

JUNGS PERSONALITY THEORY

Jung was the first psychologist to think in terms of **psychological types**. He came to believe that there were certain habitual ways of seeing, or making decisions in the world that people tended to adopt. Of these (and there were many), he thought that six were particularly important.

First, the two basic **attitudes** (as he called them) of **introversion and extraversion**.

Jung was the first psychologist to use these terms in relation to personality and they have become generally known and accepted.

Second, two **pairs of functions** (his term, again)

- **sensing and intuition** – two ways of taking in information from the world, *via* facts/data or through intuition/helicopter perspective. These are called the **perceiving functions**.
- **thinking and feeling** – two ways of making decisions, *via* logic or values. These are called the **judging functions**.

While he conceded that personality varied from time to time and situation to situation, he did believe that most people prefer one of each of the pairs above most of the time (see also below). From this, a person could often be characterised as a particular personality **type** – someone choosing a particular combination of attitudes and functions: a sensing, thinking introvert, say, or an intuitive, feeling extravert and so on.

Origins of the theory

The Jung-Freud relationship lasted from 1906 to 1914. It was a very close relationship and the break was traumatic for both men (see elsewhere in the website). Jung, in particular, experienced a psychological crisis and withdrew into himself for several years. During this period, he developed the basis for many of his most important theories that had been repressed, or not fully developed during the 'Freud years'.

His theory of psychological types was one of these and the theory was, in part at least, an attempt to understand how personality differences had led to the break with Freud (and also Alfred Adler) – to do justice to their theories, as he put it.

Jung decided that while he was an introvert, Freud was an extravert, and that this division in personality was of great importance. Note that Jung was the first psychologist to use the terms introvert and extravert, although concepts very close to this had been formulated by philosophers, psychiatrists, writers and many others for quite some time. For more detail, a short list of further readings is provided at the end of this file. Jung's writing on the subject is very detailed; although it does give an extensive history of his theoretical predecessors, the four essays at the end of Volume 6 of his Collected Works is perhaps the easiest of his writings to follow.

Extraverts: What You See is What You Get

An extravert is someone who believes that the real world is the outer one – of other people and things. He or she is focussed usually on the external world and is at their best in it. They get energy from it. An extraverted teacher, for example, can often stand in front of a class before teaching, just feeding on the energy coming from their students. If you are a teacher and an introvert try doing this! You will probably feel drained of energy – even threatened by other peoples' energy – and it is likely to take you years of practice before you learn to utilise it. Good actors, of course, can get themselves charged up in much the same way and can energise the audience in turn – one of the advantages of theatre as compared to film or DVD.

Extraverts will tend to dominate meetings and social events (see also *Jungchow*). They tend to hop from topic to topic in conversations and seem (but are not necessarily really) more friendly than introverts. They may have trouble being alone. I remember reading the brochure of a Californian Psychology Centre some years ago – clearly run by extraverts. One of their courses was a 5 day hike across the High Sierras. Clothing was optional and full and frank sharing of experiences and feelings around the camp fire each evening was expected. Introverts' hell. At the end of the hike, those of the company who were psychologically 'strong enough' were to be permitted to spend 24 hours alone in a Buddhist meditation retreat. Obviously, a real problem for the extraverts. But an introvert would say 'why do the embarrassing hike at all – can't I just spend all the time in solitary meditation?'

As one would expect, extraverts are easier to get to know than introverts – their visible personality is their most-used and most comfortable one. Their hidden depths are absent or less than those seen in introverts.

Note that one of the ways in which Jung was able to identify Freud as an extravert was by looking at his theories. To Freud, development, neuroses and even the structure of the unconscious mind, are all created by environmental forces – experiences with parents, with potty training and so on. Personality is an introject, to use a Freudian term.

Introverts: What You get is What they Show You

We all have to deal with the outer world, but dealing with the outer world doesn't necessarily, or always, mean the same thing as being extraverted. There are plenty of us introverts around who can deal with the outer world without being really much in it at all, or considering it too important! Introverts are quite certain that the real world is the one inside the psyche. That is where everything important happens and where the decisions are made.

Introverts tend to do their best work on their own and to work with the door shut and focus deeper and longer on fewer projects. They will be less aware of what is going on around them, only dimly noticing that the building is on fire perhaps! They tend to have something of an indifference to talking about their work, their beliefs or their accomplishments and can be overlooked as a result. Where an extravert gains energy from being with people, an introvert may find company wearing and gain energy when able to be alone. Of course, if you can learn to use both introverted and extraverted modes you should be able to function, overall, more effectively. More of this later.

For more details of extraverts and introverts, read *Jungchow*. Let's turn now to the **four functions** described by Jung.

SENSING AND INTUITION

THE PERCEIVING FUNCTIONS

Sensing and intuition are the two basic ways of perceiving, or taking in, the world, whether this is the outer or the inner world. These functions determine how we view the **nature** of the world and what it is that we find important about it.

Sensing types are those of us who see the world as being made up of data, or facts, of component pieces, and lots of them. Extraverted sensing types, in particular, see the world as being composed of all the different sense impressions that come in through their sense organs. This is what the world is made of and, for some sensing types, this is **all** the world is made of. If you are trying to explain an idea to someone, and they interrupt with words like "that's all very interesting, but it's a bit airy-fairy, so why don't you just give me the plain facts of the matter" they are likely to be a sensing type. This is the "typical" blunt, common sense oriented executive, or the police chief in countless films.

Sensing types are, of course, very good at using facts and incoming sense-data. They can remember details like who was at a party five years ago, who they were with and what they wore, and they know that the laminex coating on their kitchen bench is 4.4mm thick polyethelyne plastic, with an oil-resistant vinocarbonyl finish. If you are ever involved in a court case, and the case depends upon eyewitness testimony, make sure that all **your** witnesses are extraverted sensing types.

Sensing types also tend to like and be able to use tools - computers, machines and other things that require manual dexterity and the ability to **concentrate** upon details for a prolonged period. They are difficult to argue against, as they will remember all the facts that you have overlooked and forgotten and, irritatingly, they will think that remembering all the facts wins the argument!

Intuitive types (or just intuitives), by contrast, regard facts, or detail, or data as being mere stepping stones, or ways of demonstrating the proof of, ideas. Ideas are all-important. As a consequence, intuitives tend to be relatively uninterested in "mere" facts or (boring) detail: they prefer ideas, overview, a helicopter perspective and possibilities. They therefore are also much better at perceiving and using ideas, than they are with sense data. Where a sensing type, shown a forest, will count the trees and know what species they are (and possibly their commercial value), but may fail to perceive that the trees constitute a 'forest', the intuitive will immediately grasp that he/she is seeing a mighty forest and what sort of a forest it is, but may fail entirely to really notice (let alone count) the individual trees that make it up. When asked about the forest later, they are likely to be entirely unable to say what sort of trees were present, how high they were, and so on. Sensing types can't 'see the wood for the trees': intuitive types 'can't see the trees for the wood'.

To a sensing type, very often, the intuitive has their head in the clouds and little ability to comprehend or work with the "real" world of hard data. To an intuitive, the sensing type is a mere hewer of wood or fetcher of water: OK for unimportant, boring or trivial tasks, but empty of ideas (and therefore essentially uninteresting) and unable to grasp ideas or the relationships between ideas. In a word, uninspired - the sort of person who would talk about the relative merits of different brands of lawn mower (and know what all their names are). It can be almost unbearable for an intuitive to have to listen to a sensing type's description of some recent event: all those constant diversions into detail, all those unnecessary details, why don't they just cut to the chase before I die of boredom!

The clash between the intuitive and the sensing approach to reality can actually be a very serious matter. I believe it can cause more serious differences than any other 'type clash'. The two types differ at a most fundamental level: that of what is fundamental to the makeup of the world, and, therefore, what the most important things are that you need to know about the world. Sometimes an intuitive and a sensing type won't even be able to watch the news together, when one is seeing facts and the other ignores these to see only the 'ideas behind the news'.

Who Should be the Boss?

Note that in many situation comedies (from *Home Improvement* and *Yes Prime Minister* to *Just Shoot me* and *Becker*) the intuitive is portrayed as the boss, the sensing type as the assistant. This is a realistic depiction of the way that things actually work out, in some professions at least. Most entrepreneurs, for example, and most executives with entrepreneurial responsibility, tend to be intuitives - the kind of people who can 'pull ideas down out of the air': who think up a new selling strategy, or a new design, or a new departmental orientation. This is, often, what they are there for. The problem is that entrepreneurs of this sort tend, very often, to be lousy at making their ideas happen. They are simply less good at doing the job than thinking it up in the first place and they often rapidly become bored with the detail. A sensing second-in-command, by contrast, is likely to be much better at, and more interested in, the details of getting an idea on the road and more handy with materials and data and able to sustain their interest over many trials. The vital thing, in situations like this, is that the intuitive and the sensing type should stop despising each other and realise that, as a team, they cover the waterfront!

There are other jobs, of course, in which the person in command is likely to be a sensing type, the army, perhaps, or much of the public service, where everything depends upon remembering details, presenting those details correctly time and time again and where following standard operating procedures is seen as a virtue. The intuitive's typical inventiveness and originality can be seen as dangerous in such an environment - likely to get you killed, or to mess up the files. Intuitives often see the sensing work environment as stifling, repetitive and boring, but to sensing types, and to intuitives who are having a temporary 'rest' from the 'real' world of ideas and change, it is secure, dependable and comforting in its certainty.

Most intuitives probably won't believe the last statement. It is one of the most difficult things in the world to make sensing types and intuitives enter each other's worlds long enough to understand what their positive features are. Most intuitives, for example, couldn't understand why some sensing types get a positive pleasure from repetitive work: taking the same walk every day, for example, because the physical exertion itself, rather than the ever-changing beauty of the scenery, is where the pleasure is.

There are a number of ways of telling if someone is a sensing type or an intuitive. You can look at their garden, for example. If this is an interesting and ever-changing mass of hidden pathways, littered with discarded implements, bonfire makings and bags of fertiliser, you are dealing with an intuitive. If the paths are straight, the trees and bushes symmetrical (with four main branches each, one pointing to each direction of the compass) and the tools are polished, oiled and stored away after each use, the garden is run by a sensing type.

Or watch how the person copes with an assignment, let's say writing a chapter of a book. Let's imagine that they have 20 days to write 40 pages. The sensing author will sit down in their tidy, well-ordered study and look at the ranks of annotated data. Taking down their wall calendar (colour-coded coffee-brown to match the carpet), they mark off 20 days and decide to write two pages every day. They do this without stress or panic. Actually, they write four pages per day. The chapter is returned eventually with the comment 'all very worthy, but could you **please** cut by half: we don't think readers will want to read so many details.'

The intuitive author, by contrast, goes into the slum that they call a study and perches on the edge of the desk, while trying to find a chair that isn't full of still-unclassified material for future books. They clear a space on the desk and start hunting for the wall calendar. They uncover seven half-full coffee cups and while washing these up in the kitchen make another cup of coffee. While doing this, they notice that the fridge needs cleaning out... A couple of hours later, they give up the hunt for the calendar and make up a timetable on a piece of scrap paper (which they lose, almost immediately). They decide, like the sensing author, to write two pages a day, beginning the next day. The next morning, however, they just don't feel like writing.

The very thought makes them lethargic and full of ennui, even depressed. So they muse a little about the chapter, do a little light gardening, drink some coffee and start

re-reading the novels of C.P.Snow. The same sequence of events (more or less) happens again on the mornings of the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth days. On the morning of either the nineteenth or the twentieth day (depending on the author's writing speed), the chapter will be ready in the author's head. They find that they **just** have time to write it out, in a single, 12-36 hour dash, before the deadline. When it is submitted, it is likely to suffer one of two fates: acceptance and acclaim, or a return, together with a terse note pointing out that the author has completed the **wrong chapter**.

Most intuitives will have **recognised** the second description above. At times it seems that life can be easier for sensing types. They tend to be able to organise their time and their material fairly well and work to a consciously-planned schedule. The intuitive process, by contrast, is a largely unconscious process of creation, where ideas and data are assembled into an overall pattern that can often only be consciously recognised by its creator when the process is **complete**. Up until this point, the intuitive is likely to be aware only of a confusing, ever-changing, mass of half-formed ideas and suggestions. Until the intuitive has become used to their processing, and able to trust it, they tend to feel increasingly stressed by their inability to "start work" (as the sensing type would say) until their inner processing has finished.

They may even feel guilty because they are "doing nothing" while waiting for inspiration. And, finally, they will be, at times, embarrassed when their intuitive processes go wrong. When they produce the wrong chapter, or find that their chapter has "taken on a life of its own" and become something very different from what was planned: and that the new form has **irreversibly** replaced the old, agreed idea, and that the latter now seems lifeless and worthless. It is all just a part of the nature of the intuitive, creative process that its owner must get used to.

THINKING AND FEELING

THE JUDGING FUNCTIONS

We have looked at our preferences for living in the (outer or inner) world and our choice of ways of perceiving that world. Extraversion, introversion, sensing and intuition tell us most of the basic things about how an individual's typological preferences about how they take the world in – and which world. But, just perceiving the world is not enough. We have to make **decisions** in and about the world. We have to **structure** it.

There are lots of ways of doing this, of course, but two ways in particular that seemed to Jung to be the most used and the easiest to make sense of: feeling and thinking. Thinking, or the thinking function, refers to our ability to be logical - to be objective

and also to be fair. Thinking types use logic or a rational approach to making decisions, to ordering the world and, in general, to create a life-structure. An introverted thinker will create a logical, internal mental structure that they will regard with love and awe. That structure will be where they really are.

An extraverted thinker will rather use their thinking in the world and they may be unpopular as a result! (E)T stands for bossyboots. Extraverted thinkers tend to be decisive and to give orders, orders that, while logical and fair are often given without softeners. To quote a female extraverted thinking type with whom I worked for some years. "When I give an order I just give it. I don't expect my staff to need persuading to do something they're paid for." If you have just nodded in agreement with that statement, you probably are a thinking type. If you are a feeling type, you will probably have recoiled in horror at such lack of empathy. But it's all just a matter of preferences!

Feeling is a very different matter. Those with a preference for the feeling function will create a world based upon values and human feelings. They often will make decisions (and create a world) based on people's needs and wishes, rather than logic or the 'bottom line'. Out of several hundred middle and higher level production managers to whom I have given appropriate personality tests, over 90% proved to be thinking types. But, where business is filled with thinking managers, the helping professions, like nursing and human resources are usually staffed by a majority of feeling types.

To find out if another person has a thinking or a feeling preference, you can begin by listening carefully to their language. Thinkers say that they 'think', feelers that they 'feel', quite literally. One of the most popular stories used by therapists who measure personality type is about a couple in America who had lived together for several years, but still couldn't decide whether to get married. If not, the woman had at last decided to move away and start again.

The therapist gave the couple some personality tests. The woman was a clear feeling type, the man a thinking type. The therapist asked the woman. 'What do you **think** the problem is?' The reply: 'Well, I **feel** that I love this man very much, but I don't know if he loves me enough for me to marry him.' The therapist asked the man 'How do you **feel** about that?' The man answered 'Well, I **think**...first, our standard of living will be much higher if we live together; second, you will have to buy a car if you move away; and third, you will have to take out all your computer files if you move.'

The woman burst into tears but could still say, through her sobs, 'I don't **care about** any of that! Do you really love me?' At this point, the man look first confused, then uncomfortable, then a little shifty, then rather annoyed, but finally said. 'Um...um.....umm....well - I **thought** that was obvious from what I said.'

Note the disjunctions here. The feeler's fury at being expected to accept a thinking answer; the thinker's discomfort at being forced (almost) to give a feeling answer. And note the different **languages** used. Relationships (even at work) between thinkers and feelers usually involve issues of this sort. Feelers need to value others

and to feel valued: as a partner, as a man or woman: as a cook, whatever. They will expect (or at least hope for) phrases that acknowledge these valuations – and every day, too! Thinkers (or, at least, untrained thinkers) usually don't get the message. A woman might say to her husband that she needs to be valued **as** a woman. But why on earth should a (thinking type) man say that he values his wife as a woman? She **is** a woman. What's the problem? And why should a thinking woman ever have to tell her feeling husband that she loves him? Of course she does: it was clearly laid down in the wedding service. If she changes her mind, she'll certainly let him know in due course.

The feeling type is likely to feel hurt by the thinker's 'neglect' and even perhaps to perceive silence, or blunt thinking statements as rejection, anger or deliberate coldness. They may react by turning the falsely perceived emotion or attitude upon their partner, friend or co-worker. They will use this to get almost any reaction that is felt to be better than an awful emotional 'silence'. The thinking type, by contrast, may feel beset, harassed and pursued by unrequested feeling 'performances', such as embarrassing demonstrations of physical affection, requests for hugs when no physical injury has been sustained, or seemingly exaggerated, unwarranted praise. They may react rather like a classical music fan being forced to listen to a bagpipes recital: it's all too much, too loud and too lacking in thought!

And both thinkers and feelers tend to believe that they can convert the other. They can't. They will, most likely, **never** change! All they can hope for is for each partner to lay down a sort of mental dictionary (a thinker doing a logically-unnecessary task unreminded = 2 kisses or 1 'I love you'; a feeler, saying they love you unasked and remembering **not** to ask for reciprocity = 1 logically useful task performance; and so on). Not entirely satisfactory, but better than eternal unrequited needs.

There are two other important points about thinkers and feelers. First, that introvertedly- and extravertedly-directed feeling are very different things and, second, that thinkers do have a value system of their own.

Extraverted feeling is characterised by warmth and friendliness towards others. It is concerned with, and takes its values from, the outer world. Its measure is therefore often the approval of, or pleasure given to others. Extraverted feeling types thrive on giving and receiving pleasure to and from other people. They tend to be the nicest and most popular of people – except with some (especially introverted) thinking types who find them rather overwhelming. The quotation from Maggie Beer below is a good illustration of the extraverted feeling type's ability to absolutely bask in the external world when the feeling situation is just right.

A Feast for Sixty

By Maggie Beer

(extraverted feeling type?)

We decided to have a pre-Christmas party to celebrate all the things we enjoy about being at home. I love any excuse for gathering people I like together...I

wandered from group to group, passing pate and other goodies around, enjoying the

chance to relax and chat at leisure, and basking in that wonderful feeling of *bonhomie*....It was well into the evening when the last guests left, and I sat too tired to move but happy in the knowledge that our life...is extraordinarily rich.

Maggie's Table by Maggie Beer. 2001 pp10-14 Ringwood, Victoria: Penguin.

Introverted feeling is a different (organic, wholesome and nutritious) kettle of fish. Those with a strong, introverted feeling function tend to work with value systems that are their own justification. They don't need to refer to the values of other people, or of the world in general. Their value systems are created by internal (and, actually, often unconscious) processes. They may seem 'sensible' to a thinking type or not.

It doesn't really matter! What matters is that people's actions and beliefs will be judged in the light of the internal value system. And usually found wanting – it is very difficult for anyone to be able to live up to another human's internal value system. Actually, it almost as impossible for the owner of the system! This is why introverted feeling types are so often accused of having a somewhat judgemental – even condemning attitude to others. This does make for a rather frequent sense of guilt, failure or inadequacy: but it's generally useless to argue against a system based on values that don't have to conform to either logic or external standards. The following quotation, in my opinion, illustrates both the good and bad aspects of introverted feeling. One can hardly disagree with the content of any but the last sentence, but...

Kindness, love, appreciation, cheerfulness and so on are all undeniably worthy ideas, but there is something about the quotation that can set ones teeth on edge. "Carefully chosen advice; deserving praise; small clean hearts" - to be selected by the writer. To many of us, there can seem to be an underlying arrogance – an assumption of moral certainty, if not superiority – that is irritating. As my (EF) wife said, on first reading it: "Yes, very nice. I don't disagree with any of the sentiments, but it makes me want to punch them for being so smug."

A Recipe to Live By

Blend one cup of love and one half cup of kindness, add alternately in small portions one cup of appreciation and 3 cups of pleasant companionship, into which has been sifted three teaspoons of deserving praise. Flavor with one teaspoon of carefully chosen advice. Lightly fold in one cup of cheerfulness to which has been added a pinch of sorrow. Pour with tender care into small clean hearts and let bake until well matured. Turn out on the surface of society. Humbly invoke God's blessing and it will serve all mankind.

(Katie Miller in **Amish Country Cookbook** by Bob and Sue Miller. Unnumbered page)

Thinking types are often regarded as cold and lacking in values. This is not quite right. They certainly are – overall – less emotional (less warm, if you like) than feeling types. As their decisions are made using logic and thought, this is bound to be the case. But they tend to have value systems that, while different from those of feeling types, are of the greatest importance to them. These are generally based on the assumption that things should be **fair**, that decisions should be based upon merit and fairness, rather than individual needs or emotional demands. To go against a logic-based system of this sort causes the thinking type as much pain as ignoring the needs of others causes extraverted feeling types. This will happen pretty often, though. Just as the feeling type will often fail to see the logic of a situation when this contradicts their values, a thinking type will often overlook, then be caught off guard by the very existence of any feeling values in a situation. The thinker's catchcry can often be "why are you angry/upset: how was I to know it meant so much to you?"

An example of the difference between thinking and feeling values

One of the best examples of a thinking type is C.S. Forester's literary hero Horatio Hornblower. The books and the recent television series show this equally well. Hornblower is entirely devoted to duty, fairness and following the logic of a situation (whether into battle or marriage), regardless of any feelings he might have on the subject. Thinking is his dominant function and (as discussed in Chapter 1), feeling is his inferior function – the shadow of his outward persona. He is actually more afraid of his feelings (and, especially of revealing them even to himself) than he is of any physical danger, in part at least because he is always afraid that his feelings will betray his all-important thinking morality. An example of this is shown *in Hornblower and the Hotspur*, when Hornblower's much-loved steward, Doughty, strikes back at a petty officer who is beating him. A natural reaction (it is portrayed) by a gentle man. But, this is mutiny and the sentence is death. Hornblower (after much internal debate) contrives to 'accidentally' allow Doughty an opportunity to escape to an American ship while in Cadiz harbour. But – afterwards – Hornblower's thinking-type conscience is merciless.

"He sat with drooping head, deep in depression. He had lost his integrity – which meant he had lost his self-respect. In his life he had made mistakes, whose memory could still make him writhe, but this time he had done far more. He had committed a breach of duty....He had violated his sworn oath, and he had done so from mere personal reasons, out of sheer self-indulgence...He was ashamed of himself, and the shame was all the more acute when his pitiless self-analysis brought up the conviction that, if he could relive those past hours, he would do the same again....Hornblower mourned over his lost integrity like Niobe over her dead children.

(Hornblower and the Hotspur, 1962, London: Michael Joseph, p 261)

So much for Jung

The three preference choices that I have described were all those that Jung included in his theory. When he was asked, in an interview with the BBC towards the end of his life, if he had given much thought to his own typology, he said (among other things and approximately)

'Well, you see I always thought, and I had much intuition too. And I had a certain difficulty with feelings. And my relationship with the world was not very good – I was often at variance with the reality of things. So you see, from this you can make a complete diagnosis.'

Jung is saying that he had preferences for introversion, intuition and thinking. Note that he begins with thinking. While we all have a preferred perceiving function and a preferred judging function most (some say all) of us will make use of one of these preferences more than the other. In the case of Jung, it is reasonable to guess that his most-of-all preferred function is thinking; that, above all, he was an **introverted thinking type**. Introversion would therefore be termed his **dominant attitude**, thinking (probably) his **dominant function**. His secondary intuition preferences would be called his **auxiliary function**. And the opposite of his most-preferred thinking function (i.e. feeling) would be called his **inferior function**. The third function is rather neglected in the literature.

It is generally accepted by Jungians that one operates most efficiently, intelligently and consciously when using one's dominant attitude and function, quite well when using one's auxiliary function and less well when using the non-preferred functions. The inferior function is said to operate largely unconsciously, and to have a powerful emotional charge as a result. It may overwhelm ego consciousness and the preferred functions when one is stressed or otherwise vulnerable. This has positive and negative aspects. The inferior function is often discussed as the door to the unconscious and sometimes to psychological development: but it may also have catastrophic results when the individual cannot work through inferior function overwhelmment.

Finally, it is accepted by most, although not all Jungians that, while the dominant function is generally used with the dominant attitude, the auxiliary function is generally used when one is using one's less-preferred attitude. In Jung's case, introversion and thinking would go together, supported by extraverted intuition. This shouldn't be taken as true in every case, but it seems to be true for most people, in my experience and in the literature. The third function choice would then, be (occasionally) used with the dominant attitude and the inferior function would be used with the inferior (less-preferred) attitude – in Jung's case, introverted sensing followed by extraverted feeling in Jung's case. Hence, Jung's 'difficulty with feeling'.

The personality 'pecking order' for Jung would therefore be: 1=introverted thinking: 2=extraverted intuition: 3=introverted sensing: 4=extraverted feeling. For a hilarious description of Jung's problems when presented with extraverted feeling situations try to get hold of the DVD by Joe Wheelwright listed at the end of this file.

These issues are discussed a little more below and in the *Sixteen Personality Types* file. And also in some of the references at the end of this file.

The Judging-Perceiving Axis

Most followers of Jung today think that there is another important dimension of personality - the **judging-perceiving axis** which divides people who like to make decisions (**Js**) and those who like to keep bringing up possibilities (**Ps**). Jung, who never made a decision when he could think about a subject for another decade, would have been a perceiving type, making his overall typology **INTP**. The characteristics of the **INTP** and all the other preference combinations are briefly outlined in *The Sixteen Personality Types*.

The P-J axis was not one of Jung's ideas and it is a little difficult to understand and to integrate with the other aspects of personality typology. It tells you something about what you **do** with your perceiving function preference (sensing or intuition) and with your judging function preference (thinking or feeling). But, unlike the other axes of personality, it doesn't measure which of two ways of being you **prefer**. It doesn't say whether you prefer your perceiving choice or your judging choice. It's more complicated than that.

The P-J axis is actually a measure of **behaviour** in the outer world; whether, in practice, you make decisions, or try to keep things open in the outer world. In other words, do you use your preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) or your preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) when you have to deal with the outer world? A **J** uses their preferred judging function in the outer world; a **P** uses their preferred perceiving function. For extraverts and introverts, this means different things.

Most introverts, of course, use their dominant function when being introverted (dominant function with dominant attitude again). And they will generally use their auxiliary function choice in the world (auxiliary function with inferior attitude). So, if someone is an IP, for example, they will be an introvert who uses their perceiving function in the outer world. So, they will **seem** to the observer to be a sensing or intuitive type as they deal with the outer world with one of these functions; but the outer world is secondary to them. At heart, they will very probably be using Feeling or Thinking: they are really an (internal) thinker or feeler. The PJ scale says that they use their perceiving function in the world, but it **doesn't** say that that is the dominant function. An IJ, in contrast is an introvert who uses their judging function when dealing with the outer world. They will **seem** to be a judging type (feeling or thinking), but they will be using a (dominant) perceiving function inside. They are really an internal sensing or intuitive person. Jung, for example, was almost certainly an INTP, often using his perceiving intuitive preference in the outer world, but at heart an introverted thinking type.

Extraverts are different, of course. They will generally make use of their dominant function in the outer world. So, for example, if someone is an EJ, they are an extravert who uses their preferred judging function in the outer world. This function (whether thinking or feeling) is very likely to be their dominant function: dominant function with dominant attitude; however, the extraverted judger, like everyone, has two function preferences: they will have a perceiving function choice as well. But, in this case, it isn't apparent in the outer world. So where is it? It's inside. In the great majority of cases, it has been shown that extraverts make use of their second (auxiliary) function choice when introverting: auxiliary function with inferior attitude. It's a rule of thumb again, but it does seem to be true for most people. An EP, by comparison, is an extravert who uses their preferred perceiving function in the outer world. This function (sensing or intuition) is likely to be their dominant function. In most cases, they will be using their judging function when introverting. So, what you see is what you get with extraverts, with bells on. The EJ seems like a judger and they are: the EP seems like, and is, a perceiver.

So, the P-J axis, however measured, does not tell you which attitudes or functions you prefer. But it has a special usefulness. It tells you, in a limited way, how you are likely to behave in the world. And in practice, 'judgers' and 'perceivers' (whatever their precise attitude and function choices) can be two quite distinct groups of people.

Judgers and Perceivers

Judgers appear to be decisive and quickly so. When a J co-worker asks you out to lunch, for example, they expect a yes or no answer and a quick decision about what sort of food to have. If you are a P you will probably want to raise a host of possibilities. This will annoy the J and may be taken as a disguised 'no' to the lunch suggestion. Js like to make decisions and they also moan and groan if you want to change a decision once made. It can be quite frightening for a P who wants to challenge a Js decision: and they will want to challenge it – probably several times – especially at the end of a long day of negotiations, when everyone else thinks that things have finally been decided. To the true P, this is really the best time to start the whole negotiating process again from scratch.

If you are a P and you want to change a J's decision, remember to do it at long range, never face to face. The J will be annoyed and grumble, but you don't have to be within earshot! Wait a few minutes until the moaning stops and then close in to cement the change. If you are a J and you want a firm answer from a P, using red herrings can be effective. If, say, you want to go out for lunch with them, give them time to make as many suggestions as to venue as possible. Then 'decide' on a venue that you don't want. The P won't like that (I don't know why but this is how it works). Then suggest all the other venues that you don't want one by one and let the P find fault with each in turn. Aim to eliminate everything but your real choice.

Putting It All Together

We have now looked at all the personality choices that Jung and his successors envisaged - the (extraverted or introverted) worlds that we live in, our preferences for understanding the world (sensing or intuition) and for decision-making (feeling or thinking) and whether we prefer to use our decision making preference in the outer world (judging) or prefer to remain open - and suspend judgment - in the outer world (perceiving). If you have taken the short personality test on this website by now, you will know your preferences – at least when you are socialising and when you are at work. You will ‘have your letters’. Many personality writers think that you need to know all of your ‘letters’ and believe absolutely in the personality typology (one of the sixteen available) that your letters give you, as a total package to be used in relation to every life situation.

However, you need to take all this with several grains of salt. What you actually need to work out is how to make best use of what you now know about yourself. What follows is a part of my own approach to understanding psychological type.

There are all sorts of ways of doing this. All are valid: none are necessarily better than others.

First, you may not find all your letters equally as useful or even useful at all. Jung himself didn’t go beyond the first three preferences. He was an INT, in other words and that was all that he needed or wanted to know. Note also, the humility with which he described his typology: as a tendency towards certain personality directions and nothing at all to be especially proud of. Let us start, then, with the simplest typological descriptions possible. **NOTE** that what follows now is rather complex. You may find it takes a read or so to sink in.

One-Preference Characters

There are a few people in whom only a single preference is detectable. Famous recluses (like J.Paul Getty Junior) and less famous recluses like many Australian bush ‘swaggies’ can be so withdrawn from the social world that one can’t say anything about them in terms of personality, except to say that they are introverts. Or, if you prefer, that introversion is their **cardinal preference**.

Another example might be Elizabeth David, the intuitives’ intuitive of food writers, forever describing the ambience, or the memory of sights and sounds connected with her dishes, taking a helicopter perspective about the meaning of a dish, or an approach to cooking. This is what strikes me most of all about her books. She seems to be far less concerned with such issues as the values of food vs the logic or efficiency of its production, or cooking for company vs cooking for oneself.

Two-Preference Characters

Going a little further, you might find that you gain most help from discovering just your dominant attitude and your dominant function - your two 'most-preferreds', your **central** type preferences, if you like.

Jung, for example, is often described as an introverted thinking type, while Bill Clinton might be called an extraverted intuitive. This sort of description often gives a rather two-dimensional description of the individual and, if it is the only description that can be given, suggests that the person has not clearly developed all their attitude and function preferences, that they are what many type watchers call an 'undeveloped' personality. Others would say that they are just specialists in what they do best! In my experience, finding their dominant attitudes and functions is as far as about one-third need – or wish – to go.

One advantage of being able to describe a person only in terms of their dominant function and attitude is that it is easy to understand and easy to pick out a person's inferior (least-preferred) function and, as we have already seen, their psychological Achilles heel. For an introverted thinking type like Jung, this would be his feeling function - extraverted feeling (least-preferred function with non-preferred attitude). In the case of an extraverted intuitive like, perhaps, Bill Clinton, type theory would state that his probable inferior function will be (introverted) sensing - his capacity to take in, store and correctly and effectively use data, and to remember, without the use of external reminders, exactly what happened when, where and to (or with) whom.

Getting More Complex: Three Letters

Some type experts are most comfortable with the concept of a dominant function and a dominant attitude, modified by the presence of the less strongly-preferred (or auxiliary) function. Using this approach Jung, for example, becomes an introverted thinking type with auxiliary intuition: type theory, as discussed earlier (and below), then suggests that his thinking would be used introvertedly, his intuition when being extraverted. In other words, Jung would **seem** like an intuitive type at first meeting and his all-important introverted thinking might actually be less easy to see at first. It is interesting that this was Laurence van der Post's impression of him. In *Remembering Jung* (Remembering Jung, 1975, Bosustow Productions), he describes Jung as a man immediately fascinated by the ideas of others: and as 'A wonderful cook. He would start with an idea'. Very different from the reality of confrontation with Jung's thinking function in the heat of therapy!

To follow the logic of our earlier descriptions, our Bill Clinton now becomes an extraverted intuitive with auxiliary (either) thinking or feeling: surely feeling, in such a warm and loving personality. But, if so, the feeling function would be introverted. It would be an inner set of values of some importance, but not designed for public discussion. Readers will have to make up their own minds whether type theory falls down here and fails to convey the essentials of an individual's personality. Don't forget what we said earlier, that type descriptions are theoretical constructs that are useful, always fun and often very revealing: but that they don't work in every case or every situation and are only, at best, a description of personality viewed from the

outside. Many other factors come into play in complex people and in complex situations.

You may also personally find that knowing your secondary functional preference is a help. If you are an extraverted sensing type, for example, it can be useful to know that being and EST is different from being and ESF; that either your feeling or thinking will act as a moderator of your use of your dominant sensing; that facts may be used logically, or in relation to other peoples' needs.

Conventional wisdom, as already discussed, suggests that the most-preferred (dominant) function choice is normally used with the dominant attitude and that the secondary function choice is normally used (less frequently) when the non-preferred attitude has to be used. Our extraverted sensing type above would use secondary feeling or thinking when being introverted. Carl Jung, as discussed above, was an introverted thinker, who was known to use intuition when forced to be extraverted.

Another point comes out of this, however. The second function choice is often less clear than the first. Also, many people are able to make a fair use of both the secondary function choice and (upon occasion and when they really have to), its opposite. Thus, while our extraverted sensing type won't normally be able to make much effective use of intuition (the inferior function), he or she may well be able to use both thinking and feeling to some degree. Carl Jung was disastrously at sea with feelings (the opposite of his dominant thinking) but could use both his secondary preference of intuition and its opposite (sensing) to at least some degree.

All of which is fine as far as it goes, but must not be taken as being always the case. Many people have a typology that doesn't conform to 'conventional wisdom'. They may, for example, have a dominant function that is used predominantly when both extraverting or introverting: intuitives are particularly liable to do this, in my experience. Or they may have no real choice for a second function. Most books on personality typology suggest that there is something wrong with these and other 'non-conforming' arrangements and that every effort should be made to conform to a conventional preference pattern. But, in my opinion, rules like this can't be applied to everyone. Quite a few psychologically well-developed people don't conform and can happily go along with their psychological 'biases', just as they are able to accept that their personalities vary across situations.

The three letter model is as far as Jung wanted to go in relation to personality types, but most modern typologists go further, with the addition of the P-J dimension.

Four Letters

The most complex approach to personality is to try to view the totality of one's preferences holistically and to think in terms of an overall 'psychological type': one of the sixteen possible personality combinations. Brief descriptions of all the combinations are given in *The Sixteen Types*. I would also recommend reading the material on this website by and about John Beebe.

Some Recommended readings

Jung, C.G. Collected Works. Volume 6. XI. Four essays on psychological typology.

Spoto, A. Jung's Typology in Perspective. Chiron.

Wilmer, H.A. Understandable Jung. Chiron.

Remembering Jung: Conversations about C.G. Jung and His Work. 24. Joe Wheelwright. Bosustow Video.

If you can't find these references locally, they occasionally turn up in Amazon and are always available from the C.G. Jung Bookstore of Los Angeles.