

Measuring Jung's Archetypal Theory Related to Other Personality Theories

Evaluación de la Teoría de los Arquetipos de Jung en Relación a otras Teorías de la Personalidad

Andrei Tepes*

West University of Timisoara
Timisoara, Romania

Abstract

This study suggests the value of the archetypal theory (in the perspective of C.S. Pearson and H.K. Marr), building a connection between archetypes and some personality dimensions (the model of Big Five). To validate the four hypotheses, we tested 62 subjects, ages 20-25, divided into 2 groups (30 male, 32 female), all students. The following tests were used: Pearson-Marr archetype indicator, DECAS test and Buss & Perry aggression test. The results confirmed a correlation between certain archetypes and personality dimensions but also a punctual correlation between the Warrior archetype and two facets of aggression (verbal and anger), and a correlation between the archetype of the Creator and openness to experience (as a dimension of personality). In addition, this investigation showed that at the young age, the only dimension that differentiates men from women is the Lover Archetype. Despite possible amendments, the present study shows the importance of the archetypal study of personality and hence, the Pearson-Marr test.

Keywords: archetype, personality, unconscious, collective unconscious, aggression

Resumen

Este trabajo estudia el valor de la teoría de los arquetipos (desde la perspectiva de C.S. Pearson y H.K. Marr), creando una conexión entre los arquetipos y algunas dimensiones de la personalidad (según el modelo de Big Five). Para validar las cuatro hipótesis, se aplicaron cuestionarios a 62 sujetos de entre 20-25 años, divididos en dos grupos (30 hombres y 32 mujeres), todos ellos estudiantes. Las herramientas utilizadas fueron las siguientes: Pearson-Marr indicador arquetipal, test DECAS y test de agresión de Buss y Perry. Los resultados confirmaron una correlación entre ciertos tipos de arquetipos y la dimensión de la personalidad, pero también una correlación puntual entre el arquetipo del *guerrero* y dos facetas de la agresión (verbal e ira), así como una correlación entre el arquetipo del *creador* y el factor de apertura a la experiencia (como dimensión de la personalidad). Además, esta investigación mostró que a una temprana edad, la única dimensión que diferencia entre hombres y mujeres es el arquetipo del *amante*. Sin tener en cuenta posibles correcciones, el estudio presenta la importancia del estudio de los arquetipos en relación a la personalidad en relación con el test Pearson-Marr.

Palabras clave: arquetipo, personalidad, inconsciente, inconsciente colectivo, agresión

Received: December, 6 2012

Accepted: July, 10 2013

Introduction

Currently, analytical psychology by C. G Jung is on the rise. Its merit is essential in that it provides a deeper mapping of the unconscious human psyche, identifying individual and collective unconscious archetypes, which accompany the important theoretical restructuring. This restructuring has a deep resonance in psychotherapy.

This study aims to test the benefit of knowing the human personality, a tool developed by Pearson C.S. and Marr H.K. (2002) which identifies the archetypal structure of personality by detection of 12 archetypes (The Innocent, The Orphan, The Warrior, The Altruist, The Seeker, The Lover, The Destroyer, The Creator, The Leader, The Magician, The Sage, and The Jester).

This study maps the implications of personality and aggression in known archetypes described by Jung (2003). Personality dimensions can be considered a way of underground unconscious archetypes which are activated in human behavior.

Jungian archetypes also have implications in personality, bringing a contribution or an orientation depending on the correlation to a certain type of personality or certain dimensions of it.

In the following, we will see how the extent of the implications of personality (openness to experience, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness and emotional stability) and aggression (verbal aggression, physical aggression, anger and hostility) contribute to form a kind of archetypal profile.

Theoretical Framework

Conceptual clarifications

Exploring the human psyche's abyssal zone begins in a scientific manner by contributing to S. Freud, who launched the concept of individual unconscious. Continuing towards Freud, CG Jung conquered new spaces of the underground mental universe called the "collective unconscious" and "archetypes".

"Along with the consciousness which has an entirely personal nature and which we consider, even when its attached as an appendix personal unconscious - as the only mental system, there is a second psychic system whose nature is collective non personal." says CG Jung (2003, p 54). It's a simple definition of what he sees beyond the personal unconscious.

According to the same author, the collective unconscious, compared with the individual one, is not the product of a single human experience. The contents of the collective unconscious, by the excellence of hereditary origin, is more than what can be acquired by one person during his lifetime.

The concept of archetype, the inevitable correlate of the idea of the collective unconscious, indicates the presence of some form of universal psychic spread. Mythological research calls them reasons, while in the psychology of primitives they correspond to the concept of representation collectives and in the comparative study of religions they were defined as a category of imagination. Other authors have designated it as original or basic ideas. In other words, the idea of archetype is a preexisting one, which is not unique and because of this it can be found in other disciplines where, of course, there is specific terminology (Jung, 2003).

Archetype is one of the most important concepts, if not the central concept, of analytical psychology developed by Jung. However, from the beginning the concept was controversial. Today there is an attempt at reorganization of the debate around the archetypal term and underlining some of the main problems of the concept. Research has been developed, with a light contemporary knowledge, especially in genetics and neuroscience. This fact becomes clear for practical use in psychotherapy where the Jungian universal element and the concept of archetype is crucial. However, it must be concluded that there is still no solid scientific basis for the claim that complex symbolic models (such as the myth of the hero) can be transmitted in a way that each human individual has access to them (Roesler, 2012). This led

to the conclusion that if it doesn't exist as a trigger that can be proved in the archetypal development, then we can seek what may trigger or influence a particular archetypal orientation in contemporary life.

Theory of archetypes can be declared as a psychological law: whenever a phenomenon is thought to be characteristic of all human communities, it is an expression of an archetype of the collective unconscious (Stevens 1995). "We chose the term collective" wrote Jung, "because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal, in contrast with the personal psyche, it has contents and modes of behavior that are more or less the same everywhere and in all persons. In other words, it is identical in all persons, and thus constitutes a common substrate of natural superpersonal psyche which is present in all of us" (Jung, 1959 as cited in Stevens, 1995).

In this work we have sought out the 12 archetypes using the Pearson-Marr Archetypal Indicator (2002); these (Innocent, Orphan, Warrior, Altruist, Seeker, Lover, Destroyer, Creator, Leader, Magician, Sage and Jester) are related to various personality traits. Archetypes become images only when they are triggered by a stimulus, therefore they have a conscious content structure, which influences the motivation and behavior. These are potential elements of formative skills at certain stages of development that determine how we perceive the world and the transformation of actions and destiny. As Jung said (2003), the secrets of the soul are set in glorious images that are designed to attract, convince, fascinate and conquer us.

Using the Archetypal Pearson-Marr Indicator (2002) we have diagnosed a total of 12 archetypes, grouped into 3 major categories (Pearson & Marr, 2002, cited in Munteanu, Costea and Jinaru, 2010), namely:

The first category consists of archetypes that help us and others to survive: Innocent, Orphan, Altruist and Warrior.

The second category brings together those archetypes that are useful to us and others to detect and value our inner resources: Seeker, Lover, Destroyer, Creator.

The last category is also a set of four archetypes, which will provide support for an authentic life to us and to our fellows, but will also stimulate our personal and world's development: Leader, Magician, Sage, Jester.

Moving forward we want to proceed to a brief description of each archetype, in the problem postulated by Pearson and Marr (2002):

-The Innocent has self-confidence and evokes confidence in others, has hope and optimism at the beginning. The Innocents live a simple life, as good men, they trust in people and feel safe in the world.

-The Orphan is reflected in the ability to take the inevitable trials of a harsh life, or in other words, to prove a realistic view on happenings that we face. He feels empathy for others, especially for the poor.

-The Altruist is signified by the compliant and empathetic attitude in relation to others, the availability to provide help when needed and the ability to be forgiving and loving.

-The Warrior is characterized by impetuosity of competitive spirit, by dignity and pride, by the ability to formulate goals, but also to defend themselves when needed.

-The Seeker is defined by the acceptance of the differences between people, but also by the openness to experience new things.

-The Lover is defined by love for fellows, romance, loyalty for the other.

-The Destroyer has the power to overcome the vicissitudes and imbalances of existence, is able to respond and take control again, and has the ability to metamorphosize.

-The Creator stimulates innovative spirit, imagination, and quickness of mind.

-The Leader has the ability to control, has responsibility and consistency for his own axiological grid.

-The Magician displays the ability to change the circumstances by expansion of the perspective of thought and fact.

-The Sage evokes quality thinking, which is critical in formulating his own opinions.

-The Jester is characterized by the joy to work and live, and also by the ability to always be connected to the present time.

Specifically, all 12 archetypes behave as so many characters, which are latent in every human being, but how they operate varies from case to case. For example, as noted by Pearson and Marr (2002), the Warrior archetype can result in a variety of poses from samurai to cowboys, and to the researcher who discovers the cure for AIDS, respectively (Munteanu, Costea and Jinaru, 2010).

When an archetype is activated we must honor the exact tasks, which result from its specific identity. Most importantly, depending on the concrete situation in which we are involved, mobilizing the adequate archetype. For example, when meeting with the person we love there is no need to wake up the warrior archetype from lethargy, but to activate the Lover. (Munteanu, Costea and Jinaru, 2010).

Anthony Stevens (1995) talks about the link between aggression and the Warrior archetype. Since ancient times, especially man, but not only, was concerned by hunting, by inner group conflict, wars, biologically transmitted issues, mediated inclination archetypal structures in the human brain, namely the psyche. Stevens (1995) says in his study three major deficiencies of the Warrior are ignoring the unconscious dynamic, the increased importance on rational explanations of group behavior and the diminished importance of human biology. Jung's approach may have led to a way to remediate these deficiencies, because it emphasizes the power of unconscious influence on human behavior and to adopt a perspective that is essentially psychobiological (Stevens 1995). In appropriate cases, the archetypes give rise to similar thoughts, images, feelings and ideas for people, regardless of class, creed, race, etc. To accept the archetypal hypothesis, however, it is necessary to adopt a phylogenetic view of the psyche, because archetypes are biological entities that have evolved by natural selection.

In dictionaries of psychology, aggression is defined as the tendency to attack. Specifically, the term refers to a person's character. In a larger sense, the term characterizes the dynamic of assertion, which means not running from difficulty or fighting. On a general level, aggression characterizes the fundamental disposition through which human beings can achieve satisfaction in vital necessities, mainly food and sex. For many psychologists, aggression is closely linked to frustration.

Aggression is also the result of other causes. As in observations of children with sleep deprivation where they have been observed in sudden bouts of aggression followed by moments of absolute isolation. Aggression in children is often due to a deep dissatisfaction, a close second is a lack of affection or a sense of personal devaluation. When, for example, despite his sincere efforts, a scholar is punished for not satisfying his parents, the treatment applied by them is extremely unfair and can lead to minor revolt or collapse. Learning plays an important role in aggression (Sillamy, 1998).

Over the last 200 years there has been a bitter conflict between those who argue that man is a "born warrior" and those who claim that he is "born peacefully." Conflict repeatedly affects every part of

our planet where people come into contact with each other, borders between nations, races and religions were established by war as well. Tiger and Men (1995) concluded that aggression is a masculine trait, and that man tends to join into groups to increase their power and effectiveness. Since ancient times, man chose to hunt in groups, biological support was transmitted and rooted in human evolutionary history. It is true that this tendency finds a great variety of cultural forms, however, it insists that what Tiger and Men (1995) called "a predetermined irreducible factor" is exactly what Jung called an archetype of the collective unconscious.

Personality is defined as a stable element of a person's behavior, which characterizes and distinguishes it from another person. Each individual has its specific intellectual, affective and conative traits (referring to will and the temper), whose organized grouping determines personality. Each man is similar to other members of the group and also different from it by the unique imprint of his feelings. Its singularity, a fraction of the original ego is the essence of his personality. According to some authors, this would be determined by the physical constitution, others by social influences. In fact, all of the structured innate dispositions (heredity, constitution) and acquired (environmental, education and responses to these influences) are those which determine original adaptation of the individual to his environment. This organization is continuously developed and transformed under the influence of biological maturation (age, puberty, menopause, etc.) and personal experiences (socio-cultural and emotional conditions). More than biological factors, which should not minimize the importance, the psychological conditions play a significant role in the development of personality (Sillamy, 1998).

The study of personality benefits from the Big-Five Model (Howard and Howard, 2004). In this representation five factors are investigated, namely: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness. In a very brief and partial presentation (each author proposes different facets and shades to the basic model) these factors can be described as follows (Howard and Howard, 2004):

Neuroticism - N - describes people with strong neurotic accents, with strong emotions, especially in his negative side, with fears, anxiety or depression, people who need emotional support to overcome these phases. The polarity described by the N scale is related to the continuum of emotional disequilibrium - emotional balance.

Extraversion - E – describes a communicative person, sociable, talkative, with good social presence, with a special capacity of verbalization, persons which feel good in social contexts and for that reason, seek interaction with others. The polarity described by the E scale is along the continuum of extraversion-introversion.

Openness to experience - O - describes people open to sensory experiences, with artistic sense, inclination for music or art, animated by intellectual interests, characterized by scientific curiosity (particularly in the natural sciences), attracted and close to nature by a life in harmony with nature and beauty, in general. The polarity described by the O scale is captured on the continuum of Openness to experience – retained and conservative, including the preference for familiar.

Agreeableness - A - describes pleasant people, non-aggressive, animated by friendly feelings towards children, animals and, others, in general. These people manifest resistance to frustration and which does not express psychological distress through acts of physical or verbal aggression. Along with the Extraversion scale, this factor refers to those dimensions of personality involved in social relations, characterized by polarity of Agreeableness - hardness in interpersonal relations.

Conscientiousness - C – detect orderly people, who prefer well-structured and controlled environments, capable of hard work and long-term energy concentration to achieve the objectives, are willing to invest a lot of work and not to be distracted by temptations. According to Costa and McCrae (1990), this factor is

related to professional success, regardless of the activity field, the polarity expressed on the scale is conscientiousness - the tendency for hedonism.

Relevant Research

This research was developed in consultation with other studies dealing with the archetypes defined by Jung. The most relevant are A. Stevens (1995) with the work: "Jungian Approach to Human Aggression With Special Emphasis on War"; C. Roesler (2012) with his work: "Are archetypes transmitted more by culture than biology? Questions arising from conceptualizations of the archetype"; A. Munteanu, I. Costea, A. Jinaru (2010) with the work: "Accessing the Essences - a Study of Archetypes". It is recognized that the quantity of research is not enough, we realize that this somewhat limits our points of investigation, but also brings a motivation for the study of a background which is still unknown.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There is a statistically significant relationship between the archetypal structure (Innocent, Orphan, Warrior, Altruist, Seeker, Lover, Creator, Leader, Magician, Sage and Jester) of subjects and personality dimensions (Openness to experience, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness and Emotional stability) within this age group.

Hypothesis 2: There is a statistically significant relationship between the Warrior Archetype and aggressiveness dimensions (physical, verbal, anger and hostility), within this age group.

Hypothesis 3: There is a statistically significant relationship between the Creator Archetype and Openness to Experience, within this age group.

Hypothesis 4: There are statistically significant differences between archetypal structures between young females versus young males.

Methodology

Design

This study is non-experimental although it uses two independent samples of subjects: men and women. Including 62 subjects (32 women, 30 men) who were given a set of 3 questionnaires. In interpreting the data we used SPSS for Windows 16.0 and for the interpretation techniques we used the Pearson correlation and comparison with *t*test for independent samples.

Participants

In this study there are 62 subjects involved, 30 men (48.4%) and 32 women (51.6%), aged 20-25 years, with a mean $n = 21.90$. The sample was formed randomly (randomized), consisting exclusively of students of various universities in Timisoara. All participants are from urban areas and are involved voluntarily in this study.

Instruments

The *Pearson-Marr Archetype Indicator*, an instrument made by Carol S. Pearson and Hugh K. Marr (2002), using the theory developed by CG Jung archetypes. The test includes 72 items that are scored on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), which measures 12 dimensions. Each dimension corresponds to an archetype (Innocent, Orphan, Warrior, Altruist, Seeker, Lover,

Destroyer, Creator, Leader, Magician, Sage and Jester) and six items. A high score on one dimension represents the membership subject to the archetypal dimension and respectively an average score between subject and archetype can identify only certain features without joining the dimensions in question.

DECAS Personality Inventory is a tool built on the basis of Big-Five model of personality, developed by Sava (2008). Includes 8 scales that can be divided into content scales (5) and validation scales (3). Names and acronyms for all eight DECAS scales are: Content Scale (The Big Five model) (D: Openness to experience, E: Extraversion, C: Conscientiousness, A: Agreeableness, S: Emotional Stability); Validation Protocol Scale SD: social desirability (lie), RD: Random replies (random) AP: (Approval). DECAS has 95 standard questions (used to calculate the final score), with "True" / "False" responses.

Proof of aggressiveness by Buss and Perry (1992) was constructed to measure various dimensions of hostility, anger and aggressiveness. The test contains 29 items and uses a multidimensional evaluation model with a total of four scales of the four behaviors of aggression: physical aggressiveness, verbal aggressiveness, anger and hostility. In this way, physical and verbal aggressiveness would be instrumental or motor behaviors, anger would be the emotional or affective component and hostility would be the cognitive component. Each item is rated on a Likert scale from 1 (not at all 0%) to 5 (fully 100%). The scale includes 27 items scored directly and 2 reverse items (items 1 and 25). Large rates of a certain size represent a high level of aggressive behavior corresponding of that dimension.

Procedure

Each of the 62 subjects received a set of three samples (shown above). Subjects were asked to answer each question individually. Instructions were addressed both written and orally, being the same for all subjects. Their participation was voluntary.

Results

Numerical data obtained from the research was interpreted using SPSS for Windows 16.0.

Hypothesis 1.

There is a statistically significant relationship between archetypal structure (Innocent, Orphan, Warrior, Altruist, Lover, Destroyer, Creator, Leader, Magician, Sage and Jester) of subjects and personality dimensions (Openness to experience, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness and Emotional stability) within this age group. For the quantitative analysis of data obtained we present the following tables:

Table 1. Indexes of correlation between archetypal dimensions and personality dimensions.

		Openness	Extraversion	Conscientiousness	Agreeableness	Neuroticism
Innocent	Pearson Correlation	-.195	.149	.200	.268*	-.065
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.064	.123	.059	.018	.307
	N	62	62	62	62	62
Orphan	Pearson Correlation	.095	.063	-.273*	-.119	.098
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.231	.312	.016	.179	.225
	N	62	62	62	62	62
Warrior	Pearson Correlation	.070	.200	.114	-.105	.120
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.293	.060	.189	.209	.176

	N	62	62	62	62	62
Altruist	Pearson Correlation	.306**	.030	.134	.240*	-.334**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.008	.409	.149	.030	.004
	N	62	62	62	62	62
Seeker	Pearson Correlation	.294*	.437**	.156	-.012	.053
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.010	.000	.113	.464	.341
	N	62	62	62	62	62
Lover	Pearson Correlation	.200	.180	.270*	.222*	-.225*
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.059	.081	.017	.041	.040
	N	62	62	62	62	62
Destroyer	Pearson Correlation	.006	-.075	.103	-.331**	-.216*
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.482	.280	.213	.004	.046
	N	62	62	62	62	62
Creator	Pearson Correlation	.459**	.441**	.157	-.048	.304**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.111	.356	.008
	N	62	62	62	62	62
Leader	Pearson Correlation	.153	.124	.251*	-.098	.104
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.117	.169	.025	.225	.211
	N	62	62	62	62	62
Magician	Pearson Correlation	.316**	.040	.252*	.015	-.208
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.006	.377	.024	.453	.053
	N	62	62	62	62	62
Sage	Pearson Correlation	.409**	.134	.259*	-.169	-.033
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.150	.021	.094	.400
	N	62	62	62	62	62
Jester	Pearson Correlation	.169	.489**	.009	.048	.116
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.095	.000	.473	.357	.185
	N	62	62	62	62	62

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Hypothesis is partially confirmed according to Table 1 and there is a statistically significant correlation between:

The Innocent and Agreeability archetype, with a correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.268$, $p < .05$ and effect size was average with $r^2 = 0.072$, this means that the high score for the Innocent Archetype will determine increased scores on the Agreeability dimension.

The Orphan Archetype and Conscientiousness, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = -0.273$ (negative correlation) with $p < .05$ and effect size was average $r^2 = 0.075$, this means that a high score for the Orphan Archetype will determine a low score on the Conscientiousness dimension.

The Altruistic Archetype and Openness for experience, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.306$, $p < .05$ and effect size was average $r^2 = 0.094$, this means that the high score for the Altruist Archetype will determine an increased score on the Openness to experience dimension.

The Altruistic Archetype and Agreeability, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.240$, $p < .05$ and effect size was small with $r^2 = 0.058$, this means that a high score for the Altruistic Archetype will determine an increased score on the Agreeability dimension.

The Altruistic Archetype and Neuroticism, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = -0.334$, $p < .05$ (negative correlation) and the average effect size $r^2 = 0.112$, this means that the high score for the Altruistic Archetype will determine a low score on the Neuroticism dimension.

The Seeker Archetype and Openness to experience, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.294$, $p < .05$ and effect size was average $r^2 = 0.086$, this means that the high score for the Seeker Archetype will determine a high score on the Openness to experience dimension.

The Seeker Archetype and Extraversion, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.437$, $p < .01$ and powerful effect in size with $r^2 = 0.191$, this means that the high score for the Seeker Archetype will determine a high score on the Extraversion dimension.

The Lover Archetype and Conscientiousness, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.270$, $p < .05$ and effect size was average $r^2 = 0.072$, this means that the high score for the Lover Archetype will determine a high score on the Conscientiousness dimension.

The Lover Archetype and Agreeability, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.222$, $p < .05$ and effect size was low with $r^2 = 0.050$, this means that the high score for the Lover Archetype will determine a high score on the Agreeability dimension.

The Lover Archetype and Neuroticism, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = -.225$ (negative correlation) with $p < .05$ and effect size was low with $r^2 = 0.050$, this means that the high score for the Lover Archetype will determine a low score on the Neuroticism dimension.

The Destroyer Archetype and Agreeability with correlation coefficient $r(60) = -0.331$, $p < .05$ (negative correlation) and the average effect size $r^2 = 0.110$, this means that the high score for the Destroyer Archetype will determine a low score for the Agreeability dimension.

The Creator Archetype and Openness to experience, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.456$, $p < .01$ and powerful effect size with $r^2 = 0.208$, this means that the high score for the Creator Archetype will determine a high score on the Openness to experience dimension.

The Creator Archetype and Extraversion, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.441$, $p < .01$ and powerful effect size with $r^2 = 0.194$, this means that the high score for the Creator Archetype will determine a high score on the Extraversion dimension.

The Creator Archetype and Emotional Stability with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.304$, $p < .01$, and the average effect size of $r^2 = 0.092$, this means that the high score for the Creator Archetype will determine a high score on the Emotional Stability dimension.

The Leader Archetype and Consciousness, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.251$, $p < .05$ and effect size was average $r^2 = 0.063$, this means that the high score for the Leader Archetype will determine a high score on the Consciousness dimension.

The Magician Archetype and Openness to experience, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.316$, $p < .05$ and effect size was average $r^2 = 0.100$, this means that the high score for the Magician Archetype will determine a high score on the Openness to experience dimension.

The Magician Archetype and Consciousness, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.252$, $p < .05$ and effect size was average $r^2 = 0.064$, this means that the high score for the Magician Archetype will determine a high score on the Consciousness dimension.

The Sage Archetype and Openness to experience, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.409$, $p < .01$ and effect size as powerful as $r^2 = 0.167$, this means that the high score for the Sage Archetype will determine a high score on the Openness to experience dimension.

The Sage Archetype and Consciousness, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.259$, $p < .05$ and effect size was average $r^2 = 0.067$, this means that the high score for the Sage Archetype will determine a high score on the Consciousness dimension.

The Jester Archetype and Extraversion, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.489$, $p < .01$ and powerful effect in size with $r^2 = 0.239$, this means that the high score for the Jester Archetype will determine a low score on the Extraversion dimension.

For other archetypal dimensions there is no statistically significant correlation ($p > .05$) with dimensions of personality.

Hypothesis 2.

There is a statistically significant relationship between the Warrior Archetype and aggressiveness dimensions (physical, verbal, anger and hostility), within this age group.

Table 2. Correlation indices of association between the Warrior Archetype and aggressiveness dimensions

	Physical aggressiveness	Verbal aggression	Anger	Hostility
Warrior Pearson Correlation	.124	.236	.316*	.010
Sig. (2-tailed)	.336	.064	.012	.939
N	62	62	62	62

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The hypothesis is partially confirmed according to Table 2 and there is a correlation between:

The Warrior Archetype and verbal aggression with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.236$, $p < .05$ and effect size was low with $r^2 = 0.056$, this means that the high score for the Warrior Archetype will determine a high score on the verbal aggression dimension.

The Warrior Archetype and anger with the correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.316$, $p < .05$ and effect size was average $r^2 = 0.10$, this means that the high score for the Warrior Archetype will determine a high score on the verbal anger dimension.

For the Warrior Archetype there is no statistically significant correlation ($p > .05$) with physical aggression and hostility (aggressiveness dimensions).

Hypothesis 3.

There is a statistically significant relationship between the Creator Archetype and Openness to experience, within this age group.

Table 3. Correlation indices of the association of archetypes with dimensions of aggressiveness.

		Creator	Openness
Creator	Pearson Correlation	1	.459**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.000
	N	62	62
Openness	Pearson Correlation	.459**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	
	N	62	62

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

The hypothesis is confirmed (Table 3) following the statistically significant correlations between the Creator Archetype and Openness to experience, with correlation coefficient $r(60) = 0.456$, $p < .01$ and powerful effect in size with $r^2 = 0.208$, this means that the high score for the Creator Archetype will determine a high score on the Openness to experience dimension.

Hypothesis 4.

There are statistically significant differences between archetypal structures of young female versus young male.

Table 4. Values of archetypal dimensions referring to female and male gender.

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Innocent	Masculine	30	21.6667	3.20918	.58591
	Feminine	32	21.1875	2.78750	.49277
Orphan	Masculine	30	15.6333	2.82212	.51525
	Feminine	32	18.5000	8.86821	1.56769
Warrior	Masculine	30	23.8333	2.79264	.50986
	Feminine	32	24.9688	10.22800	1.80807
Altruist	Masculine	30	21.9333	3.58092	.65378
	Feminine	32	21.9062	3.12492	.55241
Seeker	Masculine	30	22.2667	3.11762	.56920
	Feminine	32	22.1250	2.68508	.47466

Lover	Masculine	30	22.5333	3.32942	.60787
	Feminine	32	24.2812	3.32376	.58756
Destroyer	Masculine	30	17.9667	3.58621	.65475
	Feminine	32	17.3750	3.57184	.63142
Creator	Masculine	30	20.5667	3.04770	.55643
	Feminine	32	19.3125	3.38343	.59811
Leader	Masculine	30	23.8333	2.92532	.53409
	Feminine	32	22.8125	3.19715	.56518
Magician	Masculine	30	21.0333	2.94177	.53709
	Feminine	32	21.9375	3.14117	.55529
Sage	Masculine	30	23.7000	2.90244	.52991
	Feminine	32	23.4375	2.93958	.51965
Jester	Masculine	30	23.6667	3.84469	.70194
	Feminine	32	22.9375	3.59154	.63490

Table 5. The significance of difference in the archetypal dimensions, depending on male or female gender. Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
Innocent	.155	.695	Equal variances assumed	.629	60	.532	.47917	.76207	-1.04521	2.00354
			Equal variances not assumed	.626	57.583	.534	.47917	.76558	-1.05354	2.01188
Orphan	2.087	.154	Equal variances assumed	-1.691	60	.096	-2.86667	1.69495	-6.25707	.52373
			Equal variances not assumed	-1.737	37.590	.091	-2.86667	1.65019	-6.20851	.47517

Warrior	Equal variances assumed	1.263	.265	-.588	60	.559	-1.13542	1.93239	-5.00078	2.72994
	Equal variances not assumed			-.604	35.884	.549	-1.13542	1.87859	-4.94579	2.67496
Altruist	Equal variances assumed	1.267	.265	.032	60	.975	.02708	.85212	-1.67742	1.73159
	Equal variances not assumed			.032	57.685	.975	.02708	.85592	-1.68642	1.74059
Seeker	Equal variances assumed	.045	.833	.192	60	.848	.14167	.73754	-1.33364	1.61697
	Equal variances not assumed			.191	57.393	.849	.14167	.74114	-1.34222	1.62555
Lover	Equal variances assumed	.089	.767	-2.068	60	.043	-1.74792	.84537	-3.43891	-.05692
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.068	59.729	.043	-1.74792	.84542	-3.43916	-.05667
Destroyer	Equal variances assumed	.002	.960	.651	60	.518	.59167	.90949	-1.22758	2.41091
	Equal variances not assumed			.650	59.710	.518	.59167	.90961	-1.22800	2.41134
Creator	Equal variances assumed	.135	.714	1.530	60	.131	1.25417	.81971	-.38550	2.89383
	Equal variances not assumed			1.535	59.910	.130	1.25417	.81692	-.37996	2.88829
Leader	Equal variances assumed	.348	.557	1.309	60	.196	1.02083	.77987	-.53915	2.58082
	Equal variances not assumed			1.313	59.968	.194	1.02083	.77761	-.53464	2.57630
Magician	Equal variances assumed	.029	.866	-1.168	60	.247	-.90417	.77420	-2.45279	.64445

	Equal variances not assumed			-1.170	60.000	.246	-.90417	.77253	-2.44947	.64113
Sage	Equal variances assumed	.008	.929	.354	60	.725	.26250	.74250	-1.22271	1.74771
	Equal variances not assumed			.354	59.832	.725	.26250	.74219	-1.22218	1.74718
Jester	Equal variances assumed	.278	.600	.772	60	.443	.72917	.94437	-1.15985	2.61819
	Equal variances not assumed			.770	58.950	.444	.72917	.94648	-1.16476	2.62310

As is clear from Table 5 there is only one statistically significant difference in terms of feminine and masculine archetype for the Lover Archetype, without a significant F we provide reliability for the first value of t . For $t(60) = -2.068$, $p < 0.05$. Therefore, the bilateral statistical hypothesis is partially confirmed because there are significant differences between men and women aged 20-24 years, but only on the Lover Archetypal dimension. On the other archetypal dimensions, differences are statistically insignificant, with $p > .05$.

Discussion

In essence, this study aims to fructify the benefits of investigation, test archetypes with Pearson & Marr 2002 and offer an unexpected chance to explore in a psychometric approach the archetype of the human psyche.

The first hypothesis sought to determine to what extent archetypes populate the abyssal human being, what activates and is in connection with the various dimensions of personality. On the whole, with the results we obtained from these correlations we can say between the two mental categories we have seen a lot of relationships. More concretely the following can be seen:

Openness to Experience as a dimension of personality, shows a statistically significant positive correlation with archetypes: Altruistic ($r(60) = .306$), Seeker ($r(60) = .294$), Creator ($r(60) = .456$), Magician ($r(60) = .316$) and Sage ($r(60) = .409$). Reviewing the definitive profile of each archetypal type, of the above, we find that orientation to the world, the centrifugal tendency is part of their essence. Also, Openness to experience as a fundamental dimension of personality is a major condition of individual and collective evolution, as well as being a characteristic valence of the four archetypes concerned.

Extraversion as a dimension of personality shows a statistically significant positive correlation with the Seeker Archetype ($r(60) = .437$), Creator ($r(60) = .441$) and Jester ($r(60) = .489$). Examining, on one hand, the defining features for extraversion as a dimension of personality and on the other hand, the characteristics of the three archetypes that correlate, can be considered common elements with the ability to interact with fellows and sociability. This element constitutes behavioral assumptions for the human conscious psyche. The Seeker and the Creator Archetype will stimulate a behavior without social inhibitions, developing relaxation in social communication.

Consciousness as a dimension of personality correlates positively with the Lover Archetype ($r(60) = .270$), Leader ($r(60) = .251$), Magician ($r(60) = .252$) and Sage ($r(60) = .259$) and negatively correlated with the Orphan Archetype ($r(60) = -.273$). Summarizing things by comparing the two groups, Conscientiousness versus four archetypes, a common note is loyalty and whether it connects to an idea, question, person etc. The negative correlation between Conscientiousness and the Orphan Archetype is explainable because, contrary to the world's common idea of the orphan, the archetype evokes a realistic vision for their existence. Especially through the ability to dominate the debauchedness of life, which is exactly the polar behavior –defined as hedonism and considered the opposite of Conscientiousness.

Agreeability as a dimension of personality correlates positively with the Innocent Archetype ($r(60) = .268$), Altruistic ($r(60) = .240$), Lover ($r(60) = .222$) and negatively correlated with the Destroyer Archetype ($r(60) = -.331$). Thus, archetypes positively correlated suggest a type of non-aggressive behavior, resistance to psychological distress and animated by friendly feelings for others; all elements that define agreeability, as a dimension of personality. As for the negative correlation between Agreeableness and the Destroyer Archetype, it is perfectly explainable given the characteristic profile of this archetype.

As a dimension of personality, **neuroticism** has only one positive correlation, the Seeker archetype ($r(60) = 0.304$) and negative correlations with the Altruistic Archetype ($r(60) = -0.334$), Lover ($r(60) = -0.225$) and Destroyer ($r(60) = -0.216$). The Seeker Archetype by his own destiny suggests great anxiety and inner sensitivity, which correlates with neuroticism, hence their positive correlation. The study of archetypes in relation to human personality is a themed approach in recent years and in more research. Some studies (Alho, 2006) approach this perspective more often, noting the personality dimensions as a lot of factors, while other studies (Munteanu, Costea and Jinaru, 2010) refer only in general terms by accessing only certain dimensions of personality. This study examines the hypothesis 1 with strict approach to the personality dimensions of the Big Five model.

The second working hypothesis shows a statistically significant correlation between the Warrior Archetype and two facets of aggression (verbal and anger). From the beginning, we see that the activation of this archetype of the Warrior by aggression was expected, by the very nature of things. If the warrior archetype does not manifest today in all possible records of aggression, it is because with modern civilized man verbal aggression and anger are the most common and also socially tolerable.

The Warrior Archetype has been studied by Stevens (1995), producing a profile of aggression, exclusively of the male subjects in areas such as security (police, army, etc.) and public exposure (politicians). From our perspective, it is important that Stevens (1995) research demonstrated a statistically significant correlation between the Warrior archetype, verbal aggression ($r(60) = .236$) and anger ($r(60) = 0.316$), which correlates with the result obtained by our work. The surprising correlation being the depths of the unconscious, which are brought to the surface of consciousness by the dominant archetype of the Warrior, highlighting the instrumental aggressive, active, affective and emotional behavior.

In youth, aggressive tendencies find expression in dangerous and violent sports, street gang acts, sports fans, etc. A different expression of aggressiveness can also follow in the passive behavior, observed by the increased number of people watching aggressive movies, movies that are often placed in the box office. The existence of correlation on aggressiveness dimensions (verbal aggressiveness and anger) with the Warrior Archetype proves that aggressive behavior is just as old as man. Historical statistics support this hypothesis: from 1500 BC and 1860 AD there was in the world an average of 13 years of war, for each year of peace (Stevens, 1995), which proves that whatever the degree of cultural

encouraging, aggression makes its presence. Whenever there were human communities, conflicts were generated both within them and between them, at all levels of intimacy.

The relics of archetypal aggressive behavior are pushed to behavioral limits and bring to light the gloomy secrets of the unconscious, not just any, but the collective unconscious. Daily relationship is merged with acts of dimension beyond consciousness, as presented by Jung (2003) and are really deeply and continuously subjects for study.

The third hypothesis captures a highly significant correlation between the Creator Archetype and Openness to experience. In the preamble we should justify which inspired such a situation. As demonstrated by studies of the psychology of creativity (Munteanu, 1999), Openness to experience is a fundamentally creative attitude in managing the creative act. This is why, this correlation was perfectly predictable and it shows by default (as the related correlation of the two hypotheses) the diagnostic value of the Pearson-Marr test. This explains the discussion results that the Open to experience personality will be accompanied by catalysts from the collective unconscious, which populate the Creator Archetype, and therefore, a sense of harmony, curiosity, and self-improvement will be fueled by unconscious resources. In agreement with studies of creativity psychology, it is known that creative work requires cooperation between consciousness and the abyssal forces and our hypothesis practically validated this cooperation (Moore, 1997).

Creation study has innovated the importance of relationships between biological, psychological and social factors (Munteanu, 1999). Here, the amount of creatological consciousness has already been discussed leaving room for potential unconscious elements. Creative development may also involve the subdivisions beyond consciousness; hypothesis 3 shows the correlation between the Creator Archetype and Openness to experience as a dimension of personality. The relational behavior between the Seeker Archetype and Openness to experience develops the creative definition supporting the creative process focused on a synergy of individual personality factors and results in an idea or a new product, with or without utility or social value (Munteanu, 1999). This brings an additional factor to the collective unconscious through the archetypal dimension of the Creator.

The last hypothesis has proposed to detect whether or not male and female archetypal structures have a statistically significant difference. Their findings identified the presence of such differences only in terms of the Lover Archetype. This finding is an additional argument, which demonstrates that, since the archetypal matrix, the only notable difference between men and women is affect. Results that neither of the two genders are superior to the other in absolute value, advocating unequivocally for equality.

Conclusions

The Psychoanalytic conception, the classic version or its derivatives, more or less faithful, have demonstrated the major importance of the unconscious in the context of the human psyche. The Pearson-Marr test inspired by Jungian analytical psychology and psycho-diagnosis enriched this study as a valuable tool for exploring the depths of the human psyche.

This study was a sample of the desire to determine whether the collective archetypal structure of the unconscious resonates with dimensions of personality (Big Five model) and indirectly, to test its usefulness in a psycho-diagnostic approach.

We formulated 4 hypotheses which were confirmed: one full and three in part. Concretely, this study demonstrated that most archetypes studied in this age group found correspondences in the five dimensions of personality. Among investigated youth, verbal aggression and anger are the most common manifestations of the Warrior archetype, the same was found for Openness to experience as a form of

expression for the Creator archetype; and the Lover archetype differentiated the males from females in this age group only.

Unfortunately, despite the efforts invested we have identified a limited number of studies on the same subject both in foreign literature and in the local literature and because of this we are unable to shade qualitative analysis as we wanted. We hope that further research will prove more persuasive values of this instrument.

Study limitations and practical implications

The existence of a small number of studies for archetypal types is the main limitation of the study whereas their absence did not have enough investigative guidelines. This limitation also supplied motivation, which was behind the initiation of the present study. Another problem would be the small number of subjects: 30 men and 32 women. Although there are two samples, which satisfy the minimum requirement of 30 subjects, for a finer observation we recommend a larger sample in any next study.

Recommendations for following studies should be using all dimensions of personality and development of comparison and some combinations of correlation. Specifically, between aggressiveness – archetypes with aggressiveness – personality dimensions and archetypes – personality dimensions. Using several studies on archetypal types would bring increased consistency.

Acknowledgments

I want to thank my supervisor in this study Dr. Anca Munteanu. I thank her for the trust and support she offered unconditionally. I thank her because she gave me support both morally and literary. I am deeply grateful for my first little steps in psychology and for the parable through which she gifted it to me.

References

- Albu, M. (2009). A new questionnaire for the evaluation of the big five superfactors, Cognition, Brain, Behavior. *An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 13 (1), 79-90.
- Alho, P. M. (2006). Collective complexes—total perspectives. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 51 (5), 661-680.
- Buss, A. H. and Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 452-459.
- Calaguas, G. M. (2011). The incidence of peer aggression and peer victimization between the sexes. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 8 (2), 51-156.
- Costa, R. R. and McCrae, P.T. (2003). Personality in Adulthood: A Five Factor Theory Perspective. *Guilford Press*, New York.
- Danci, M. (2011). Archetypes and the Spheres of the Tree of Life. *Scientific Journal of Humanistic Studies*, 3 (5), 129-134.
- Griessel, L. and Kotze, M.(2009). The Feminine and the Masculine in the Development of the Self in Women—A Post-Jungian Perspective. *Women's Studies*, 38 (2), 183-212.

- Henderson, R. S. (2012). The Archetypes Are Alive and Well. *Psychological Perspectives*, 55 (1), 106-117.
- Howard, P. J. and Howard, J. M., (2004). *The Big Five Quickstart: An Introduction To The Five Factor Model Of Personality For Human Resource Professionals*. Center for Applied Cognitive Studies, Charlotte: NC.
- Jung, C. G. (2003). *Complete Works 1. Archetypes and the collective unconscious*. Bucharest: Ed. Trei.
- Jung, C. G. (2008). *Memories, dreams and reflections*. (recorded and edited by Aniela Jaffe). Bucharest: Ed. Humanitas.
- Kradin, R. (2005). The roots of empathy and aggression in analysis. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 50 (4), 431-449.
- McCully, R. S. (1976). Reply to Comment. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 21 (1), 74-77.
- Munteanu, A. (1999). *Forays into creatology*. Timisoara: Ed. Augusta.
- Munteanu A., Costea I. and Jinaru. A. (2010). Accessing the Essences - a Study of Archetypes. *Journal of Experiential Psychotherapy*, 13 (3) (51), 33-38.
- Moore, A. D. (1997). *Invention, Discovery, Creativity*. Bucharest: Romanian Encyclopedic.
- Pearson C.S. and Marr H.K. (2002). *Introduction to Archetypes. A companion for understanding and using the Person-Marr Archetype Indicator Instrument*. Gainesville Florida: Center for Applications of Psychological Type Inc.
- Roesler, C. (2012). Are archetypes transmitted more by culture than biology? Questions arising from conceptualizations of the archetype. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 57 (2), 223-246.
- Sava, F. A. (2008). *Inventarul de personalitate DECAS [DECAS Personality Inventory]*. Timisoara: ArtPress. <http://www.decas.ro/>
- Sillamy, N. (1998). *Larousse Dictionary of Psychology*. New York: Universe Encyclopedia.
- Stevens, A. (1995). Jungian Approach to Human Aggression with Special Emphasis on War. *Aggressive Behavior*, 21, 3-11.
- Tiger, L. and Men, W. (1995). From Rage in Marriage to Violence in the Streets--How Gender Affects the Way We Act. *Society*, 32 (3), 79-83.
- Zamoșteanu, A. (2008). *Family and Systemic Psychotherapy interventions*. Timișoara: Eurobit.

***Andrei Tepes**, is licensed in Psychology, a graduate of the Faculty of Sociology and Psychology of the University of West Timisoara Romania. Currently, he is a master student in Organizational Psychology, Psychology of Work and Transports.
Email: andrei.tepes@yahoo.com