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**DEVELOPING WRITERS BY IDENTIFYING PERSONALITY TYPES**

 "Some writers with some tasks seem unduly vexed. Thoughts won't come, and when they do they evanesce as the writer tries to work them into written language" - Mike Rose

 As students attempt to learn the essentials of basic writing in entry-level college English courses, they are faced with a multitude of hurdles, ranging from time management; lack of enthusiasm for writing, poor instruction, lack of self-efficacy, or writing anxiety. Whatever the issue may be, it is our job as teachers and mentors to help develop these students’ writing abilities and confidence. No matter what the reason is, each writer has to "develop new schemas, new strategies, new internal structures" in order to grow in writing. But in order for this growth to occur, the teacher must offer heuristics for rethinking and revising of information (Graves 4). And before tools are offered, the writer must be placed within a context because an "anxious writer out of context may be neither anxious nor a writer and according to Kurt Lewins *Field Theory in Social Science*, behavior is the function of the interaction between the individual and his or her own environment rather than a function of one or another acting alone (Bloom 119). Having stated the importance of placing the writer in context, this research paper will address the issue of writing anxiety and how to apply the MBTI and Carl Jung's personality types to help develop our freshman English writing students in English 101 and English 102. It is important to also note that change is pragmatic and not automatic; the student's writing process will not change immediately or even through the course of one semester, this is merely a tool to help better understand how our students learn and in response, to be able to offer tools to help them grow. We understand that we cannot change the writing processes for these students in just one semester; with our findings, we hope to provide our colleagues with firsthand experience on applying personality theory to students in their English classes and develop new methods to understand students so that 'we' as instructors can implement more effective writing heuristics.

 Writing anxiety has also been thought of as synonymous with “writer’s block”, but the distinction must be made before moving forward with this study. Jensen and DiTiberio provide us with a good definition of the two: “writer’s block is the inability to make effective decisions during the writing process. While writing anxiety is an affective reaction, or an arousal response, to writing in general, a writer’s block is a specific cognitive dysfunction at a particular point in the writing process” (Personality and the Teaching of Composition 118). In applying this definition, it becomes apparent that writing anxiety entails a relatively higher level of stress throughout the whole process of writing: it isn’t just one fork in the road or decision to make – it is a constant oppression.

**Birth of personality typology and personality testing**

 In his exploration of the unconscious, founder of analytical psychology, Carl Gustav Jung uncovered the existence of two dichotomous pairs of cognitive functions. These finding were first published in his 1921 book, *Psychological Types.* He termed these two functions the rational and the irrational. The rational was also thought of as 'judging' and the irrational as 'perceiving'. Jung then went on to assert that these two can be viewed as extrovert and introvert functions of how a person deals with their reality. Jung described the two as follows: Introverts are people who prefer their internal world of thoughts, feelings, fantasies, dreams, and so on, while extroverts prefer the external world of things and people and activities. Whether a person is an introvert or an extrovert, they have their own way of dealing with the world, or as Jung would say; functions used to deal with the world. There are four different functions: sensing, thinking, intuiting, and feeling. All humans have these functions; they just use them differently and in different combinations.

 Derived from Carl Jung’s personality archetypes is the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator Test (MBTI), first published in 1962, by Katharine Cook Briggs and her daughter, [Isabel Briggs Myers](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Isabel_Briggs_Myers). They began creating the indicator during World War I to help women understand what types of war-time jobs they should enter in. Since then, the MBTI has grown to be the one of the most widely used personality test that is directly associated with Jung's personality typology. There are different versions of this test but essentially, it entails a number of questions which are believed to validate a person’s personality type in accordance with Jung's theory. It is important to note its correlation with Jung's theory because the MBTI manual itself states that the indicator is designed to implement a theory; therefore the theory must be understood to understand the MBTI.

**Myths and Flaws Regarding Personality Testing:**

In T*he Mismeasure of Man,* Stephen Jay Gould asserts a debunking of intelligence and personality testing with an explanation of what he terms the reification fallacy:

[R]eification, or our tendency to convert abstract concepts into entities. We recognize the importance of mentality in our lives and wish to characterize it, in part so that we can make the divisions and distinctions among people that our cultural and political systems dictate. We therefore give the word "intelligence" to this wondrously complex and multifaceted set of human capabilities. This shorthand symbol is the reified and intelligence achieves its dubious stats as a unitary thing.

 There are many different types of tests out there that deal with personality and with the internet being at many people’s fingertips, these tests run rampant on the internet. Many of us have taken tests to determine which job would best fit our personality or maybe even which relationship would work best, and much research has been conducted to validate these tests. Of the most famous personality tests ranging from the Rorschach, Thematic Apperception Test, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Big Five, the MBTI was found to be the most reliable by the National Research Council when analyzing its usefulness with regard to its reported value with providing insight about one’s own personality and the personality of others with whom one worked. Thorne then goes on to suggest that although the MBTI test may do well in this scenario, he makes the argument that “personality tests tells us generally what people tend to do, but not why they do it” (Thorne 329). Coming to terms with this argument makes it important to remember that the MBTI only be used as a tool and not a definite set standard which will apply to every mind in the classroom. Another argument which rigorously analyzes and interprets the MBTI is David Pittenger’s article *The Utility of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* in which Pittenger applies various methods and tests to analyze the MBTI. This 21 page study of the MBTI renders the following conclusion: “Although the test does appear to measure several common personality traits, the patterns of the data do not suggest that there is reason to believe that there are 16 unique types of personality” (483). He also makes the point that Jung “conceived of personality as an invariant” (471). The MBTI test may show fluctuations in personality based on how the questions are answered. The problem with this depends on the validity on the person’s answers based on how true they are or how they are feeling when they take the test.

 Culminating the research on personality tests indicates that it can be useful if understood and applied correctly. If Pittenger proves that it can measure certain personality traits and if a personality is predominantly variant with occasional fluctuations than it is safe to assert that a heuristic can be implemented based on personality. As long as we keep in mind that each person and writing assignment must be placed in context we can offer exercises or approaches for different scenarios.

**Why Address Writing Anxiety in Terms of Personality Theory?**

Writing anxiety studies vary from interpreting self-efficacy to gender and racial specific demography. These studies are important because they depict the multi facets in learning about writing anxiety and how all personality types deal with the process. In Martinez et. al. article, *Pain and Pleasure in Short Essay Writing: Factors Predicting university Students' Writing Anxiety and Writing Self-Efficacy*, we learn how the physiological, cognitive and behavioral effects of writing anxiety have influenced their students.Extensive research has proven the adverse effect of writing anxiety on developing writers of Universities across the Nation. Leading figure in Sociology, Rachel Ann Rosenfeld studied the effects of *Anxiety and Learning* and examined the different factors that cause anxiety, mainly focusing on testing situations, programmed learning, teacher behavior in the classroom, and open classrooms – which are focused around the students providing their own learning structure. Her article also surveyed faculty members that had expressed concerns about dealing with students overall anxiety in the classroom. Rosenfeld’s report concluded that “no one method of teaching will be best for every student/teacher/subject combination: and that overall, “anxiety interferes with the academic achievement of college students” (163, 151). A more specific article relating to writing anxiety in the college classroom, *Pain and Pleasure in Short Essay Writing: Factors Predicting University Students’ Writing Anxiety and Writing Self-Efficacy* addresses how “writing anxiety is also related to students poor performances on English writing exams and in jobs requiring writing” (Martinez et. al. 351). This Journal study examines the predictors of writing anxiety and writing self-efficacy and also argues that writing anxiety is multidimensional, meaning that this anxiety consists of both” dispositional attitudes existing over time and context, and situational attitudes specific to particular tasks” (352).

 So if writing anxiety consists of situational attitudes specific to a particular task, then perhaps the cognitive and behavioral effects of this anxiety can be addressed through personality studies. Susan Peck MacDonald wrote: “Inexperienced writers usually begin college with a tendency to fluctuate wildly between subjective and objective extremes, between immersion in subjective opinion or inexperience and unintentional plagiarism” and Jensen and DiTiberio remark that although she is unaware of it, MacDonald is actually uses personality factors to describe one aspect of how students write (DiTiberio and Jensen 2). Mike Rose explained in his article *Writer's Block: The Cognitive Dimension. Studies in Writing and* Rhetoric that three models come to mind when considering writing anxiety: behaviorist, psychoanalytic and sociological/political (17). The third model, sociological/political is meant to be a study of the environmental conditions which are important to factor into the cognitive analysis of personality. Rose builds a hypothetical cognitive model upon which he asserts that a writer comes to a writing task with “domain knowledge”, which are facts and propositions that have been stored in long term memory, and also a number of “composing sub-processes (linguistic, stylistic, rhetorical, etc)” (25). He then goes on into how to direct a writers sub-process, which is exactly the point where one could begin to suggest exercises based on their personality types. A further examination of personality types in the classroom writing setting will allow teachers to better understand how students in Freshman English courses differ and to learn to appreciate their differences in skills, but more importantly, how to develop a mature, productive writer.

 Both Carl Jung and the developers of the MBTI test believed that development was continuous and a lifetime goal. They also understood that every individual has a preferred cognitive process but that the preferred should be supplemented by the other to an extent so that there is a balanced development. An example of this would be a person who is mainly an introvert which seeks to venture out into discussions with an extrovert because they are aware of the need for a healthy balance to better develop their overall writing abilities (DiTiberio and Jensen 79).

**Becoming Aware of MBTI Biases When Evaluating Students and Their Writing: Practical Solutions from One Teacher**

**Jenny Flack**

 One of my students (I’ll call him Joe) often uses the phrase “I feel you” to indicate understanding—not as an expression of empathy, but as a signal of comprehension, such as in response to essay prompts or homework requirements. Having an ENFJ MBTI type myself, it makes complete sense to me that Joe uses a phrase like this; he’s a talkative, often volatile student whose interest in class peaks with personal engagement and flags without it—a sure Extrovert and Feeler. I reward his enthusiasm by letting him lead class discussions, ensuring him plenty of opportunities to voice his opinions, but after reading English Professor Susan Callahan’s article, “Responding to the Invisible Student” in which she (an INTJ) describes ENFP students as “chatty” and admits that she has “no such confidence” in them compared to another INTJ student (Callahan 67), I wondered: How much of my own personality makes me understanding and encouraging of Joe? Although I appreciate the sophistication of his ideas and the audacity he displays in expressing them, he’s currently failing my class, and yet this doesn’t color my opinion of him academically or personally. Should it? This section of our paper explores not only my own biases as a teacher, but also discusses other possible biases and solutions for teachers to avoid them, both in terms of teaching writing and responding to it.

 I don’t see my personal bias towards Joe as entirely problematic; after all, I believe that teachers can only be effective when they become invested in their students. Furthermore, Peter Elbow argues that teachers’ esteem for their students and their students’ writing goes hand-in-hand in his article “Ranking, Evaluating, and Liking: Sorting Out Three Forms of Judgment” when he says, “Good writing teachers like student writing (and like students)… Teachers who hate student writing and students are grouchy all the time” (Elbow 190). It’s important for teachers to cultivate healthy, if not profound, relationships with their students, and for them to be aware of the fact that these relationships influence their opinions about student writing. So, if a teacher’s “reception of… writing is… colored by all… other interactions that take place between [a] teacher and [an] individual student,” in Callahan’s words (Callahan 67), then how can instructors temper their biases and adjust their teaching methods to all personality types? Elbow suggests a simple solution: “get a kick” out of student writing, or in other words, get interested in it. When teachers “see what is *potentially* good… they encourage it,” and teachers who are more interested in their students’ writing are better at critiquing it (Elbow 190).

 In order to foster an interest and unbiased exploration of student composition, Elbow suggests implementing a system where teachers and students can share ungraded, private, low-stakes writing, such as ungraded journal entries (191). This tool can be useful for both Introverted and Extroverted MBTI types if students are given the option of writing both inside and outside of class: Introverts will feel comfortable journaling in a quiet, solitary place where they’re at leisure to “pause” and “anticipate the direction of their writing” before jumping in (Jensen and DiTiberio 32), while Extroverts might enjoy the “collaborative reflection” type of journaling Callahan suggests, in which students journal collectively as a group in class, incubating their idea via group discussion and then recording them (Callahan 74).

Alternatively, Extroverts who “dislike writing because of the isolation and lack of oral feedback,” such as one Jensen and DiTiberio mention in their article “Personality and Individual Writing Process,” could record their musings on their own via mp3 in an “audio journal” that teachers respond to with their own recordings (Jensen and DiTiberio 289). In his article “Talking About Text: The Use of Recorded Commentary in Response to Student Writing,” Chris M. Anson identifies a “social dimension” to his tape-recorded commentary that “show[s] something of [his] own reading process, the way [he] interprets the student’s words…” (Anson 166). For English 101 students who may be experiencing a bewildering variety of writing expectations from many instructors, any tool teachers can use to elucidate their evaluation process (and the MBTI that influences it) is useful to students (Jensen and DiTiberio 185). The fact that Anson feels his verbal comments are more revealing of his own expectations of his students’ writing suggests that he himself is an Extrovert; however, all teachers should take advantage of their unique preferences, which only become biases if they subjugate student preferences different from their own. This kind of open-dialogue journaling, whether oral or written, could also prove useful for a variety of students.

 Perhaps journals could be used most effectively in tandem with another technique Elbow describes: having students share journal writing directly with one another and their teacher, specifically through the lens of the group conference Susan K. Miller discusses in her article “Using Group Conference to Respond to Essays in Progress” (Elbow 191). Again, Extroverts benefit from the social nature of a group conference; Miller describes how Nancy, one student in Miller’s writing group, prompts Lynn, another student, to flesh out her personal narrative about rock climbing by writing questions on her essay such as “How did this experience affect your life?” (Miller 313). Introverts who may not feel comfortable immediately verbalizing what’s in their heads will feel grounded coming into the group conference with written comments prepared to read, while Extroverted students benefit from a discussion where they can toss around (and thus hone in on) effective comments.

Not only does this format give each student feedback from “several sets of eyes” or MBTI perspectives, each with their own priorities (314), but also, teachers will rely less on their particular biases when they aren’t forced to be the sole critics of student work. Elbow explains, “It’s easier to like [students’] writing when I don’t feel myself as the only reader and judge” (Elbow 191). Indeed, when teachers can synthesize critique from students of several MBTI types, they’ll be able to respond more objectively to student writing. Furthermore, according to Callahan, Judging teachers who rarely stray from lesson plans might be surprised at the leaps their classes make when giving Perceiving students the freedom to take the reins: “Students with a clear P preference are extremely valuable because they let me see where the course might’ve gone… without any encouragement from me” (Callahan 73). The more teachers can be aware of their own biases and actively work to seek alternate points of view, the more success they’ll have appreciating their students and their students’ work.

 In addition to how teachers engage their students socially or via writing activities in journals or conferences, teachers must be aware of how their MBTI type affects their written responses to student essays. In Thomas C. Thompson’s study “Personality Type and Responding to Student Writing: Directions for Study,” Thompson hones in on the key fact that two of the Myers-Briggs type preferences, Intuiting and Sensing (how people take in information) and Thinking and Feeling (how people make decisions) are integral to how teachers respond to students writing, since teachers must both “take in information from the writing” and “make decisions based on the information they take in” (Thompson 3). Consequently, teachers must ensure that their notion of an “ideal text,” according to Lil Brannon and C.H. Knoblauch in their article “On Students’ Rights to Their Own Texts: A Model of Teacher Response,” doesn’t “compromise [their] ability to help students say… what they want to say and [their] ability to recognize legitimately diverse ways of saying it” (Brannon and Knoblauch 119). Each student’s writing must be encouraged based on its own unique merits, and when teachers respond to writing only through the lens of their own MBTI, they risk pigeon-holing students both personally and academically.

For example, an NT teacher in Thompson’s study suggests that his student identify his essay’s main ideas and “choose just two of the themes to focus on” (Thompson 7). This response is typical of an Intuiting-Thinker; the N prioritizes how details fit together to comprise meaning and the T prefers logic and clarity—an economy of themes that point at a few simple truths. However, S students who feel their ideas are best communicated through practical details might feel that this N teacher is asking them to “read into” meaning where there is none—self-reflection can be laborious for S's, and their strength lies in organizing and supporting claims thoroughly, not conjuring innovative abstractions. Likewise, an F student who likes coming to conclusions that feel satisfying based on personal values rather than objective truths might feel that this T teacher isn’t validating his or her particular ideals—such “feelings” seem objectively true to Feelers, even if T's perceive them as subjective and therefore questionable.

Instead, teachers of any MBTI type can tailor their written responses to student writing more effectively by simply reading their students’ writing carefully and determining what MBTI preferences their students might exhibit. In their book *Writing and Personality,* the ever-resourceful Jensen and DiTiberio prescribe the following exercise: near the beginning of any semester, have students compose a brief paragraph about the subject “A Christmas Tree.” N students will often out themselves with a clear preference for metaphor and abstractions, and S students for concrete facts and practical information. T students may write with a logical progression that explains itself, while F students prioritize self-expression and loyalty to personal values (Jensen and DiTiberio 45-8). The qualifiers “often” and “may” are vital; even after Callahan studied her students’ writing thoroughly during her own survey of student writing and its links to personality, she concedes that oftentimes she could only identify two type preferences for any one of her students (Callahan 68). Moreover, Jensen and DiTiberio always temper their work by warning that anyone’s writing “bears the stamp not only of one’s personal signature, but of the influence of teachers, professions, and the broader society… in which one lives” (Jensen and DiTiberio 215). Teachers, too, are subject to these influences (Thompson 9); however, to the extent that personality type allows or prevents teachers to teach effective writing strategies for every student, I believe that the tools, studies, and literature that make up the discourse on MBTI and writing are compelling enough to warrant use and further study.

Finally, I acknowledge that my and Williams’ research has revealed several biases I often exhibit in my own teaching. Although I implement a variety of classroom activities that would appeal to both Extroverts (group work, group peer editing, presentations) and Introverts alike (free writing, at-home peer editing, reflective post-writing) it’s difficult for me to completely disavow the notion that students who participate verbally in class are better than those who don’t. I take great pains to make my classroom a safe place—I can every student by name, never force students to volunteer, and when one does hazard a guess, I always validate that student by saying, “That’s an excellent point—did everyone hear what Student X said?” So when, despite my efforts, students still don’t verbally participate, the snobbier version of myself who lives in my head cocks her hip and gripes, “If they can write a great paper, why don’t they speak up? There’s nothing to be afraid of; they must just be being lazy.” This is a misconception and I’m completely aware of it. Fortunately, having many Introverted friends and family members has “trained” me to read their behavior as deliberate and thoughtful, not lazy. This semester I took special care to check in on my Introverted students’ school and home lives during one-on-one writing conferences. When I administered free-writes in which students were free to write about any topic of their choosing, I responded carefully in writing, knowing my Introverted students would value this personal reply especially. This isn’t difficult for me to understand because, I, too, have always valued written feedback on my writing; although I test Extroverted on the Myers-Briggs, I’m also moderately Introverted. While Jensen and DiTiberio claim that Extroverts prefer to write in noisy, populated places where they won’t feel isolated, here I sit, composing this analysis from my kitchen table because I actually prefer to be quiet and alone when I write (Jensen and DiTiberio 28-30). Consequently, I think it’s easier for teachers with moderate type preferences to be aware of non-dominant types in their students.

On the other hand, it was difficult for me to contain my mirth when I read the sample paragraph written by an ST student about “A Christmas Tree,” describing only the most objective details, such as Christmas trees’ price range, and cautioning that they “are also a fire hazard if not watered properly” (46). “What kind of pitiful individual can only recite the apparent traits of an object without taking any agency to question what it might mean?” I found myself thinking. “Don’t they care?” As a creative writer, it’s difficult for me to take such a barren response to such a fertile topic seriously, but in terms of evaluating analytical essays, I appreciate the logical, detail-orientedness of STs, who wrote some of the most well-organized and evidenced essays I read this semester. These papers may not have been a joy to read in terms of their personal significance, but I was in raptures over their coherence. It would be foolish of me to expect to entirely curb my inherent NF passion for innovating ideas and moving prose, but if I continue to be aware of my own biases, I stand a good chance of appreciating what every student brings to the table.

**Conclusion**

 It’s our hope that this exploration of the varied studies, surveys, and research surrounding the Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicator and its use in easing writing anxiety and informing composition instruction is a beneficial introduction to the possible virtues of MBTI as a tool in the composition classroom. No matter the personality of the teacher, it’s important to remember *Writing and Personality’s*wise words: “The most successful writers discover their preferred patterns…and then employ contrasting… aspects of their personality… as they mature” (Jensen and DiTiberio 215). More constructive than typing ourselves and our students, we must strive to develop all dimensions of our personality and cultivate the necessary open-mindedness to appreciate every type of intelligence. In this way, teaching becomes more than an art or science; it bequeaths humanity, confers power, and promotes understanding of the human condition.

**Writing Processes and Characteristics of Personality Types**

 What follows is a breakdown of each MTBI types' writing processes, strengths, anxieties, and solutions for unblocking and revising. This section acts as an elaboration of the heuristic we handed out during our presentation; we hope it will provide instructors with a practical guide to each preference. These descriptions reference George H. Jensen and John K. DiTiberio's work on writing and personality at large, since much of their work defines and re-defines these traits.

**Extrovert (E)**

**Writing Process:** Extraverts generate ideas by talking about the topic and then leap into writing with little planning. Discussing drafts with others helps while their first drafts tend to need editing (Jensen and DiTiberio from *Personality and the Teaching of Composition* 171).

**Strengths:** They typically excel at writing from experience. Their prose is likely to be vital and reflect a clear connection between experience and thought (98).

**Weaknesses/Anxieties:** They may write more fragmentally, touching superficially on a broad range of topics or they may not adequately reflect on their topic (98).

**Solutions for Drafting/Revising:** The best way to make contact with E's is through talking. They usually respond better to oral than to written feedback; they value active experience (113).

**Introvert (I)**

**Writing Process:** Basic writing process for these writers follows the prewriting-writing-rewriting pattern. They like to plan before writing and want most ideas clarified before writing (171).

**Strengths:** Will tend to write more intensely about a more limited range of ideas or topics. They will usually reflect on their topic enough to make abstractions from it and clearly perceive the audience as someone with values different than their own (98).

**Weaknesses/Anxieties:** An introvert's weakness is that their writing may be so distant from experience that it lacks vitality or fails to reflect clearly the connection between experience and thought. They may also be reluctant to express ideas and feeling, even on paper (98).

**Solutions for Drafting/Revising:** They respond better to any situation when given advance notice and when not expected to think on their feet. Before talking with I's, it might be helpful to provide them with an agenda; this will allow them time to think about what they want to say (113).

**Intuition (N)**

**Writing Process:** These types work best when given a general direction from which they can create their own goals. They tend to generate ideas quickly and write quickly but only write generalities in their first drafts (171).

**Strengths:** Excel at developing unique approaches to a topic. They will write imaginatively and originally about sound concepts and theories (98).

**Weaknesses/Anxieties:** These writers may leap into the middle of the piece or narrative and fail to provide background information. They may also fail to include support for their ideas and find it difficult to follow directions (98).

**Solutions for Drafting/Revising:** These types attend better to communications that begin with concepts, theories, or inferences. They value being innovative, original and theoretical (113).

**Sensing (S)**

**Writing Process:** Sensory types prefer explicit detailed directions. They generate ideas from experience and feel more comfortable when following a pattern that their teacher has prescribed (171).

**Strengths:** Sensory writers tend to excel at following directions closely, at attending to concrete observations and accurately presenting data. They will write accurate descriptions and sound technical report (98).

**Weaknesses/Anxieties:** These types may fail to present the ideas and concepts behind their concrete data. They may also fail to see the unique demands of the rhetorical situation (98).

**Solutions for Drafting/Revising:** Attend better to communications that begin with the concrete. They prefer facts, concrete examples and practical solutions. They tend to respond well to compliments about being accurate, reliable and precise (113).

**Thinking (T)**

**Writing Process:** Thinkers tend to prioritize *what* they say instead of how they say it; they strive for coherence and truth through in their writing through logical organization and astute critiques of others’ arguments (*Writing and Personality* 49, 149).

**Strengths:** Clarity; their arguments are easy to follow and their claims are always developed and supported (163).

**Weaknesses/Anxieties:** Their confidence in the objectivity of truth may lead Thinkers to “regard their beliefs as universally held… and thus write abrasively or dogmatically,” which may cause them to alienate their audiences (163).

**Solutions for Drafting/Revising:** Thinkers can benefit from bringing a personal dimension to their writing—exploring how their values can make an argument more compelling, making an effort to include and understand others’ opinions, and softening their words with qualifiers (149).

**Feeling (F)**

**Writing Process:** Feelers prioritize *how* they express themselves and personalize their claims with “human stories.” It’s important that their ideas “flow naturally from one to another” (150).

**Strengths:** They are excellent at captivating an audience with their real-life examples, compelling metaphors, and persuasive writing (163).

**Weaknesses/Anxieties:** It can be difficult for Feelers to write on topics they don’t feel personally invested in (149); on the other hand, Feelers who feel too close to their subject matter can sound “gushy or overly sentimental.” Furthermore, they may avoid criticism because it seems cruel to others (163).

**Solutions for Drafting/Revising:** Feelers can brainstorm lists of topics or personal goals they feel strongly about list of things they feel strongly about; whenever they encounter a subject that seems irrelevant, they can refer to the list and try to find connections (149-50). Furthermore, if Feelers frame criticism as another mode of voicing their opinions, they may view it less negatively (150).

**Judging (J)**

**Writing Process:** Judgers have a regimented writing process in which they plan their time, hone in on specific topics, compose multiple drafts, and adhere to deadlines. They prefer to make “conclusive statements” in their writing (151).

**Strengths:** They are “quick and decisive” writers, and their powerful claims lend a natural confidence to their prose (166).

**Weaknesses/Anxieties:** Their strong desire for closure and definitive solutions may lead Judgers to “arbitrary… conclusions,” especially when they haven’t taken the time to gather sufficient information (166). Additionally, Judgers may avoid revision, viewing it as a messy process that flays open their orderly work.

**Solutions for Drafting/Revising:** Instead of seeking perfect closure, Judgers can utilize their natural confidence to “stat[e] forthrightly that not everything is known” about a topic. Focusing on “raising questions” instead of “making pronouncements” will lend an open and inclusive feeling to their writing (151).

**Perceiving (P)**

**Writing Process:** Perceivers must consider many topics and their possible connections before settling on a focus, and even then will only do so near a deadline (152)

**Strengths:** Their research and claims are comprehensive and well-argued, and they often present innovative, unexpected ideas (151, 166).

**Weaknesses/Anxieties:** In their drive to be inclusive, Perceivers may be unable to narrow their topics, leading to writing that is “broad,” “tedious[s]” or “rife with transgressions” (166).

**Solutions for Drafting/Revising:** Unlike Judgers, Perceivers benefit from working up to a deadline—the pressure can help them choose one side of an argument and catch irrelevancies in their writing. Also, if Perceivers reassure themselves that their draft is “good enough for now,” they can take comfort that the topic itself isn’t closed to contemplation, just their draft (152).