

The Four Dimensions of Myers and Jung

(That is --- What do all those letters mean and where do they come from?)

*Excerpted from Please Understand Me II, by David Keirsey
Copyrighted 1998, all rights reserved*

Extroversion (E) and Introversion (I)

Intuition (N) and Sensing (S)

Thinking (T) and Feeling (F)

Judgment (J) and Perception (P)

Function Types vs Intelligence Types

What follows shows the great contrast of Jung's and Myers's four function types and their variants with my four intelligence types and their skilled action roles. In considering the contrasts please bear in mind that Jung and Myers were trying to figure out what the different types have in mind, while I am trying to figure out what they can do well under varying circumstances.

Function Types	Intelligence Types
Thinking Types ESTJ -- ENTJ [Extraverted Thinking] ISTP -- INTP [Introverted Thinking]	NT Rationals ENTJ -- INTJ [Coordinator] ENTP -- INTP [Engineer]
Intuitive Types ENTP-- ENFP [Extraverted Intuiting] INFJ -- INTJ [Introverted Intuiting]	NF Idealists ENFJ -- INFJ [Mentor] ENFP -- INFP [Advocate]
Feeling Types ESFJ -- ENFJ [Extraverted Feeling] ISFP -- INFP [Introverted Feeling]	SP Artisans ESTP -- ISTP [Expediter] ESFP -- ISFP [Improviser]
Sensory Types ESTP -- ESFP [Extraverted Sensing] ISFJ -- ISTJ [Introverted Sensing]	SJ Guardians ESTJ -- ISTJ [Administrator] ESFJ -- ISFJ [Conservator]

The first great difference between the two schemes lies in the way function typology and intelligence typology see the ESTJs and the ENTJs. Jung and Myers call both ESTJs and ENTJs "Extraverted Thinking" types, and thus nearly identical in attitude and action. I, however, see them as light years apart. All NT Rationals, including ENTJ Coordinators, are abstract in communicating messages and utilitarian in using tools to implement their goals, while all SJ Guardians, including ESTJ Administrators, are concrete in communicating messages and cooperative in using tools.

The second major difference lies in the two typologies' view of the ISFP and the INFP. Myers and Jung put them in the same category -- the "Introverted Feeling" type -- very much alike and very little different, while I consider them just as far apart as the ENTJ and ESTJ. After all, the INFP Advocate is an NF Idealist, abstract in thought and speech and cooperative in selecting and using tools, hence diametrically opposite to the ISFP Improviser, a concrete utilitarian SP Artisan.

The third great difference between the intelligence and function typologies is the way the two see the INTP and the ISTP. Myers and Jung see them as nearly identical, both "Introverted Thinking" types,

with a few minor differences. I, however, see them as far more different. While they are both utilitarian in choosing and using tools, the INTP is an Engineer Rational, steadfastly abstract in thought and speech, and the ISTP is an Expeditor Artisan, just as steadfastly concrete in thought and speech.

The fourth great difference is in the two views of the ENFJ. Function typology sees the ENFJ as very little different from the ESFJ, while intelligence typology sees a much greater difference. The two have in common a cooperative attitude about ways and means of pursuing goals, but the ENFJ, a Mentor Idealist, is unmistakably abstract in thought and speech, and the ESFJ, a Conservator Guardian, is unmistakably concrete.

The other differences are great, but less important in comparison to the ones I have just discussed. Thus function theory has the INFJ quite similar to the INTJ, while intelligence theory has the INFJ a Mentor Idealist, the INTJ a Coordinator Rational, the two miles apart in what they do and what they want. And function theory sees the ENFP as much like the ENTP, while intelligence theory sees the ENFP as an Advocate Idealist, the ENTP as an Engineer Rational, the two, again, very different in their behavior and corresponding attitudes. Admittedly ENFPs and ENTPs can be hard to tell apart, at least on short acquaintance, but watch for any length of time and their differences show up one by one until it is abundantly clear that the resemblance is at best superficial.

Extraversion or Introversion (E/I)

*Excerpted from Please Understand Me II, by David Keirsey
Copyrighted © 1998, all rights reserved*

While Jung considered the distinction between [extraversion \(E\)](#) and [introversion \(I\)](#) as the most important of his dimensions of personality, I think of it as least useful in understanding people and predicting what they'll do. Indeed, in my view it borders on the trivial compared to [S-N](#), and is much less useful than [T-F](#) and [J-P](#). Presumably extreme extraverts and extreme introverts are easy to spot, and that may be the reason the Jungians and therefore the Myersians consider the concept to be so important.

Important or not, Myers's E-I scale is badly flawed because she inherited Jung's error of confusing extraversion with observation (S) and introversion with introspection (N). And so to make the E-I distinction useful at all, we must define the two concepts, not in terms of mental focus or interest, but in terms of social address or social attitude. Thus when someone is observed to be talkative and sociable (the so-called "extravert") he or she can be described as "expressive." In contrast, people who are more quiet and private (the so-called "introverts") can be described as "reserved." Interestingly, because **Reserved** persons tend to hold their fire verbally, they tend to listen carefully to what others say, while **Expressive** persons tend not to listen very well, so eager are they to tell others of what they have on their minds. So in general, the Expressive are quick to speak and slow to listen, while the Reserved are quick to listen and slow to speak.

Of course, everyone is expressive in *some* degree, but not in the *same* degree. Those who are more expressive appear more comfortable around groups of people than they are when alone. Thus they can also be thought of as socially gregarious or outgoing. On the other hand, those who are more reserved seem to be more comfortable when alone than when in a crowd. And thus they can be thought of as socially seclusive or retiring. Remember, however, that these distinctions are not clear cut: each individual surely varies from time to time in his or her desire to be expressive and in company or reserved and in seclusion.

A metaphor might shed light on this difference. Imagine that a person's energy is powered by batteries. Given this, then Expressive persons (ESTPs, ENFJs, etc.) appear to be energized, charged up, by contact with other people. Owing to the surge they get when in company, they are quick to approach others, even strangers, and talk to them, finding this an easy and pleasant thing to do, and something they don't want to do without. Such interaction apparently charges their batteries and makes them feel alive. Thus, when they leave a lively party at two o'clock in the morning, they might well be ready to go on to

another one. Their batteries are almost overcharged, having received so much stimulation from the social interaction. In fact, quiet and seclusion actually exhaust the Expressive, and they report feelings of loneliness (or power drain) when they are not in contact with others. For example, if an Expressive person goes to a library to do research in the stacks, he or she may, after fifteen minutes or so, feel bored and tired, and have to exercise strong will-power to keep from taking a short brain break and striking up a conversation with the librarian.

On the other hand, Reserved persons (ISFJs, INTJs, etc.) can be said to draw energy from a different source. They prefer to pursue solitary activities, working quietly alone with their favored project or hobby, however simple or complicated it may be, and such isolated activities are what seem to charge their batteries. Indeed, the Reserved can remain only so long in contact with others before their energies are depleted. If required by their job, family, or social responsibilities to be expressive or outgoing -- to make a great interpersonal effort -- they are soon exhausted and need alone time in quiet places to rest and to restore their depleted energy. Thus, if Reserved persons go to a noisy cocktail party, after a short period of time -- say, half an hour -- they are ready to go home. For them, the party is over, their batteries are drained. This is not to say that the Reserved do not like to be around people. They enjoy socializing with others, but at large social gatherings or professional meetings they tend to seek out a quiet corner where they can chat with one or two other persons.

There is some social bias toward expressiveness in American social life, but Reserved persons have no reason to feel that there is anything wrong with them, and should be sure to provide adequately for their legitimate desire for quiet time to themselves.

Sensation or Intuition (S/N)

Carl Jung used the words "sensation" and "sensing" (S) to mean paying attention to what is going on outside ourselves, that is, external attention. Thus "sensation" may be used synonymously with three words pertaining to external attention, "observation", "externalization," and "exteroception."

In contrast, Jung gave us two engaging metaphors to convey how he used the word "intuition" (N). Intuition, he said, is "listening to the inner voice" or "heeding the promptings from within." The word "intuition" is engaging because it literally means "internal attention." We pay attention to what is going on inside ourselves with our mind's eye and our mind's ear, these promptings coming as thoughts and feelings. Thus "intuition" can be used synonymously with three other terms pertaining to internal attention, "introspection," "internalization," and "interoception." So we can contrast "introspection" with "observation," "internalization" with "externalization," and "interoception" with "exteroception."

For the purposes of describing personality types, I have found the easiest and most accurate terms to be "introspection" and "observation."

Very simply, we observe objects through our senses. Thus we look at objects to see them, listen to sounds to hear them, touch surfaces to feel them, sniff odors to smell them, and mouth substances to taste them. We can observe what is present, but not what isn't present. Whatever isn't present to our senses we can only imagine by means of introspection.

Naturally, all of us do both observation and introspection, but it is a rare individual who does an equal amount of each. The vast majority of us, maybe 85%, spend most of our waking hours looking at, listening to, and touching objects in our immediate presence, and very little of our time introspecting, that is, making inferences, imagining, daydreaming, musing, or wondering about things not in our presence.

The point not to be missed is that we cannot do these things simultaneously. When we observe what's going on around us, we cannot at the same time observe what's going on within us. We may alternate our attention, but we cannot divide it. Some of us, from infancy on, seem to be more raptly attentive to inner promptings, others, to outer promptings. The reason for this difference in attention is not at all

clear, and certainly it is a matter of conjecture. But if the reason for this preference in attention is obscure, the consequences of it are not. Those of us who attend inwardly much of the time as children strengthen that preference, our inner voice becoming louder and clearer, our inner promptings more vivid and complex. Likewise, those of us who heed the external much of the time come to see and hear objects in more detail and with greater specificity.

Now, if we look at Myers's type descriptions, people are either more observant than introspective, or more introspective than observant. Observers (SPs and SJs) seem more at home when looking after the particulars of everyday living, attending to concrete things -- food, clothing, shelter, transportation -- and to practical matters such as recreation and safety, and are likely to leave the more abstract issues to others. In turn, Introspectors (NTs and NFs) tend to be more content when these concrete concerns are handled by someone else and they are left free to consider the more abstract world of ideas. This does not mean, of course, that Observer types are without an inner life -- far from it -- but simply that their introspection takes a back seat to their observation. Nor does this mean that Introspector types are unaware of the objects around them -- not at all -- but simply that they are more inclined to become absorbed in their ideas.

To put this difference another way, Observers might be called "earthlings" or "terrestrials," concrete, down to earth beings who keep their feet on the ground. These persons see what is in front of them and are usually accurate in catching details. It is said that "they don't miss much." Observers want facts, trust facts, and remember facts, and they want to deal with the facts of a situation as they are, either in the here and now, or as recorded in the past. They focus on what is happening, or what has happened, rather than anticipating what might be, what would happen if, or what might occur in the future.

In contrast, Introspectors might be called "extraterrestrials," abstract beings who live with their head in the clouds, strangers in a strange land who wonder about the curious antics of the earthlings. Absorbed as they often are in their internal world, Introspectors tend to miss a great deal of what's right around them -- current reality is merely a problem to be solved, or a stage of development toward some future ideal. Not only can they miss details, they can also lose track of where they are, and for instance drive right past their highway turn-off. "It's only reality" they sometimes say, to register their relative disinterest in the merely concrete. But more than disinterest, Introspectors can be discontent with reality, even bothered by it, and speculate about possible ways of improving it.

Because of their tenuous grasp of reality, Introspectors can appear to Observers as flighty, impractical, and unrealistic -- the dreamer or absent-minded professor who can't be bothered with the nitty-gritty of living. For their part, Observers can seem to Introspectors as unimaginative, concerned only with trivial pursuits, and exasperatingly slow to consider implications and possibilities. Both views are exaggerations. Indeed, both kinds of people are capable and even creative in their own way -- it's just that they attend to very different sides of life, with the other side getting short-changed.

Thus Observers can manage the material world with skill, but the penalty they pay for ignoring the promptings from within is that these promptings can gradually fade away, and they may end up with relatively undeveloped introspective abilities. They may now and then introspect, but not for long and with little pleasure. On the other hand, Introspectors practice introspection much of their time, and with pleasure, but the penalty they pay for this is that they can end up with relatively undeveloped observational abilities.

The two ways are not mutually exclusive. Introspectors have no choice but to turn outward at times and concern themselves with the business of everyday living, while Observers do occasionally look inward to ponder, and dream, and make inferences. Such excursions can even be stimulating and satisfying, but neither type can be in both worlds at once, and each will usually show a strong preference for one over the other. For both types, the vitality, the immediacy, and the significance of life is found more easily in their own world, while what is central to the other's world seems relatively foreign, uninteresting, and unimportant.

Thinking or Feeling (T/F)

Excerpted from Please Understand Me II, by David Keirse
Copyrighted © 1998, all rights reserved

Everybody has **thoughts (T)** and **feelings (F)** but some pay more attention to their thoughts than to their feelings while others pay more attention to their feelings than to their thoughts. Those who attend mainly to their thoughts are said to govern themselves with their head, their concepts and percepts being their guides to action. In contrast, those who pay more attention to their feelings are said to follow their heart, which means that much of what they do is based on emotion or desire. If we use a distinction made by the great pragmatist William James, some people are more "tough-minded" and others more "tender-minded." But if we note the words Myers used in her type portraits, we see that her distinction is between those who can be called "tough-minded" and those who can be called "friendly."

There is some criticism exchanged between these types. The Tough-minded are often accused of being "inhuman," "heartless," "stony-hearted," "remote," of having "ice in their veins," and of living "without the milk of human kindness." In the same way, the Friendly are chided for being "too soft-hearted," "too emotional," "bleeding-hearts," "muddleheaded," "fuzzy-thinkers," and for "wearing their heart on their sleeve."

Such accusations can be vehement and damaging, particularly in marriages and other family relationships, when two people of different orientation are in conflict over an important decision. An ENFP wife, for example, might want her INTP husband to open up emotionally and "let his feelings show," while he might wish she "would be logical for once." Or an ESTJ father might want his ISFP son to straighten up and "use his head" for a change, while the son might wish his father could "lighten up" and be more understanding of what he really is and can do.

Another polarizing (and inaccurate) stereotype is that the Friendly types have more and deeper emotions than the Tough-minded types -- one side is seen as sensitive and warm-hearted, and the other seen as insensitive and cold-hearted. Here again, however, the truth is that both react emotionally with similar frequency and intensity, the difference being a matter of display. The Friendly tend to make their emotions and wishes quite visible and audible, so others see them as capable of deep feelings. To be sure, when they show their feelings, others cannot help being affected, their own emotions even aroused by the display. The Tough-minded, in contrast, are embarrassed by an exhibition of intense feeling, and will hide their feelings rather than be seen as losing self-control. Because of this, they are often described as "cold" and "indifferent," when in fact they are feeling something quite strongly -- only working hard to contain themselves.

When they can get past the stereotypes, these two orientations usually find they can complement each other quite well, whether in business or in marriage, with the Tough-minded partner providing a source of clarity and toughness, and the Friendly partner providing a source of compassion and personal consideration.

Judgment or Perception (J/P)

Excerpted from Please Understand Me II, by David Keirse
Copyrighted © 1998, all rights reserved

Myers claimed that she confined her usage of the word "**judgment (J)**" to mean "coming to a conclusion," but again and again she used "judgment" to describe people who make and keep schedules in their daily lives. Myers also used the word "**perception (P)**" to describe people who prefer to probe for options and thus not be tied to a schedule.

In other words, **Schedulers** are judicious about schedules, **Probers** perceptive of options. Schedulers make agendas, timetables, programs, lists, syllabi, calendars, outlines, registers, and so on, for

themselves and others to follow; Probers keep their eyes open for chances to do things they want to, for opportunities and alternatives they might avail themselves of. Each orientation has problems. By committing themselves to a set agenda, Schedulers tend to stop looking for alternatives and options and so may never know what they're missing. By keeping their options open Probers are reluctant to commit themselves to schedules and so are inclined to miss deadlines and leave tasks unfinished.

Unfortunately, the difference between Schedulers and Probers can be a source of irritation in personal relationships, both in the home and the workplace, the latter where opposites must work together to accomplish a task. Schedulers, whether observant or introspective, tend to believe that one's work comes before all else, and must be finished before one rests or plays. This strict work ethic has a marked effect on what they will do to get the job done. They tend to establish deadlines and to take them seriously, expecting others to do the same. And they are willing to do all sorts of preparation, maintenance, and cleaning up afterwards -- just because these are necessary to see the job through to its conclusion.

Not so with Probers, who seem more playful about their work. The job doesn't have to be finished before play or rest begins, and they tend to look upon deadlines as mere alarm clocks which buzz at a given time, easily turned off or ignored while they catch an extra forty winks, almost as if the deadline were used more as a signal to start than to complete a project. Also, Probers are much more insistent that the work be enjoyable and to the purpose. Indeed, if the given task is not directly instrumental (is mere preparation, maintenance, or clean up), then they may balk at doing it, or wander off and leave it to someone else.

This difference extends to the physical environment as well. Schedulers tend to be neat and orderly. They like their desk at work to be tidy, and their house picked up -- dishes done, bed made, car washed, and so on. Not that they always manage all of these chores, but they are unhappy when their personal space is a mess, and straightening things up is often near the top of their list. Probers, in contrast, have a much greater tolerance for disorder in their physical environment. They seem absorbed in whatever they're doing or thinking about at the moment, and are somewhat oblivious to the details of housekeeping. And so their personal spaces -- office, house, garage, car -- are often cluttered with a variety of objects they have picked up, used, and then dropped when they have finished with them.

These two styles -- Oscar and Felix in *The Odd Couple* -- can get on each other's nerves. Schedulers can become impatient with Probers for what seems their passiveness and playfulness, and can be heard to describe them as "indecisive" and "foot-dragging," as "aimless" and "lazy," as "uncooperative," "quibbling," and a "roadblock," as "sloppy" and even "slovenly." On the other hand, Probers can become impatient with Schedulers because of their pressure and urgency, and will describe them as "in too big a hurry" and "too rule-bound," as "driven" and "wearing blinders," as "uptight," "stressed-out," and "slave-driving," as "arbitrary," "rigid and inflexible," and even as "neat-freaks."

Usually, such irritation and name-calling will subside when the two study each other's behavior. Many become fascinated and entertained by their differences, and with further understanding find it easy to make allowances for the other's way. Some can actually come to see that the two styles are complementary in turning in a job well done: Probers to spot opportunities and lay out alternatives, and Schedulers to be timely and press for closure.