

Archetypes and Types

Tiina Hautala

Vesa Routamaa

University of Vaasa, Department of Management

Abstract

This paper describes how Pearson-Marr Archetypes (PMAI) are represented in Finland. Data was collected mainly from students of business administration at the University of Vaasa in the years 2004-2007. All together 450 people filled in the modified archetypes questionnaire, and with this data factor analysis was run. There were 368 persons whose personality type was known and thus, they were studied with regard to both archetype and type. The Pearson-Marr model comprises twelve different archetypes: Innocent, Orphan, Warrior, Caregiver, Seeker, Destroyer, Lover, Creator, Ruler, Magician, Sage and Jester. In this study, six archetypes were found: Caregiver, Destructive Orphan, Ruling Warrior, Lover, Magical Creator and Ruling Sage. Statistical analyses of the type and archetype produced significant results for each factor. ESFJs scored high as Caregivers and Lovers; ENTPs and ISTJs as Ruling Warriors; ENTPs, INTJs, and ENFPs as Magical Creators; INTPs, ENFPs, ENTJs, and ESTJs as Ruling Sages. No type rated Destructive Orphan significantly high though ESTJ rated it low. These results are consistent with Finnish culture.

About the archetypes

While the origins of the archetypal hypothesis date back as far as Plato, probably the most famous definition of archetypes is the one presented by Jung. According to Jung (1968), archetypes are components of the collective unconscious and serve to organize, direct, and inform human thought and behavior. The influence of archetypes can be detected in the form of myths, symbols, and psychic aptitudes of human beings the world over. Each stage of life is mediated through a new set of archetypal imperatives which seek fulfillment in action: being parented, initiation, courtship, marriage, and preparation for death (Stevens, 2006).

Jung (1968) outlined four main archetypes: the Self (the regulating center of the psyche and facilitator of individuation), the Shadow (the opposite of the ego image, often containing qualities that the ego does not identify with but possesses nonetheless), the Anima (the feminine image in a man's psyche) and the Animus (the masculine image in a woman's psyche). Other archetypes include the anima, the divine child, the great mother, the wise old man, the trickster, and the core or maiden (Boeree, 1997: www.ship.edu/~cgboeree/jung.html; Carr, 2002).

Archetypes or like concepts are now used by many consultants to guide the development of business organizations. However, to date, only a few studies have probed their contributions. Carr (2002) studied archetypes and the psychodynamics related to the management of change. Carr suggests that an organization might gain an understanding of the symbols and practices that have contributed to the cultural messages that are being given to its employees. Accord-

ingly, examining under what conditions certain archetypal images emerge and their relationship to other images will help to enhance the understanding of behavior in business organizations (Carr, 2002).

The Pearson-Marr Archetypes (PMAI)

Pearson (1991) has concluded that there are at least five ways to explain what an archetype is:

- ✦ Spiritual seekers may think of archetypes as gods or goddesses, encoded in the collective unconscious.
- ✦ Rationals, such as academics, may conceive of archetypes as controlling paradigms
- ✦ Scientists may see archetypes as holograms, just as Jung recognized that the archetypal images he found in patients' dreams could also be found in myths, legends, and art.
- ✦ For people who are committed to religious positions, the archetypes are different facets of God.
- ✦ People who are interested in human growth may understand the archetypes as guides on their journey.

Pearson (1991) believes in the last option, and suggests that archetypes bring a task, a lesson, and ultimately a gift. Archetypes teach a person how to live. All twelve archetypes are important on the heroic journey, and for the individuation process.

The individuation process includes preparation (Innocent, Orphan, Warrior, Caregiver), the journey (Seeker, Lover, Destroyer, Creator) and the return (Ruler, Magician, Sage, Fool). The preparation gives the basic skills for living in

*Myers-Briggs Type Indicator®, MBTI®, and Introduction to Type are registered trademarks of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Trust in the US and other countries.

society, the journey gives us the knowledge when to give up or hold on, and when to focus on the new, and the return is a reward for the journey that includes taking responsibility for our lives as well as transforming and healing others and ourselves. These twelve archetypes may be described briefly as follows (Pearson 1991; Pearson & Marr, 2002):

The Innocent wants to be loved and be a part of things. He wants to be socially acceptable.

The innocent calls for a safe, secure environment. He has a desire to be protected, to experience unconditional love and acceptance. At his best, he is very positive and optimistic; he has a basic trust in others.

The Orphan is a survivor, and a bit of a cynic. He avoids situations that equate to hurting himself. He demonstrates interdependence, empathy, and realism. He has a tendency towards abandonment, betrayal, and self-betrayal. He may also have a tendency to disillusionment, discrimination, and victimization. At his best, he has a deep belief in the dignity of ordinary people and empathy for others, especially those in need.

The Warrior has a high level of assertiveness and fights for what really matters. He has courage, discipline, and skills. He calls for confrontation of a great challenge or obstacle. At his best, he has the fortitude to stand up for his ideals, himself, and others.

The Caregiver is generative and loving. He creates atmospheres and environments in which people feel safe and cared for. He has compassion and generosity. He tends to take responsibilities that require care of others. At his best, he sees others with kindness and compassion and shares their caring with everyone.

The Seeker is self-ruling and ambitious. He has a tendency towards alienation and dissatisfaction, emptiness. The Seeker finds a sense of higher meaning and value in his life. At his best, he is adventurous, independent, and self-sufficient.

The Lover has a longing for commitment and passion. He also has a tendency towards infatuation, seduction, yearning, and falling in love (with a person, an idea, a cause, or work). At his best he is charismatic, and he creates situations in which he helps people experience a touch that feels very special.

The Destroyer tends toward humility and acceptance. The Destroyer helps to recognize the need for change, without denying the pain or grief it involves. In this stage the tendency is towards the experience of pain, suffering, tragedy, and loss. At his best, he knows how to deal with loss with some grace and how to move on. He knows how to let go of old habits, activities, and relationships that are no longer productive or fulfilling.

The Creator has the gifts of creativity, identity, and vocation. He calls for daydreams, fantasies, images, or flashes of inspiration. At his best, he is highly imaginative and, with aesthetic sense, creates with ease. He has the potential to recreate his own life as a work of art.

The Ruler has sovereignty, responsibility, and competence. He seeks to provide resources, harmony, support, and order to life. At his best he takes control when things are in disarray, having a highly developed sense of responsibility.

The Magician has personal power. He can make win-win situations possible. He can make visions real. At his best, he is charismatic, highly self-aware, and he has the ability to unite people behind a common vision.

The Sage is skeptical, wise, and nonattached. He has a deep desire to find the truth. He accepts subjectivity as part of human life. At his best he is wise, curious, objective, and fair. He can commit to people and ideas even if it is impossible to know everything for sure.

The Jester (The fool) has the gifts of joy, freedom, and liberation. He has a desire to have more enjoyment in life, and he can experience it fully in the moment, even in stressful or difficult times.

Cultural differences between the United States and Finland

The best-known studies describing cultural differences among many countries are Hofstede's (1967, 2003). Figure 1 shows that the U.S. scores higher on three of Hofstede's cultural dimensions. The except is Uncertainty Avoidance, where Finland is higher. The differences are particularly great in Individualism and Masculinity.




Figure 1. Cultural Differences between the United States and Finland

Data

The data for the study of type and archetypes was collected in 2003-2007 mainly from students of business administration at the University of Vaasa. In total of 450 people filled in a modified questionnaire on archetypes. People whose MBTI-type was known numbered 369.

Method

The data from the total sample, 450, were then factor analyzed, with varimax rotation. A six-factors model produced reasonable results. Most of the factors were composed of two original archetypes, but the items fitted well together as can be seen in the next section. The six archetypes were: Caregiver, Destructive Orphan, Ruling Warrior, Lover, Magical Creator, and Ruling Sage.

Cronbach's alpha varied from 0.585 (Caregiver) to 0.789 (Magical Creator). The value of Cronbach's alpha should be at least 0.5, and good value is 0.7/0.8, thus the reliability concerning alphas can be regarded as acceptable.

(For specific information on the factors see Appendix I and II.)

Statistical analyses of archetypes and types were made after summing the items of each factor. With the SRTT-program those types belonging in the upper quartile (types who belonged in the 25 percent who answered very high in the archetype dimension) were compared to the whole sample (N=369). A person may rate more than one archetype as high and may appear in more than one of the archetype-type tables (Tables 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13).

Results

The type distribution of the archetype sample is presented in Table 1. This sample was slightly different from a large Finnish sample (N=2960; Rissanen & Routamaa, 2003). The preferences for Thinking (52%) - Feeling (48%) and Judging (52%) - Perceiving (48%) are more equal in the archetype sample. In the comparison sample preferences for Thinking (64%) and Judging (70%) clearly outnumber those for Feeling and Perceiving. In these data, the types in the archetype sample were mostly ESTJs (18%) ENFPs (14%) and ESFJs (10%). Only a few of the types were INs (INFJs, INFPs, INFPs or INTJs).

Table 1. Type Distribution of the Archetype Sample

N = 369

				N	%
ISTJ N = 26 %= 7.05 ■■■■■■	ISFJ N = 18 %= 4.88 ■■■■■■	INFJ N = 3 %= 0.81 ■	INTJ N = 8 %= 2.17 ■■	E	267 72.36
				I	102 27.64
				S	241 65.31
				N	128 34.69
ISTP N = 23 %= 6.23 ■■■■■■	ISFP N = 10 %= 2.71 ■■■■	INFP N = 8 %= 2.17 ■■	INTP N = 6 %= 1.63 ■■	T	192 52.03
				F	177 47.97
				J	191 51.76
				P	178 48.24
ESTP N = 26 %= 7.05 ■■■■■■	ESFP N = 32 %= 8.67 ■■■■■■■■	ENFP N = 51 %= 13.82 ■■■■■■■■ ■■■■	ENTP N = 22 %= 5.96 ■■■■■■	IJ	55 14.91
				IP	47 12.74
				EP	131 35.50
				EJ	136 36.86
ESTJ N = 68 %= 18.43 ■■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■■	ESFJ N = 38 %= 10.30 ■■■■■■■■■■	ENFJ N = 17 %= 4.61 ■■■■■■	ENTJ N = 13 %= 3.52 ■■■■	ST	143 38.75
				SF	98 26.56
				NF	79 21.41
				NT	49 13.28
				SJ	150 40.65
				SP	91 24.66
				NP	87 23.58
				NJ	41 11.11
				TJ	115 31.17
				TP	77 20.87
				FP	101 27.37
				FJ	76 20.60
				IN	25 6.78
				EN	103 27.91
				IS	77 20.87
				ES	164 44.44
				Sdom	102 27.64
				Ndom	84 22.76
				Tdom	110 29.81
				Fdom	73 19.78

Note: n = 1% of sample.

Caregiver

*“Assuming they should help others”
(Pearson & Marr, 2002)*

In the archetype sample, the items that loaded on Caregiver describe Finnish people rather well. Finns tend to be more feminine than Americans (Hofstede, 1967, 2003). “Kind” behavior is quite typical of Finnish people. The items that did not load on Caregiver describe

altruistic behavior. Thus the Caregiver’s manner of behavior in Finland is more akin to “good habits” and learned behavior to put others needs above one’s own, than a truly altruistic need to do something good for others. Table 2 presents the items loading significantly on this factor and those that did not.

Table 2. Items Loading on Caregiver in Finland and Items Deleted from Caregiver List.

<i>Caregiver- Finnish version, items:</i>	<i>PMAI-name</i>
22. I find it easier to do for others than to do for myself	Caregiver
28. I have a hard time saying no	Caregiver
31. I put the needs of others before my own	Caregiver
<hr/>	
<i>Items Deleted from Pearson’s Caregiver</i>	
19. I find fulfillment through giving to others	
25. I find satisfaction caring for others	
34. Kindness is a primary value for me	

The results of matching Caregiver and type are presented in Table 3. ESFJs (*) ranked themselves highest in the Caregiver category, as did most other feeling types. Exceptions were ENFP and INFP. One thinking type: ENTP was also represented among the Caregivers, having a self-selection index greater than one.

Feeling (**), Sensing-Feeling (**), Feeling-Judging (***) and Feeling-dominance (**) were rated highest here, whereas Thinking (**), Sensing-Thinking (**) and Thinking-Judging (*) were underrepresented. Quite typically, Feeling types tended to be more Caregiving than were Thinking types. It is no surprise that they are highly

represented in careers like nursing (Rissanen, 2003). Concerning the ENTPs’ response, it may be that their tendency to have (too) many projects running at the same time, affected the outcome of this factor due to the presence of the item: ‘I have a hard time saying no.’ The meaning of this sentence may be different for ENTPs than for Feeling types. ENFPs and INFPs tend to focus on individualism, and they are seeking to understand themselves throughout their lives. Thus it may be easier for them to focus on themselves. The feeling preference for both is introverted.

Table 3. Type Distribution of Caregivers compared with Total Sample

N = 111

				N	%	I	
ISTJ N = 4 % = 3.60 I = 0.51 ■■■■■	ISFJ N = 6 % = 5.41 I = 1.11 ■■■■■■	INFJ N = 2 % = 1.80 I = 2.22 ■■	INTJ N = 2 % = 1.80 I = 0.83 ■■	E	86	77.48	1.07
				I	25	22.52	0.81
				S	71	63.96	0.98
				N	40	36.04	1.04
ISTP N = 4 % = 3.60 I = 0.58 ■■■■■	ISFP N = 4 % = 3.60 I = 1.33 ■■■■■	INFP N = 2 % = 1.80 I = 0.83 ■■	INTP N = 1 % = 0.90 I = 0.55 ■	T	46	41.44	0.80**
				F	65	58.56	1.22**
				J	61	54.95	1.06
				P	50	45.05	0.93
ESTP N = 6 % = 5.41 I = 0.77 ■■■■■■	ESFP N = 10 % = 9.01 I = 1.04 ■■■■■■■■	ENFP N = 14 % = 12.61 I = 0.91 ■■■■■■■■	ENTP N = 9 % = 8.11 I = 1.36 ■■■■■■■■	IJ	14	12.61	0.85
				IP	11	9.91	0.78
				EP	39	35.14	0.99
				EJ	47	42.34	1.15
ESTJ N = 17 % = 15.32 I = 0.83 ■■■■■■■■■■	ESFJ N = 20 % = 18.02 I = 1.75** ■■■■■■■■■■	ENFJ N = 7 % = 6.31 I = 1.37 ■■■■■■	ENTJ N = 3 % = 2.70 I = 0.77 ■■■	ST	31	27.93	0.72**
				SF	40	36.04	1.36**
				NF	25	22.52	1.05
				NT	15	13.51	1.02
				SJ	47	42.34	1.04
				SP	24	21.62	0.88
				NP	26	23.42	0.99
				NJ	14	12.61	1.14
				TJ	26	23.42	0.75*
				TP	20	18.02	0.86
				FP	30	27.03	0.99
				FJ	35	31.53	1.53***
				IN	7	6.31	0.93
				EN	33	29.73	1.07
				IS	18	16.22	0.78
				ES	53	47.75	1.07
				Sdom	26	23.42	0.85
				Ndom	27	24.32	1.07
				Tdom	25	22.52	0.76*
				Fdom	33	29.73	1.50**

Note: n = 1% of sample.

Print date: 3/12/08

* < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001

Base total N = 369. Groups are dependent.

Calculated values of Chi Square or Fisher's exact probability (underlined).

Type Table Significance				E	2.08	IJ	0.66	SJ	0.19	IN	0.06
<u>0.12</u>	0.10	<u>0.22</u>	<u>1.00</u>	I	2.08	IP	1.14	SP	0.79	EN	0.26
<u>0.24</u>	<u>0.73</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>0.67</u>	S	0.13	EP	0.01	NP	0.00	IS	2.08
0.65	0.02	0.19	1.30	N	0.13	EJ	2.05	NJ	0.36	ES	0.70
1.02	10.24	1.04	<u>0.76</u>	T	7.13	ST	7.84	TJ	4.44	Sd	1.41
				F	7.13	SF	7.31	TP	0.78	Nd	0.22
				J	0.65	NF	0.12	FP	0.01	Td	4.03
				P	0.65	NT	0.01	FJ	11.61	Fd	9.90

Destructive Orphan

*Assuming that it pays to be careful (Orphan)
Assuming that they should cut their losses
(Destruction)
(Pearson & Marr, 2002)*

Table 4 presents the items loading on this archetype and those that did not. Two dimensions: Orphan and Destroyer were merged in this factor, with one additional item from Seeker. Taken

together, these items describe a certain disappointment with life, depression, and tiredness. Identity has been lost, through recent experiences. The deleted items were more connected with disappointments with other people, and with grieving about losses. Thus this Finnish version emphasizes an overall lack of motivation, insecurity, and emptiness.

Table 4. Items Describing the Destructive Orphan in Finland and deleted items.

<i>Destructive Orphan Items - Finnish version:</i>	<i>PMAI-name</i>
2. I am concerned by how hurt I was as a child.	Orphan
10. I feel safe (<i>negative loading: I do not feel safe</i>).	Orphan
14. I feel overwhelmed by situations.	Orphan
26. I feel restless.	Seeker
43. There is an emptiness in my life.	Destroyer
46. I feel bewildered by so much change in my life.	Destroyer
49. Recent experiences have caused me to rethink who I am.	Destroyer
<hr/>	
<i>Items Deleted from Pearson's Orphan:</i>	
5. <i>I've learned it is important not to expect too much.</i>	
8. <i>People I count on let me down.</i>	
11. <i>Others take advantage of me.</i>	
17. <i>I find it is hard to get motivated.</i>	
<hr/>	
<i>Items Deleted from Pearson's Destroyer:</i>	
37. <i>I am breaking out of a bad situation.</i>	
52. <i>I am grieving a loss.</i>	

Table 5 presents the distribution of the Destructive Orphan archetype. ESTJs (*) ranked themselves least often as this archetype. No other significant results were found. People with a preference for Introversion and Feeling had a slight but not significant tendency towards Destructive Orphan behavior, and, surprisingly, ENTJs did too. Feeling types may be more sensitive, especially when combined with Introversion. Thus the world might sometimes seem

quite a negative place to them. ESTJs represent the most common type in Finland. It is easy for them to operate and live in Finland, because almost every fifth person shares the same ways of thinking and acting. ESTJs and ENTJs had the second highest mean of coping resources (Shelton, 1996) and ENTJs have ranked lowest on burnout scales (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk & Hammer et al. 1998). These results do not seem very suitable to ENTJs.

Table 5. Type Distribution of Destructive Orphan Archetype compared with Total Sample

N = 70

				N	%	I	
ISTJ N = 7 %= 10.00 I = 1.42 ††††††††	ISFJ N = 6 %= 8.57 I = 1.76 ††††††††	INFJ N = 1 %= 1.43 I = 1.76 †	INTJ N = 0 %= 0.00 I = 0.00	E	45	64.29	0.89
				I	25	35.71	1.29
				S	45	64.29	0.98
				N	25	35.71	1.03
ISTP N = 5 %= 7.14 I = 1.15 †††††††	ISFP N = 2 %= 2.86 I = 1.05 ††	INFP N = 3 %= 4.29 I = 1.98 ††††	INTP N = 1 %= 1.43 I = 0.88 †	T	30	42.86	0.82
				F	40	57.14	1.19
				J	36	51.43	0.99
				P	34	48.57	1.01
ESTP N = 4 %= 5.71 I = 0.81 †††††	ESFP N = 7 %= 10.00 I = 1.15 ††††††††	ENFP N = 10 %= 14.29 I = 1.03 ††††††††††††	ENTP N = 2 %= 2.86 I = 0.48 ††	IJ	14	20.00	1.34
				IP	11	15.71	1.23
				EP	23	32.86	0.93
				EJ	22	31.43	0.85
ESTJ N = 6 %= 8.57 I = 0.47* ††††††††	ESFJ N = 8 %= 11.43 I = 1.11 ††††††††††††	ENFJ N = 3 %= 4.29 I = 0.93 ††††	ENTJ N = 5 %= 7.14 I = 2.03 †††††††	ST	22	31.43	0.81
				SF	23	32.86	1.24
				NF	17	24.29	1.13
				NT	8	11.43	0.86
				SJ	27	38.57	0.95
				SP	18	25.71	1.04
				NP	16	22.86	0.97
				NJ	9	12.86	1.16
				TJ	18	25.71	0.83
				TP	12	17.14	0.82
				FP	22	31.43	1.15
				FJ	18	25.71	1.25
				IN	5	7.14	1.05
				EN	20	28.57	1.02
				IS	20	28.57	1.37
				ES	25	35.71	0.80
				Sdom	24	34.29	1.24
				Ndom	13	18.57	0.82
				Tdom	17	24.29	0.81
				Fdom	16	22.86	1.16

Note: † = 1 person. Print date: 3/12/08 * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001
 Base total N = 369. Groups are dependent.
 Calculated values of Chi Square or Fisher's exact probability (underlined).

Type Table Significance				E	2.81	IJ	1.77	SJ	0.15	IN	<u>1.00</u>
1.15	2.54	<u>1.00</u>	<u>0.23</u>	I	2.81	IP	0.69	SP	0.05	EN	0.02
<u>0.78</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>0.36</u>	<u>1.00</u>	S	0.04	EP	0.26	NP	0.02	IS	3.11
<u>0.80</u>	0.19	0.02	<u>0.28</u>	N	0.04	EJ	1.09	NJ	0.27	ES	2.67
5.58	0.12	<u>1.00</u>	<u>0.08</u>	T	2.91	ST	1.95	TJ	1.20	Sd	1.91
				F	2.91	SF	1.76	TP	0.73	Nd	0.86
				J	0.00	NF	0.42	FP	0.72	Td	1.26
				P	0.00	NT	0.26	FJ	1.38	Fd	0.51

Ruling Warrior

*Assuming that the tough prevail (Warrior)
Assuming that they should exercise control
(Ruler)
(Pearson & Marr, 2002)*

Two dimensions, Warrior and Ruler, were merged here to constitute the Ruling Warrior. Table 6 shows that the items loading on this archetype consisted of competition and control. The names suggest competition more than bravery. The deleted items emphasized assertiveness, bravery, risk-taking, and leadership skills. As previously stated, Finnish culture is more

feminine than masculine (Hofstede, 1967-2003) and Finnish people do not like to stand out from the crowd. Even if individuality is appreciated in Finland (Hofstede 1967-2003), it should happen without making too much noise about it. Also, it is not natural for Finnish people to praise themselves, which could be the reason why the two items (I am good at matching people’s abilities with the task to be done; I have leadership qualities) did not load significantly on this archetype.

Table 6. Items Describing the Ruling Warrior in Finland and Deleted items.

<i>Ruling Warrior - Finnish version, items:</i>	<i>PMAI-name</i>
3. Competition energizes me	Warrior
18. Competition brings out my best efforts	Warrior
45. I prefer to be in control	Ruler
<hr/>	
<i>Items Deleted Pearson’s Warrior:</i>	
6. I am willing to take personal risks to defend my beliefs.	
9. I put fear aside and do what needs to be done	
12. I stand up to offensive people	
15. I am comfortable being assertive	
<hr/>	
<i>Items Deleted Pearson’s Ruler:</i>	
39. I am good at matching people’s abilities with task to be done	
42. I have leadership qualities	
48. I prefer to be in charge	

The most competitive types were ENTP (**)
and ESTJ (**), and the least were ESFJs (**)
(See Table 7). ENTPs and ESTJs can be easily
imagined to enjoy competition more than do
others. ESTJs display their competitiveness
when dealing with conflict (Hammer &
Huszczo, 1996). At the preference level,
Extraversion (***), Thinking (***), and
at the combination level Sensing-Thinking
(*), Intuition-Thinking (*), Thinking-
Perceiving (*), Extraverted-Intuition (*) and

Thinking-dominance (*) were overrepresented.
Accordingly, underrepresented were
Introversion (***), Feeling (***), Sensing-
Feeling (***), Feeling-Perceiving (*),
Feeling-Judging (*), Introverted-Sensing
(**) and Feeling-dominance (*). Introverted
types do not compare themselves so much
to others, and competition, especially for
those with a feeling-preference, can arouse
anxiety when the harmonious atmosphere is
broken.

Table 7. Type Distribution of Ruling Warrior Archetype compared with Total Sample

N = 129

				N	%	I	
ISTJ N = 5 % = 3.88 I = 0.55 ■■■■■	ISFJ N = 3 % = 2.33 I = 0.48 ■■■	INFJ N = 1 % = 0.78 I = 0.95 ■	INTJ N = 2 % = 1.55 I = 0.72 ■■	E	107	82.95	1.15***
				I	22	17.05	0.62***
				S	78	60.47	0.93
				N	51	39.53	1.14
ISTP N = 7 % = 5.43 I = 0.87 ■■■■■■	ISFP N = 1 % = 0.78 I = 0.29 ■	INFP N = 1 % = 0.78 I = 0.36 ■	INTP N = 2 % = 1.55 I = 0.95 ■■	T	83	64.34	1.24***
				F	46	35.66	0.74***
				J	66	51.16	0.99
				P	63	48.84	1.01
ESTP N = 13 % = 10.08 I = 1.43 ■■■■■■■■■■	ESFP N = 9 % = 6.98 I = 0.80 ■■■■■■■■	ENFP N = 16 % = 12.40 I = 0.90 ■■■■■■■■■■	ENTP N = 14 % = 10.85 I = 1.82** ■■■■■■■■■■	IJ	11	8.53	0.57*
				IP	11	8.53	0.67
				EP	52	40.31	1.14
				EJ	55	42.64	1.16
ESTJ N = 34 % = 26.36 I = 1.43** ■■■■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■■■■	ESFJ N = 6 % = 4.65 I = 0.45** ■■■■■■	ENFJ N = 9 % = 6.98 I = 1.51 ■■■■■■■■	ENTJ N = 6 % = 4.65 I = 1.32 ■■■■■■	ST	59	45.74	1.18*
				SF	19	14.73	0.55***
				NF	27	20.93	0.98
				NT	24	18.60	1.40*
				SJ	48	37.21	0.92
				SP	30	23.26	0.94
				NP	33	25.58	1.09
				NJ	18	13.95	1.26
				TJ	47	36.43	1.17
				TP	36	27.91	1.34*
				FP	27	20.93	0.76*
				FJ	19	14.73	0.72*
				IN	6	4.65	0.69
				EN	45	34.88	1.25*
				IS	16	12.40	0.59**
				ES	62	48.06	1.08
				Sdom	30	23.26	0.84
				Ndom	33	25.58	1.12
				Tdom	49	37.98	1.27*
				Fdom	17	13.18	0.67*

Note: n = 1% of sample. Print date: 3/12/08 * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001
 Base total N = 369. Groups are dependent.
 Calculated values of Chi Square or Fisher's exact probability (underlined).

Type Table Significance				E	IJ	SJ	IN
<u>0.09</u>	<u>0.13</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>0.72</u>	11.12	6.36	0.97	1.42
0.22	<u>0.17</u>	<u>0.27</u>	<u>1.00</u>	11.12	3.16	0.21	4.79
2.78	0.72	0.33	8.46	2.06	2.00	0.44	8.60
8.29	6.85	2.53	0.74	2.06	2.85	1.62	1.05
				12.04	4.07	2.57	1.91
				12.04	14.23	5.95	0.90
				0.03	0.03	4.14	6.33
				0.03	4.88	4.18	5.45

Lover

*Assuming that love is the answer
(Pearson & Marr, 2002)*

Table 8 presents the item loading for the Lover archetype. This factor with the Finnish data loaded quite similarly to the one in the English PMAI. Only two items were removed. The four

items mostly describe love between couples. The deleted items described love for all and helping people connect with each other. These items describe altruistic love and, similar to the items of the Caregiver, these altruistic behaviors do not fit well in Finnish culture.

Table 8. Items describing Lover in Finland as well as deleted items.

<i>Lover - Finnish version, items:</i>	<i>PMAI-name</i>
24. I find fulfillment through relationships	Lover
30. Intimacy is a priority for me	Lover
33. I am romantic	Lover
36. I feel more complete when I am in love	Lover
<hr/>	
<i>Items Deleted from Pearson's Lover:</i>	
21. I feel loving toward people in general	
27. I like to help people connect with one another	

Table 9 presents the type distribution of Lover archetype. The most loving were all feeling types (middle columns), especially ESFJ (**). ESFJs were also highly represented in the Caregiving archetype. This emphasizes their people-oriented tendencies. ESFJs were ranked among the highest in their satisfaction with "Mar-

riage/intimate relationship" (Myers et al., 1998), and this Lover archetype is consistent with that result. At the type level, all the Feeling types were overrepresented, and accordingly Thinking types were underrepresented. These results support type theory and recent studies of MBTI.

Table 9. Type Distribution of Lover Archetype compared with Total Sample

N = 99

				N	%	I	
ISTJ N = 4 % = 4.04 I = 0.57 † † † †	ISFJ N = 8 % = 8.08 I = 1.66 † † † † † † † †	INFJ N = 1 % = 1.01 I = 1.24 †	INTJ N = 1 % = 1.01 I = 0.47 †	E	76	76.77	1.06
				I	23	23.23	0.84
				S	67	67.68	1.04
				N	32	32.32	0.93
ISTP N = 3 % = 3.03 I = 0.49 † † †	ISFP N = 3 % = 3.03 I = 1.12 † † †	INFP N = 3 % = 3.03 I = 1.40 † † †	INTP N = 0 % = 0.00 I = 0.00	T	33	33.33	0.64***
				F	66	66.67	1.39***
				J	55	55.56	1.07
				P	44	44.44	0.92
ESTP N = 3 % = 3.03 I = 0.43 † † †	ESFP N = 12 % = 12.12 I = 1.40 † † † † † † † † † † † †	ENFP N = 16 % = 16.16 I = 1.17 † † † † † † † † † † † † † † † †	ENTP N = 4 % = 4.04 I = 0.68 † † † †	IJ	14	14.14	0.95
				IP	9	9.09	0.71
				EP	35	35.35	1.00
				EJ	41	41.41	1.12
ESTJ N = 16 % = 16.16 I = 0.88 † † † † † † † † † † † † † † † †	ESFJ N = 18 % = 18.18 I = 1.77** † † † † † † † † † † † † † † † † † †	ENFJ N = 5 % = 5.05 I = 1.10 † † † † †	ENTJ N = 2 % = 2.02 I = 0.57 † †	ST	26	26.26	0.68**
				SF	41	41.41	1.56***
				NF	25	25.25	1.18
				NT	7	7.07	0.53*
				SJ	46	46.46	1.14
				SP	21	21.21	0.86
				NP	23	23.23	0.99
				NJ	9	9.09	0.82
				TJ	23	23.23	0.75*
				TP	10	10.10	0.48**
				FP	34	34.34	1.25
				FJ	32	32.32	1.57***
				IN	5	5.05	0.75
				EN	27	27.27	0.98
				IS	18	18.18	0.87
				ES	49	49.49	1.11
				Sdom	27	27.27	0.99
				Ndom	22	22.22	0.98
				Tdom	21	21.21	0.71*
				Fdom	29	29.29	1.48**

Note: † = 1 person. Print date: 3/12/08 * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001
 Base total N = 369. Groups are dependent.
 Calculated values of Chi Square or Fisher's exact probability (underlined).

Type Table Significance				E	IJ	SJ	IN
<u>0.25</u>	2.99	<u>1.00</u>	<u>0.46</u>	1.32	0.06	1.90	<u>0.49</u>
<u>0.15</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>0.69</u>	<u>0.20</u>	1.32	1.62	0.87	0.03
<u>0.11</u>	2.03	0.62	<u>0.46</u>	0.33	0.00	0.01	0.59
0.46	9.10	<u>1.00</u>	<u>0.53</u>	0.33	1.21	0.56	1.40
				18.95	8.89	3.97	0.01
				18.95	15.31	9.50	0.02
				0.78	1.19	3.31	4.78
				0.78	4.53	11.38	7.71

Magical Creator

“Assuming what can be imagined can be created” (Creator)

“Assuming that perception defines reality” (Magician)

(Pearson & Marr, 2002)

Table 10 presents the items describing the Magical Creator. This Finnish archetype consisted mainly of Creator items, with the addition of

two Magician items, plus one Seeker and one Destroyer. As a whole, this factor consists of creativity and change. Items which were dropped out were quite difficult to interpret, as they were rather abstract constructs (Changing my inner thoughts changes my outer life; I believe everyone and everything in the world is interconnected).

Table 10. Items Describing the Magical Creator in Finland and Deleted Items.

<i>Magical Creator – Finnish version, items:</i>	<i>PMAI-name</i>
32. I am exploring new possibilities.	Seeker
40. My life is changing rapidly.	Destroyer
41. I have a lot more great ideas than I have time to act on them.	Creator
47. Inspiration comes easily to be.	Creator
50. People see me as a creative person.	Creator
53. I have a good imagination.	Magician
61. I like to transform situations.	Magician
64. My presence is often a catalyst for change.	
<hr/>	
<i>Items Deleted from Pearson’s Creator:</i>	
38. I am creating my own life	
44. I have times of high accomplishment that feel effortless to me	
<hr/>	
<i>Items Deleted from Pearson’s Magician:</i>	
55. Changing my inner thoughts changes my outer life	
58. I believe everyone and everything in the world are interconnected	

Table 11 presents the type distribution of the Magical Creator archetype. The Magical Creator found the most statistically significant results in this study. In the upper left quadrant of the table, ISTJ (**), ISFJ (**), ISTP (**), and ESFJ (*) rank themselves least likely to identify with this archetype. In the lower right quadrant, those ranking Magical Creator highest were ENFP (***), ENTP (***), and ENTJ (*). Several significant results were found at the preference level: Extraversion (***), Intuition (***), and at the pair level, Extraversion-Perceiving (***), Intuition-Feeling (***), Intuition-Thinking (***), Intuition-Perceiving (***), Extraverted-Intuition (***), and Intuition-dominance (***). Their opposites, Introversion (***), Sensing (***), Introverted-Judging (***), Sensing-Thinking (***), Sensing-Feeling (***), Sensing-Judging (***), Introverted-Sensing (***), and Sensing-dominance (***), at p.<0.001 were statistically underrepresented at this level.

These results are consistent with earlier studies of MBTI, in which ENFPs and ENTPs were regarded as creative types. Both ENFPs and ENTPs have been described as creative and imaginative innovators (Myers et al., 1998). ENFPs are among the three highest on a measure of creativity, and also ENTPs ranked high (Thorne and Gough, 1991). They do not like routines, whereas people with a preference for Sensing and Judging do enjoy predictable daily rituals. In addition, many ENTJs identify with the Magical Creator archetype. Their typical area of excellence is organizing, directing, and developing innovations (Pearman, 2002).

Even if, for example, INFPs are regarded as highly creative types, it may be that these Magical Creator items also focus more on changing and transforming the outer situations, not just upon an introverted idea-level, where INFPs would probably be higher.

Table 11. Type Distribution of Archetype Magical Creator compared with Total Sample

N = 116

				N	%	I	
ISTJ N = 1 % = 0.86 I = 0.12** ■	ISFJ N = 0 % = 0.00 I = 0.00**	INFJ N = 1 % = 0.86 I = 1.06 ■	INTJ N = 3 % = 2.59 I = 1.19 ■■■	E	103	88.79	1.23***
				I	13	11.21	0.41***
				S	46	39.66	0.61***
				N	70	60.34	1.74***
				T	58	50.00	0.96
				F	58	50.00	1.04
ISTP N = 1 % = 0.86 I = 0.14** ■	ISFP N = 2 % = 1.72 I = 0.64 ■■	INFP N = 2 % = 1.72 I = 0.80 ■■	INTP N = 3 % = 2.59 I = 1.59 ■■■	J	46	39.66	0.77**
				P	70	60.34	1.25**
				IJ	5	4.31	0.29***
				IP	8	6.90	0.54**
				EP	62	53.45	1.51***
				EJ	41	35.34	0.96
ESTP N = 8 % = 6.90 I = 0.98 ■■■■■■■	ESFP N = 9 % = 7.76 I = 0.89 ■■■■■■■	ENFP N = 30 % = 25.86 I = 1.87*** ■■■■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■	ENTP N = 15 % = 12.93 I = 2.17*** ■■■■■■■■■ ■■■	ST	29	25.00	0.65***
				SF	17	14.66	0.55***
				NF	41	35.34	1.65***
				NT	29	25.00	1.88***
				SJ	26	22.41	0.55***
				SP	20	17.24	0.70*
				NP	50	43.10	1.83***
				NJ	20	17.24	1.55*
				TJ	31	26.72	0.86
				TP	27	23.28	1.12
				FP	43	37.07	1.35**
				FJ	15	12.93	0.63*
ESTJ N = 19 % = 16.38 I = 0.89 ■■■■■■■■■ ■■■■■	ESFJ N = 6 % = 5.17 I = 0.50* ■■■■■	ENFJ N = 8 % = 6.90 I = 1.50 ■■■■■■■	ENTJ N = 8 % = 6.90 I = 1.96* ■■■■■■■	IN	9	7.76	1.15
				EN	61	52.59	1.88***
				IS	4	3.45	0.17***
				ES	42	36.21	0.81*
				Sdom	18	15.52	0.56***
				Ndom	49	42.24	1.86***
				Tdom	31	26.72	0.90
				Fdom	18	15.52	0.78

Note: n = 1% of sample.

Print date: 3/12/08

* < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001

Base total N = 369. Groups are dependent.

Calculated values of Chi Square or Fisher's exact probability (underlined).

Type Table Significance				E	IJ	SJ	IN
<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>1.00</u>	22.85	<u>0.00</u>	23.32	0.26
<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.52</u>	<u>0.73</u>	<u>0.38</u>	I	IP	5.01	EN
0.01	0.18	20.59	14.66	S	EP	35.80	IS
0.47	4.81	2.02	<u>0.03</u>	N	EJ	6.44	ES
				T	ST	1.56	Sd
				F	SF	0.59	Nd
				J	NF	8.00	Td
				P	NT	6.08	Fd

Ruling Sage

*“Assuming that they should exercise control”
(the Ruler)*

*“Assuming that the truth will set you free” (the Sage)
(Pearson & Marr, 2002)*

Table 12 presents the items describing the Ruling Sage. This Finnish factor consists of three

items of the Sage and two of the Ruler. As a whole this factor can be interpreted as having a tendency favoring objectivity and challenges, as well as being dutiful. Deleted items were the same as mentioned earlier under the Ruler factor (see Table 6), with the addition of one concerning the Sage.

Table 12. Items describing the Ruling Sage in Finland and deleted items.

<i>Ruling Sage- Finnish version, items:</i>	<i>PMAI-name</i>
51. I take over if things look like they are getting out of hand	Ruler
54. I have a duty to meet my obligations	Ruler
59. I strive for objectivity	Sage
65. I try to find truths behind illusions	Sage
71. I like challenges that really make me think	Sage
<i>Items Deleted Pearson's Ruler</i>	
39. I am good at matching people's abilities with the task to be done	
42. I have leadership qualities	
48. I prefer to be in charge	
<i>Items Deleted Pearson's Sage</i>	
56. I believe there are many good ways to look at the same thing	

Table 13 presents the type distribution of the Ruling Sage archetype. ENTP (**), ESTJ (**), ENTJ (*), and INTP (*) regarded themselves highest in this dimension, whereas ESFP (**) regarded themselves lowest. Many significant results appear at the preference level. At the highest level of statistical significance ($p < 0.001$) were by Thinking (***), Intuitive-Thinking (***) and Thinking-dominance. Among the lowest ($p < 0.001$) were Feeling (***) and Sensing-dominance (***). Three NT-types (ENTJ, ENTP, INTP) were represented as having high values here, and INTJs were also high here, although not significantly. The tendency of Thinking

types is towards objectivity and when combined with intuition, trying to discern the truth by “reading between the lines” or beyond illusions. NTs are highly ambitious and, along with INTs, enjoy solving difficult problem. Challenges where thinking is needed suit them also. For example, NTs are overrepresented among students preferring cognitive approaches to psychotherapy (Quenk and Quenk, 1996). To extraverted TJ types this dutifulness, and taking over things is consistent with leadership. These types have a tendency to look after things and have a natural authority.

Table 13. Type Distribution of Ruling Sage Archetype compared with Total Sample

N = 140

				N	%	I	
ISTJ N = 5 % = 3.57 I = 0.51 ■■■■■	ISFJ N = 4 % = 2.86 I = 0.59 ■■■■	INFJ N = 1 % = 0.71 I = 0.88 ■	INTJ N = 6 % = 4.29 I = 1.98 ■■■■■	E	108	77.14	1.07
				I	32	22.86	0.83
				S	81	57.86	0.89*
				N	59	42.14	1.21*
ISTP N = 6 % = 4.29 I = 0.69 ■■■■■	ISFP N = 4 % = 2.86 I = 1.05 ■■■■	INFP N = 1 % = 0.71 I = 0.33 ■	INTP N = 5 % = 3.57 I = 2.20* ■■■■■	T	92	65.71	1.26***
				F	48	34.29	0.71***
				J	77	55.00	1.06
				P	63	45.00	0.93
ESTP N = 10 % = 7.14 I = 1.01 ■■■■■■■■	ESFP N = 5 % = 3.57 I = 0.41** ■■■■	ENFP N = 17 % = 12.14 I = 0.88 ■■■■■■■■■■ ■■	ENTP N = 15 % = 10.71 I = 1.80** ■■■■■■■■■■ ■	IJ	16	11.43	0.77
				IP	16	11.43	0.90
				EP	47	33.57	0.95
				EJ	61	43.57	1.18*
ESTJ N = 36 % = 25.71 I = 1.40** ■■■■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■■	ESFJ N = 11 % = 7.86 I = 0.76 ■■■■■■■■	ENFJ N = 5 % = 3.57 I = 0.78 ■■■■■	ENTJ N = 9 % = 6.43 I = 1.82* ■■■■■■	ST	57	40.71	1.05
				SF	24	17.14	0.65**
				NF	24	17.14	0.80
				NT	35	25.00	1.88***
				SJ	56	40.00	0.98
				SP	25	17.86	0.72*
				NP	38	27.14	1.15
				NJ	21	15.00	1.35
				TJ	56	40.00	1.28**
				TP	36	25.71	1.23
				FP	27	19.29	0.70**
				FJ	21	15.00	0.73*
				IN	13	9.29	1.37
				EN	46	32.86	1.18
				IS	19	13.57	0.65**
				ES	62	44.29	1.00
				Sdom	24	17.14	0.62***
				Ndom	39	27.86	1.22
				Tdom	56	40.00	1.34***
				Fdom	21	15.00	0.76

Note: n = 1% of sample. Print date: 3/12/08 * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001
 Base total N = 369. Groups are dependent.
 Calculated values of Chi Square or Fisher's exact probability (underlined).

Type Table Significance				E	IJ	SJ	IN
<u>0.06</u>	<u>0.21</u>	1.00	<u>0.06</u>	2.58	2.15	0.04	2.25
1.46	<u>1.00</u>	<u>0.16</u>	<u>0.03</u>	I	IP	5.62	EN
0.00	<u>0.01</u>	0.53	9.09	S	EP	1.59	IS
7.97	1.46	<u>0.61</u>	<u>0.02</u>	N	EJ	3.45	ES
				T	ST	8.21	Sd
				F	SF	3.21	Nd
				J	NF	7.42	Td
				P	NT	4.32	Fd

Conclusions

This study focused on testing an archetypes questionnaire in Finland and finding out how the archetypes related to type. Analysis found six factors that accounted for most of the variance among the items, rather than the twelve in the original English version. However, these six factors fit Finnish culture well and their content was congruent. The items in the factors showed internal consistency. In addition, the degree of reliability of the factors was very good.

According to Pearson (1991), archetypes occur in a certain order, that is, in stages: where the first archetypes logically belong in the first years of life; being preparation (Innocent, Orphan, Warrior, Caregiver), the middle ones in adulthood, being journey (Seeker, Destroyer, Lover, Creator), and the last ones are included in late adulthood, the return (Ruler, Magician, Sage, Fool). This study did not confirm these stages, because some items loaded on different factors and different stages. For example, items for Warrior Ruler (preparation + return), Crea-

tor Magician (journey + return), and Orphan Destroyer (preparation + journey) are derived from different stages. Even when they originally belonged in different archetypes, the items fit together very well. Thus it might be that in Finland these six archetypes are sufficient. The relationships between archetypes and personality types were very logical and offered new insights into type, at least for Finland.

In the future more data could confirm the structure of archetypes in Finland. Also test-retest studies would be interesting to see if the archetypes changes over time. Furthermore, studies could concentrate on type, archetype, and age to see if certain archetypes are typical of certain types at a certain age, e.g., if it is typical for an ESTJ to take the journey of Caregiver - Lover - Ruling Warrior - Ruling Sage. Perhaps factor analyses with certain types could also result in interesting factors. Maybe each type has its own archetype / factor distribution.

References

- Boeree, C.G. (1997). www.ship.edu/~cgboeree/jung.html
- Carr, A. (2002). Jung, archetypes and mirroring in organizational change management. Lessons from a longitudinal case study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15/5, 477-489.
- Hammer, A.L & Huszycz, G.E. (1996). Teams. In A.L. Hammer (Ed.), *MBTI applications: A decade of research on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (pp.81-104). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Hautala, T. M. (2005). *Personality and Transformational leadership. Perspectives of Subordinates and Leaders*. Doctoral Thesis. *Acta Wasaensia*, 145.
- Hofstede, G. (1967-2003). *Cultural Dimensions*. Available in www: http://www.geert-hofstede.com/hofstede_dimensions.php
- Jung, C. G. (1968). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious* (R. F. C. Hull, Trans. 2nd. ed. Vol. 9, Part I). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Myers, I., McCaulley, M., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. 3th ed. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Pearman, R.B. (2002). *Introduction to Type and Emotional Intelligence. Pathways to Performance*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Pearson, C.S (1991). *Awakening The Heroes Within. Twelve Archetypes to Help Us Find Ourselves and Transform Our World*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Pearson, C.S. & H.K., Marr (2002). *Introduction to Archetypes. The Guide to Interpreting Results from the Pearson-Marr Archetype Indicator Instrument*. Florida: Center for Applications of Psychological Type.
- Quenk, N.L & Quenk, A.T (1996). Counseling and psychotherapy. In A.L. Hammer (Ed.), *MBTI applications: A decade of research on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (pp.105-122). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Rissanen, A-L & Routamaa, V. (2003) In Rissanen: "Persoonallisuus ja ammattiinvalikoitumienn – Persoonallisuustyypit eri ammateissa Suomessa" (*Personality Types in the Different Occupations in Finland*). Master theses. Vaasa: Yliopiston kirjapaino.
- Shelton, J. (1996). Health, stress and coping. In A.L. Hammer (Ed.), *MBTI applications: A decade of research on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (pp.105-122). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Stevens, A. (2006): 'The Archetypes' in *The Handbook of Jungian Psychology. Theory, Practice and Applications*. (eds. Papadopoulos, R.K). London: Routledge.
- Thorne, A., & Gough, H. (1991). *Portraits of type: An MBTI research compendium*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Appendix I. Item factor Loadings (Varimax)

Factor	Factor loadings	In Pearson & Marr's factor
<i>Caregiver</i>		
22. I find it easier to do for others that to do for my self	0.724	Caregiver
28. I have a hard time saying no	0.658	Caregiver
31. I put the needs of others before my own	0.758	Caregiver
<i>Eigenvalue: 1.383, Cronbach alpha: 0.585</i>		
<i>Destructive Orphan</i>		
2. I am concerned by how hurt I was as a child	0.551	Orphan
10. I feel safe	-0.609	Orphan
14. I feel overwhelmed by situations	0.642	Orphan
26. I feel restless	0.595	Seeker
43. There is an emptiness in my life	0.645	Destroyer
46. I feel bewildered by so much change in my life	0.528	Destroyer
49. Recent experiences have caused me to rethink who I am.	0.547	Destroyer
<i>Eigenvalue: 3.051, Cronbach alpha: 0.701</i>		
<i>Ruling Warrior</i>		
3. Competition energizes me	0.787	Warrior
18. Competition brings out my best efforts	0.802	Warrior
45. I prefer to be in control	0.603	Ruler
<i>Eigenvalue: 1.483, Cronbach alpha: 0.657</i>		
<i>Lover</i>		
24. I find fulfillment through relationships	0.646	Lover
30. Intimacy is a priority for me	0.705	Lover
33. I am romantic	0.677	Lover
36. I feel more complete when I am in love	0.646	Lover
<i>Eigenvalue: 1.714, Cronbach alpha: 0.625</i>		
<i>Magical Creator</i>		
32. I am exploring new possibilities	0.535	Seeker
40. My life is changing rapidly	0.520	Destroyer
41. I have a lot more great ideas than I have time to act on them	0.677	Creator
47. Inspiration comes easily to be	0.722	Creator
50. People see me as a creative person	0.730	Creator
53. I have a good imagination	0.607	Creator
61. I like to transform situations	0.521	Magician
64. My presence is often a catalyst for change	0.643	Magician
<i>Eigenvalue: 4.513, Cronbach alpha: 0.789</i>		
<i>Ruling Sage</i>		
51. I take over if things look like they are getting out of hand	0.637	Ruler
54. I have a duty to meet my obligations	0.537	Ruler
59. I strive for objectivity	0.637	Sage
65. I try to find truths behind illusions	0.560	Sage
71. I like challenges that really make me think	0.539	Sage
<i>Eigenvalue: 2.201, Cronbach alpha: 0.608</i>		

Appendix II. Deleted items of PMAI

<i>Deleted items</i>	<i>In Pearson's factor</i>
1. I assume that people I meet are trustworthy.	Innocent
4. I believe that people don't really mean to hurt each other.	Innocent
5. I've learned it is important not to expect too much.	Orphan
6. I am willing to take personal risks to defend my beliefs.	Warrior
7. I can count on others to take care of me	Innocent
8. People I count on let me down	Orphan
9. I put fear aside and do what needs to be done	Warrior
11. Others take advantage of me	Orphan
12. I stand up to offensive people	Warrior
13. I know my needs will be provided for	Innocent
15. I am comfortable being assertive	Warrior
16. The world is as safe place	Innocent
17. I find it is hard to get motivated	Orphan
19. I find fulfillment through giving to others	Caregiver
20. I am looking for greener pastures	Seeker
21. I feel loving toward people in general	Lover
23. I am searching for ways to improve myself	Seeker
25. I find satisfaction caring for others	Caregiver
27. I like to help people connect with one another	Lover
29. I am holding out for something better	Seeker
34. Kindness is a primary value for me	Caregiver
35. I am a nonconformist	Seeker
37. I am breaking out of a bad situation	Destroyer
38. I am crating my own life	Creator
39. I am good at matching people's abilities with task to be done	Ruler
42. I have leadership qualities	Ruler
44. I have times of high accomplishment that feel effortless to me	Creator
48. I prefer to be in charge	Ruler
52. I am grieving a loss	Destructive
55. Changing my inner thoughts changes my outer life	Magician
56. I believe there are many good ways to look at the same thing	Sage
57. I enjoy making people laugh	Jester
58. I believe everyone and everything in the world are interconnected	Magician
60. I like to "lighten up" people who are too serious	Jester
62. I think deeply	Sage
63. Others see me as fun	Jester
66. I chuckle at the absurdity of life	Jester
67. Spiritual help accounts for my effectiveness	Magician
68. Others seek out my advice	Sage
69. I joke around a lot.	Jester
70. The process of my own self-healing enables me to help others	Magician
72. There is nothing better than a good laugh	Jester