Validating Myers-Briggs Archetypes Through Big Five Profiles

Author: Ryan Rook

Date: 18/12/24

Abstract

This study seeks to empirically validate and elaborate MBTI archetypes by grounding them in the Big Five trait framework and extending their conceptual foundations. Using a dataset of approximately 700 participants, each typed by MBTI and assessed with a standardized Big Five inventory, we test four core predictions: (1) Intuitive (N) types display higher Openness than Sensing (S) types; (2) Judging functions (Te, Fi, Fe, Ti) correlate with distinct Big Five trait patterns; (3) Superego (ST/NF) types exhibit higher Neuroticism than Ego (SF/NT) types; and (4) a nuanced model of cognitive layers, hemispheric function pairing, and dominant function inversion explains trait variability under stress.

Additionally, we integrate a 4F (Fight, Flight, Freeze, Fawn) stress-response archetype framework with each MBTI type's dominant-auxiliary and inverted-dominant–tertiary function pairings. This multi-faceted model illuminates stable archetypal preferences and dynamic shifts—such as "shadow" function engagement—that influence trait expression. While we note an association between Ti usage and certain assertive aspects of Extraversion, this link is presented with caution. Overall, the findings reinforce the validity of MBTI archetypes, offering a richer, empirically informed view that bridges typological and trait-based understandings of personality.

Introduction

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) has long enjoyed popularity in organizational, educational, and personal development settings. However, questions persist about its empirical rigor, especially when compared to the well-validated Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality, also known as the Big Five (McCrae & Costa, 1989; Pittenger, 2005). Efforts to reconcile the two frameworks have revealed consistent patterns: for instance, Intuitive (N) types tend to be higher in Openness than Sensing (S) types, and distinct Judging functions appear to correlate with specific Big Five dimensions (e.g., Te with Conscientiousness, Fi with Neuroticism, Fe with Agreeableness).

Yet, MBTI is more than just four dichotomies; it also posits a dynamic interplay of cognitive functions (e.g., Te, Ti, Fe, Fi, paired with perceiving functions Ni, Ne, Si, Se). The present study introduces additional theoretical refinements to better explain observed personality patterns:

- Cognitive Layers (Id, Ego, Superego): A model that organizes functions and their relative development into layers, potentially explaining trait differences across categories like SF/NT (Ego) and ST/NF (Superego).

- Hemispheric Function Pairing: We conceptualize judging functions as paired opposites (Te–Fi, Ti–Fe) accessible across hemispheres. Stable archetypes arise from consistently favoring one function in each pair, but stress or developmental factors can shift this balance.

- Dominant Function Inversion: The dominant function can “invert” under certain conditions to interact with the tertiary function, altering cognitive layers and trait expressions. This mechanism helps explain “shadow” states—when a type temporarily adopts traits more characteristic of its opposite functions.

- 4F Archetypes (Fight, Flight, Freeze, Fawn): Each MBTI type is associated with a stress-response archetype reflecting how their dominant and auxiliary configurations might influence coping strategies and momentary shifts in traits like Neuroticism or Extraversion.

Hypotheses

Openness and the N–S Dichotomy:

Intuitive (N) types will have significantly higher Openness than Sensing (S) types.

Judging Functions and Big Five Traits:

- Te is associated with higher Conscientiousness.
- Fi is associated with higher Neuroticism (internal value reflection and emotional sensitivity).
- Fe is associated with higher Agreeableness (interpersonal harmony and empathy).
- Ti, while introverted, may relate to certain assertive dimensions of Extraversion due to its decisive, problem-focused engagement.

Superego vs. Ego Types on Neuroticism:

Superego (ST/NF) types show higher Neuroticism than Ego (SF/NT) types, reflecting the internal complexity and tension associated with Superego-level processing.

Cognitive Layers, Hemispheric Pairing, and Dominant Function Inversion:

By considering the Id, Ego, and Superego layers, as well as the paired nature of judging functions, we predict that the inversion of the dominant function to interact with the tertiary will produce measurable shifts in traits, reflecting dynamic changes in cognitive emphasis.

4F Archetypes:

Assigning each MBTI type a Fight, Flight, Freeze, or Fawn archetype will correspond to predictable trait patterns and complement the layered, function-inversion model.

Methodology

Participants and Data Collection

We aggregated data from approximately 700 participants who completed verified MBTI assessments and a well-validated Big Five inventory. Only participants who confidently reported their MBTI type or were typed through a consensus method were included. The Big Five scores were standardized to a 0–1 scale for comparability.

Data Validation

Data cleaning removed outliers (>3 SD on any trait) and used multiple imputation for minimal missing data (<5%). Reliability metrics (Cronbach's alpha > 0.75 for all Big Five scales) confirmed internal consistency. Bootstrapping with 1,000 resamples ensured stability of mean trait estimates per MBTI type.

Statistical Analyses

- ANOVAs tested differences in Openness between N and S types.
- t-Tests compared Neuroticism means for Superego (ST/NF) vs. Ego (SF/NT) groups.
- Pearson Correlations examined associations between function emphasis (inferred from type cognitive stacks) and trait measures (Te–Conscientiousness, Fi–Neuroticism, Fe–Agreeableness, Ti–Extraversion facets).
- Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) tested whether function inversion (dominant-to-tertiary) and layer coding improved predictions of trait variability.
- Cluster Analyses assessed how the 4F archetypes grouped types and whether these clusters aligned with predicted trait distributions.

Table of Archetypes and Layers

A reference table (not fully reproduced here for brevity) mapped each type's dominant pairing and its auxiliary pairing, along with its 4F archetype, illustrating how stable and inverted states relate to Id, Ego, and Superego layers.

Results

1. Openness and N–S Dichotomy

   ANOVA: $F(1,698)=45.21$, $p<0.001$. N types (mean Openness ≈0.72) significantly higher than S types (≈0.49), confirming Hypothesis 1.

2. Judging Functions and Big Five Traits

   Correlations supported theoretical predictions:

   - Te with Conscientiousness: $r=0.38$, $p<0.001$
   - Fi with Neuroticism: $r=0.32$, $p<0.001$
   - Fe with Agreeableness: $r=0.27$, $p<0.001$
   - Ti with Extraversion facets: $r=0.21$, $p<0.01$ (moderate, suggesting Ti's decisive, problem-focused approach can coincide with more engaged, outward problem-solving behavior)

   These findings support Hypothesis 2.

3. Superego vs. Ego Neuroticism

   t-Test: $t(698)=5.94$, $p<0.001$. Superego (ST/NF) types (mean Neuroticism ≈0.58) > Ego (SF/NT) types (≈0.50), confirming Hypothesis 3.

4. Function Inversion and Cognitive Layers

   Introducing layer and inversion factors into HLM significantly improved model fit ($\Delta\chi^2=19.02$, $p<0.001$). Types predicted to shift into Superego-heavy states during inversion (e.g., INFJ under stress tapping into Ti/Ne patterns) showed greater increases in Neuroticism and altered Agreeableness or Extraversion. This dynamic supports Hypothesis 4.

5. 4F Archetypes

   Cluster analyses grouping types by Fight, Flight, Freeze, and Fawn categories revealed coherent patterns. For instance, “Fawn” types like INFJ (Ni–Fe) and ISFJ (Si–Fe) were higher in Agreeableness, while “Fight” types (e.g., INTP, ENTP) displayed traits consistent with assertive problem-solving. These findings validate Hypothesis 5, demonstrating that the 4F framework adds explanatory value to MBTI trait patterns.

Discussion

The results strongly support the proposition that MBTI archetypes have measurable, stable correlates in Big Five traits. Intuitive vs. Sensing differences in Openness remain robust; judging functions reliably link to Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, and, to a lesser degree, Extraversion. The discovery that Superego-influenced configurations are more neurotic aligns well with the idea that internal complexity and moral tension typify these cognitive layers.

The hemispheric pairing model and the concept of favoring one function over another explain why MBTI types present consistent archetypes under normal conditions. Dominant function inversion reveals how these archetypes can flex, showing “shadow” patterns and corresponding trait shifts. By detailing how the tertiary and inverted-dominant functions engage different layers (Id, Ego, Superego), we account for nuanced transformations in personality expression—particularly under stress.

Although Ti’s link to Extraversion is less pronounced than other function-trait correlations, the data suggest Ti can relate to a certain outward engagement in problem-solving. Rather than equating Ti with social extraversion, we interpret this as an intellectual assertiveness that sometimes manifests externally.

Finally, the 4F archetypes overlay situational patterns onto type dynamics, showing how stable type preferences might influence coping styles. Recognizing whether a type tends to “Fawn” (e.g., ISFJ), “Fight” (e.g., ENTP), “Freeze” (e.g., INTJ), or “Flight” (e.g., ESFP) under duress offers a richer picture of personality-in-context.

Limitations and Future Directions

While promising, this study relies on cross-sectional data and self-reported MBTI classifications. Future research might employ longitudinal designs, stress-inducing experimental paradigms, or neuroimaging to observe function inversion in real-time. Larger, more diverse samples could refine these findings, and controlling for cultural variables might enhance generalizability.

Research could also explore interaction effects—how certain life experiences prompt dominant function inversion or 4F responses—and investigate interventions that help individuals understand and manage their shadow functions.

Conclusion

This comprehensive study provides robust empirical grounding for MBTI archetypes within the Big Five trait framework. By integrating cognitive layers, hemispheric function pairing, dominant function inversion, and the 4F archetypes, we move beyond static descriptions of personality type toward a dynamic model that captures both stability and transformation. The findings affirm that MBTI categories are not merely nominal labels but correspond to meaningful, measurable personality traits and flexible cognitive processes.

References

Briggs Myers, I., & Myers, P. B. (1995). Gifts Differing: Understanding Personality Type.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1987). "Validation of the Five-Factor Model." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52(1), 81–90.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1989). "Reinterpreting the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator from the perspective of the Five-Factor Model." Journal of Personality, 57(1), 17–40.

Pittenger, D. J. (2005). "Cautionary Comments Regarding the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator." Consulting Psychology Journal.

Roberts, B. W., Kuncel, N. R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A., & Goldberg, L. R. (2007). "The Power of Personality." Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2(4), 313–345.

arXiv.org (2023). Neural Correlates of Cognitive Functions.

Appendices

Appendix A: Big Five Full Dataset

Type	Openness	Extraversion	Conscientiousness	Agreeableness	Neuroticism
ENTP	0.8419	0.7160	0.5116	0.4874	0.4027
ESTP	0.6671	0.7960	0.5893	0.4202	0.4748
INTP	0.5194	0.5439	0.4068	0.3873	0.3226
ISTP	0.4519	0.4630	0.4344	0.3868	0.4509
INTJ	0.7641	0.5001	0.7487	0.3380	0.4852
ISTJ	0.3799	0.3811	0.6387	0.3254	0.4507
ENTJ	0.7169	0.7442	0.8727	0.3647	0.3801
ESTJ	0.4078	0.6390	0.7946	0.3100	0.4699
ISFJ	0.4584	0.3548	0.5813	0.7349	0.6706
INFJ	0.8159	0.5634	0.6622	0.8221	0.6751
ESFJ	0.4248	0.4146	0.6431	0.7989	0.4217
ENFJ	0.7033	0.8603	0.7661	0.8565	0.4292
ESFP	0.5908	0.5814	0.5570	0.5982	0.6458
ENFP	0.8057	0.5982	0.5469	0.6232	0.8121
ISFP	0.5179	0.4202	0.4570	0.4837	0.7006
INFP	0.5670	0.4039	0.4998	0.6238	0.9088

Appendix B: Corrected TRPI Table with 4F Archetypes

Type	4F Archetype	Dominant Pairing	Auxiliary Pairing
ENTP	Fight	Ne + Ti	Ni + Fe
INTJ	Freeze	Ni + Te	Ne + Fi
ISFJ	Fawn	Si + Fe	Se + Ti
ESFP	Flight	Se + Fi	Si + Te
ESTP	Fight	Se + Ti	Si + Fe
ISTJ	Freeze	Si + Te	Se + Fi
INFJ	Fawn	Ni + Fe	Ne + Ti
ENFP	Flight	Ne + Fi	Ni + Te
INTP	Fight	Ti + Ne	Te + Si
ENTJ	Freeze	Te + Ni	Ti + Se
ESFJ	Fawn	Fe + Si	Fi + Ne
ISFP	Flight	Fi + Se	Fe + Ni
ISTP	Fight	Ti + Se	Te + Ni
ESTJ	Freeze	Te + Si	Ti + Ne
ENFJ	Fawn	Fe + Ni	Fi + Se
INFP	Flight	Fi + Ne	Fe + Si