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Teaching has sometimes been described as “a function of personality.” Although clearly an oversimplification of a complex and difficult activity, the concept nevertheless has considerable merit; what we as teachers can do or are willing to try in the classroom and in our relationships with our colleagues, our students, and our institutions is in many ways determined by what we are as people. In a similar way, what we as individuals involved in faculty development can or are willing to do with or for faculty, administrators and students is as much a function of our personalities as of the skills we bring to our tasks. This article will explore one possible way of relating programs and practitioners by examining the relationship between a variety of approaches to faculty development and Carl Jung’s four personality types¹ and then suggest ways these speculations might have practical application to program planning and development.

I

A number of models or approaches to faculty development have been suggested in recent years (Bergquist and Phillips, 1975; Bergquist, Phillips, and Quehl, 1975 and 1977; Gaff, 1975). Bill Bergquist and I described a three-part model in 1975 (Bergquist and Phillips, 1975), one that was modified later that year by Jerry Gaff

¹ As discussed below, these four types are characterized by either thinking, feeling, sensing or intuiting. Jung, of course, actually identified eight types, because any of these four can be manifested in either a basic extroverted or introverted personality orientation. This article will not attempt to differentiate between these two fundamental personality characteristics, although it does seem reasonable to suggest that, to the extent that the extroverted type is more concerned with the external object than with him or herself as subject, faculty development, as a change activity, will most commonly be populated by extroverted personality types.
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Taken together, these two discussions have identified four particular approaches to faculty development. Personal development and organizational development are generally well understood. Personal development seeks to "clarify values, attitudes and philosophies" and "improve intrapersonal and interpersonal functioning" through such activities as life planning and personal growth workshops. Organizational development attempts to "improve organizational effectiveness" through team building and management training (Bergquist et. al., 1975 and 1977). Activities more directly related to instructional effectiveness, though much more often practiced in most faculty development programs than either personal or organizational development, are somewhat more difficult to classify.

I would like to suggest two general approaches. The first, instructional development, is specifically concerned with courses and curricula, directly attempts to improve student learning and generally employs a fairly structured approach to the design and evaluation of learning experiences; this definition of instructional development is consistent with that developed by Gaff (Gaff, 1975). A second approach to improved teaching may, however, be defined as instructional improvement. This approach is less concerned with courses, curricula and competencies and more with the improvement of existing methodologies—primarily lectures and class discussions—and the exploration of such alternate approaches to instruction as simulations, small group discussions, student journals, role playing, independent study and field experiences. The differences between instructional development and instructional improvement, though often misunderstood or even unacknowledged—as demonstrated by the fact that the terms are frequently used interchangeably—are profound. Instructional development, either explicitly or implicitly, identifies the student as its client and specifically seeks to bring about and demonstrate through evaluation increased student learning, while instructional improvement more frequently sees the faculty member as its client and seeks to improve and extend individual faculty competence. Greater clarity of definition between these two approaches might help all of us articulate more specifically exactly what it is we are about.

Four approaches, then, to faculty development— instructional development, instructional improvement, organizational development and personal development—may be identified. Each makes
fundamentally different assumptions about improved faculty effectiveness and employs fundamentally different methodologies. The thesis of this discussion is that each, moreover, reflects fundamentally different personal orientations and that our choice of one or more of these approaches to faculty development is at least in part a reflection of who we are as people; we do what we are.

II

Carl Jung has identified four personality types that are particularly useful and relevant here, for they correspond in quite specific ways to our four approaches to faculty development. The four personality types are well-known: the thinking type is given to objective analysis and logic and is rational and analytical; the feeling type is concerned with the emotional quality of life and with responding to feelings; the sensing type relies on sense perceptions and tends to be pragmatic and assertive; the intuiting type is imaginative, conceiving, projecting and is oriented to the future (Tichy and Nisberg, 1976). A more detailed analysis of each type will suggest particular relationships with specific approaches to faculty development.

The thinking type, the individual whose “every important action proceeds, or is intended to proceed, from intellectually considered motives” (Jung in Campbell, 1971, p. 197), is most easily recognized. The thinker

is highly analytical, logical, and systematic. He finds satisfaction in identifying problems, developing a variety of alternatives or solutions, carefully examining these, and testing them to see that the most logical, systematic approach is followed. . . . [This type] typically functions in a steady, tenacious manner. He relies on observation and rational principles, avoiding emotionalism and speculation (Tichy and Nisberg, 1976, p. 299).

The thinking type seems most closely drawn to some form of instructional development; a definite sense of the objectivity and logic of this approach to improved teaching and learning can be gained by a well-known discussion of “individualized learning”:

The success of any program should be determined by many factors,

2 This article in part relates Jung's personality types to various change agent styles in the general area of organizational development and serves as the inspirational basis of the present discussion.
ranging from cost analyses to space utilization to community reactions, but the final criterion must be the performance of the student. Has he learned? Since students learn at different rates, the instructional program should be flexible enough to allow a student to move through it as rapidly or as slowly as he can in order to reach the established goals. . . . As individualized courses are explored, it becomes apparent that many of the problems can be reduced, if not eliminated, by building content options into the units of a course at appropriate times. . . . Flexible time frames require an evaluation program geared to meet the timing needs of the student. . . . [Problems here] include the need to score, analyze, report, and store large quantities of data, the need to locate and coordinate facilities for machine scoring. . . . Ideally, for each instructional unit, a variety of alternate instructional forms should be available (Diamond et. al., 1975, pp. 4–7).

A thoroughgoing instructional developer will stress behavioral objectives, research, evaluation and data collection. Whether used to evaluate learning outcomes or teaching effectiveness, instruments will tend to be objectives-based and criteria-referenced. Extensive use of media and instrumental technology is common; structured course designs, detailed flow charts and computer printouts abound. All of this is consistent with the rational, logical assumptions made by the thinking personality type.

The strength of this approach to improved teaching and learning is the power of its logic and intellectual consistency: instructional development works and comprehensive instructional development programs can provide objective data to demonstrate that effectiveness. The weakness of this approach is one shared by the thinking type generally, for it tends to exclude from its scope a number of important affective, personal and interpersonal concerns. As Jung writes, the “fact that an intellectual formula never has been and never will be devised which could embrace and express the manifold possibilities of life must lead to the inhibition or exclusion of other activities and ways of living that are just as important” (Jung in Campbell, 1971, p. 199). In the extreme, instructional development can become programmatic, defensive and even dogmatic. The power of its logic then becomes its weakness; because within its own definitions instructional development is so effective, other approaches not consistent with its intellectual assumptions may be ignored or dismissed.

Jung’s second personality type is in many ways directly opposed to his first. Unlike the thinking type, the feeling type
places a high value on human interaction. . . . [This type] seeks and enjoys the stimulation of contact with others and typically tries to understand and analyze his own emotions and those of others. His concern for people usually makes him quite astute in understanding what they say and do. . . . [This type] is very capable and readily willing to determine discrepancies between outward behavior and inner feelings and is typically sensitive to his own motives and those of others (Tichy and Nisberg, 1976).

The feeling type seems most naturally drawn to personal development as his or her approach to improved teaching and learning. This type will emphasize subjective reflection, the emotional and the affective. Faculty will be encouraged to explore their own value systems and personal life plans; learning experiences will be promoted that will emphasize the personal development of both faculty and students. Students will be encouraged to explore the non-academic aspects of their education and, at the least, integrate the personal with the intellectual. Feeling types are uncomfortable with the structure that is so characteristic of their thinking colleagues and will seek out learning environments for faculty and students that are relatively unstructured, informal and interactive. In general, the feeling type explores and concentrates on those areas of growth and development avoided or ignored by the thinking type.

And this is the primary strength of personal development, for it embraces exactly those areas of faculty and student behavior most often not addressed by the other approaches. If, indeed, teaching is a function of personality, then an emphasis on personal development may well be the most powerful means of improving teaching and learning. Its primary weakness is the reverse side of its strength, for in emphasizing the affective it may avoid and even disparage the intellectual. Rational, cognitive and technological approaches to improved instruction may be too easily dismissed. Not only is personal development at odds with the dominant norm of higher education but is also as unfaithful to the total range of human behavior as is instructional development. In extreme cases, personal development can become anti-rational and anti-intellectual; feeling can become valued exclusively for its own sake. As long as the faculty member "feels good about himself," the advocate of personal development may be satisfied. The skills and methodologies needed to translate intellectual and emotional content into significant student learning may well remain undeveloped.
Just as Jung's first two personality types—and the strategies they choose for improved teaching and learning—are clearly opposed to each other and embrace clearly different aspects of educational behavior, so too are his second two personality types. The sensing type and the intuiting type are both concerned with other aspects of being, perceiving and acting and, by extension, focus on different approaches to faculty development. The sensing type seems particularly attracted to this field, for he is very action oriented. He thrives on having things happen here and now and is very concerned if too much time is consumed deliberating over decision making and action implementation. . . . [This type] wants to implement whatever he believes should be done and sees the specific action of others as indicators of their commitment. The senser is most likely to express a direct, down-to-earth, energetic approach to work and life (Tichy and Nisberg, 1976, p. 298).

As Jung writes, for the sensing type "life is an accumulation of actual experiences. . . . Sensation for him is a concrete expression of life—it is simply real life lived to the full" (Jung in Campbell, 1971, p. 217).

The sensing type seems most strongly drawn to instructional improvement. In particular, this individual loves to run workshops, especially those of a more active and experiential kind, for it is in those settings that actual things happen in the here and now. Physical movement, excitement and activity characterize this individual's work. Alternate teaching methods, especially those of an experiential nature, are frequently promoted; simulations, games and role playing constitute an important part of his repertory. Although the sensing type may use classroom observation and diagnosis, the purpose of that data collection is not for its own sake—as sometimes seems to be the case with some instructional development efforts—but only to provide a basis for action. "Hands on" work with faculty in their classes is valued, and efforts will often be made to help faculty involve students more actively in classroom activities, frequently through the use of various kinds of small groups, experiential learning and field work. Immediate action is perhaps the highest value for individuals working in instructional improvement, a value quite consistent with the sensing personality type.

The strength of this approach to faculty development is its orientation to action: it is practical, realistic and often produces relatively
quick results. A week-long or even week-end workshop, the active intervention in a particular classroom over the relatively brief period of a semester can bring about change. An orientation to action, however, can also be a weakness, for instructional improvement efforts and in particular those that are heavily workshop-based can be superficial and short term; although workshops can certainly bring about change, they frequently lack the follow-up support and commitment needed to bring about more permanent and thoroughgoing results. Just as personal development can degenerate into feeling for its own sake, so too may instructional improvement degenerate into activity only for its own sake. A series of exciting and stimulating workshops may satisfy the need of the sensing type for the concrete experiences and activities he or she needs for a full and real life but may not bring about long lasting instructional change.

Individuals conforming to Jung’s fourth personality type, although perhaps less common in the field of faculty development than the other three, have had significant impact on the movement. The intuitive personality type places high value on ideas, innovations, concepts, theory, and long-range planning. He derives his greatest satisfaction from the world of possibilities and his imagination has a way of being a catalyst for the thinking of those around him. He is often involved in community life. . . . [The intuitive type] is often interested in the forces of conflict and theoretical possibilities (Tichy and Nisberg, 1976, p. 299).

This type “tries to apprehend the widest range of possibilities, since only through envisioning possibilities is intuition fully satisfied. . . . He is the initiator or promoter of new enterprises” (Jung in Campbell, 1971, pp. 223–4). In his or her concern for the broadest range and scope for activity, the intuitive type is most often drawn to an examination of institutions as a whole and consequently is likely to articulate an organizational development approach to faculty development. This approach emphasizes such activities as organizational diagnosis, goal setting and long-range planning and utilizes the methodologies of team building, decision making and conflict management. Yet this approach is even broader, for while stressing the organizational nature of planned change the intuitive type is also likely to call for a comprehensive undertaking, one that would ideally have activities taking place not just at the organizational level but also in the areas of instructional development, instructional im-
programment and personal growth, perhaps an unrealistic expectation. The intuitive type may even include in his or her vision such “meta-
issues” as community development, trustee development, funding, interinstitutional arrangements and the state of higher education as a whole. The intuitor’s vision of what is possible is indeed limitless.

The breadth of this approach to faculty development is obviously its greatest strength and primary weakness. What goes on in our classrooms, our departments and our committees is clearly depend-
ent on their organizational context, and other change efforts that focus on more specific and limited areas of activity often find their long range impact mitigated or even negated by these larger forces. Yet in an attempt to be comprehensive the intuitor may accomplish less than he or she might, for the chosen task may simply be one that cannot be done. As Jung writes,

the intuitive may fritter away his life on things and people, spreading about him an abundance of life which others live and not himself. If only he could stay put, he would reap the fruits of his labours; but always he must be running after a new possibility, quitting his newly planted fields while others gather in the harvest (Jung in Campbell, 1971, p. 224).

The intuitor has and will continue to have significant impact on faculty development and higher education generally; that impact, however, will likely have to be realized by others.

III

Jung’s personality types, of course, do not “occur at all frequently in . . . pure form in actual life” (Jung in Campbell, 1971, p. 266); instead individuals will manifest a dominant or characteristic per-
sonality type coupled, on close examination, with the features of one or more of the other types. The same obviously is true of faculty development efforts; rarely will one find a program that follows a single, exclusive model. Yet perhaps the various combinations of approaches taken to faculty development is not haphazard but, like the choice of a primary approach, is again at least partly a function of the personalities of the actors involved. As Jung suggests, individuals will manifest both a primary or principal personality type and, generally, characteristics of one or more of the other types. That is, a thinking type may combine with that primary function characteristics of the sensing or intuiting personality types. Jung is
careful to point out, however, that “only those functions can appear as auxiliary whose nature is not opposed to the dominant function. For instance, feeling can never act as the second function alongside thinking, because it is by its very nature too strongly opposed to thinking” (Jung in Campbell, 1971, p. 267). This concept of complementary and incompatible functions may well be extended to the various approaches to faculty development.

The relationship between these approaches can perhaps best be presented diagramatically:

```
Instructional Development
  (Thinking personality type)
Instructional Improvement   Organizational Development
  (Sensing personality type)  (Intuiting personality type)
Personal Development
  (Feeling personality type)
```

As this diagram suggests, any individual approach to faculty development will be most compatible with approaches on either side of it and least compatible with the approach directly opposite. Although obviously quite tentative, this configuration can perhaps prove useful in program planning and development.

If, for instance, instructional improvement is chosen as the primary focus or vehicle for a faculty development program, the designers of that effort might well expect that, as their program matures, it will perhaps need to begin addressing issues of instructional and personal development. Workshops and the promotion of alternate and frequently experiential methodologies need not be short term. Often these kinds of activities can lead, on the one hand, to requests for more thoroughgoing course and curriculum revision, the province of instructional development, and, on the other, to a serious rethinking of professional and personal goals and values, one of the primary concerns of personal development. Efforts at organizational development, however, are not likely to grow directly out of workshops on instructional improvement.

In the same way, a primary focus on instructional development may at some point wish to incorporate components of instructional improvement (perhaps for those faculty unwilling to be involved in the extensive demands of course and curriculum design) and organizational development (as is the case, in fact, when time free learn-
ing opportunities necessitate such organizational changes as open registration and the abandonment of normative grading. A major organizational development effort may find itself, as a consequence of those activities, needing to supply complementary services in the areas of instructional development (the most systematic and organizationally related approach to improved teaching and learning) and personal development (the most direct way of assisting individuals to change their roles in the organization). Although least common, a program with a primary focus on personal development may sooner or later need to address issues of instructional improvement and organizational development.

In addition to providing a long-range perspective on planning and development, the potential relationship between practitioners and programs may have more immediate consequences for day-to-day implementation. Most faculty development programs are not designed and executed by a single individual; in institutions where this is the case, that person might well benefit from an exploration of possible relationships between program elements and his or her personal orientation. One way of doing this would be to use the "Myers-Briggs Type Indicator," an instrument that provides the individual respondent with a profile of his or her strengths on the Jungian categories discussed in this article. Such an analysis could provide useful insights into the limitations and potentials of that individual's program.

Most faculty development efforts, however, whether led by a single individual or not, are often planned and implemented by groups; in these cases the concepts discussed in this article might be particularly useful. If each member of a faculty development committee or team were to take the "Myers-Briggs Type Indicator," a profile of the personal orientation of each of the group's members could easily be developed. This could serve as an important vehicle for identifying the general orientation of the group, if any, for clarifying the nature of potential conflict among individual members and for assessing the range of orientations and strengths available to the group. A similar process could be used periodically during the group's life and might be a particularly useful way of integrating new members into the team or committee. Through an identification

of personality type and a discussion of the possible relationships between various types and program activities, a faculty development group should be able to articulate a clearer sense of its own proposals, strengths, and potentialities.

IV

The choice of approaches to improved teaching and learning is broad and the various ways in which a program can develop and mature are numerous. Often the initial approach taken in an institution to faculty development will be determined by factors unrelated to the individuals who will be actively conducting the program; someone else, for instance, may have written the original proposal. The direction in which any program will move as it gains experience and credibility is often difficult to predict, much less control. Yet it would be unwise to dismiss from consideration the personalities of the people involved in faculty development efforts. As this article has suggested, some degree of compatibility may exist between personal orientation and program approach. What we do as faculty development practitioners, the kinds of services and resources we offer our clients and the directions in which we would like our programs to move are perhaps more within our control than we realize. As we each reflect on our successes and failures, we may each wish to consider the extent to which what we have done and what we hope to do are reflections of what we are as people.
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