

**Original citation:**

Powell, Ruth, Robbins, Mandy and Francis, Leslie J.. (2012) The psychological-type profile of lay church leaders in Australia. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, Vol.15 (No.9). pp. 905-918.

**Permanent WRAP url:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/52207>

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes the work of researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**Publisher's statement:**

"This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of an article Powell, Ruth, Robbins, Mandy and Francis, Leslie J. (2012) The psychological-type profile of lay church leaders in Australia. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, Vol.15 (No.9). pp. 905-918., published in *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* (2012), © Taylor & Francis, available online at:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13674676.2012.686478>

**A note on versions:**

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk)



The psychological type profile of lay church leaders in Australia.

Ruth Powell\*

NCLS Research/Australian Catholic University, Australia

Mandy Robbins

Glyndŵr University, UK

and

Leslie J Francis

University of Warwick, UK

\* Corresponding author: Tel: 61 2 8267 4394  
Email: [rpowell@ncls.org.au](mailto:rpowell@ncls.org.au)  
PO Box A2178,  
Sydney South  
NSW 1235  
Australia

### **Abstract**

A sample of 845 lay church leaders (444 women and 401 men) from a range of 24 different denominations and movements (including house churches and independent churches) completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales within the context of the 2006 Australian National Church Life Survey. The psychological type profiles of these lay church leaders were almost identical to the type profiles of 1527 Australian churchgoers (936 women and 591 men) published in an earlier study by Robbins and Francis (2011). The predominant types among female lay church leaders were ISFJ (21%), ESFJ (21%), and ISTJ (18%). The predominant types among male lay church leaders were ISTJ (28%), ISFJ (17%), ESTJ (13%), and ESFJ (12%). The SJ temperament accounted for 67% of the female lay church leaders and for 70% of the male lay church leaders. The strengths and weaknesses of the SJ leadership style are discussed.

*Keywords:* psychological type, religion, psychology, churchgoers, lay leaders, congregations, Australia

### **Introduction**

Psychological type theory, originally proposed by Jung (1971), provides an interesting framework for assessing individual differences in the personality profile of active church attenders and leaders (Francis, 2009). As well as being of interest to those who are concerned with the psychology of religion, a psychological type framework has also had an impact in church life. It has been applied among those interested in developing self-reflective practices among leaders. It also explains differences in attitudes and values between those in different areas of ministry and in different traditions. Further, studies

about psychological type can help to explain preferences for different areas of Christian ministry, in the same way it can inform career choices.

According to psychological type theory, there are four indices on which individual differences can be assessed. Two orientations, styled introversion and extraversion, are concerned with where energy is drawn from. The two perceiving functions, sensing and intuition, are concerned with how information is gathered. The two judging functions, feeling and thinking, relate to how decisions are made. The two attitudes toward the outer world, judging and perceiving, address how a person prefers to deal with the outer world.

The two orientations are defined as introversion (I) and extraversion (E). They are concerned with the sources of psychological energy. Introverts are oriented to the inner world, they are energised by solitude, and by their inner ideas and concepts. They tend to think before acting, and work best alone without interruption. They tend to prefer to learn by reading, and to communicate by writing. On the other hand, extraverts draw energy from the outside world; they are stimulated by people and events, and are drained by solitude. They prefer to work in groups, communicating face-to-face or on the phone and learning by talking tasks through.

The two perceiving functions are concerned with the way people receive and process information. Individuals who prefer sensing (S) perceive their environment through their senses and tend to focus on the actual reality of a situation. They attend to specific detail, rather than the overall picture. They will move step-by-step to a conclusion and prefer well-established patterns. On the other hand, individuals who prefer intuition (N) make sense of their environment with imagination and inspiration. They focus on the possibilities, perceiving meaning and relationships. They can aspire to being innovative, acting as change-agents.

The two judging functions are concerned with how people make decisions and judgements. Those with a preference for feeling (F) make judgments based on a subjective assessment of the personal factors involved. They will be more concerned with promoting peace and harmony, than standing by abstract principles. Individuals with a preference for thinking can weigh facts objectively and logically when making decisions. They stand for truth, fairness and justice. They will tend to respond to ideas rather than feelings.

In developments of Jung's theory, a fourth index has been added that describes two attitudes toward the outer world: judging and perceiving. Judging types prefer their outside world to be organised and planned. They work best with lists and agendas to structure their time and tend to be satisfied when a decision is made. They are goal-oriented and want to move to closure. Perceiving types tend not to impose order on the outside world. They adapt well to changing circumstances, preferring a flexible, open-ended approach. Making allowances for new information or opportunities means that tasks may not get completed.

The four bipolar preferences create a set of building blocks. However, a distinctive feature of psychological type theory is the way that the four preferences can be combined to create 16 discrete types; each one is identified by a four-letter 'shorthand' – such as 'ISTJ' or 'ENFP'.

Psychological type theory has been applied to Christian beliefs and practices, such as evangelism (e.g. Butler, 1999), preaching (e.g. Francis & Village, 2008), and leadership styles (Francis, 2008). Moreover, there is a growing body of empirical research concerned with applying psychological type theory to areas of church life and the Christian community. In this research, there is a suite of psychological instruments capable of measuring the four components of psychological type theory. Three of these instruments have received particular attention: the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley,

1985), the Keirseley Temperament Sorter (Keirseley & Bates, 1978), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005).

The application of psychological type to Christian belief and practice have covered areas such as attitude to charismatic experience (e.g. Francis & Jones, 1997), dogmatism and conservative Christian belief (e.g. Ross, Francis, & Craig, 2005; Francis & Jones, 1998), and happiness (Francis & Jones, 2000). Some increasingly rich streams of research have focussed on the psychological types of religious professionals.

### **Psychological type of religious professionals**

In the United Kingdom, there has been a growing body of knowledge about the type profile of religious professionals training for ministry or serving in ministry within a range of different denominations. These studies include, for example, Anglican Church in Wales clergymen (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001; Francis & Payne, 2002), male and female Bible college students (Francis, Penson, & Jones, 2001), evangelical church leaders (Francis & Robbins, 2002; Craig, Francis, & Robbins, 2004), male missionary personnel (Craig, Horsfall, & Francis, 2005), Roman Catholic priests (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006a), youth ministers (Francis, Nash, Nash, & Craig, 2007), evangelical Anglican seminarians (Francis, Craig, & Butler, 2007), male and female Anglican clergy in the Church of England (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007), and Newfrontiers lead elders (Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009).

The 2001 International Church Life Surveys provided a source of data for a large-scale study of 3,715 clergy in three countries: Australia, England and New Zealand. Psychological type and work-related psychological health was examined in a study by Francis, Robbins, Kaldor and Castle (2009). Results showed that this sample of clergy show clear preferences for introversion (62%) over extraversion (38%), for sensing (61%) over intuition (39%), for feeling (59%) over thinking (41%), and for judging (77%) over

perceiving (23%). The two most strongly represented types were ISFJ and ISTJ which accounted for 19% and 15% of the clergy respectively.

A further study of the psychological type of Australian clergy largely confirmed earlier findings (Kaldor & McLean, 2009). As part of the Australian 2006 National Church Life Survey, in parallel with a church attender survey, local church leaders, lay and ordained, in each participating congregation were invited to complete a 2006 NCLS Leader Survey. The 3241 church leaders with overall responsibility for their congregations were included in the analysis out of the 8439 leaders who completed the 2006 Leader Survey. The Francis Psychological Type Scales were included in one of the four variants of the Leader Survey (Version A).

Unlike the earlier 2001 three-country study, this sample of Australian senior church leaders showed only a slight preference for introversion (51%) over extraversion (49%). However, as previously, there was a clear preference for sensing (61%) over intuition (39%), for feeling (57%) over thinking (43%), and for judging (69%) over perceiving (31%). Again, the two most strongly represented types were ISTJ and ISFJ, paralleling research in England and Wales that suggests an ISFJ is the sort of person who provides a backbone for church leadership.

Kaldor and McLean's study also used 2001 NCLS Leader data to match psychological type with leaders' own perceptions of the roles they felt they performed best in church life. The results suggested that the roles with which leaders are most comfortable are influenced by their psychological type. The role and type match found by Kaldor and McLean (2009, p. 150) is summarized as follows:

- *Introvert leaders:* Conducting worship/sacraments; administering the congregation/parish.

- *Extravert leaders:* Developing a vision and goals for the future; training people for ministry and mission; Converting others to the faith
- *Sensing leaders:* Administering the congregation/ parish; visiting, counselling and helping people
- *Intuitive leaders:* Training people for ministry and mission; developing a vision and goals for the future.
- *Leaders with a feeling predisposition:* Visiting, counselling and helping people; conducting worship/sacraments.
- *Leaders with a thinking predisposition:* Training people for ministry and mission; teaching people about the Christian faith; developing a vision and goals for the future.
- *Leaders with a judging approach:* Administering the congregation/parish.
- *Leaders with a perceiving approach:* Involvement in wider community; developing a vision and goals for the future.

A key goal of Kaldor and McLean's (2009) study was to identify the leadership strengths found in vital, healthy and growing congregations. In this context, they analysed the average growth/decline and levels of owned vision in churches led by leaders with different personality profiles and concluded that:

churches that are growing numerically or where there is an owned vision for the future are more likely to be led by leaders who are extraverted, intuitive and, to a lesser extent, with a perceiving approach to the world. This profile is the opposite to the most common personality types among church leaders (ISFJ and ISTJ) and accounting for only 11% of leaders. (Kaldor & McLean, 2009, pp. 151-152)

One particular line of investigation among clergy has focused on psychological type and work-related psychological health. A study based on the 2001 International

Church Life Survey conducted among clergy in Australia, England and New Zealand showed that psychological type is able to predict differences in work-related psychological health among clergy. Clergy who prefer introversion and thinking experience lower levels of work-related psychological health than clergy who prefer extraversion and feeling. (Francis, Robbins, Kaldor, & Castle, 2009). This study was subsequently replicated by Francis, Wulff, and Robbins (2008) among clergy in The Presbyterian Church (USA), by Robbins and Francis (2010) among clergywomen in the Church of England, and by Robbins, Powell, and Francis (in press) among Australian senior female clergy. All four studies agreed that introverts experienced lower levels of work-related psychological health in comparison with extraverts.

### **Psychological type of church attenders**

A second research tradition has begun to map the psychological type profile of church attenders, including studies conducted in the USA (Gerhardt, 1983; Rehak, 1998), Canada (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1993, 1995), Wales (Craig, Francis, Bailey, & Robbins, 2003; Francis, Robbins, Williams, & Williams, 2007), England (Francis, Duncan, Craig, & Luffman, 2004; Francis, Butler, Jones, & Craig, 2007; Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011) and Australia (Robbins & Francis, 2011). The two main conclusion from this body of research are particularly relevant to the discussion of the psychological type profile of lay church leaders.

The first conclusion concerns the way in which church attenders reflect a rather different psychological type profile from that of the wider population from which they are drawn. This point is well made in the study of Australian church attenders reported by Robbins and Francis (2011). In this study, a sample of 1,527 churchgoers (591 males and 936 females) completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005) within the context of the Australian National Church Life Survey from a range of different Christian

denominations. Compared with the data held by the Australian Archive of the Psychological Type Research Unit (Ball, 2008), both male and female churchgoers displayed significantly higher levels of preference for sensing, for feeling, and for judging. Male churchgoers displayed significantly higher levels of preference for introversion. The two predominant types among female churchgoers were ISFJ (23%) and ESFJ (22%), compared with 13% and 8% respectively in the wider population. The two predominant types among male churchgoers were ISTJ (29%) and ESTJ (15%), compared with 21% and 16% respectively in the wider population. In principle churches proclaim their invitation to worship to all psychological types. In practice some psychological types appear more willing to respond.

The second conclusion concerns the way in which clergy reflect a rather different psychological type profile from that of the congregations from which they are drawn. This point is well made in the study of Anglican church attenders in England reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011). In this study a sample of 3,304 churchgoers (1,169 males and 2,135 females) attending Anglican churches completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). Comparison with the data on Anglican clergy published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) demonstrated that both male and female clergy show a much higher preference for intuition than is the case among their congregations. In the Church of England 62% of clergymen preferred intuition, compared with 22% of male church attenders; 65% of clergywomen preferred intuition, compared with 19% of female church attenders. Intuitive types in church leadership promote change and development, while sensing types in church congregations are more like to resist change and development.

### **The psychological type of lay church leaders**

One area of investigation that remains underdeveloped is an understanding of the psychological type of lay church leaders. This group is important in church life for a number of reasons. These are the leaders who contribute in a voluntary capacity to maintaining and developing church life. Depending on denominational processes, clergy can move through congregations. Lay leaders may well be part of their churches for longer terms. They hold positions of influence and can shape the cultural style and ministry directions of a local church – either formally or informally. However, there are few examples of studies that specifically identify lay leaders as the subject of psychological type profiling. The three extant studies of lay church leaders are all based in the United Kingdom.

A pioneering study by Francis, Craig, Horsfall and Ross (2005) analysed the psychological type of 322 female and male evangelical lay church leaders. Females showed preferences for sensing, feeling and judging. Extraversion and introversion were equally represented. Among male lay leaders, there were preferences for introversion, intuition, thinking and judging. This study also found that lay church leaders differed significantly from the UK population in certain ways. The most notable was the over-representation of intuitive types among both female and male evangelical lay church leaders.

A second study of 74 female and 40 male parochial church council members by Francis, Butler and Craig (2005) looked at the dynamics of psychological type and gender. The data showed that both women and men preferred introversion over extraversion and judging over perceiving. The women demonstrated clear preferences for sensing over intuition, and feeling over thinking, while the men had the opposite preferences.

A third study of male vergers within the Church of England provides an interesting counterpoint. Craig, Duncan and Francis (2006b) note that vergers ‘...act behind the

scenes to ensure that services run smoothly and that the details of protocol are met' (p. 457). The findings showed that vergers have clear preferences for introversion, sensing, thinking and judging. In particular, the preference for sensing is significantly over-represented in comparison with both clergy and laity. The ISTJ type fits well with the role of verger.

### **Research Agenda**

The present study builds on and extends previous research in three ways. The first aim is to report for the first time on the psychological type profile of lay church leaders (male and female) serving in Australian churches. The second aim is to extend British research conducted among comparatively small samples and a restricted range of denominations among a larger sample of lay church leaders across a wider range of denominations. The third aim is to compare the psychological type profile of lay church leaders with the psychological type profile of the pool of congregations from which they were drawn.

This study is possible due to the availability of data from the Australian National Church Life Survey. The NCLS Research team has conducted regular survey work among church congregations over two decades (Kaldor, Bellamy, Correy, & Powell, 1992; Kaldor, Bellamy, Moore, Powell, Castle, & Correy, 1995; Kaldor, Bellamy, Powell, Castle, & Hughes, 1999; Kaldor, Bellamy, Powell, Hughes, & Castle, 1997; Kaldor, Dixon, Powell, Bellamy, Hughes, Moore, & Dalziel, 1999; Bellamy & Castle, 2004; Bellamy, Cussen, Sterland, Castle, Powell, & Kaldor, 2006; Kaldor & McLean 2009; Kaldor, McLean, Brady, Jacka, & Powell, 2009).

### **Method**

#### **Procedure**

In 2006, some 24 denominations and movements (including house churches and independent churches) participated in the Australian National Church Life Survey (NCLS). In addition to an Attender Survey distributed to all church attenders in participating congregations, the 2006 NCLS Leaders Survey was made available in paper form and online to all congregational leaders, both lay and ordained. The invitation was as follows: ‘This survey is for anyone who contributes significant time (eg 1 day per week) to strategic leadership and/or direction setting here. They may or may not be paid for that work’. Of the four different variants of the Leader questionnaire, Version A included a measure of psychological type.

### **Instrument**

*Psychological type* was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). This is a 40-item instrument comprising four sets of 10 forced-choice items.

Respondents are asked to select the characteristic that they felt best represented their personality. Items relate to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). This instrument has been designed specifically for application within a self-completion questionnaire-style survey. Its shorter length makes it useable within the context of a church service. It has already been used extensively in surveys among religious professionals and in UK studies of church attenders (see Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011).

*Leadership role* was assessed using a survey item which asked respondents to select the best description of their position in the church. The ‘*Lay church leaders*’ sample was based on those who selected ‘layperson serving as a member of a leadership team’.

### **Data analysis**

The research literature concerning the empirical investigation of psychological type uses a distinctive approach for displaying data in the form of ‘type tables’. These type tables provide information about the sixteen discrete psychological types, about the four dichotomous preferences, and about the six sets of pairs and temperaments. They also present the dominant types, and the introverted and extraverted Jungian types. The use of type tables has been adopted in this paper in order to facilitate the integration of these new data within existing literature and to enable comparison with other studies. However, discussion will be restricted to aspects of the data strictly relevant to the research question.

### **Sample**

Of the 2336 respondents who completed the items in the Francis Psychological Type Scales in the 2006 NCLS Leaders Surveys, 847 identified themselves as ‘a lay person serving as a member of the leadership team’. These respondents were selected as the sample for this study. All 24 denominations and movements (including house churches and independent churches) were represented in the sample. These were reduced to 10 denominations or denominational groups for this study. (See Table 1).

- Insert table 1 here -

Overall 47.5% of respondents in the lay church leaders sample are male and 52.5% are female. Of the female respondents, 0.5% were under the age of twenty, 6.3% in their twenties, 10.1% were in their thirties, 20.7% were in their forties, 27.5% were in their fifties, 27.5% were in their sixties, and 7.4% were aged seventy or over. More than a quarter of female respondents attended an Anglican church (28.6%), followed by the Uniting Church (16.9%), Catholic Church (16.7%), Pentecostal churches (14.2%), and Baptist churches (7.0%). Of the male respondents, none were aged under twenty, 7.5% were in their twenties, 12.0% were in their thirties, 18.5% were in their forties, 26.8% were in their fifties, 26.5% were in their sixties, and 8.8% were aged seventy or over. The

largest proportion of male respondents attended an Anglican church (24.2%), followed by the Uniting Church (15.5%), Baptist churches (15.0%), the Catholic Church (10.5%), and Pentecostal churches (9.0%).

### Results

Compared to a recommended threshold of 0.65 (DeVellis, 2003), the Francis Psychological Type Scales generated the following alpha coefficients: extraversion and introversion, .80; sensing and intuition, .75; feeling and thinking, .68; perceiving and judging, .78. All these alphas exceed the recommended threshold, confirming previous studies that suggest these scales function well in church-related contexts (e.g. Francis, Craig, and Hall, 2008, Francis, Robbins, Kaldor and Castle, 2009).

The type distribution for the 444 Australian female lay church leaders is presented in Table 2. These data show strong preferences for judging (83%) over perceiving (17%), for sensing (75%) over intuition (25%), and for feeling (66%) over thinking (34%). Differences are less pronounced for introversion (53%) over extraversion (47%). The predominant types among female lay church leaders are ISFJ and ESFJ (each 21%), followed by ISTJ (18%). In other words, the SFJ preference accounts for 42% of all female lay church leaders. All told the SJ preference accounts for two out of every three female lay church leaders (67%).

- Insert table 2 here -

Table 2 also compares the 444 Australian female lay church leaders with the 936 Australian female churchgoers reported by Robbins and Francis (2011). These data show close similarities between the two groups. There is a slight preference for introversion among both female churchgoers (52%) and among female lay church leaders (53%). There is clear preference for feeling among both female churchgoers (62%) and female lay church leaders (66%). There is strong preference for sensing among female churchgoers

(81%) and almost as strong among female lay church leaders (75%). There is a strong preference for judging among female churchgoers (87%) and almost as strong among female lay church leaders (83%).

The type distribution for 401 Australian male lay church leaders is presented in Table 3. Like the female lay leaders, these data also show strong preferences for judging (86%) over perceiving (14%), and for sensing (75%) over intuition (25%). However, in contrast to the female lay leaders, male lay leaders have a clear preference for introversion (61%) over extraversion (39%) and a preference for thinking (55%) over feeling (45%). The predominant type among male lay church leaders is ISTJ (28%), followed by ISFJ (17%), ESTJ (13%), and ESFJ (12%). In other words, the STJ preference accounts for 41% of all male lay church leaders and the SFJ preference accounts for 29% of this group. All told the SJ preference accounts for 70% of the male lay church leaders.

- Insert table 3 here -

Table 3 also compares the 401 Australian male lay church leaders with 591 Australian male churchgoers reported by Robbins and Francis (2011). These data show close similarities between the two groups. There are preferences for introversion among both male churchgoers (59%) and male lay church leaders (61%). There are preferences for thinking among both male churchgoers (60%) and male lay church leaders (55%). There are preferences for sensing among both male churchgoers (78%) and male lay church leaders (75%). There are preferences for judging among both male churchgoers (88%) and male lay church leaders (86%).

### **Discussion and conclusion**

This study set out to build on and to extend previous research concerning the psychological type profile of lay church leaders. Data made available from the 2006 Australian National Church Life Survey identified 845 lay church leaders (444 women and

401 men) from across 24 denominations and movements (including house churches and independent churches). The 845 lay church leaders were then compared with the 1527 Australian churchgoers (936 women and 591 men) reported by Robbins and Francis (2011). Three main conclusions emerge from these data.

The first conclusion concerns the way in which the psychological type profiles of these lay church leaders reflect the congregations from which they are drawn. Such compatibility between lay church leaders and their congregations suggests both potential strengths and potential weaknesses. The strength is that such leaders will know and understand the style of their congregations. The weakness is that the congregations are already out of step with the psychological type profile of the wider community (see Robbins & Francis, 2011) and the lay church leaders are no better equipped than the congregations to model the profile of the wider community.

The second conclusion concerns the way in which the two types ISFJ and ISTJ are so strongly represented among lay church leaders. ISFJs account for 21% of female lay church leaders and 17% of male lay church leaders. In her book, *Introduction to Type*, Myers (1998, p.7) provides insightful profiles of these two types who are so crucial to shaping church congregations and lay church leadership. The ISFJ profile is as follows:

Quiet, friendly, responsible and conscientious. Work devotedly to meet their obligations. Lend stability to any project or group. Thorough, painstaking, accurate. Their interests are usually not technical. Can be patient with necessary details. Loyal considerate, perceptive, concerned with other people feel.

The ISTJ profile is as follows:

Serious, quiet, earn success by concentration and thoroughness. Practical, orderly, matter-of-fact, logical, realistic and dependable. See to it that everything is well

organised. Take responsibility. Make up their own minds about what should be accomplished and work towards it steadily, regardless of protests or distractions.

The third conclusion concerns the overall strength of the SJ profile among lay church leaders, accounting for 67% of female lay church leaders and for 70% of male lay church leaders. In their study, *Personality type and religious leadership*, Oswald and Kroeger (1988) give particular attention to the strengths and to the weaknesses of SJ style leadership. They characterise the SJ leader as ‘the conserving, serving pastor’ who prizes ‘being the guardian of the creative genius of the past’ (p. 79).

According to Oswald and Kroeger (1988) SJ leadership carries the following strengths: congregations managed by SJ leaders will not go through unnecessary change, and when changes are initiated they will be implemented by evolution not by revolution. SJ leaders will work hard to foster a sense of loyalty and belonging in their congregation. They will prioritise a sense of social, moral and spiritual obligation throughout the congregation. They will work hard to develop sound plans, clear procedures and precise policies, and encourage others to adhere to them. SJ leaders bring superior skills to administrative functions, but they find dealing with people more difficult. SJ leaders will excel in pastoral ministry, taking especial care of the needs of the young and of the elderly. They are realists who like a common-sense approach to pastoral counselling and to problem solving. For SJ leaders, worship will be formal, dignified, and predictable.

Oswald and Kroeger (1988) also discuss some of the potential difficulties found by SJ leaders, including the drawbacks of literalism and pessimism. For them, scripture needs to be interpreted with respect for the literal text. For them, others’ enthusiasms need to be subjected to stringent risk-assessments. They may become particularly vulnerable to burnout as a consequence of their commitment to rules, procedures and obligations. They may weary some members of their congregation by an apparent obsession with structure,

order and discipline. They may find individuals who reject conventional church teaching hard to accept. They may be irritated by church members who fail to appreciate the importance of structure, deadlines and procedure.

The study of Anglican clergy in England reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) indicates that the SJ profile may be much less strong among the ordained clergy, accounting in their study for 31% of clergymen and 29% of clergywomen. Such disparity between the professional clergy and lay church leaders may help to illuminate some areas of potential conflict and misunderstanding within the leadership team. While the professional clergy may wish to lead their churches to try new things and to run the risk of adventure, the SJ preferences of the lay church leaders may collude with the church congregations to prefer a more familiar and more conventional approach to church life.

Further studies are now needed to build on this pioneering survey of lay church leaders. As these data build up over time within the context of the Australian National Church Life Survey it will become possible to compare the psychological type profile of lay church leaders across different denominations and set these profiles alongside the full-time professional leaders working within the same denominational contexts.

### References

- Ball, I. L. (2008). Australian data on the distribution of psychological types. *Bulletin of Psychological Type, 31*, 53-55.
- Bellamy, J. Cussen, B. Sterland, S. Castle, K. Powell, R. Kaldor, P. (2006). *Enriching church life: A practical guide for local churches*. Adelaide: Openbook.
- Bellamy, J & Castle, K. (2004). *2001 church attendance estimates*. Occasional Paper No. 3, Sydney South, New South Wales: NCLS Research.
- Butler, A. (1999). *Personality and Communicating the Gospel*. Cambridge: Grove Books.
- Craig, C. L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L. J. (2006a). Psychological type preferences of Roman Catholic priests in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 27*, 157-164.
- Craig, C. L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L. J., (2006b). Safeguarding tradition: Psychological type preferences of male vergers in the Church of England. *Pastoral Psychology, 54*, 457-463.
- Craig, C. L., Francis, L. J., Bailey, J., & Robbins, M. (2003). Psychological types in Church in Wales congregations. *The Psychologist in Wales, 15*, 18-21.
- Craig, C., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2004). Psychological type and sex differences among church leaders in the United Kingdom, *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 25*, 3-13.
- Craig, C. L. Horsfall, T., & Francis, L. J. (2005). Psychological types of male missionary personnel training in England: a role for thinking type men?, *Pastoral Psychology, 53*, 475-482.
- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990). Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members. *Journal of Psychological Type, 20*, 25-33.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage.

Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*.

London: Darton, Longman and Todd.

Francis, L. J. (2008). Psychological type and leadership styles. In John Nelson (Ed.), *How to become a creative church leader* (pp. 26-35). Norwich: Canterbury Press,.

Francis, L. J. (2009). Psychological type theory and religious and spiritual experience. In M. De Souza, L. J. Francis, J. O'Higgins-Norman, & D. G. Scott (Eds.), *International Handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing* (pp 125-146). Dordrecht: Springer.

Francis, L. J., Butler, A., & Craig, C. L., (2005). Understanding the Parochial Church Council: Dynamics of psychological type and gender. *Contact*, 147, 32-32.

Francis, L. J., Butler, A., Jones, S. H., & Craig, C. L. (2007). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church: A perspective from England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 10, 435-443.

Francis, L.J ., Craig, C. L., & Butler, A. (2007). Psychological types of male evangelical Anglican seminarians in England. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 67, 11-17.

Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., & Hall, G. (2008). Psychological type and attitude toward Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 23, 181-191.

Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Horsfall, T., & Ross, C. F. J. (2005). Psychological types of male and female evangelical lay church leaders in England, compared with United Kingdom population norms. *Fieldwork in Religion*, 1, 69-83.

Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 11, 266-284.

- Francis, L. J., Duncan, B., Craig, C. L., & Luffman, G. (2004). Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England. *Journal of Adult Theological Education, 1*, 66-77.
- Francis, L. J., Gubb, S., & Robbins, M. (2009). Psychological type profile of Lead Elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 30*, 61-69.
- Francis, L. J., & Jones, S. H. (1997). Personality and charismatic experience among adult Christians. *Pastoral Psychology, 45*, 421-428.
- Francis, L. J., & Jones, S. H. (1998). Personality and Christian belief among adult churchgoers. *Journal of Psychological Type, 47*, 5-11.
- Francis L. J., & Jones, S. H. (2000). Psychological type and happiness: A study among adult churchgoers. *Journal of Psychological Type, 54*, 36-41.
- Francis, L.J., Nash, P., Nash, S., & Craig, C.L. (2007), Psychology and youth ministry: psychological type preferences of Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom, *Journal of Youth Ministry, 5*(2), 73-90.
- Francis, L. J. & Payne, V. J. (2002). The Payne Index of Ministry Styles (PIMS): Ministry styles and psychological type among male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 13*, 125-141.
- Francis, L. J., Payne, V. J., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type, 56*, 19-23.
- Francis, L. J., Penson, A. W. and Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male and female Bible College students in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 4*, 23-32.
- Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2002). Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders. *Journal of Belief and Values, 23*, 217-220

- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Craig, C. L. (2011). The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: Compatible or incompatible with their clergy? *International Journal of Practical Theology, 15*, 243-259.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Kaldor, P., & Castle, K. (2009). Psychological type and work-related psychological health among clergy in Australia, England and New Zealand. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 28*, 200-212.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Williams, A., & Williams, R. (2007). All types are called, but some are more likely to respond: The psychological profile of rural Anglican churchgoers in Wales. *Rural Theology, 5*, 23-30.
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2008). *Preaching with all our souls*. London: Continuum.
- Francis, L. J., Wulff, K., & Robbins, M. (2008). The relationship between work-related psychological health and psychological type among clergy serving in the Presbyterian Church (USA), *Journal of Empirical Theology, 21*, 166-182.
- Gerhardt, R. (1983). Liberal religion and personality type. *Research in Psychological Type, 6*, 47-53.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kaldor, P., Bellamy, J., Correy, M., & Powell, R. (1992). *First look in the mirror: Initial findings of the 1991 National Church Life Survey*. Homebush West, New South Wales: Lancer.
- Kaldor, P., Bellamy, J., Moore, S., Powell, R., Castle, K., & Correy, M. (1995). *Mission under the microscope: Keys to effective and sustainable mission*. Adelaide, South Australia: Openbook Publishers.

Kaldor, P., Bellamy, J., Powell, R., Castle, K., & Hughes, B. (1999). *Build my Church:*

*Trends and possibilities for Australian churches.* Adelaide, South Australia:

Openbook Publishers.

Kaldor, P., Bellamy, J., Powell, R., Hughes, B., & Castle, K. (1997). *Shaping a future:*

*Characteristics of vital congregations.* Adelaide, South Australia: Openbook

Publishers.

Kaldor, P., Dixon, R., Powell, R., Bellamy, J., Hughes, B., Moore, S., & Dalziel, J. (1999).

*Taking stock: A profile of Australian church attenders.* Adelaide, South Australia:

Openbook Publishers.

Kaldor, P., & McClean, J. (2009). *Lead with your strengths: Making a difference wherever*

*you are.* Sydney South, New South Wales: NCLS Research.

Kaldor, P., McLean, J., Brady, M, Jacka, K., & Powell, R. (2009). *Introduction to Lead*

*with your strengths booklet.* Sydney: NCLS Research,

Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me.* Del Mar, California: Prometheus

Nemesis.

Myers, I. B. (1998). *Introduction to type: A guide to understanding your results on the*

*Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (fifth edition, European English version). Oxford:

Oxford Psychologists Press.

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of*

*the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.* Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists

Press.

Oswald, R.M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality type and religious leadership.*

Washington, DC: The Alban Institute.

Rehak, M.C. (1998). Identifying the congregation's corporate personality. *Journal of*

*Psychological Type*, 44, 39-44.

Robbins, M., & Francis, L. J. (2010). Work-related psychological health among Church of England clergywomen: Individual differences and psychological type. *Review of Religious Research, 52*, 57-71.

Robbins, M., & Francis, L. J. (2011). All are called, but some psychological types are more likely to respond: Profiling churchgoers in Australia. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 22*, 213-229.

Robbins, M., Powell, R., and Francis, L. J. (in press). Work-related psychological health among clergywomen in Australia: A study in psychological type.

Ross, C. F. J. (1993). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church: Comparisons with Catholics, Evangelicals and clergy. *Journal of Psychological Type, 26*, 28-35.

Ross, C. F. J. (1995). Type patterns among Catholics: Four Anglophone congregations compared with Protestants, Francophone Catholics and priests. *Journal of Psychological Type, 33*, 33-41.

Ross, C. F. J., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2005). Dogmatism, religion and psychological type. *Pastoral Psychology, 53*.

Table 1:

*Australian lay church leaders by denominational groups and sex*

	<u>Female</u>		<u>Male</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Anglican	127	28.6	97	24.2	224	26.5
Baptist	31	7.0	60	15.0	91	10.8
Catholic	74	16.7	42	10.5	116	13.7
Churches of Christ	15	3.4	30	7.5	45	5.3
Lutheran	23	5.2	26	6.5	49	5.8
Pentecostal	63	14.2	36	9.0	99	11.7
Presbyterian	3	0.7	19	4.7	22	2.6
Salvation Army	22	5.0	15	3.7	37	4.4
Uniting	75	16.9	62	15.5	137	16.2
Other Protestant	11	2.5	14	3.5	25	2.9
Total	444	100.0	401	100.0	845	100.0

*Source: 2006 NCLS Leaders Survey A.**Pentecostal includes Australian Christian Churches (AOC); Apostolic, C3 Churches, Christian Revival Crusade, Christian Life Centres, Four Square Gospel, Christian Outreach Centres and other independent Pentecostal churches.*

Table 2:

Type distribution for Australian female lay leaders

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 80 (18.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.14 +++++ +++++ +++++ +++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 94 (21.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.91 +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +	INFJ <i>n</i> = 17 (3.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.94 ++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 13 (2.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.76 +++	E <i>n</i> = 209 (47.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.98	I <i>n</i> = 235 (52.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.02	S <i>n</i> = 333 (75.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.92**	N <i>n</i> = 111 (25.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.32**
ISTP <i>n</i> = 5 (1.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.17 +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 12 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.33 +++	INFP <i>n</i> = 9 (2.0%) <i>I</i> = 2.37 ++	INTP <i>n</i> = 5 (1.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.96 +	<b>Pairs and Temperaments</b>			
				IJ <i>n</i> = 204 (45.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.98	IP <i>n</i> = 31 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.39	EP <i>n</i> = 45 (10.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.26	EJ <i>n</i> = 164 (36.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.92
ESTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.32 +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 18 (4.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.19 ++++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 19 (4.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.60 ++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 6 (1.4%) <i>I</i> = 2.53 +	ST <i>n</i> = 115 (25.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.84	SF <i>n</i> = 218 (49.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.97	NF <i>n</i> = 74 (16.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.49**	NT <i>n</i> = 37 (8.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.08
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 28 (6.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.50*** +++++ +	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 94 (21.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.97 +++++ +++++ +++++ +	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 29 (6.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.80* +++++ ++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 13 (2.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.37 +++	TJ <i>n</i> = 134 (30.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.88	TP <i>n</i> = 18 (4.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	FP <i>n</i> = 58 (13.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.46**	FJ <i>n</i> = 234 (52.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.00
				IN <i>n</i> = 44 (9.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	EN <i>n</i> = 67 (15.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.68***	IS <i>n</i> = 191 (43.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.02	ES <i>n</i> = 142 (32.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.82**
				ET <i>n</i> = 49 (11.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.67**	EF <i>n</i> = 160 (36.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	IF <i>n</i> = 132 (29.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.99	IT <i>n</i> = 103 (23.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.06

  

Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	41	9.2	0.63**	I-TP	10	2.3	1.05	Dt.T	51	11.5	0.68**
E-FJ	123	27.7	1.09	I-FP	21	4.7	1.64	Dt.F	144	32.4	1.15
ES-P	20	4.5	0.94	IS-J	174	39.2	1.00	Dt.S	194	43.7	1.00
EN-P	25	5.6	1.76*	IN-J	30	6.8	0.85	Dt.N	55	12.4	1.11

Note: N = 444

\* *p* < .05    \*\* *p* < .01    \*\*\* *p* < .001

Table 3:

*Type distribution for Australian male lay leaders*

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences							
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 112 (27.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.96 +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 69 (17.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.34 +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 15 (3.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.76 ++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 25 (6.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.08 +++++ +	E <i>n</i> = 158 (39.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.96	I <i>n</i> = 243 (60.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	S <i>n</i> = 299 (74.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.96	N <i>n</i> = 102 (25.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.13	T <i>n</i> = 221 (55.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.93	F <i>n</i> = 180 (44.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.11	J <i>n</i> = 346 (86.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.99	P <i>n</i> = 55 (13.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.10
ISTP <i>n</i> = 3 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.34 +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.84 +	INFP <i>n</i> = 10 (2.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.47 +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 5 (1.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.92 +	Pairs and Temperaments							
				IJ <i>n</i> = 221 (55.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.05	IP <i>n</i> = 22 (5.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.85	EP <i>n</i> = 33 (8.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.35	EJ <i>n</i> = 125 (31.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.89				
ESTP <i>n</i> = 3 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.34 +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 10 (2.5%) <i>I</i> = 2.11 +++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 15 (3.7%) <i>I</i> = 2.21* ++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 5 (1.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.23 +	ST <i>n</i> = 170 (42.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.88	SF <i>n</i> = 129 (32.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.11	NF <i>n</i> = 51 (12.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.12	NT <i>n</i> = 51 (12.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	SJ <i>n</i> = 279 (69.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.98	SP <i>n</i> = 20 (5.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.74	NP <i>n</i> = 35 (8.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.52	NJ <i>n</i> = 67 (16.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.00
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 52 (13.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.87 +++++ +++++ +++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 46 (11.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.83 +++++ +++++ ++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 11 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.90 +++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 16 (4.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.31 ++++	TJ <i>n</i> = 205 (51.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.97	TP <i>n</i> = 16 (4.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.59	FP <i>n</i> = 39 (9.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.69*	FJ <i>n</i> = 141 (35.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.01	IN <i>n</i> = 55 (13.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	EN <i>n</i> = 47 (11.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.33	IS <i>n</i> = 188 (46.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	ES <i>n</i> = 111 (27.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.86
				ET <i>n</i> = 76 (19.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	EF <i>n</i> = 82 (20.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	IF <i>n</i> = 98 (24.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.18	IT <i>n</i> = 145 (36.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.94				

	Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types				
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	68	17.0	0.95	I-TP	8	2.0	0.56	Dt.T	76	19.0	0.88
E-FJ	57	14.2	0.84	I-FP	14	3.5	1.21	Dt.F	71	17.7	0.89
ES-P	13	3.2	0.96	IS-J	181	45.1	1.08	Dt.S	194	48.4	1.07
EN-P	20	5.0	1.84	IN-J	40	10.0	0.94	Dt.N	60	15.0	1.12

Note: N = 401

\* *p* < .05    \*\* *p* < .01    \*\*\* *p* < .001