

Developing Models and Beliefs:

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

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

Peter Geyer

Part I: Type and Religion

*Crayon Angel songs are slightly out of tune
But I'm sure I'm not to blame
Nothin's happened, but I think it will soon
So I sit here waitin' for God
and a train
To the Astral plane.....*

*Phony prophets stole the only light I knew
And the darkness softly screamed
Holy visions disappeared from my view,
But the angels come back and laugh
in my dreams
I wonder what it meansJudee Sill
1969*

1. A book with a dual purpose

There weren't too many type-related books around in Melbourne in the late 1980s, so if you wanted to develop a library, there weren't many places to visit for a newly MBTI Accredited person. At that time, the only text on type development seemed to be Grant Thompson and Clarke's *Image to Likeness* (1983), which was a religious text I located in a Catholic Bookshop in Elizabeth Street, and never saw anywhere else for quite some time.

The information I was after was provided in an Appendix. I decided it was unnecessary for me to read the rest of the text, as my preferred religious literature was more research, history, anthropology and the like. The sort of book I was after wasn't available until Peter Tufts Richardson's *Four Spiritualities* some years later (1994).

Some 20 years after its release, *Image to Likeness* seems to have become solely associated with Harold Grant, and his Appendix containing his type dynamics and development framework, probably because nothing else from him on the topic has been made generally available. And it's also been the framework generally taken up by those teaching MBTI to others over time.

This contemporary success is in the face of somewhat mixed reviews of the book (both type and religious content) from various sources around the time of publication (viz., Barker, Edwards, Murry, O'Brien [1986], Scanlon [1985]). To be fair, much of the success may be due to a similar functional framework presented by the Jungian analyst John Beebe, from independent research (Harris 1996). Notwithstanding that, *Image to Likeness* is, however approached, clearly an influential and important text in the history and development of type and deserves to be fully examined.

There are two themes in this book: interpreting type in a religious setting, and type theory, including type dynamics and development.

In the first part of this review, I will provide some contextual information on religions and religious data for those either unfamiliar with or curious about this perspective on life. Belief or skepticism is up to the reader. Grant's framework and its relationship to other approaches to human development (type and otherwise) will be the subject of the second part.

MBTI, Psychological Types and Religion

Unlike Freud, C.G.Jung (none of his colleagues called him Carl) was positively interested in religion, particularly the *numinous*, or religious experience, a term coined by his contemporary Rudolf Otto (1931). The son of a minister, Jung found the symbols and ideas behind religion of interest in developing his view of the unconscious, and the archetypes. Although various beliefs have been ascribed to Jung, I consider him agnostic, in the pure meaning of the term.

Isabel Myers' ultimate title for her book on type, *Gifts Differing*, comes from the Bible. Her son, Peter Myers has pointed out, however, that although she was a graduate of Swarthmore College, a Quaker university, she was not a member of any church (Goldsmith and Wharton 1993). One might think of her as a Deist: someone who believed in God, but subscribed to her own view of what that might mean. Perhaps also she was comfortable with the language of the society she lived in with regard to understanding God and related spiritual issues.

It would be fair to say that a religious or spiritual focus on the MBTI hasn't been at the forefront of its' publisher, CPP Inc. There the emphasis has been on organisations, groups and so forth as far as publications go, which has led, both here and overseas, to the primary location of the MBTI in the human resources field rather than overlapping many fields of interest and application. I believe this focus to be a mistake with respect to the general acceptance and practice of the MBTI, with several professions remaining unconvinced, or even ignorant of its presumptions and use.

All that aside, however, in the development of the public face of the MBTI and type in the USA and elsewhere, including Australia, religion and spirituality (a peculiarly American term) has been a prominent interest area in the USA and elsewhere. Several books and booklets have been produced over the years with themes such as prayer, religious leadership and so on. Almost without exception, these have been in the American evangelical tradition in terms of their aims and understanding of religious belief.

What I mean by that is that the texts are essentially about a particular view of Christianity. This view presumes a personal experience (actual or sought) with Jesus of Nazareth, often referred to simply as *Christ*, a title rather than a name, meaning Messiah, a Jewish term, or *Saviour*. An equivalent in some ways is *Mahdi*, familiar to Gordon of Khartoum in the late 19th century and, at the time of writing, currently bandied about in Iraq.

The religious literature associated with type tends to be non-academic. A notable exception is Richardson's book, mentioned earlier, as it deals with comparative religion and is in some ways an academic text, containing a number of relevant references. There's more to this general approach than Christianity, and I'll return to some of the peculiarly American approaches to this later.

In Australia, a somewhat powerful foundation myth has the MBTI brought there by Roman Catholic priests and nuns who studied at the University of California at Berkeley. It's presumed that in their studies these people had some contact with information from the Institute of Personality Research (IPAR), which had been using and researching the MBTI at Berkeley since 1948. Margaret Dwyer is an example of this group (1988)

Their main use of the MBTI would have been in spiritual development, in which the use of Jesus of Nazareth as a role model is common. This is a process not necessarily the same as American spirituality, for theological and other reasons, but certainly compatible in some ways.

There may be one or two other avenues of the MBTI's introduction into Australia. Certainly the Stephen Moss initiative in the early 1980s to establish an Australian region of the Association for Psychological Type was by no means religious in intent.

In any case, people holding an office with the Catholic church, as well as many raised as Catholics, were prominent in AusAPT's early days, together with a number of members and representatives of the Uniting Church. For quite a few, though, religious belief was more nominal or social than anything else.

Writing a book combining religion and Jungian psychology might seem deceptively easy. Victor White, a correspondent and appreciator of Jung wrote that

The worker on the borderlands of religion and psychology must be bilingual, and there is no dictionary which will supply the exact equivalents of the two languages he [sic] must employ (1953)

On the other hand, Eugene Taylor has investigated connections between psychology and spirituality from colonial times in the United States. He suggests that views on the Self and its development, such as Jung's, actually predate Jung in the American experience (1999; also Hoopes 1989).

These views are generally individual and evangelical in tone and fairly eclectic, often including an interest in and affinity with Native American religions (shamans, sweat lodges etc. and/or religious experience in general. The words of Judee Sill's songs beginning this article give an idea of aspects of this genre (1969). The American spiritual approach lies less in the efflorescences of the 1960s and 1970s than with centuries-old practices and encounters. Sedona has its origins in Massachusetts.

Any American MBTI Conference today will reflect some of this approach in presentations and presumptions about belief. The self-help movement in general, including many organisational texts also has this perspective; you don't need to go too far past "Vision" and "Mission" as terms to see that.

Some of this approach seems to be visible in Australia, but its origins seem American in the vast majority of instances. *Self-help*, for instance has its origins in Calvinism, where being saved (i.e. being with God after death) involves a personal relationship with the deity and an obligation for the individual to pull themselves up by their own efforts, with rewards seen as tangible and overt.

Whilst there are cultural differences between the USA and elsewhere, the view of achievement and self-worth permeates government and social policies, even here in

Australia, where historically it hasn't been a popular view. Centrelink and other agencies operate under this paradigm; whether it's useful is open to question..

Image to Likeness, Type and Religion

Religious texts using type have a variety of aims, focusing sometimes on prayer, or understanding the perspective of each of the four Gospels (Kroeger 1996; Malone 2000). *Image to Likeness* is a book developed out of workshops or retreats with the aim of helping people to "develop God's image in their lives" , linking this aim with Jung's notion of the Self. Type preferences are used to link Bible references and individual development. Jesus of Nazareth is seen as the exemplar of these preferences.

The Bible translation used is the Jerusalem Bible, which intends to make Biblical language clearer for today's society and more accurate than many older versions. It has a different approach to the Revised Standard Version, the generally accepted translation today, and might even be considered more "liberal" (as far as American political labels go) in its approach and in its market.

The "King James" translation, popular for centuries because of its English expression, and the perception of its translators being close to God, is not considered a very good translation in technical terms To be fair, knowledge of language and the availability of texts is much greater today, as is the historical knowledge of the time of Jesus and earlier events.

The historicity of the Bible as a whole is problematic, in part because the notion of what history is today, was not established until the 19th Century. The Bible's various authors, whether or not inspired by God—variously *el Shaddai*, *Adonai* (a plural word) or *YHWH* (*Yahweh*—Jehovah is a mistranslation from earlier times)—were not familiar with our culture's approach to history. The Gospels, for instance, are not intended to be history as is currently understood, but more like religious truth, or *mythos*, as Karen Armstrong puts it (2000).

Armstrong also suggests that people who take what's known as a "fundamentalist" approach to such literature use techniques based on early modern or modern notions of scientific method, wanting to take the text literally in a way contemporaries of the Gospel writers would neither have considered, nor thought relevant.

Whether words and events attributed to Jesus can be determined with accuracy, or that an original Gospel text is a possibility for discovery (the oldest original texts used have been produced several decades at least after the events described) has been the subject of much discussion (e.g. Pagels, Vermes, Parker). Much work has been done to uncover what can be considered as original, using other historical and linguistic sources.

For all its use of contemporary language (Aramaic), Mel Gibson's *Passion of Christ* fails an accuracy test on the basis of the type of cross carried by Jesus and its

depiction of Pontius Pilate alone, notwithstanding its stated adherence to a Gospel text.

This may come down to not knowing enough about something, as Umberto Eco might put it (2003), or something else. In terms of *mythos*, of course, it has its basis in medieval mystery plays and, possibly, the *Terminator* movies.

Image and Likeness presumes that words and deeds attributed to Jesus of Nazareth in the Gospels are actually his words and deeds. It's an effusive text at times, exhortatory even, in terms of a spiritual guide. Its focus is on the notion of community, which I think heavily circumscribes its interpretations.

Whilst its theology is by no means fundamental, presumptions are made where contemporary data on Jesus in his time (scanty at best) might indicate a need for caution. The texts of the New Testament, as might be expected, are actually treated ahistorically with respect to authors. So we're in *mythos*, perhaps where we should be with this sort of text. Curiously, the *mythos* includes Henry Thoreau: no surprise to Eugene Taylor, but perhaps one to Thoreau

The authors state the aim of the book to be:

a general indication, with some variables, of how a developmental typology may be interwoven with some themes and vehicles of spirituality in a way which facilitates integral human growth. (p14)

The book provides a particular definition of type preferences—with a curious notion of "freedom" attached, which tends to undermine the notion of "preferences", as well as Jung's observation that type determines and limits our judgements. Separate chapters outline how Jesus exemplifies the preferences and opposites. In part II I will examine this issue more closely, but I'm left with the idea that the authors don't understand the chasm of difference associated with having a "preference". It's not something you can turn off and on at will (or perhaps it is, for certain beings).

Each function has a chapter dedicated to it, with exercises for you to practise what has been stated—thus emphasising the nature of the book as a workbook; a text for practice, no matter your preference.

Sensing is "a gift to be simple". There's an evangelical hymn relating to that statement, which I encountered when studying organisation behaviour. Other words here are *humble, obedient, present, attentive*: something of *zen* in some respects, although little of SPs, or extraversion for that matter.

Jesus as a Sensing person is described in terms such as *ears, touch, servant, and alert expectation*—the first and last of these letting in some aspect of extraverted-sensing people.

Thinking is next, a strange selection in terms of order, until you realise that the chapters are arranged in reverse type dynamics order for an ENFP (Grant's

preferences: I don't know about the others). For the authors "this is the truth that sets us free"—which seems to me to be an unusual proposition, even as a seeker of truth myself. A literary allusion to a play, *Murder in the Cathedral*, follows, which isn't exactly thinking truth (I'd prefer the facts in a decent history about Thomas a'Becket, whose murder it is).

At any rate, this chapter is about justice and order, which strikes me as extraverted thinking more than anything else. This is the spot where God makes the tough decisions, and where Jesus displays what might be seen as righteous behaviour, but for me is straight-out anger. If you're angry, of course, then you're not in your preferred functions.

To be fair to the authors, I suspect that that's where they use thinking: they don't see it as positive. So, in their community, thinking is loosely tolerated. The depictions here seem to me to be of cold, ruthless people, necessary evils, in a way.

Feeling comes next. After the aggressiveness of thinking, it's "with a joyful heart" and an invidious comparison with thinking actually commences the chapter. "Wounding of feeling" and Jesus as "healer of the heart" are themes, and the affect component of feeling is emphasised, rather than decision making.

Jung warned against this interpretation of feeling as being not all that accurate. But it's clear that the authors' community is a feeling one: *harmonious*, *warm*, *martyrs* and so on. For me, the descriptions seem to have more to do with emotion than anything else, which—while it's attended to more by feeling types than thinking types (a terminology which seems too rigid for the authors)—is essentially associated with the unconscious and expressed via extraversion.

Finally, *intuiting*, or Hope. "Eye Has Not Seen" (capitals are as expressed in the book). *Creativity* and *freedom* are the words expressed here, as well as *receptive* and *contemplative*, curiously introverted words. Jesus is the *prophet*, the *dreamer*, the *fool*, somewhat like those sorts of people in general. If he's typical of the Old Testament prophets (and we don't have enough data on this, he might be INFJ—a regular type for recent Superman characterisations—or perhaps INFP, given the righteous anger. But I can't see him as an exemplar in the way suggested in this book.

Individuation describes the journey: the "fullness of love" as it says here. I'm not sure whether this implies that getting to Jesus implies ending at N or F, or a misreading of *nirvana*, the Buddhist concept, that actually means *ceasing* to exist. My understanding of individuation is a process without an end point, but here it necessarily ends with God, which is fine according to the framework.

I'm just wondering where the thinking types fit in: but it doesn't seem to be my journey, anyway.

Part II: Type Dynamics and Development

*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 first part of this 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, 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 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.

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 naturally became 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 the appropriate, or any 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 at all 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 2000)

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 (1993).

Eleanor Corlett and Nancy Millner in *Navigating Midlife* (1993) reference both Grant and Beebe as far as the direction of functions goes, but still give a choice of direction and don't refer to the development model at all. Millner's *Creative Aging* (1997) 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

- Donald Harman Akenson: *Saint Saul; A Skeleton Key to the Historical Jesus* Oxford 2000
- Karen Armstrong *The Battle for God. Fundamentalism in Judaism, Christianity and Islam.*
Harper Collins. 2000
- 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]
- Margaret T. Dwyer *Wake up the Sun: An Exploration of Personality Types and Spiritual Growth*
Desbooks 1988
- Umberto Eco: *Mouse or Rat: Translation as Negotiation* Weidenfeld & Nicholson 2003
- 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
- Robert & Carol–Ann Faucett *Personality and Spiritual Freedom: Growing in the Christian Life
Through Understanding Personality Type and the Myers–Briggs Type
Indicator* Image Books 1987
- Israel Finkelstein and Neil Asher Silberman: *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision
of Ancient Israel and the origin of its Sacred Texts.* Free Press 2001
- Richard Frankel *The Adolescent Psyche: Jungian and Winnicottian perspectives* Routledge
1999
- Peter Geyer *Quantifying Jung: The Origin and Development of the Myers–Briggs Type
Indicator* MSc Thesis, University of Melbourne 1995
- Malcolm Goldsmith *Knowing Me, Knowing God: Exploring your spirituality with Myers–Briggs
Triangle* 1997 [1994]
- Malcolm Goldsmith and Martin Wharton: *Knowing Me, Knowing You: Exploring Personality Type
and Temperament* (fwd. Peter Briggs Myers) SPCK 1993
- Alison Gopnik, Andrew Meltzoff and Patricia Kuhl *The Scientist in the Crib: what early learning
tells us about the mind* Perennial 2001
- Peter Hammill *Slender Threads* (Hammill Stratsong/Carlin Music) from Peter Hammill:
Chameleon in the Shadow of the Night Virgin/Charisma CASCD1067 1989
[1973]

- Anne Singer Harris *Living with Paradox: an introduction to Jungian psychology* Brooks/Cole 1996
- 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*
- Sandra Krebs Hirsh and Jane A.G. Kise *Looking at Type and Spirituality* CAPT 1997
- Soultypes* Hyperion 1998
- James Hoopes *Consciousness in New England: From Puritanism and Ideas to Psychoanalysis and Semiotics* Johns Hopkins 1989
- C.G.Jung *Psychological Types* (CW6) Princeton 1971
- C.G.Jung *The Development of Personality* (CW17) Princeton 1991
- Jane A.G. Kise, David Stark and Sandra Krebs Hirsh *LifeKeys* Bethany House 1996
- Jane A.G. Kise, David Stark and Sandra Krebs Hirsh *LifeKeys Discovery Workbook* Bethany House 1998
- Jane A.G. Kise and Kevin Johnson *Find Your fit: Dare to act on God's design for you* Bethany House 1998
- Jane A.G. Kise and Kevin Johnson *Find Your fit Discovery Workbook* Bethany House 1999
- Otto Kroeger *The Four Temperaments* (Otto Kroeger Associates Videos 1996)
- Mary McGuiness *You've got Personality: An introduction to the Personality Types described by Carl Jung and Isabel Myers* MaryMacBooks 2004
- Peter Malone *The Same as Christ Jesus: Gospel and Type* StPauls 2000
- Chester P. Michael and Marie C. Norrisey: *Prayer and Temperament: Different Prayer for Different Personality Types* The Open Door Inc. 1984
- Nancy Millner *Creative Aging: Discovering the unexpected joys of later life through personality type* Davies-Black 1997
- M.Robert Mulholland Jr *Invitation to a Journey: A Road Map for spiritual Formation* InterVarsity Press 1993.
- Barbara W. Murry *Review of From Image to Likeness: A Jungian Path in the Gospel Journey in MBTI News* Vol. 8, No 2, Spring 1986. p30
- 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
- Rudolf Otto *The Idea of the Holy* Oxford University Press Second Edition 1958 [1950] (First English Edition 1923)
- Elaine Pagels *The Origin of Satan* Random House 1995
- Elaine Pagels *Beyond Belief* Random House 2003
- D.C.Parker *The Living Text of the Gospels* Cambridge, 1997
- Jaroslav Pelikan *Jesus Through the Centuries: His place in the history of culture* Yale 1985
- 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
- Judee Sill *Crayon Angels* (Judee Sill, Blimp Music BMI 1969) from Judee Sill Asylum Records CD AMCY-6064 1999 [1971]
- Barbara Strauch *Why are they so Weird? What's really going on in a teenager's brain* Bloomsbury 2003
- Eugene Taylor *Shadow Culture: Psychology and Spirituality in America* Counterpoint 1999
- Hernry L. Thompson *Jung's Function-Attitudes Explained* Wormhole 1996

Roger Tourangeau, Lance J. Rips and Kenneth Rasinski: *The Psychology of Survey Response*
Cambridge 2000

Geza Vermes: *The Changing Faces of Jesus* Allen Lane 2000

Geza Vermes *The Authentic Gospel of Jesus* Allen Lane 2003

Victor White *God and the Unconscious* Henry Regnery Company 1953

The Bible Revised Standard Version Bible Society/Collins 1971

Peter Geyer has been a student of religions and belief for some decades. A member of the *Australian Association for the Study of Religions* since 1981, he has qualified to teach religions and history in secondary schools. His BA (Hons) thesis was *Baron Friedrich von Hugel and the Question of Authority in the Roman Catholic Church*. Peter is also a contributor to *Soultypes* by Sandra Hirsh and Jane Kise. Peter has also 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. Peter is agnostic, and prefers INTP with extraverted sensing as Tertiary