ISSN: 2710-0170

The Differences and Connections between the Classical Jungian Model and Socionics: A Comparative Analysis

Yuxi Yang

Department of Biological Science, Xi'an Jiaotong Liverpool University, Suzhou, China

Yuxi.yang23@student.xjtlu.edu.cn

Abstract

This paper argues that the Classical Jungian Model and Socionics, despite their shared origin in Carl Jung's theory of psychological types, embody two fundamentally different epistemologies of the psyche---one hermeneutic-dialectical, the other cybernetic-structural. Their integration is possible only if we recognize this epistemic gap and adopt a multi-level meta-framework. Through systematic comparison across six dimensions---epistemological foundations, functional architectures, conceptualizations of the unconscious, empirical strategies, application domains, and scientific legitimacy---we demonstrate that these are not merely alternative translations of Jung but complementary perspectives with distinct strengths and irreducible tensions. We conclude by proposing six empirically testable hypotheses and a research agenda that acknowledges both the promise of integration and the persistence of foundational incommensurabilities.

Keywords

Jungian typology, Socionics, information metabolism, archetypal psychology, comparative framework, epistemology.

1. Introduction

Personality typology has been central to psychological inquiry since the discipline's inception. Yet the field remains fractured---not merely by empirical disputes, but by deeper epistemological divides about what a "type" actually is. Is it a hermeneutic tool for understanding the symbolic dimensions of individual experience? Or is it a structural parameter in an information-processing system whose interpersonal outputs can be predicted with mathematical precision?

Carl Jung's Psychological Types [1] gave birth to both possibilities. Jung distinguished between two attitudes---extraversion and introversion---and four cognitive functions: thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition. This framework has spawned numerous derivative systems. In the West, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) became a cultural phenomenon, with estimates suggesting over fifty million administrations annually [2]. Meanwhile, in the Soviet Union during the 1970s, Aušra Augustinavičiūtė developed what she termed "Socionics"---a comprehensive theory of information metabolism that extends Jung's typology into a structural model capable of predicting interpersonal dynamics, team compatibility, and broader sociocultural patterns [3,4].

The asymmetry is striking. Socionics has developed a substantial following in Eastern Europe, with dedicated research institutes, academic journals, and professional certification programs, yet remains virtually unknown in Western psychological circles [3,5]. This is not merely a matter of language barriers or political history. It reflects something deeper: the two traditions answer different questions with different methodological commitments. The Classical Jungian Model, particularly as elaborated by depth psychologists such as John Beebe [6,7], maintains a

ISSN: 2710-0170

primary focus on intrapsychic dynamics, emphasizing individuation, archetypal integration, and therapeutic transformation. Socionics foregrounds information-theoretic principles, cybernetic systems theory, and predictive models of interpersonal compatibility [4,8].

Aims and Original Contribution

This paper makes four specific contributions: (1) demonstrating that the Classical Jungian Model and Socionics embody distinct epistemologies---hermeneutic-dialectical versus cybernetic-structural---rather than simply different vocabularies for the same reality; (2) proposing and applying a six-dimensional comparative framework that enables precise discrimination between the two systems while identifying genuine points of convergence; (3) subjecting both traditions to rigorous critical evaluation, including their susceptibility to confirmation bias, typological reification, and the Forer effect; and (4) arguing that integration requires a multi-level meta-framework preserving the irreducible strengths of each system while acknowledging tensions that cannot be fully resolved. We conclude by proposing six empirically testable hypotheses with specific research designs.

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1. The Classical Jungian Model: A Hermeneutic-Dialectical Epistemology

Jung constructed his typology through decades of clinical observation, comparative religious studies, anthropological fieldwork, and philosophical reflection. The result was not a "model" in the engineering sense but an exploratory resource---what Walker [9] calls an "epistemological reflection tool" that orients inquiry rather than delivering predictive laws.

Attitudes and Functions as Modes of Being. The two attitudes represent fundamentally different orientations of psychic energy, what Jung termed "libido"---not merely sexual energy but life force in its broadest sense. Extraversion involves a readiness to act or react toward the external world of objects, people, and concrete events [10]. The extraverted individual is oriented toward the object, finding meaning in external achievement, social recognition, and tangible results. Introversion, conversely, represents an orientation toward the subjective world of inner experience. As Weinstein [11] emphasizes, "Introversion and extraversion are not measures of social grace; they are ideas about one's characteristic stance or preference in mediating between our subjective or inner life and the outer world."

The four functions divide into two rational (judging) and two irrational (perceiving) processes. Thinking and feeling constitute the rational functions, both engaged in evaluative judgment---the former operating through impersonal, causal logic, the latter through a value-based assessment of acceptability and relational worth [1]. Sensation and intuition constitute the irrational functions, concerned with perception rather than judgment: sensation apprehends what is concretely present through the senses, while intuition discerns latent meanings, relationships, and possibilities beyond immediate sensory data [12].

The Hierarchical Model and Its Archetypal Elaboration. Jung proposed that one function becomes dominant, serving as the primary mode of conscious adaptation, while a second operates as auxiliary. The remaining functions occupy progressively less conscious positions, with the function opposite to the dominant in both attitude and nature occupying the inferior position, closely associated with the unconscious and compensatory processes [1]. This hierarchical model implies that psychological development involves not merely strengthening preferred functions but gradually differentiating and integrating all functions---a process Jung termed "individuation."

John Beebe [6,7] significantly elaborated this framework into an eight-function, eight-archetype model. In Beebe's framework, the dominant function is carried by the Hero/Heroine archetype, representing the ego's most confident, skilled, and differentiated mode of operation.

ISSN: 2710-0170

The auxiliary function is associated with the Good Parent archetype, reflecting its supportive, nurturing, and guiding role. The tertiary function is linked to the Puer/Puella Aeterna (Eternal Child), characterized by playful exploration and potential immaturity. Most significantly, the inferior function is associated with the Anima (in men) or Animus (in women)---the contrasexual soul image that serves as the gateway to the unconscious and the source of both greatest vulnerability and greatest transformative potential [6,7]. Beebe's model extends beyond the four conscious functions to encompass four additional "shadow" functions: the Opposing Personality (carrying the dominant function's opposite attitude), the Witch/Senex (carrying the auxiliary function's opposite attitude), the Trickster (carrying the tertiary function's opposite attitude), and the Demon/Daimonic (carrying the inferior function's opposite attitude). These shadow functions represent the ego's defensive reactions against challenges to its preferred mode of functioning and the psyche's unconscious patterns that can disrupt conscious intentions, generate compulsive behaviors, and produce seemingly irrational emotional responses [7].

Internal Heterogeneity of the Classical Jungian Tradition. It is crucial to recognize that the "Classical Jungian Model" is not monolithic. James Hillman's archetypal psychology, for instance, offers a radical reinterpretation of the relationship between archetypes and types, treating archetypes as autonomous psychic images that resist reduction to cognitive functions [13]. Marie-Louise von Franz, in her extensive work on the inferior function, emphasized its role as the "door to the unconscious" with a nuance distinct from Beebe's Anima/Animus association---she stressed the inferior function's connection to the collective unconscious and its potential for both destructive possession and creative renewal [14]. Anthony Stevens [15] advanced an evolutionary Jungian perspective, arguing that psychological types reflect biologically prepared adaptive strategies shaped by natural selection. These diverse elaborations mean that "Classical Jungian Model" encompasses a spectrum of theoretical commitments, and our focus on Beebe's framework represents one influential contemporary articulation rather than the entirety of the tradition.

Empirical Challenges and Partial Validation. The Classical Jungian Model has faced significant empirical challenges. Barimany [16] conducted a large-scale study (N = 5,247) using Latent Class Analysis to examine whether the theoretically proposed hierarchy of preferences---dominant, auxiliary, tertiary, and inferior functions---corresponds to empirical patterns. The study found that while the opposition between dominant and inferior functions was strongly supported across 46 of 47 latent classes, the relationship between dominant and auxiliary functions was more complex than traditionally assumed, with attitude (extraversion/introversion) not always conforming to the expected pattern of alternation [16]. These findings suggest that while Jung's basic framework possesses substantial empirical validity, the precise structural relationships among functions may be more nuanced than classical formulations imply.

2.2. Socionics: A Cybernetic-Structural Epistemology

Socionics represents a distinctive theoretical development that, while grounded in Jungian principles, incorporates additional conceptual frameworks from cybernetics, information theory, systems theory, and thermodynamics. Developed by Aušra Augustinavičiūtė beginning in the 1970s within the intellectual environment of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Socionics reconceptualizes Jung's psychological functions as "information elements" and the psyche as an information processing system engaged in continuous metabolic exchange with its environment [3,4].

Information Metabolism and Model A. The foundational concept of information metabolism (IM) was borrowed from the Polish psychiatrist Antoni Kępiński, who proposed that living organisms, including the human psyche, function as open systems that process information in

ISSN: 2710-0170

ways analogous to biological energy metabolism [3]. Augustinavičiūtė integrated this concept with Jung's typology to create a model in which psychological types are understood not merely as static categories but as dynamic patterns of information processing---distinctive "types of information metabolism" (TIMs) that determine how individuals perceive, evaluate, organize, and respond to different categories of information in their environment [4,8].

The centerpiece of Socionics is Model A, which is table below.

Table 1 : Basic descriptions of socionics (Pietrak, 2018)

Position	Block	Function Name	Corresponding Jungian Function	Dimensionality	Consciousness	Brief Description
1	EGO	Leading Function	One of the four Jungian functions (introverted or extraverted)	4D (Time, Situation, Norm, Experience)	Conscious	The strongest and most confident function. Used spontaneously and naturally; forms the core of personal identity and worldview.
2	EGO	Creative Function	The other Jungian function with opposite attitude	3D (Situation, Norm, Experience)	Conscious	Supports the leading function; used for problem-solving, influencing the external world, and generating new ideas or actions.
3	SUPER-EGO	Role Function	Same attitude as the leading function, but lower dimensionality	2D (Norm, Experience)	Conscious (weak)	An area where the individual tries to perform but feels insecure. Used mainly to adapt to social expectations; prone to criticism and self-doubt.
4	SUPER-EGO	Vulnerable Function	Same attitude as the creative function, with lowest dimensionality	1D (Experience)	Conscious (weakest)	The most sensitive "blind spot" or "pain point." The individual has poor judgment here, finds criticism unbearable, and is easily hurt by others who are strong in this area.
5	SUPER-ID	Suggestive Function	Same dimensionality as Leading, but opposite attitude	1D (Experience)	Unconscious (receptive)	The deepest unconscious need and desire. The individual readily accepts external input in this area and feels great comfort and support when it is provided.
6	SUPER-ID	Mobilizing Function	Same dimensionality as Creative, but opposite attitude	2D (Norm, Experience)	Unconscious (receptive)	An unconsciously sought area of growth. External stimulation in this function awakens interest and energy, though the individual still needs guidance.
7	ID	Ignoring Function	Same attitude as the Leading function, higher dimensionality	3D (Situation, Norm, Experience)	Unconscious (used)	A strong but devalued function. The individual can use it skillfully but tends to underestimate its importance, employing it only as a "background tool" when necessary.
8	ID	Demonstrative Function	Same attitude as the Creative function, highest dimensionality	4D (Time, Situation, Norm, Experience)	Unconscious (used)	A very powerful but fully automated function. Used effortlessly and without conscious awareness; it is simply "demonstrated" naturally in behavior, often without the individual realizing it.

2.3. A Comparative Framework for Analysis

The preceding descriptions reveal not merely different terminologies but different ways of knowing the psyche. To compare these systems rigorously, we propose six analytical dimensions. The selection of these dimensions is not arbitrary but draws on established criteria in the personality psychology literature for evaluating and comparing theoretical systems. In their foundational critique of the MBTI, McCrae and Costa [17] implicitly employed a multi-

ISSN: 2710-0170

dimensional evaluative approach, assessing the instrument on psychometric adequacy, theoretical coherence, and construct validity---criteria that map onto our dimensions of empirical strategy and scientific legitimacy. More broadly, the philosophy of psychological explanation distinguishes between ontological commitments (what a theory posits as real), epistemological norms (how a theory validates knowledge), and pragmatic functions (what a theory enables practitioners to do), a tripartite scheme that informs our separation of epistemological foundations, functional architecture, and application domain [9]. Tudge and Winterhoff's framework for comparing developmental theories similarly emphasizes the need to assess theories on their structural assumptions, explanatory scope, and applied utility in parallel rather than in isolation [18]. These precedents justify a comparative framework that treats a typological system not as a singular entity to be judged on one criterion alone, but as a configuration of interrelated theoretical and methodological commitments.

The six dimensions are:

Epistemological Foundations: The implicit theory of knowledge and truth-claim validation.

Functional Architecture: The structural organization, hierarchy, and relationship between elements/functions.

Role of the Unconscious: The conceptualization of non-conscious processes and their dynamics.

Empirical Strategy: The primary methods for generating and validating knowledge claims.

Application Domain: The primary real-world contexts for which the system is designed.

Scientific Legitimacy: The degree of institutional acceptance and recognized empirical support.

We acknowledge at the outset that these dimensions are not orthogonal. A system's epistemological foundations (Dimension 1) significantly constrain its choice of empirical strategy (Dimension 4): a hermeneutic epistemology that validates knowledge through interpretive coherence will not naturally generate randomized controlled trials, just as a cybernetic epistemology oriented toward predictive accuracy will not prioritize phenomenological depth. Similarly, functional architecture (Dimension 2) and the role of the unconscious (Dimension 3) are mutually implicating---how one structures the conscious functions determines what "unconscious" can mean as a residual category. Application domain (Dimension 5) follows in part from empirical strategy, since a system validated primarily through clinical case studies will find its most natural home in therapeutic contexts, while one validated through structural modeling will gravitate toward organizational and predictive applications. This interrelation is a feature rather than a defect: it reveals the internal coherence of each system as a self-reinforcing configuration of assumptions. However, it also means that apparent disagreements on any single dimension may trace back to more fundamental differences in epistemological orientation, a point we return to in Section 5.1.

The framework also has explicit limitations. First, it does not include a dedicated dimension for developmental dynamics---how type is theorized to emerge, stabilize, or transform across the lifespan. This omission is significant, as the two systems diverge sharply on this question: the Jungian tradition, particularly through the concept of individuation, treats psychological development as a lifelong process of functional differentiation and integration, whereas Socionics' Model A implies a relatively fixed structural configuration established early in life. We excluded this dimension not because it is unimportant, but because the available theoretical literature on developmental processes in Socionics is markedly thinner than in the Jungian tradition, making a balanced comparison difficult within the scope of this paper. The question of type change is therefore addressed as an open tension in Section 5.3 rather than as a formal dimension of comparison.

Second, the framework does not separately assess sociocultural embeddedness---how each system's claims are conditioned by the cultural and historical contexts of their emergence. The Classical Jungian Model developed within early twentieth-century European depth psychology,

ISSN: 2710-0170

inheriting its individualistic orientation toward the psyche and its assumptions about gender and the contrasexual soul image. Socionics emerged from the Soviet cybernetic tradition, inheriting its emphasis on systems, information processing, and the optimization of collective functioning. These origins shape each system's core concerns and blind spots. We treat sociocultural context as a critical lens applied throughout the analysis (most explicitly in Section 5.3) rather than as a separate comparative dimension, precisely because it operates at a different logical level---it conditions all six dimensions rather than standing alongside them.

A final limitation concerns the internal heterogeneity of each tradition. As noted in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, neither "the Classical Jungian Model" nor "Socionics" is a monolithic theoretical entity. Our six-dimension comparison necessarily operates at a level of abstraction that smooths over intra-tradition disagreements---between Beebe and Hillman on the nature of archetypes, or between Bukalov and Gulenko on the formalization of Model A. We acknowledge this simplification as a necessary cost of comparative clarity, while flagging throughout where internal disputes bear directly on the comparison.

With these caveats, the six-dimensional framework provides a structured and transparent basis for the systematic comparison that follows in Section 3.

These dimensions were selected based on three criteria: (a) theoretical philosophical significance---do they address fundamental assumptions about the nature of psychological knowledge? (b) practical utility---do they illuminate differences that matter for practitioners? and (c) empirical testability---do they generate differential predictions that could be evaluated through research?

3. Comparative Analysis

3.1. Convergences

Despite divergent trajectories, distinct cultural contexts, and markedly different theoretical emphases, the Classical Jungian Model and Socionics share several fundamental similarities reflecting their common Jungian ancestry. Both systems are built upon Jung's eight-function framework, comprising the four cognitive functions each expressed in either extraverted or introverted attitude. This shared foundation means that both systems recognize the same basic repertoire of psychological processes, even as they organize, interpret, and apply them in different ways [5]. Both generate a taxonomy of sixteen distinct psychological types, derived from the combinatorial logic of the two attitudes and the four functions. Although nomenclature differs---Jungian typology uses four-letter codes (e.g., INTJ, ESFP) while Socionics employs three-letter codes (e.g., IEI, LIE)---the underlying typological structure is isomorphic [5].

Both systems employ hierarchical organization of functions, distinguishing between more conscious, differentiated, and reliable functions and less conscious, more primitive, and less reliable ones. In the Classical Jungian Model, this hierarchy is expressed through the concepts of dominant, auxiliary, tertiary, and inferior functions, with the inferior function serving as a gateway to the unconscious and a source of both greatest weakness and greatest transformative potential [1,7]. In Socionics, the hierarchy is expressed through Model A's dimensional structure and block organization, with the Ego block functions representing the most developed and conscious processes, and the Super-Ego and Super-Id blocks representing areas of vulnerability, defensive sensitivity, and unconscious need [3,4,8]. Both systems also recognize psychological compensation---the idea that the psyche maintains dynamic equilibrium through the interplay of opposing functions and attitudes. Jung emphasized that the inferior function compensates for the one-sidedness of the dominant function, and that psychological health requires the integration of all functions rather than exclusive development of preferred ones [1]. Similarly, Socionics posits that weak functions require external support and that individuals

ISSN: 2710-0170

are naturally drawn to others who can provide what their own psyche lacks---a principle manifested most clearly in the theory of dual relations and intertype compatibility [3,4].

Both systems have generated extensive applied literatures. Weinstein [11] demonstrates how Jungian type theory can inform legal education and clinical supervision by helping educators understand diverse learning styles and professional orientations. Morushko et al. [19] show how Socionics can be applied to remote diagnosis of personality types through analysis of social media content, including visual features and verbal markers. Phoon [12] applied Jungian typology to the study of spiritual gifts in Christian contexts, while Chow [20] examined the relationship between Jungian type and cultural identity integration among immigrants. These diverse applications demonstrate the practical utility of both frameworks across varied cultural and professional domains.

3.2. Divergences in Functional Architecture and the Unconscious

This section examines divergences along three dimensions from Table 1: Functional Architecture, Role of the Unconscious, and Epistemological Basis. These dimensions are intertwined because differences in how functions are structured directly entail differences in how the unconscious is conceptualized and how knowledge claims are validated.

Structural Complexity and Formalization. The most immediately striking difference concerns the structural complexity and formalization of the two models. The Classical Jungian Model, in its classical formulation, recognizes four primary functions and, in Beebe's elaboration, four additional shadow functions, yielding a total of eight functional positions [6,7]. While this represents a significant expansion of Jung's original hierarchy, it remains relatively parsimonious in structural assumptions, with functional relationships defined primarily through archetypal associations and roles in psychological development and individuation. Socionics' Model A also contains eight positions, but these are organized into a more complex structural matrix with multiple cross-cutting dimensions: strength (strong vs. weak), consciousness (conscious vs. unconscious), valuation (valued vs. unvalued), direction of information flow (accepting vs. producing), and dimensional level (1D through 4D) [3,4,8]. This multidimensional structure enables Socionics to generate more precise and differentiated predictions about individual behavior but at the cost of greater theoretical complexity and a steeper learning curve for practitioners.

The Introverted Auxiliary Controversy. A crucial architectural difference concerns the treatment of the auxiliary function in introverted types. As Bukalov and Karpenko [8] carefully document, "In introverted Myers-Briggs types, compared with Jung's ideas, the dominant and auxiliary mental functions are swapped." This means that in MBTI-derived Jungian typology, an introverted thinking type (e.g., ISTP) is understood to have intuition as the auxiliary function, whereas Jung's original formulation in Chapter X ("General Description of the Types") would place sensation in that position. However, Jung's original text does not provide an absolute, unambiguous rule for auxiliary function attitude across all types; his descriptions in Chapter X are primarily phenomenological and case-based rather than structurally axiomatic. Socionics, by contrast, maintains what its proponents argue is greater fidelity to Jung's original structure, preserving the relationship between dominant and auxiliary functions across all types without the introversion-extraversion swap that characterizes MBTI-derived formulations [8]. This difference, while seemingly technical, has profound implications for type identification, functional analysis, and the theoretical coherence of the typological system as a whole. If Socionics is correct, then decades of MBTI-based research may have systematically misidentified the auxiliary functions of introverted types, with cascading effects for understanding type development, intertype dynamics, and therapeutic intervention. Yet this claim requires more rigorous text-critical examination than it has typically received; a

ISSN: 2710-0170

systematic, paragraph-by-paragraph comparison with Jung's Chapter X case analyses remains a task for future scholarship.

Functional Relationships: Archetypal vs. Information-Theoretic. The two models also differ fundamentally in their conceptualization of functional relationships. In the Classical Jungian Model, particularly as developed by Beebe [6,7], functions are understood primarily through their archetypal associations and roles in the individual's psychological development, therapeutic transformation, and individuation process. The inferior function, for example, is not merely a weak cognitive process but a portal to the unconscious, associated with the Anima/Animus archetype and carrying profound implications for psychological transformation, creative expression, and spiritual development [7]. The shadow functions represent not merely undeveloped cognitive abilities but active psychological forces---defensive complexes, autonomous complexes, and archetypal patterns---that can disrupt conscious intentions, generate compulsive behaviors, and produce seemingly irrational emotional responses [7].

In Socionics, functions are understood primarily through their information-processing properties, their structural relationships within Model A, and their roles in maintaining efficient information metabolism. The vulnerable function (position 4), for example, is conceptualized as the "point of least resistance"---the function most susceptible to external influence, most prone to generating psychological distress when challenged, and most likely to produce defensive reactions when the individual is pressured to operate in this domain [3]. While this structural analysis captures important behavioral patterns, it may provide less guidance for understanding the deep psychological significance of functional experiences, their symbolic and mythological dimensions, and their transformative potential---domains where the Classical Jungian Model, with its archetypal framework, offers richer theoretical resources.

The Unconscious: Dynamic Realm vs. Structural Matrix. These divergent functional architectures entail correspondingly divergent conceptions of the unconscious. In the Classical Jungian Model, the unconscious is a vast, dynamic, and creatively autonomous realm populated by archetypal contents, personal complexes, and the shadow---the repository of everything the ego has rejected, denied, or failed to integrate [1,7]. The unconscious, in this view, is not merely the absence of consciousness but a positive reality with its own logic, language, and transformative potential.

In Socionics, the unconscious is conceptualized more structurally and less dynamically, as the realm of the Super-Id and Id blocks---functions that operate automatically and outside conscious awareness but are not inherently antagonistic to the ego or populated by repressed contents. The Socionics unconscious is less a realm of repressed, potentially disruptive contents than a set of automatic processing routines that can be either supportive (Id block) or needy (Super-Id block) depending on their structural position within Model A [3]. This structural conceptualization has the advantage of clarity and predictability but may sacrifice some of the depth psychological richness that makes the Jungian unconscious such a powerful concept for therapeutic work and creative exploration.

Dimensionality: A Socionics Innovation Without Parallel. The dimensional framework of Socionics represents another architectural innovation without direct parallel in the Classical Jungian Model. The assignment of dimensional levels (1D through 4D) to each functional position provides a quantitative basis for understanding functional strength and has been linked to specific cognitive capacities and operational complexities. A first-dimensional function can process only experiential parameters, producing stereotyped, rigid responses that lack situational flexibility. A fourth-dimensional function, conversely, can integrate time, situation, norm, and experience into a comprehensive framework capable of generating genuinely novel and adaptive responses [21,8]. This dimensional system allows Socionics to make precise predictions about how individuals will respond to different types of information and why certain kinds of communication are experienced as supportive while others are

ISSN: 2710-0170

experienced as threatening or overwhelming. However, the empirical basis for these dimensional assignments remains contested. While Bukalov [21] links dimensional levels to specific numbers of operational units and even to quantum computational properties, these claims have not been subjected to independent empirical verification and appear to rely on internal consistency arguments rather than external validation.

3.3. Divergences in Application, Empirical Strategy, and Scientific Legitimacy

This section addresses the remaining three dimensions from Table 1: Application Domain, Empirical Strategy, and Scientific Legitimacy. These dimensions are practically significant because they determine how each system is deployed in real-world contexts and how its knowledge claims are evaluated.

The divergent architectures of the two models generate corresponding differences in their practical applications, theoretical emphases, and the contexts in which they have been most extensively developed and deployed. The Classical Jungian Model has been developed primarily as a tool for psychological understanding, therapeutic intervention, personal growth, and the cultivation of self-awareness. Its applications in psychotherapy, as articulated by Beebe [7] and others, focus on helping individuals recognize their typological patterns, understand the sources of their psychological difficulties and relational conflicts, and engage in the lifelong process of individuation---the integration of conscious and unconscious contents toward a more complete, authentic, and psychologically whole sense of self.

Socionics, by contrast, has been developed with a stronger emphasis on predictive modeling, structural analysis, and the systematic optimization of interpersonal and organizational systems. Its theory of intertype relations provides a comprehensive framework for predicting the quality of interactions between different psychological types, with applications in matchmaking, team building, organizational design, leadership selection, and even political analysis and historical interpretation [3,4]. The concept of "duality"---the relationship between two types whose functional configurations are maximally complementary---has been particularly influential in Eastern European applied psychology, with studies suggesting that dual partners experience enhanced psychological well-being, more effective collaboration, and greater relational satisfaction due to the natural complementarity of their information processing patterns [3,4].

Diagnostic methodologies also reflect these different theoretical orientations. Classical Jungian assessment typically relies on standardized self-report instruments such as the MBTI or the Majors Personality Type Indicator, which measure preferences through forced-choice questionnaires that present respondents with pairs of equally attractive alternatives [11,20]. These instruments assume that individuals possess sufficient self-knowledge to report their preferences accurately and that type can be validly assessed through conscious self-report. Socionics has developed a broader and more diverse range of diagnostic approaches, including visual analysis of facial features, body language, and physical appearance; verbal analysis of speech patterns, keyword usage, and rhetorical style; and structured interview techniques designed to elicit type-relevant behavioral responses [19]. This multimodal approach reflects a more holistic conception of type that extends beyond conscious self-report to encompass bodily, behavioral, and communicative manifestations of psychological structure. However, the reliability and validity of these Socionics diagnostic methods have not been established through rigorous psychometric research.

Regarding scientific legitimacy, the Classical Jungian Model occupies a paradoxical position: it is culturally ubiquitous yet academically marginalized. The MBTI enjoys massive popular success but faces persistent criticism from academic psychology for weak psychometric properties. Meanwhile, Beebe's clinical model and Jung's original theory remain influential in psychodynamic and humanistic circles but are rarely engaged by mainstream cognitive or

ISSN: 2710-0170

personality psychology. Socionics, conversely, has achieved substantial institutionalization in Eastern Europe---complete with research institutes, journals, and certification programs---yet is classified by some Western scholars as "parascience" due to its limited peer-reviewed empirical validation and its tendency to generate unfalsifiable post-hoc explanations [3]. Both systems thus face legitimacy deficits, though of different kinds: the Jungian model suffers from popular overexposure and academic neglect, while Socionics suffers from institutional isolation and insufficient cross-cultural validation.

4. Critiques and Contested Issues

4.1. Critiques of the Classical Jungian Model and MBTI: A Necessary Distinction

It is essential to distinguish between critiques of the MBTI as a psychometric instrument and critiques of Jung's original type theory or Beebe's clinical elaboration. The following criticisms apply primarily to the MBTI and similar self-report instruments; they do not automatically transfer to Jung's phenomenological theory of psychological types or to Beebe's archetypal model, which operate with different epistemological commitments and methodological standards.

The Dichotomy Problem. The most persistent criticism concerns the MBTI's reliance on dichotomous categories. McCrae and Costa [17] demonstrated that psychological traits such as extraversion and introversion are distributed continuously in the population, not bimodally. Forcing individuals into discrete type categories may obscure meaningful individual differences and produce arbitrary boundaries where none exist in nature.

Test-Retest Reliability. The MBTI has shown modest test-retest reliability, with approximately 75% of respondents receiving the same four-letter type upon retesting [22]. While this may seem acceptable, it means that one in four individuals would be classified differently on a second administration---a level of instability that would be unacceptable for most psychological assessments used in clinical or occupational decision-making.

The Barnum Effect. Type descriptions often contain statements sufficiently vague and universally applicable that most individuals will recognize themselves in them. This "Barnum effect" [23] raises serious questions about whether type assessments measure genuine psychological differences or merely provide a vocabulary for self-description that feels personally meaningful regardless of accuracy.

Theoretical Fragmentation. The lack of consensus on fundamental issues---such as whether types are best understood as discrete categories or as positions on continuous dimensions, or whether the auxiliary function in introverts should be understood as extraverted or introverted---undermines the model's scientific coherence [24]. However, from a hermeneutic-dialectical perspective, such "fragmentation" may reflect the inherent complexity of the psyche itself rather than a defect in the theoretical framework. Jung's original theory was never intended as a fixed taxonomic system but as an "epistemological reflection tool" [9] for orienting clinical inquiry.

4.2. Critiques of Socionics

Lack of Standardized Assessment.

Unlike the MBTI, which has undergone decades of psychometric refinement (however imperfect), Socionics lacks widely validated, standardized assessment instruments. The visual-verbal diagnostic methods described by Morushko et al. [19] have not been subjected to rigorous reliability and validity testing. More fundamentally, the absence of standardized instruments reflects a deeper epistemological problem: Socionics claims to identify not merely conscious preferences but an underlying structural architecture (Model A) whose eight functional positions are presumed to operate with differential strength, consciousness, and

ISSN: 2710-0170

dimensionality regardless of the subject's self-awareness. Without instruments that can independently verify these structural claims---particularly the distinction between conscious Ego-block functions and unconscious Id-block functions---the entire edifice of intertype relations rests on diagnostic procedures whose reliability remains unestablished.

Cross-Cultural Validation Deficits.

Socionics has been developed primarily within Russian and Ukrainian intellectual traditions, with limited cross-cultural validation. Whether the sixteen-type taxonomy and the intertype relation predictions hold across diverse cultural contexts remains an open question. If intertype relations theory is valid, it should exhibit cross-cultural universality; yet existing studies have not systematically tested whether duality, conflict, and other relation types manifest identically across individualist and collectivist cultures, or whether cultural norms mediate the expression of type-structural compatibilities. For instance, the very concept of "information metabolism" presupposes a cybernetic organism-environment boundary that may not be culturally invariant; collectivist cultures might blur the self/other distinction in ways that fundamentally alter the predicted dynamics of, say, "supervision" or "request" relations.

Explanatory Validity Concerns: The Dimensional Framework.

The dimensional framework and the assignment of specific operational unit counts to functional positions [21] appear impressively precise but lack independent empirical support. Three specific problems merit attention:

First, conceptual confusion: Bukalov [21] equates information-processing "complexity" with mathematical "dimensionality," but it is unclear whether the four parameters (time, situation, norm, experience) are orthogonal dimensions in any rigorous mathematical sense or merely descriptive categories. If they are not independent, the dimensional hierarchy may be a taxonomic convenience rather than a structural property of cognition.

Second, quantification without cognitive correspondence: The claim that the leading function possesses approximately 10^{28} possible combinations while the vulnerable function has only 5,040 is not derived from empirical observation of cognitive processes but from a combinatorial model whose connection to actual information processing remains speculative. These numbers lack any corresponding construct in cognitive science or neuroscience; they function as formal exercises rather than operationally measurable quantities.

Third, circularity risk: The dimensional levels appear to be assigned based on post-hoc behavioral observations (e.g., the leading function behaves more flexibly than the vulnerable function) and then used to "predict" those same behavioral patterns. Without independent measurement of dimensionality---assessed through tasks blind to type diagnosis---the framework risks circular reasoning.

Critique of Model A's Structural Ontology.

Beyond the dimensional framework, Model A itself rests on several deeply contested ontological commitments. The assumption that the psyche contains exactly eight functional positions, organized into four blocks (Ego, Super-Ego, Super-Id, Id), is presented as a deductive necessity derived from Jung's typology combined with Kępiński's information metabolism. Yet this derivation is more analogical than logical. Jung's original theory described a fluid, dynamic interplay of functions whose differentiation varied by individual and developmental stage; Model A transforms this fluid phenomenology into a rigid structural matrix where each function occupies a fixed "address" in the psychic architecture. This reification is particularly problematic for the Super-Ego and Super-Id blocks, which are posited to contain functions that are simultaneously conscious (in the sense of being reportable) yet weak or unconsciously needy---an ambiguous status that invites confirmation bias in clinical assessment.

Moreover, the strong/weak distinction in Model A presumes a binary or quasi-binary organization of cognitive capacity that contemporary cognitive science does not support.

ISSN: 2710-0170

Research on expertise, working memory, and cognitive control suggests that cognitive abilities are domain-specific, context-dependent, and continuously distributed rather than neatly partitioned into four "strong" and four "weak" functions. The Socionics claim that an individual's "vulnerable" function (position 4) is universally their point of least resistance across all situations is a sweeping generalization that ignores the extensive literature on situated cognition and task-specific competence.

Critique of Information Elements as Objective Categories.

One of Socionics' most distinctive---and most problematic---claims is that information elements (Te, Fe, Se, Ne, Ti, Fi, Si, Ni) represent objective categories of information existing independently in the external world, not merely intra-psychic processes. This reconceptualization commits what philosophers of science would recognize as a category mistake: it conflates cognitive processes (how the mind organizes experience) with ontological categories (what kinds of information exist in reality). While Jungian functions can be understood as phenomenological modes of apprehension, Socionics treats them as if they were natural kinds of information that the psyche "metabolizes" like nutrients. There is no independent evidence that the external world is structured into exactly eight information elements corresponding to Jung's functional attitudes; this appears to be a projection of the typological framework onto reality rather than an empirical discovery about it.

Critique of Intertype Relations Theory.

The theory of intertype relations represents perhaps the most ambitious and least empirically substantiated component of Socionics. The claim that all possible dyadic relationships among sixteen types can be exhaustively classified into sixteen distinct relationship types---each with predictable patterns of harmony, tension, complementarity, or conflict---rests on combinatorial logic rather than empirical observation of actual human relationships.

The definitions of these relations often appear circular: "duality" is defined as the relation where partners' leading and suggestive functions align, and then this alignment is cited as the cause of the harmonious interaction observed. Without longitudinal studies controlling for confounding variables (demographic similarity, shared values, physical attractiveness, communication skills, attachment styles), the predictive validity of intertype relations remains entirely speculative.

Furthermore, the theory implies a troubling mechanistic determinism in interpersonal dynamics. By reducing relational compatibility to the structural alignment of Model A configurations, Socionics risks neglecting the role of conscious choice, moral commitment, shared experience, and deliberate skill-building in relationship formation. The assertion that conflict relations are structurally inevitable because one partner's leading function corresponds to the other's vulnerable function pathologizes relational difficulty as a deterministic output of type geometry, potentially discouraging the very communication and compromise that empirical relationship research identifies as crucial to relational success.

Critique of Quadra Theory and Societal Application.

The extension of Socionics from individual psychology to sociopolitical analysis---particularly the theory of quadras and the "law of quadra succession"---represents a drastic extrapolation that lacks historical methodology. The claim that societies progress through cyclical phases dominated by different quadras, each bringing distinctive problem-solving orientations, is reminiscent of nineteenth-century cyclical theories of history (e.g., Spengler) that have been largely discredited for their selective evidence and post-hoc narrative construction. Without rigorous historiographical methods, control comparisons, and falsifiable periodization criteria, quadra theory functions as a just-so story that can be retrofitted to any historical sequence by selectively typing leaders, movements, or eras.

Empirical Gaps in Intertype Relations Research.

ISSN: 2710-0170

Beyond Pietrak's [3] sympathetic review, the empirical literature on intertype relations remains sparse and methodologically limited. Few studies employ adequate sample sizes, control for confounding variables (such as demographic similarity, shared values, or physical attractiveness), or report effect sizes. The existing evidence consists largely of convenience samples and retrospective self-reports, leaving the core predictive claims of intertype theory essentially untested by conventional scientific standards.

"Parascience" Classification.

Pietrak [3], in his otherwise sympathetic review, notes that Socionics has been classified by some scholars as "parascience"---a body of knowledge that mimics the form of science without adhering to its methodological standards. This classification reflects concerns about the lack of falsifiable predictions, the absence of controlled empirical studies, and the tendency to explain away negative evidence through ad hoc modifications to the theory. The very comprehensiveness of Socionics---its ability to generate a structural interpretation for virtually any psychological or social phenomenon---becomes a methodological weakness when those interpretations cannot be subjected to risky predictions. A theory that predicts everything, in principle, predicts nothing in practice.

4.3. Shared Vulnerabilities: Confirmation Bias and Typological Reification.

Both systems share two fundamental vulnerabilities. Confirmation bias: Once an individual is "typed," both the person and those around them may selectively attend to behaviors consistent with the type description while discounting or failing to notice contradictory evidence. A manager who knows an employee is "INTJ" may interpret the employee's silence in meetings as "strategic thinking" rather than "disengagement" or "social anxiety." Typological reification: There is a persistent tendency to treat type categories as natural kinds rather than as heuristic constructs. Jung himself warned against this: "My typology is far rather a critical apparatus serving to sort out and organize the welter of empirical material, but not in any sense to stick labels on people at first sight." Yet both Jungian and Socionics practitioners frequently fall into precisely this reification trap, speaking of types as if they were biological species rather than interpretive frameworks. In Socionics, this reification is arguably more severe: whereas the Classical Jungian Model treats type as a dynamic, developmental orientation, Socionics' Model A presents type as a fixed structural configuration, making type change conceptually difficult and potentially pathologizing any significant shift in functional preferences as diagnostic error rather than psychological growth.

5. Connections and Integration Prospects

5.1. The Epistemic Gap

The fundamental obstacle to integration is epistemological. The Classical Jungian Model operates within a hermeneutic-dialectical framework: knowledge is achieved through the interpretation of symbolic meanings, the dialectical interplay of conscious and unconscious, and the gradual unfolding of individuation as a narrative process. Truth claims are validated through clinical efficacy, phenomenological adequacy, and the coherence of symbolic interpretation. Socionics operates within a cybernetic-structural framework: knowledge is achieved through the formal modeling of information flows, the structural analysis of type configurations, and the prediction of interpersonal outputs. Truth claims are validated through structural consistency, predictive accuracy, and the optimization of system performance.

These are not merely different methods; they embody different ontological commitments about what the psyche is. For the Jungian, the psyche is fundamentally a meaning-making entity whose truth is disclosed through symbolic expression and narrative integration. For the Socionist, the psyche is fundamentally an information-processing system whose operations can

ISSN: 2710-0170

be modeled with mathematical precision. This epistemic gap does not preclude dialogue, but it does set limits on integration. We cannot simply "add" archetypal depth to structural precision, because the two frameworks ask different questions and produce different kinds of knowledge.

5.2. Promising Directions for Partial Integration

Enriching Socionics with Archetypal Phenomenology. Enriching Socionics with Archetypal Phenomenology. The Classical Jungian Model's rich phenomenological and archetypal dimensions could enrich Socionics' structural framework by providing deeper understanding of the subjective experience of different functional positions. Beebe's [6,7] archetypal associations, for example, could be mapped onto Model A's functional positions to create a more psychologically nuanced account of how the eight functions manifest in individual experience.

Enhancing Jungian Practice with Structural Precision. Socionics' structural precision and intertype theory could enhance the Classical Jungian Model's applicability to interpersonal and organizational contexts. The detailed analysis of how different type configurations interact---covering sixteen distinct relationship types with their characteristic patterns of harmony, tension, complementarity, and conflict---could provide Jungian practitioners with more systematic tools for understanding relational dynamics.

Rigorous Empirical Research. Barimany's [16] large-scale study of functional hierarchies demonstrates the potential for quantitative investigation of Jungian hypotheses using contemporary statistical methods. Similar empirical attention to Socionics' claims---particularly its intertype theory, dimensional framework, and predictions about information processing patterns---would strengthen the scientific credentials of both approaches.

Artificial Intelligence Applications. Mascarenas [2] has proposed that Jungian cognitive functions can be mapped onto algorithmic categories to create artificial personalities capable of passing Turing-style tests, while Bukalov [21] has suggested that Socionics' Model A could serve as an architecture for quantum computing systems designed to simulate consciousness. These technological applications may drive convergence between the two frameworks by requiring precise operationalizations that satisfy both phenomenological and structural criteria.

Dialogue with Contemporary Cognitive Science. Both traditions could be enriched by explicit engagement with contemporary cognitive science. Kahneman's dual-process theory [25] offers a potential bridge: Jung's perceiving functions (sensation, intuition) may map onto rapid, automatic System 1 processes, while his judging functions (thinking, feeling) may involve slower, deliberate System 2 operations---though this mapping is far from exact and requires careful theoretical refinement. Predictive processing frameworks [26] might reframe Socionics' "information metabolism" as a process of predictive error minimization, where different types prioritize different classes of prediction errors. Finally, the relationship between typological constructs and the Big Five model requires systematic investigation. McCrae and Costa [17] showed that MBTI dimensions correlate with Big Five traits (e.g., Intuition with Openness, Extraversion with Extraversion), but whether Socionics information elements or Beebe's archetypal positions offer incremental validity beyond the Big Five remains an open empirical question that should inform the design of Hypothesis 1.

5.3. Open Questions, Tensions, and Sociocultural Dimensions

Several tensions appear irreducible: Can the Jungian dynamic unconscious, populated by archetypal contents and the shadow, be reconciled with the Socionics structural unconscious of automatic processing routines? Does the Jungian goal of individuation---becoming who one uniquely is---conflict with the Socionics goal of optimal information metabolism and harmonious intertype relations? Does the Jungian emphasis on the individual's capacity for

ISSN: 2710-0170

conscious choice and moral responsibility conflict with Socionics' emphasis on type-determined information processing patterns?

These tensions are not defects to be eliminated but productive differences that keep the field intellectually alive. A mature meta-framework would preserve them as dialectical poles rather than attempting to collapse them into a single unified theory.

Type Change and Developmental Dynamics. A further tension concerns the mutability of type. The Jungian tradition, particularly as articulated by von Franz [14] and subsequent developmental theorists, treats individuation as a lifelong process in which functions may gradually differentiate and the personality may undergo profound transformation. If types can change, the predictive validity of intertype relations would necessarily decay over time---a possibility Socionics has not adequately addressed. Conversely, Socionics' Model A implies a relatively fixed structural configuration; while individuals may develop greater skill in using weak functions, the underlying information metabolism type is presumed stable. This divergence has profound implications for therapeutic practice: a Jungian analyst might view type change as a sign of psychological growth, while a Socionics practitioner might interpret the same shift as diagnostic error or temporary adaptation.

Sociocultural Dimensions. Both systems have largely neglected sociocultural variables. Jung's theory of the Anima/Animus rests on a heteronormative assumption that the contrasexual soul image serves as the gateway to the unconscious---a framework that has been critiqued for its binary gender assumptions and its inapplicability to non-heterosexual identities. Beebe's model inherits these assumptions, though recent Jungian scholarship has begun to reconceptualize the Anima/Animus as relational patterns rather than strictly gendered structures. Socionics, with its emphasis on structural compatibility, has paid little attention to whether type expression is moderated by socioeconomic status, educational background, or cultural context. The extraversion-introversion distinction, for example, may manifest differently in collectivist cultures where individual self-assertion is discouraged, potentially confounding Western-derived type assessments. These sociocultural lacunae limit the generalizability of both frameworks and should be central to any future research agenda.

6. Conclusion

This comparative analysis reveals two theoretical systems that, despite sharing common ancestry in Jung's theory of psychological types, have evolved into distinctive frameworks with different epistemological foundations, structural architectures, and areas of greatest applicability. The Classical Jungian Model offers a phenomenologically rich, developmentally oriented framework that emphasizes the dynamic interplay of conscious and unconscious processes, the archetypal dimensions of psychological life, and the transformative potential of individuation. Socionics offers a structurally precise, information-theoretically grounded framework that emphasizes the systematic organization of psychological functions, the predictive modeling of interpersonal dynamics, and the cybernetic principles underlying information metabolism.

They are not competing paradigms vying for theoretical supremacy, but neither are they simply "different languages for the same reality." They represent complementary perspectives on the complex, multifaceted phenomenon of human personality---perspectives that can enrich one another when their distinct epistemological commitments are respected.

6.1. Three Testable Hypotheses

H1: Cross-System Type Concordance and the Auxiliary Function Controversy

Core Claim: Individuals typed independently in both the Classical Jungian (MBTI-derived) and Socionics systems will show higher cross-system concordance for the E/I and J/P

ISSN: 2710-0170

(rational/irrational) dimensions than for function-attitude assignments in introverted types, directly reflecting the auxiliary function controversy documented in Section 3.2.

Theoretical Rationale: This hypothesis addresses the most fundamental structural dispute between the two systems. As Bukalov and Karpenko [8] argue, MBTI-derived Jungian typology "swaps" the dominant and auxiliary functions in introverted types relative to Jung's original Chapter X descriptions, whereas Socionics maintains what it claims is greater fidelity to Jung's phenomenological structure. If Socionics is correct, then decades of MBTI-based research may have systematically misidentified the auxiliary functions of introverted types, with cascading consequences for understanding type development and intertype dynamics. Conversely, if independent Jungian analysts and Socionics practitioners agree on E/I and J/P but disagree on function-attitude assignments for introverts, this would demonstrate that the two systems---despite their shared Jungian ancestry---are not merely translating the same reality into different vocabularies, but are encoding genuinely divergent structural ontologies. This hypothesis thus provides an empirical test of whether the "epistemic gap" identified in Section 5.1 manifests at the level of basic diagnostic practice. A finding of low concordance on function-attitude assignments would confirm that the two systems have diverged not just in terminology but in their underlying models of psychic structure.

Design: 300 participants, assessed independently by qualified Jungian analysts (using structured clinical interview and MajorsPTI) and certified Socionics practitioners (using multimodal visual-verbal methods), with both groups blind to each other's ratings. Analysis: Cohen's kappa for inter-rater agreement across dimensions, with specific attention to discordance patterns in introverted types.

H2: Type Stability versus Individuation—A Longitudinal Test of Ontological Commitments

Core Claim: Psychological type, as assessed by both Jungian and Socionics methods, will show moderate stability over 12-month intervals (test-retest $r > .70$) in non-therapeutic controls; however, individuals engaged in intensive depth psychotherapy will exhibit significantly greater type-shift on archetypally sensitive measures (e.g., inferior function activation, Anima/Animus emergence) than on structural measures (e.g., Model A leading function or MBTI preference clarity).

Theoretical Rationale: This hypothesis tests the deepest ontological divergence between the two systems. The Classical Jungian Model operates within a hermeneutic-dialectical framework in which the psyche is fundamentally a meaning-making entity capable of profound transformation through the individuation process. Jung [1] and von Franz [14] conceptualized the inferior function not merely as a weak cognitive process but as a dynamic portal to the unconscious; its integration implies a restructuring of the personality that may alter the individual's typological presentation over time. Beebe's [7] archetypal model extends this by associating the inferior function with the Anima/Animus, suggesting that therapeutic work at this depth should produce measurable shifts in how the individual relates to their least developed functions. Socionics, conversely, operates within a cybernetic-structural framework in which type represents a fixed information metabolism configuration. Model A posits that while individuals may develop greater skill in using weak functions, the underlying TIM remains constant; any apparent type change is interpreted as diagnostic error or superficial behavioral adaptation rather than genuine structural transformation. This hypothesis therefore pits the Jungian developmental ontology against the Socionics structural ontology. If depth psychotherapy produces significant shifts on archetypal measures but not on structural measures, it would suggest that the two systems are capturing different levels of reality: the Jungian model tracks dynamic, transformative processes, while the Socionics model captures a more stable structural baseline. This finding would support the paper's argument that integration requires a multi-level meta-framework rather than the subsumption of one system under the other.

ISSN: 2710-0170

Design: 200 participants, half in long-term Jungian analysis (minimum 6 months, two sessions weekly) and half in a non-therapeutic control condition. Assessments at baseline, 6 months, and 12 months using both MajorsPTI (with archetypal position scoring) and Socionics Model A diagnosis. Analysis: latent growth curve modeling to compare stability coefficients across measurement systems, with specific attention to whether inferior function scores show greater volatility than leading function scores in the therapeutic group.

H3: The Dimensional Framework—Structural Precision or Taxonomic Convenience?

Core Claim: Socionics dimensional levels (1D through 4D) will predict response latency and error rates in information-processing tasks, with 4D functions showing faster, more accurate responses than 1D functions; however, the magnitude of this effect will be moderated by task domain familiarity, challenging the claim that dimensionality reflects universal structural properties of cognition independent of experiential learning.

Theoretical Rationale: This hypothesis subjects Socionics' most distinctive structural innovation to empirical scrutiny while illuminating its relationship to the Classical Jungian Model. Bukalov [21] assigns dimensional levels to Model A positions, claiming that the leading function (4D) integrates time, situation, norm, and experience, while the vulnerable function (1D) processes only experiential parameters. This framework is presented as a quantitative basis for understanding functional strength and has been linked to combinatorial claims about operational units (10^{28} vs. 5,040). However, as noted in Section 4.2, these dimensional assignments risk circularity if they are derived from post-hoc behavioral observations and then used to predict the same behaviors. More importantly, the dimensional framework embodies the cybernetic-structural epistemology of Socionics: it treats cognitive differences as fixed architectural properties of the information-processing system. The Classical Jungian Model, by contrast, understands functional differences phenomenologically and developmentally; Jung emphasized that functions differentiate through lived experience, and Beebe's archetypal model suggests that functional expression is shaped by dynamic psychological complexes rather than fixed dimensional capacities. If the dimensional effect is strong but moderated by domain familiarity, this would suggest that what Socionics calls "dimensionality" may partially reflect accumulated expertise rather than innate structural constraints---blurring the boundary between Socionics' structural determinism and Jung's developmental phenomenology. Conversely, if dimensionality predicts performance independent of familiarity, this would provide crucial support for Socionics' claim that Model A captures genuine cognitive architecture. This hypothesis thus serves as a critical test of whether the two systems' divergent epistemologies correspond to empirically distinguishable cognitive mechanisms.

Design: 150 participants, typed via independent Socionics diagnosis. Custom information-processing tasks parametrically varied in complexity, designed to engage each of the eight functions (e.g., Sternberg logical inference for Ti; emotion-labeling without external criteria for Fi; rapid visual search for Se; pattern-completion from sparse cues for Ni). Task difficulty and domain familiarity will be manipulated as crossed factors. Analysis: mixed-effects models with dimensionality, task difficulty, and familiarity as predictors, testing for a dimensionality × familiarity interaction.

6.2. A Research Agenda

Future research should prioritize: (1) methodological pluralism combining self-report, behavioral observation, neuroimaging, and structural analysis; (2) cross-cultural validation of both systems to determine whether their claims to universality hold or reflect specific cultural-historical contexts, with particular attention to how collectivist vs. individualist cultures modulate the expression of E/I and rational/irrational preferences; (3) longitudinal developmental studies tracking type patterns across the lifespan and examining whether therapeutic intervention can produce genuine type change or merely surface behavioral

ISSN: 2710-0170

adaptation; (4) computational modeling comparing the predictions of both systems against empirical data, including predictive processing frameworks [26] that might translate Socionics' information metabolism into formal, testable algorithms; (5) systematic investigation of the relationship between typological constructs and the Big Five model [17] to determine whether types provide incremental validity or merely repackage trait dimensions in categorical form; and (6) meta-theoretical reflection on multi-level frameworks preserving both hermeneutic and structural knowledge forms, while remaining attentive to sociocultural variables---gender, class, and culture---that moderate the expression and measurement of psychological type.

The enduring significance of both the Classical Jungian Model and Socionics lies not in their ability to provide definitive, exhaustive, or universally applicable accounts of human personality, but in their capacity to orient inquiry, foster self-understanding, illuminate the remarkable diversity of human psychological organization, and provide practical guidance for personal development, interpersonal harmony, and collective flourishing. Their continued evolution, critical refinement, and creative integration---conducted with epistemic humility and methodological rigor---promise to enrich both scientific understanding and practical application in the study of human personality for generations to come.

References

[1] Barimany, M. E. (2017). The hierarchy of preferences in Jungian psychological type: Comparing theory to evidence [Doctoral dissertation]. The George Washington University. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

[2] Beebe, J. (2007). Type and archetype: Part I: The spine and its shadow. TypeFace, 18(2), 7–11.

[3] Beebe, J. (2017). Energies and patterns in psychological type: The reservoir of consciousness. Routledge.

[4] Berens, L. V. (1985). A comparison of Jungian function theory and Keirseyan temperament theory in the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator [Doctoral dissertation]. United States International University. University Microfilms International.

[5] Bukalov, A. (2023). The nature of the psyche and consciousness, quantum computers and information models in psychoinformatics (socionics). Artificial Intelligence, 28(3), 18–35. https://doi.org/10.15407/jai2023.03.018

[6] Bukalov, A. V. (n.d.). Socionics — a new stage in development of psychology and humanitarian disciplines. International Institute of Socionics.

[7] Bukalov, A. V., & Karpenko, O. B. (n.d.). Emergence and development of informational socionic models of the psyche. International Institute of Socionics. [https:// socionic. info] (https: //socionic.info)

[8] Chow, A. T. Y. (2017). The relationship between Jungian personality type and the process of identity integration in acculturating persons [Master's thesis]. Adler University. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

[9] Clark, A. (2013). Whatever next? Predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 36(3), 181–204.

[10] Forer, B. R. (1949). The fallacy of personal validation: A classroom demonstration of gullibility. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 44(1), 118–123.

[11] Geyer, P. (1995). Quantifying Jung: The origin and development of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator [Master's thesis]. University of Melbourne.

[12] Hillman, J. (1975). Re-visioning psychology. Harper & Row.

[13] Jung, C. G. (1971). Psychological types (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.; H. G. Baynes, Trans., rev.). Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1921)

[14] Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

ISSN: 2710-0170

[15] Mascarenas, D. D. L. (2016). A Jungian based framework for artificial personality synthesis. In Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Emotions and Personality in Personalized Systems (EMPIRE 2016) (Vol. 1680, pp. 48–54). CEUR-WS.org.

[16] McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1989). Reinterpreting the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator from the perspective of the five-factor model of personality. Journal of Personality, 57(1), 17–40.

[17] Morushko, A., Khymytsia, N., & Shakhovska, N. (2020). Determining the psychological portrait of members of web communities through socionic analysis. In Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Control, Optimisation and Analytical Processing of Social Networks (COAPSN 2020) (Vol. 2616, pp. 112–124). CEUR-WS.org.

[18] Pietrak, K. (2018). Review of the socionic model of information metabolism at individual, interpersonal and societal levels. Cognitive Systems Research, 47, 1–11. [https:// doi.org/ 10.1016/j.cogsys.2017.07.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogsys.2017.07.001)

[19] Pittenger, D. J. (1993). The utility of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Review of Educational Research, 63(4), 467–488.

[20] Phoon. (1986). A correlational study of Jungian psychological types and nineteen spiritual gifts [Doctoral dissertation]. Andrews University.

[21] Stevens, A. (1994). Jung: A very short introduction. Oxford University Press.

[22] Tudge, J. R. H., & Winterhoff, P. A. (1993). Vygotsky, Piaget, and Bandura: Perspectives on the relations between the social world and cognitive development. Human Development, 36(2), 61–81.

[23] von Franz, M.-L. (1971). The inferior function. Spring Publications.

[24] Walker, G. (2012). Sociological theory and Jungian psychology. History of the Human Sciences, 25(1), 52–74. [https:// doi.org/ 10.1177/ 0952695 111427360] (https:// doi.org /10.1177 /0952695111427360)

[25] Weinstein, I. (2015). Learning and lawyering across personality types. Clinical Law Review, 21(2), 427–454.

[26] Zīlīte, L. (2014). Type theory and socionics: Are they complementary theories? In SOCIETY. INTEGRATION. EDUCATION. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference (Vol. 22, pp. 64–73).