychologists Press 1985
- Isabel Briggs Myers, Mary H. McCaulley, Naomi L. Quenk and Allen L. Hammer: *Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (Third Edition) Consulting Psychologists Press 1998
- Katharine D. Myers and Linda K Kirby *Introduction to Type Dynamics and Development: Exploring the next level of type* CPP 1994 Second Edition
- Peter Briggs Myers Comments made at PCW 16 *Otto Kroeger-The Power of the Unscored Items* at APT XV Minneapolis Mn June 27 2001 (author's notes)
- Steve Myers *Using the MTR-i Team Roles alongside the MBTI Instrument in Proceedings: APT XV International Conference Minneapolis Mn June 25-July 1 2001 pp169-182. APT 2001*
- Dario Nardi, Shirley Tilden and Sidney Craig Courtice *Type Development Discussion Forum* in Bulletin of Psychological Type Vol 27 No 3, Summer 2004 pp44-6
- Rog. O'Brien Review of *From Image to Likeness: A Jungian Path in the Gospel Journey* in MBTI News Vol. 8, No 2, Spring 1986. pp30-1
- Naomi Quenk *The Inferior Function and the Shadow in Jungian Psychology* in MBTI News Vol.4 No 2, 1982 p5
- Naomi Quenk *Beside Ourselves: Our Hidden Personality in Everyday Life* CPP 1993
- Peter Tufts Richardson *Four Spiritualities: Expressions of Self, Expressions of Spirit* Davies-Black 1996
- Susan Scanlan (ed.) The Type Reporter Vol.1 No 3., Winter 1985

- Carol Schumate *Varieties of verbal expression* in Bulletin of Psychological Type Vol 27 No 3, Summer 2004 pp35-6
- Barbara Strauch *Why are they so Weird? What's really going on in a teenager's brain* Bloomsbury 2003
- Henry L. Thompson *Jung's Function-Attitudes Explained* Wormhole 1996
- Roger Tourangeau, Lance J. Rips and Kenneth Rasinski: *The Psychology of Survey Response* Cambridge 2000

Peter Geyer has been studying type theory since first encountering it in 1988, whilst undertaking a Graduate Diploma in Organisation Behaviour. His MSc thesis *Quantifying Jung: The origin and Development of the Myers–Briggs Type Indicator* (1995) has been the catalyst for continuing research and writing on type and Emotion, Social Change, Grand Theory etc. His PhD studies involve investigating the theory behind the MBTI, its plausibility, and how that theory is interpreted by trained professionals. He prefers INTP, with extraverted sensing as a Tertiary function.