

Spammmmyummy

10 October 2022 (New->19 August 2023)

Using the Nucleus Stack for MBTI does not make it Jungian + Expanding past Grant

First off, Jungian is a typology system made by Carl Jung where he studied people's attitude towards the world and how they judge/perceive the things that happen. This also covers the conscious, unconscious, and occasionally mentioning the shadow within his book *Psychological Types*. As for MBTI, Myers Briggs simplified Jung's work in hopes of making it more applicable to her version of the modern world (which has changed by now). Also, her simplification wasn't able to convey the things Jung explained because she ignored parts of the theory in her newer version. Key concepts like Jung's interpretation of introversion/extroversion were lost in Myer's simplification. This caused the different descriptions, Jung's VS Brigg's, to be two systems instead of the same one.

Now, when I speak of the jungian/nucleus stack, I'm referencing types that are IIEE/EEII instead of altering between extroverted functions and introverted functions. For example, an INFJ using the Grant stack would be NiFeTiSe, while it would be NiFiTeSe for the nucleus stack. The nucleus/jungian stack also aligns with concepts found in Jungian itself, which MBTI derives from, so it's quite valid. I've spoken of this in my other posts/stories so anyone wondering can read through them. And how, with the inconsistency Jung had towards the stack, multiple ones might exist. Not that I would use all of them or apply all of them, but just acknowledging that it was vaguely mentioned if anyone wanted it (and if I ever get to it).

However, I've noticed that some people don't acknowledge the nucleus stack even though it is more truthful to the original theory than the Grant stack is. This doubt seems to be due to the general consensus not using nucleus (which can be changed if people decided to play a part in it), or because "it has no basis." Where questions like "did the creator mention this?" occur even though the reason there are so many different systems and improvements are because people decided to go further than whatever the creator had written. For one, MBTI wouldn't exist if Myers chose to be content with whatever Jung had written. This goes for socionics as well. Improvements are only possible when people become open to change, so why shut down an idea simply because the creator didn't directly state it?

As for its reliability, the nucleus stack works well with MBTI because Jung had mentioned that the conscious has one attitude (intro/extro) and the unconscious has the opposite attitude (intro/extro). In which the dominant would be conscious and the inferior as unconscious. The auxiliary then aids the dominant function by supporting its relation to the object (attitude) while the tert is the inferior's auxiliary.

If the auxiliary were in the opposite attitude, it would be going against the individual's natural preference. In this way, the auxiliary would fail to support the dominant function because its relation to the object would be completely different. For example, being cognitively extroverted means that the individual has a positive relationship with objective happenings and is willing to put its energy into the world. An auxiliary with introversion would not rely or put effort into the outside world. So if the aux is in the opposite attitude of the dominant, it would not be able to work with the dominant and instead go against it. What's the point of the auxiliary function if it can't help the dominant function? This disconnect between the dominant function and the auxiliary is why the nucleus stack is quite valid on its own and remains more truthful to Jung's theory than the Grant stack does.

Instead of it being "balanced" like how it is described in the Grant stack, it reflects that the individual does indeed have a preference with cognitive introversion or extroversion; unlike in Gifts Differing where there was a focus of introversion/extroversion solely relating to people's social preference as a way to make it more applicable. This goes to such an extent that Myers says that hell is losing the opportunity to party for the extrovert, and going to a party is hell for the introvert. The E and I in a type (IXXX/EXXX) loses its importance and becomes a stereotype, along with it being shallow simply so people will attach the label to themselves in order to feel a sense of worth. On the other hand, when applying the nucleus stack, introversion/extroversion holds more value and shows a cognitive preference instead of a social one.

Despite the way it stems from Jungian, the nucleus stack is being used as a tool towards MBTI and its cognitive functions. It follows theories from Jungian but it isn't Jung's psychological types. Even if it may be the Nucleus stack people are using, it is not Jungian if it's TeSe or NeFe. It's still MBTI as it uses the MBTI cognitive functions.

Additionally, in Jungian, the cognitive functions aren't the same as MBTI ones. There's no Se or Ni to be ordered in the same way MBTI is capable of. Only the functions of intuition/sensation/feeling/thinking and attitudes of introversion/extroversion exist. This means there are four functions instead of eight. When these functions and attitudes come together, a type would then be IT(S) or something of that sort. The concept of introversion/extroversion is carried over from Jungian so the stack is referred to as the Jungian stack. But an NiFi INFJ is not Jungian, it's MBTI with the Jungian/nucleus stack. Confusing the stack for Jung's psychological types descriptions makes it seem as if knowing the stack means

understanding Jung's works but this is false. There's much more to Jungian and terms like SiTi ISTJ doesn't even fall into it. Clarification of this was the aim of the post.

Extra Info!! Jungian works in a way where the dominant is a function with an attitude. Ex. EF being in the extroverted attitude with feeling as dominant, and can have a preferred auxiliary, either being S or N. Sensing or intuition. For EN it would have an auxiliary of T or F. Though there are pure types - being purely EN without strong preference of T or F. In most cases though, the preference exists so the completed type would be an EN(F). There's no EN(EF) or something of the sort. And the dichotomies in Jungian go much deeper than MBTI ones. So, if MBTI seems interesting, I think people will enjoy socionics or Jungian better.

Alright, that was all for this. I just redid it because the previous one was horrible and people keep mistaking things like NiTi for Jungian when it's really not. Let me know if you have any questions, I'll try my best to direct you to an answer.

Sources: Psychological Types, Gifts Differing