SPEAKING DIFFERENT LANGUAGES, STRIVING FOR THE SAME

Comparing Socionics to the American Type Theory.

Victor Gulenko

1996 – revised in 2001.

Authorized and revised translation by **Dmitri Lytov** (socion@hotbox.ru)

For a long time development of *socionics* was limited by a single country borders, but in 1984 its founder, Aušra Augustinavičiūtė, learned about the MBTI test (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator) [19], and this was the beginning of communication between socionics and its "transatlantic cousin".

Comparison between the American *type theory* and *socionics* became possible due to publication in 1995-1996 of several books of American authors: D.Keirsey, M.Bates, O.Kroeger, J.Thuesen, P.Tieger, and B.Barron-Tieger [11-13,16]. Although the Source # 1, the theory of *personality types* developed by C.G.Jung [20], is the same for the both typologies, there is a serious difference between them in contents and language.

Moreover, whereas we, the socionists of the former USSR pretended that socionics be considered as an independent science and are even sure to have created a new scientific paradigm, the American adherents of the named typology limited application of their typology by just people and their groups and, in my opinion, for this reason are satisfied with a very modest term *type watching*.

I will hereinafter refer to the American theory and practice of studying human types as *type theory* or *type watching*. The trilogy published in Russia [11-13] gave a general overview of human types and their characteristics in business sphere and relations between men and women.

1. CRITERIA OF DIVISION.

There are only 4 pairs of Jungian criteria of splitting the mankind into 16 types. Adherents of any socionic trend used to apply them both in theoretical works and in practice, e.g. type diagnostics. However, Gregory Reinin (St. Petersburg) proved mathematically existence of 11 *derivative dichotomies* of the named 16 types in addition to 4 basic ones [5].

I myself, for example, in addition to Jungian criteria often use several Reinin criteria already proven by practice, namely: *static-dynamic*, *leftists-rightists*, *central-peripheral*, *aristocrats-democrats*, which are not known to American researchers [7, 9].

The situation with type names becomes more and more sophisticated. The Americans refused to use Jung's *rationality-irrationality* term in favor of a different one called *judging-perceiving*. On the other

hand, in order to adapt the typology to local mentality, A.Augustinavičiūtė gave the *thinking-feeling* dichotomy a different name: *logic-ethic* [3].

Russian translators of P.Tieger's and B.Barron-Tieger's book [16] have added the last drop of absurdity by translating *thinking-feeling* into Russian as *rationality-irrationality*. Having no idea about the Source #1, they (of course striving only for the good) "granted" a riddle to the reader of how to differ *rationality* from *thinking* and *irrationality* from *feeling*.

Next problem to encounter in attempts to study socionics is related to conventional signs of criteria. In the US psychologists used to refer to Jungian criteria by letters: E – *extroversion*, I – *introversion*, S – *sensing*, N – *intuitive*, T – *thinking*, F- *feeling*, J – *judging*, P- *perceiving*. In socionics this system is known but rarely used. **Hereinafter I will refer to socionic types by names used in MBTI, according to the comparison table made by Russian MBTI adherents [15]**.

On the other hand, socionics pays more attention to so-called *communicative aspects* absent in the American *type theory* but strictly corresponding to 8 basic Jungian types [3]: a) structural and practical *logic*; b) *ethic* of relations and emotions; c) force and perception *sensing*; d) time and potential *intuition*. Aspects are created by splitting each of 4 Jungian functions (*intuition*, *sensing*, *ethic*, *logic*) into 2 components: *static* and *dynamic* (Tab. 1).

Two different systems of signs are used for communication aspects. The first comes from A.Augustinavičiūtė's colleagues who have proposed geometric conventional signs: *triangle, square, round* and *corner*, either *black* or *white*. Later, I have proposed to refer to the aspects by letters, as more convenient and conforming to the scientific tradition. American system of signs had not been known to me at that time.

Alas, for this reason several letters have quite different meaning: compare F: *force sensing* (my system of socionic signs) and *feeling* in MBTI; I – *potential intuition* (socionics) and *introversion* (MBTI); T – *time intuition* (socionics) and *thinking* (MBTI).

My choice of letters was not voluntary: each letter corresponding to a *communication aspect* has its meaning. In the meantime, I tried to observe conformity of my symbolic with the semantics of general scientific system of symbols, like information, time, energy, force, etc. Here are these 8 universalia – the *communication aspects*:

Socionic function	C.G.Jung's terminology	Description in socionics *	Hypothetic correlation to MBTI ® types, pseudonyms according to D. Keirsey [1]
◣ or E	Extroverted feeling	Dynamic (extroverted) ethic or ethic of emotions: Lat. *emoveo* – I move (smb.)	ENFJ (Pedagogue), ESFJ (Seller)
⌐ or R	Introverted feeling	Static (introverted) ethic or ethic of relations: Lat. *relatio* – relation.	INFJ (Author), ISFJ (Conservator)
■ or P	Extroverted thinking	Dynamic (extroverted) logic or practical logic: Lat. *profiteor* – I make useful actions.	ENTJ (Field Marshall), ESTJ (Administrator)
□ or L	Introverted thinking	Static (introverted) logic or structural logic: Lat. *lex* – law, rule.	INTJ (Scientist), ISTJ (Trustee)
○ or S	Introverted sensing	Dynamic (introverted) sensing or perception sensing: Lat. *sensus* – sensation.	ISTP (Artisan), ISFP (Artist).
● or F	Extroverted sensing	Static (extroverted) sensing or force sensing: Lat. *factor* – I influence.	ESTP (Promoter), ESFP (Entertainer)
△ or T	Introverted intuition	Dynamic (introverted) intuition or time intuition: Lat. *tempus* – time.	INTP (Architect), INFP (Questor)
▲ or I	Extroverted intuition	Static (extroverted) intuition or potential intuition: Lat. *intueor* – I look through.	ENTP (Inventor), ENFP (Journalist)

*Table 1. Correspondence between Jungian function, socionic function and Jungian personality typology. Translator's note: in MBTI correspondence of functions to types, their **essence** and order in type models is **different**: comp. e.g. www.typelogic.com. The letters come from Latin, however, it is*

*easy to find in the same way explications of the letters in English: **E**motions, **R**elations, **P**ractice, **L**ogic, **S**ensation, **F**orce, **T**ime, and **I**ntuition.*

2.   TYPE NAMES.

Each type may be described in two different ways: by combining either Jungian criteria or communication aspects, and the last is used exclusively in socionics. Difference of approaches leads to differences in type descriptions, and chaos grows up.

American symbols consist of 4 letters, while ours of either 3 (type as a combination of Jungian criteria), or 2 (as a combination of communication aspects).

For example, the same type is named: ESTJ in the type theory, and in socionics: LSE (*logic-sensing extrovert*) = ■○ = PS in *socioanalysis* (a school in socionics founded by the author). The 4 letters system used in the US competes with more compact socionic systems.

The problem of type names is more complex. As a rule, human types do not have their particular names in the US and are indicated by 4 letters; exception is made only by Keirsey who refers to types according to occupation-related pseudonyms [1].

Unfortunately in the former USSR a misleading system of pseudonyms is still in use of naming types by celebrities (e.g. writers: *Dumas-father* stands for ISFP, *Gorky* for ISTJ; book heroes – *Holmes* stands for ESTJ, *Don Quixote* for ENTP; there are even persons unknown outside Russia). Several socionists [17, 18] still use such pseudonyms ignoring the trend of transition to functional names.

In 1989 (published in 1995) I made the first attempt among socionists to introduce a functionally motivated system of names to be convenient for management consulting practice and professional orientation [8] based on Keirsey system. It still helps me in reading lectures and performing seminars and trainings, and is described in details in [10].

My repeated appeals to stop using ridiculous terminology have been ignored for a long; finally, the situation changed, but instead of attempts to a dialog with me, the socionists in Kiev offered their own alternative system of names. Seeds of controversies and hostilities have been sown.

Since socionic circles are not integral, and some of socionists are hostile to other schools, the diversity of name systems seems to grow up in the future. I see 2 ways out of this problem.

Either socionists will be able to come to an agreement like chemists did in a similar situation at Karlsruhe International Congress 1860, or one or two systems will win as a result of natural selection. The first way is preferable for our science, but in this case somebody will have to tame his ambitions.

3.   TYPE MODELS

Type components (differentiation criteria or communication aspects) are usually positioned in certain order which allows building schemes. Such schemes are usually called models, and these are used both in socionics and in the type theory.

The difference is that socionic models (e.g. the *A-Model* - see Tab. 2) consist of communication aspects, whereas the American model - of Jungian criteria. As a result, these two models are not easy to combine. Our models consist usually of 8 positions, and American - only 4.

Another essential difference: order of numbering functions in the model is also different. Let us consider for example two types: *intuitive-logic extrovert* (ENTP) and *logic-intuitive introvert* (INTJ). What are their main functions? A socionist would answer: for the first it is *intuition*, and for the second – *logic* (i.e. *thinking*). By contrast, a type scientist says that *intuition* is the main function for the both, but it is *extroverted* for ENTP and *introverted* for INTJ.

In other words, hierarchy of functions must be the same for the both types: main - *intuition*, auxiliary - *logic*, third - *feeling*, fourth - *sensing*. The difference is, that the ENTP's first function is *extroverted*, and the INTJ's - *introverted*. According to socionics, however, *intuition* is *extroverted* for the both, but has different positions in their models.

"A-Model" positions	Blocks	ENTP	ISFJ
1. Leading (personality program)	EGO	▲	⌐
2. Auxiliary (creative)		□	●
3. Role, mask, emergency reaction	SUPER-EGO	●	□
4. Most vulnerable		⌐	▲
5. Suggestion	SUPER-ID	○	■
6. Activation		◣	△
7. Ignoring	ID	△	◣
8. Standard		■	○

Table 2.   The A-Model [4] - the socionic basis of building up personality type descriptions).

Type scientists are discrepant in treating type models. I found no information concerning *extroversion* or *introversion* of 3 and 4 functions in MBTI literature.

The same problem arises with defining the weakest function. It must stand at the 4 position. Therefore, it is *sensing* for both INTJ and ENTP. According to socionics, it is only half true: ENTP's weakest function is *feeling*.

The models applied in the type theory and socionics are strongly different by configuration. The American model is linear, it is just a sequence of 4 functions positioned in descendent order by their "strength". The socionic model is a combination of 2 functional circles positioned one above another (Tab. 2, 4).

In addition, the *A-Model* consists of blocks - pairs of functions. There are 4 such blocks: *Ego* (1+2), *Super-Ego* (3+4), *Super-Id* (5+6), *Id* (7+8) [20]. Due to this socionics can model 4 functional modes for each type. For example, socioanalysis operates with 2 different temperament conditions of a type, as well as type attitudes to kinds of activities which compensate each other when a type changes communication distance.

The type theory appeals to the type dynamic, which is based on gradual development of functions along 4 stages of human life. But this macrodynamics hardly reflects changes of human behavior under different circumstances. Socioanalysis is more interested in macrodynamics, i.e. transition of a type from one functional mode into another due to internal rhythm as well as under external influence [6].

Therefore socionics and the type theory went different ways in studying dynamic processes.

4.   SMALL GROUPS

In studying *small groups*, or *quaternions* (Tab. 5), the situation is in favor of socionics. In MBTI only one class of such groups is recognized by all authors: D.Keirsey's *temperaments*. These are *sensing-perceiving* (Dionysus), *sensing-judging* (Epimetheus), *intuitive-feeling* (Apollo) and *intuitive-thinking* (Prometheus) [15].

Socionists discovered a great number of *small groups* (also called *Reinin groups*). Theoretically there are more than 200 different types of such groups, but only a small part of them is more or less studied. Most applicable in socionics are 6 groups based on Jungian criteria (temperaments, attitudes towards certain activities, perception, communicability, stimuli, argumentation), as well as progress groups (project implementation, stress resistance, expansion), and quadras (see also Tab. 5).

Let me draw your attention to D.Keirsey's very specific understanding of *temperaments*. People belonging to same Keirsey temperament are much different by their emotional and dynamic characteristics. It is hard to accept that the polite Author (INFJ), aggressive Pedagogue (ENFJ), melancholic Questor (INFP) and sanguine Journalist (ENFP) belong to the same temperament type.

As we learned from studying opinions of specialists, small groups are convenient to use in socioanalysis. We discovered laws regulating subsequent expulsion of one group by another. Based on this I perform training where I demonstrate different communication technologies. We also perform systematical studies of small groups of different kinds. What about Americans?

As I can imagine, according to the American literature available, type scientists at their seminars split the auditory into 2 parts and order to do the same task, e.g. to make a list of their expenses. According to differences in their answers, they make conclusions about typological differences between thinking

and feeling, sensing and intuitive types etc. These obvious differences, in their opinion, make a big psycho-therapeutic effect.

I cannot ignore the fact that distribution of Myers Briggs types by *career interests* and *reaction towards changes* has direct analog in socionic *quaternions* (Tab. 3) [comp. 4, 9, 19]:

		Attitudes (socionics), career interests (MBTI)			
		Managers: ST(◪+◕)	Socials: SF(◣+◕)	Humanitarians: NF(◣+△)	Scientists: NT(◪+△)
Temperaments (socionics), reaction towards changes (MBTI)	Stable-balanced: IJ(□x or ◳x)	ISTJ □●	ISFJ ◳●	INFJ ◳▲	INTJ □▲
	Perceptive-adaptive: IP(○x or △x)	ISTP ○■	ISFP ○◣	INFP △◣	INTP △■
	Flexible-mobile: EP(●x or ▲x)	ESTP ●□	ESFP ●◳	ENFP ▲◳	ENTP ▲□
	Linear-promotive: EJ(■x or ◣x)	ESTJ ■○	ESFJ ◣○	ENFJ ◣△	ENTJ ■△

Table 3.   Temperaments, attitudes and Jungian personality types (comparison between socionics and MBTI).

The distribution is the same as in the socionic table of *temperaments* and *attitudes*, but the difference in principle and subsequently, practical application of the difference was not understood.

5.   INTERTYPE RELATIONS

More or less systematical studies of intertype relations were obviously not undertaken by type analysts until now. Nothing even far similar to the socionic table of intertype relations (Tab. 4) appears in the books of American authors. This is why we cannot make an idea how Americans treat groups of relations, build up agreeability scales etc. based on their works.

It seems that type analysts admit any relations between psychological types. In their books I find appeals to have consideration to differences between partners and to build on this basis conflict and favorable relations, whatever type a partner may belong to.

The only criterion they use is total similarity or total difference of the partners' psychological structures. However, there is no unity in opinion which of two is favorable for communication at close distances, e.g. for marriage.

I.Myers-Briggs in her basic work [2] shows on statistic examples better co-existence of similar types. On the other hand, O.Kroeger and J.Thuesen report they watched better harmony in contrast pairs [11-13].

Due to A.Augustinavičiūtė, socionics disposes with the concept of *duality*. Therefore, this is evidence in favor of adherents of better agreeability of contrast pairs. However, pairs of *identical* types cannot be considered as non-comfortable and "bad".

We really disagree with D.Keirsey who "recommends" relations of total contrast, e.g. INFJ and ISFJ as best partners for ENTP [15]. In socionics they are described as *conflict* or *supervision,* i.e. not best but worst (see Tab. 4). Real examples of these conflicts are easy to find in MBTI literature [11-13].

The school of socioanalysis has not yet come to a completed intertype relations agreeability scale. In more precise terms, it proposes at least 8 such different scales to use for different communication objectives and situations. A socioanalyst would answer that any relations may be stable if rules of

integrate are observed. However, stability of *conflict* relations costs much more than stability of *dual* partners.

Example: ENTP 1▲□2 4└●3 6■○5 7△■8		Interaction of attitudes			
		Hospitality	Co-working	Discussion	Adaptation
Interaction of temperaments	Balance	56 – duality ○■ - ISFP	58 – semi-duality ○■ - ISTP	78 – contrast △■ - INTP	76 – illusionary △■ - INFP
	Acceleration	65 – activation ■○ - ESFJ	85 – instructor ■○ - ESTJ	87 – quasi-identity ■△ - ENTJ	67 – instructee ■△ - ENFJ
	Monotonous	34 –super-ego ●└ - ESFP	32 – collegial ●□ - ESTP	**12 – identity ▲□ - ENTP**	14 – congeneric ▲└ - ENFP
	Slowdown	43 – conflict └● - ISFJ	23 – supervisee □● - ISTJ	21 – reflection □▲ - INTJ	41 – supervisor └▲ - INFJ

Table 4.   Intertype relations as correspondence of a partner's two leading functions to positions of the "A-Model". Example: ENTP's relations.

In addition, about two years ago I developed a concept of relative socionics. Its main idea is that the psychical type is a relative idea. At close communication distances, as a result of long-term communication, personality types of communicants "get shadowed", but the relationship between them becomes better structured [7].

At far psychological distances individuals "within his type" and relations with other people may be of any kind. At close distances a group communication stereotype becomes a valid force which makes a person change in favor of the group integrating relationship. As a result, people of different personality types behave in the same way, and it becomes difficult to define their born psychological structures.

In real life middle communication distances are most used, and therefore it seems that a type time after time "gets smoother", and as soon as the surrounding pressure softens, gets "embossed" again. In other words, it behaves like a spring – shrinks and then straightens again. In fact, distorted and contaminated types are much easier to meet everywhere than immutable and sterile ones.

		Roles and stimuli			
		Leaders: ES: ◑	Jokers: EN: ◮	Guards: IS: ◒	Guru: IN: ◭
Methods	Constructors: TJ: ◪x	ESTJ ■○	ENTJ ■◮	ISTJ □●	INTJ □▲
	Restructurers: TP: x◪	ESTP ●□	ENTP ▲□	ISTP ○■	INTP △■
	Diplomats: FP: x└	ESFP ●└	ENFP ▲└	ISFP ○■	INFP △■
	Guardians: FJ: └x	ESFJ ■○	ENFJ ■◮	ISFJ └●	INFJ └▲

Table 5.   One more example of quaternions (splitting 16 types into 4 groups).

6

Therefore we can admit that socionics is more advanced than the type theory in the field of intertype communication. But it also cannot give an absolute type compatibility forecast because it is not easy to calculate in advance relative effects caused by a type's adaptation to surrounding.

6. APPLICATION OF PERSONALITY TYPOLOGY IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

Together with the type theory as such there is another psychological and pedagogical school in the US called *learning styles*. Socionists working in the sphere of school education are familiar with this due to the Betty Lou Leaver's book [14].

This brochure considers a problem of horrible discrepancy between requirements of school programs and the dominating training system, on the one hand, and the diversity of students' personality types, on the other. I completely agree with this thesis, since many times I had to work with teachers and school class collectives where blind conservatism of many teachers and education authorities became notorious for a long time.

Betty Lou Leaver proposes to train the whole class based on dominating styles of students' perception, but taking into account also risk groups, i.e. typological minorities. This objective of achieving an individual-based approach to a class collective as an entity fully corresponds to the socioanalytical approach. However, I suppose serious structural differences to exist between the socionics and the theory of training styles. In my opinion, most of pairs of differences between styles she describes represent different sides of a same Jungian dichotomy.

This shortcoming of the theory of training styles becomes obvious as soon as I tried to translate Leaver's differentiating criteria into the language of "usual" socionics.

Dichotomy # 1: focused on *left* or *right* brain hemisphere. According to the text, it becomes obvious at once that this pair is identical with the **Dichotomy # 2**, *analytic - synthetic* types.

Analytic types, i.e. *left hemisphere*, tend to verbal kinds of activities, control correctness of their speech. *Synthetic* types, i.e. *right hemisphere*, have good space imagination and do not prefer to accept didactical explications or to study rules. It is easy to admit that this corresponds to the socionic (and Jungian) dichotomy of *rationality - irrationality* (*judging - perceiving*, according to MBTI).

Dichotomy # 3: context-dependent (*particular*) and context-independent (*global*). The first are under stress at lessons because most training tasks are artificial constructions not related to situations "from the life". The second rarely have big troubles on lessons because they normally work with non-context-related tasks. For a socioanalyst, the context dependence is just a different label for *irrationality*. And the context independence, on the other hand, corresponds to *rationality*.

Dichotomy # 4: *sharpeners - levelers*. *Levelers* hardly find essential differences between 2 objects and facts, for them more natural is to find similarity. *Sharpeners* make good counter-comparisons and manage to perform classification operations.

Again we see not a new category of personal criteria but the same *rationality* to which peculiar is the ability to strengthen contradictions, and *irrationality* which emphasizes the entirety of the object and neglects differences between its components.

Dichotomy # 5: *inductive - deductive*. The text implies that *deductive* students like rules and with pleasure listen to a teacher's explications. *Inductive* ones, on the contrary, badly admit rules, but are able to work with exceptions, violations of strict systems. However, it is nothing else but the Jungian *rationality-irrationality* criterion.

And the next 2 more dichotomies again undoubtedly reflect different aspects of the *rationality - irrationality* criterion.

Dichotomy # 6: *random* and *sequential* students. The first like freedom (*irrational*), second - order (*rational*).

Dichotomy # 7: students of *audial* or *visual* perception type. *Audial* types need greater quantity of various sound signals and even noise (*irrationality*), and *visual* types need silence and a possibility to concentrate (*rationality*).

Dichotomy # 8: *concrete* or *abstract* as it seems, goes out of this monotonous way. At the first look, it is more similar to the socionic dichotomy of *sensing-intuition*. However, according to the book, *concrete* types like excursions and hate lectures, and *abstract* – vice versa. And here are the same *irrationality* (lack of order, need of changing impressions) – *rationality* (structured lesson in a classroom).

There is, however, one more dichotomy in the book which corresponds to another pair of socionic criteria. This is the **Dichotomy # 9**, *reflectivity – impulsivity*.

Reflective students think about their tasks much longer than *impulsive* ones who work successfully when a lesson develops dynamically. *Reflectivity* as relevant to weak energetic is obviously identical to *introversion* while *impulsivity* as tending to dynamic and activity – to *extroversion*.

Leaver herself agrees that there is a correlation between the styles. Students with dominating *right hemisphere* often belong at the same time to *audial* type, *context-dependent*, tend to *synthesis*, *induction* and *leveling*. *Left hemisphere* students usually belong to *visual* type, focused on *deduction*, *analysis* and *sharpening*. But if this is right, would it not better to unite particular phenomena into one fundamental criterion and to look for another criteria of a similar generalization grade? This is what the socionics is engaged in.

And the last and very important observation where the type theory, the theory of *learning styles* and *socioanalysis* come to agreement. Under the actual system of training the most suffering are children from the commutative (*sensing-perceiving*) group. And teachers having to train these children suffer as much. You can read in details how I work in classes where this group dominates [10].

7.   AUTHORS HERE AND IN THE US

Having compared theoretical fundamentals of the type theory and socionics, one can come to conclusion that these typological trends reflect in many details psychological types of their creators and main authors.

Books on the type theory are written in figurative and emotional language, are impressive and easy to understand. One can find little complicated logic and "dry" scientific speculations in there. At the same time, books in socionics are full of schemes, complicated tables and theoretical constructions in logic manner. The contrast between these two approaches is obvious.

Speaking the language of socioanalysis, the type theory has been developed by Humanitarians (NF types – see Tab. 3), including the founders, Isabel Myers and Catherine Briggs (INFP and INFJ)), and many of their adherents. By contrast, founders of socionic schools and most of active socionists belong, like A.Augustinavičiūtė herself, to the group of Scientists (NT types – see Tab. 3).

The contradiction between the type theory, on the one hand, and the socionics, on the other, is therefore implied by objective circumstances and in many details is similar to the classical dispute between humanitarian and precise sciences. The dispute between "physicists" and "poets" comes back into the deep past, but nobody still won in this dispute. And who still has doubts that the victory will profit nobody? It can only harm our common child, the scientific typology of personality and intertype relations.

I want to finish this surveying article with a suggestion to unite forces of specialists both in the US and here in order to eliminate the discrepancy of concepts and conventional signs as soon as possible, to develop a mutually acceptable language of communication between different schools and to profit from difference of opinions in favor of the future information civilization. Let us avoid competition and strive to cooperation!

8. LITERATURE LIST.

1. Keirsey D., Bates M. Please Understand Me. Character & Temperament Types. Gnosology Books Ltd., 1984.

2. Myers I., Myers P. Gifts Differing. Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologist Press, 1980.

3. Аугустинавичюте А. О дуальной природе человека//Соционика, ментология и психология личности, 1996, №№ 1 - 3. (A.Augustinavičiūtė. On the Dual Nature of a Human).

4. Аугустинавичюте А. Социон (основы соционики) //Соционика, ментология и психология личности, 1996, №№ 4, 5. (A.Augustinavičiūtė. Socion or Fundamentals of Socionics).

5. Аугустинавичюте А. Теория признаков Рейнина//Соционика, ментология и психология личности, 1998, №№ 1 - 6. (A.Augustinavičiūtė. Reinin's Theory of Binary Criteria).

6. Гуленко В.В. Выразительные возможности психических состояний. Человек и мир языком универсалий//Соционика, ментология и психология личности, 2001, № 3. (V.V.Gulenko. Expressive Possibilities of Psychical Conditions).

7. Гуленко В.В. Интровертная соционика//Соционика, ментология и психология личности, 1996, № 4. (V.V.Gulenko. Introverted Socionics).

8. Гуленко В.В. Как называть социотип? //Соционика, ментология и психология личности. 1995, №3, с.74-80. (V.V.Gulenko. On Giving Sociotype a Name).

9. Гуленко В.В. Менеджмент слаженной команды. Новосибирск, Рипэл, 1995. (V.V.Gulenko. Harmonious Team Management).

10. Гуленко В.В. Отчёт о соционической работе в 6-г классе средней школы #16 Октябрьского района г.Новосибирска. Новосибирск, 21.04.1996. (V.V.Gulenko. Report of Socionic Practice in the 6-G Class of the Secondary School #16, Oktyabrsky District, Novosibirsk City).

11. Крёгер О., Тьюсон Дж. Типы людей. М., Персей-Вече-АСТ, 1995. (O.Kroeger, J.Thuesen, Type Talk).

12. Крёгер О., Тьюсон Дж. Типы людей и бизнес. М., Персей-Вече-АСТ, 1995. (O.Kroeger, J.Thuesen, Type Talk at Work).

13. Крёгер О., Тьюсон Дж. 16 дорог любви. М., Персей-Вече-АСТ, 1995. (O.Kroeger, J.Thuesen, 16 Ways to Love Your Lover).

14. Ливер Бетти Лу. Обучение всего класса. М.: Новая школа, 1995. (Leaver, Betty Lou. Teaching the Whole Class).

15. Овчинников Б.В., Павлов К.В., Владимирова И.М. Ваш психологический тип. СПб., «Андреев и сыновья», 1994. (B.V.Ovchinnikov, K.V.Pavlov, I.M.Vladimirova. Your Psychological Type).

16. Тигер П., Бэррон-Тигер Б. Делай то, для чего ты рождён. М., Армада, 1996. (P.Tieger, B.Barron-Tieger. Discover the Perfect Career for You through the Secrets of Personality Type).

17. Филатова Е.С. Соционика для Вас. Новосибирск, 1994. (Ye.Filatova. Socionics for You).

18. Филатова Е.С. Соционика в портретах. Новосибирск, 1996. (Ye. Filatova. Socionics in Portraits).

19. Шнейдерман Б. Психология программирования. М. 1984. (B.Shneiderman. Software Psychology. Human Factors in Computer and Information Systems).

20. Юнг К.Г. Психологические типы. СПБ., Ювента, М., Прогресс-Универс, 1995. (C.G.Jung. Psychological Types).

21. Якушина Н.Р., Синицын Е.С. Соционика в сократовских диалогах. Новосибирск, 1995. (N.R.Yakushina, Ye.S.Sinitsyn, Socionics in Socratic Dialogs).