

Original citation:

Lankshear, David W. and Francis, Leslie J.. (2015) Inside Southwark Cathedral : a study in psychological-type profiling. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18 (8). pp. 664-674.

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/81864>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by 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 Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* on 27 November 2015, available online:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.961705>

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

Inside Southwark Cathedral: A study in psychological type profiling

David W Lankshear

University of Warwick

Leslie J Francis*

University of Warwick

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Centre for Education Studies

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

A series of recent studies has begun to map the psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England and Wales. The present study sets the profile of 120 men and 161 women attending Sunday services in Southwark Cathedral against the profile of 1,169 men and 2,135 women attending Anglican parish churches reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011). These data found significantly higher proportions of intuitive types and thinking types within the cathedral congregation and a significantly lower proportion of participants displaying the SJ temperament. The implication of these findings are discussed for appreciating the distinctive style of cathedral worship and of cathedral ministry.

Keywords: psychological type, cathedral studies, psychology, religion

Introduction

Psychological type theory is beginning to play an increasingly visible role both in the psychology of religion (Lewis, 2012) and in empirical theology (Village, 2011). One example of this development concerns the field of congregational studies where empirical research employing psychological type theory has been conducted in North America, the United Kingdom and Australia: in North America by Gerhardt (1983), Rehak (1998), (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990), Ross (1993, 1995), and Bramer and Ross (2012); in the United Kingdom by Craig, Francis, Bailey, and Robbins (2003), Francis, Duncan, Craig, and Luffman (2004), Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007), Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011), Village, Baker, and Howat (2012), Francis and Robbins (2012), and Francis (2013); and in Australia by Robbins and Francis (2011, 2012), and Robbins, Francis, and Powell (2012).

Psychological type theory

Psychological type theory has its roots in the pioneering work of Carl Jung (1971) and has been developed and popularised through a series of type indicators, type sorters or type scale. The most frequently employed of these measures in church-related research and congregational studies are the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS: Keirsey & Bates, 1978), the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator (MBTI: Myers & McCaulley, 1985), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). At its core psychological type theory distinguishes between two orientations, two perceiving functions, two judging functions, and two attitudes toward the outer world. In each of these four areas, psychological type theory conceptualises difference in terms of two discrete categories (or types) rather than in terms of a continuum stretching between two poles.

In psychological type theory, the two orientations are concerned with contrasting energy sources and distinguish between introversion (I) and extraversion (E). Introverts are energised by the inner world. When tired they prefer to go inwards to regain energy.

Extraverts are energised by the outer world. When tired they prefer to congregate with other people to regain energy. Introverts enjoy their own company and appreciate silence.

Extraverts enjoy the company of others and prefer to engage in conversation. A congregation shaped by introverts may seem somewhat strange to extraverts, while a congregation shaped by extraverts may seem somewhat strange to introverts.

In psychological type theory, the two perceiving functions are concerned with contrasting ways of taking in information and distinguish between sensing (S) and intuition (N). Sensing types are concerned with the details of a situation as perceived by the five senses. Intuitive types are concerned with the meaning and significance of a situation. Sensing types feel comfortable with the familiar and with the conventional. They tend to dislike change. Intuitive types feel comfortable with innovation and with new ideas. They tend to promote change. A congregation shaped by sensing types may seem somewhat strange to intuitive types, while a congregation shaped by intuitive types may seem somewhat strange to sensing types.

In psychological type theory, the two judging functions are concerned with contrasting ways of evaluating situations and distinguish between thinking (T) and feeling (F). Thinking types are concerned with the objective evaluation of a situation, and with identifying the underlying logic. Feeling types are concerned with the subjective evaluation of a situation, and with identifying the underlying values. Thinking types are more concerned with supporting effective systems. Feeling types are concerned with supporting interpersonal relationships. A congregation shaped by thinking types may seem somewhat strange to feeling types, while a congregation shaped by feeling types may seem somewhat strange to thinking types.

In psychological type theory, the two attitudes toward the outer world are concerned with which of the two psychological processes is employed in the outer world and distinguish

between judging (J) and perceiving (P). Judging types employ their preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) in the outer world. Perceiving types employ their preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) in the outer world. Judging types display a planned, orderly and organised profile to the outer world. Perceiving types display a flexible, spontaneous and unplanned profile to the outer world. A congregation shaped by judging types may seem somewhat strange to perceiving types, while a congregation shaped by perceiving types may seem somewhat strange to judging types.

As well as discussing the four contrasting pairs independently (introversion *or* extraversion, sensing *or* intuition, thinking *or* feeling, and judging *or* perceiving), psychological type theory draws these component parts together in a variety of ways, three of which are particularly important. First, the combination of the components allows each individual's strongest, or *dominant* function to be identified: dominant sensing types are practical people; dominant intuitive types are imaginative people; dominant feeling types are humane people; and dominant thinking types are logical people. Second, alongside their dominant preference individuals are given clearer identity by their second strongest, or *auxiliary* function. The auxiliary is the preferred function for the opposite process complementing the dominant function, leading to eight dominant-auxiliary pairs: dominant sensing with thinking, dominant sensing with feeling, dominant intuition with thinking, dominant intuition with feeling, dominant feeling with sensing, dominant feeling with intuition, dominant thinking with sensing, and dominant thinking with intuition. Third, all four preferred components of psychological type theory cohere to generate 16 complete types, usually identified by their initial letter (for example INTJ or ESFP).

Working from the same building blocks of psychological type theory, temperament theory as developed by Keirse and Bates (1978) proposes four main temperament types defined by the following combinations: SJ, SP, NF, and NT. In the language shaped by

Keirsey and Bates (1978) the Epimethean Temperament characterises the SJ profile, people who long to be dutiful, to be useful to the social units to which they belong, and to preserve and hand on to others what they have inherited. The Dionysian Temperament characterises the SP profile, people who want to be engaged, involved, and doing something new. The Promethean Temperament characterises the NT profile, people who want to understand, explain, shape and predict realities, and who prize their personal competence. The Apollonian Temperament characterises the NF profile, people who quest for authenticity and for self-actualisation, who are idealistic and who have great capacity for empathic listening.

Psychological type theory in congregational studies

Working within the UK, Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007) analysed data from a sample of 185 churchgoers attending small congregations in rural Wales and compared the profile of male and female churchgoers with population norms for the United Kingdom published by Kendall (1998). The main finding from this comparison concerned the undue weighting toward sensing, feeling and judging in church congregations. Among women ISFJ accounts for 32% of churchgoers, compared with 18% of the general population, and ESFJ accounts for 28% of churchgoers, compared with 19% of the general population. Among men ISFJ accounts for 19% of churchgoers, compared with 7% of the general population, and ESFJ accounts for 27% of churchgoers, compared with 6% of the general population. The over-representation of ISFJ and ESFJ among churchgoers leads to under-representation of other types. Francis, Robbins, Williams and Williams (2007) chose for their study the descriptive (but challenging) title, 'All types are called, but some are more likely to respond'.

The major shortcoming with the study reported by Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007) concerned the interpretative weight carried by a sample of only 185 churchgoers. A more recent study, reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011), addressed

this shortcoming by assembling data from 2,135 women and 1,169 men surveyed in the context of Anglican church services in England and by (again) comparing the psychological type profile of these churchgoers with the population norms for the UK published by Kendall (1998). The findings from this larger study are remarkably similar to some of the findings from the smaller study (especially among the women). Among the female churchgoers there were strong preferences for sensing (81%), for feeling (70%) and for judging (85%), with a balance between introversion (49%) and extraversion (51%). In this study 25% of the women reported ISFJ, 25% reported ESFJ, and 73% reported the SJ temperament. Among the male churchgoers there were preferences for introversion (62%), for sensing (78%), for thinking (58%) and for judging (86%). In this study 17% of the men reported ISFJ, 11% reported ESFJ, and 71% reported the SJ temperament.

The major shortcoming with the two studies reported by Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007) and Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011) is that both studies were restricted to Anglicans in England and Wales. Another study, reported by Robbins and Francis (2011) addressed this shortcoming by drawing on data collected by the Australian National Church Life Survey from 936 women and 591 men surveyed in the context of church services across 18 participating denominations and by comparing the psychological type profile of the churchgoers with the population norms for Australia published by Ball (2008). The findings from this Australian study are remarkably similar to the findings reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011). Among the female churchgoers, there were strong preferences for sensing (81%), for feeling (62%), and for judging (87%), with a balance between introversion (52%) and extraversion (48%). In this study, 23% of the women reported ISFJ and 22% reported ESFJ. Among the male churchgoers, there were preferences for introversion (59%), for sensing (78%), for thinking (60%), and for judging (88%). In this study, 13% of the men reported ISFJ and 14% reported ESFJ.

Overall, when the profiles of the men and women are added together from the three studies (giving a sample of 5,016), the ISFJ profile of churchgoers is confirmed with introversion (54%), sensing (80%), feeling (58%), and judging (86%). Given the predominance of the ISFJ profile within church congregations, the hypothesis was advanced in a subsequent study by Francis and Robbins (2012) that extraverts, intuitive types, thinking types and perceiving types who attend church are the least likely to feel at home in or satisfied with the churches they attend. They tested this hypothesis among a sample of 1,867 churchgoers who completed a measure of psychological type, together with a measure of frequency of attendance and an index of congregational satisfaction. These data confirmed that congregations were weighted towards preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging (ISFJ), and the individuals displaying the opposite preferences (extraversion, intuition, thinking, and perceiving) recorded lower levels of congregational satisfaction. On the basis of these findings, Francis and Robbins (2012) took the view that, not only were extraverts, intuitive types, thinking types and perceiving types less in evidence in church congregations, those who were there were expressing lower levels of congregational satisfaction and thus more likely to join the category of church leavers (see Francis & Richter, 2007).

Psychological type theory in cathedral studies

A separate strand of research has also begun to introduce psychological type theory within the field of cathedral studies, although this strand has focused primarily on understanding the profile of cathedral visitors (Francis, Williams, Annis, & Robbins, 2008; Francis, Mansfield, Williams, & Village, 2010; Francis, Annis, Robbins, ap Siôn, & Williams, 2012). Walker (2012), however, took this strand in a somewhat different direction in order to examine the psychological type profile of 164 men and 239 women who attended two carol services on consecutive nights in Worcester Cathedral in December 2009. Walker's

study found some significant differences between churchgoers and those who attended the cathedral carol services among both men and women.

For women there were no significant differences in terms of the orientations (51% extraverts in the cathedral and 51% extraverts in the parish churches), or in terms of attitudes (85% judging types in the cathedral and 85% in the parish churches). Significant differences emerged, however, with regard to the two processes. In terms of the perceiving process, the proportion of sensing types fell from 81% in the church congregations to 73% in the cathedral congregation, with a consequent increase in intuitive types from 19% to 27%. In terms of the judging process, the proportion of feeling types fell from 70% in the church congregations to 61% in the cathedral congregation, with a consequent increase in thinking types from 30% to 39%. In terms of dominant types, there were significantly more dominant thinking types (19% compared with 14%) and significantly more dominant intuitive types (14% compared with 10%) in the cathedral congregation compared with the church congregations. In terms of temperament theory, the proportion of SJs fell from 73% in the church congregations to 68% in the cathedral congregation.

For men there were no significant differences in terms of the orientations (42% extraverts in the cathedral and 38% in the parish churches), or in terms of the attitudes (84% judging types in the cathedral and 86% judging types in the parish churches). Significant differences emerged, however, with regard to the two processes. In terms of the perceiving process, the proportion of sensing types fell from 78% in the church congregations to 70% in the cathedral congregation, with a consequent increase in intuitive types from 22% to 30%. In terms of the judging process, the proportion of feeling types fell from 42% in the church congregations to 31% in the cathedral congregation, with a consequent increase in thinking types from 58% to 69%. In terms of dominant types there were significantly more dominant thinking types (28% compared with 20%) in the cathedral congregation compared with the

church congregations. In terms of temperament theory, the proportion of SJs fell from 71% in the church congregations to 62% in the cathedral congregation.

Clearly Walker's (2012) study suggests that the cathedral carol service attracts a distinctive congregation comprising higher proportions of intuitive types and thinking types than found in regular church congregations. Walker argues that the cathedral carol service relates the Christmas story in a way that goes beyond the senses and hints at 'a deeper mystery understood or apprehended in the depths of the human soul' (p. 993), an experience enhanced by a professional quality choir, by a professional organist, and by an evocatively lit Grade 1 listed ancient building. Such qualities may resonate with intuitive types. Walker also argues that the cathedral carol service is not couched in a context of emotional and relational engagement or cast in the 'feeling' idiom of many church services. Such qualities may resonate with thinking types.

Research question

The question raised by Walker's (2012) study concerns the extent to which the distinctive appeal of the cathedral to intuitive types and to thinking types is mainly limited to the highly distinctive environment of the cathedral carol service, or whether it extends to the routine Sunday worship as well. It is the aim of the present study to explore this issue.

Method

Procedure

On one Sunday during late September 2013, the congregation attending services in Southwark Cathedral were invited to assist the cathedral by compiling a questionnaire. The questionnaire comprised three sections exploring background, attitudes and psychological profile, including psychological type. Participation was voluntary and anonymity and confidentiality were assured. A total of 288 questionnaires completed by participants aged

twenty or over were submitted at the end of the service, of which 281 had full data on psychological type profile.

Participants

The 281 participants who had fully completed the psychological type profile data comprised 120 men and 161 women; 5% were in their twenties, 12% in their thirties, 13% in their forties, 21% in their fifties, 30% in their sixties, 16% in their seventies, and 3% were aged eighty or over. The majority regarded the cathedral as their main place of worship (69%), attended services weekly (63%), and were on the membership roll of the cathedral (56%). The majority were white (90%) and either in part-time (16%) or full-time (43%) work.

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 related 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). Recent studies have demonstrated that this instrument functions well in church-related contexts. For example, Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported alpha coefficients of .83 for the EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale. Participants were asked for each pair of characteristics to check the 'box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if you feel both characteristics apply to you. Tick the characteristics that reflect the real you, even if other people see you differently'.

Data analysis

The research literature concerning the empirical investigation of psychological type has developed a highly distinctive method for analysing, handling, and displaying statistical

data in the form of 'type tables'. This convention has been adopted in the following presentation in order to integrate these new data within the established literature and to provide all the detail necessary for secondary analysis and further interpretation within the rich theoretical framework afforded by psychological type. Type tables have been designed to provide information about the sixteen discrete psychological types, about the four dichotomous preferences, about the six sets of pairs and temperaments, about the dominant types, and about the introverted and extraverted Jungian types. Commentary on this table will, however, be restricted to those aspects of the data strictly relevant to the research question. In the context of type tables the statistical significance of the difference between two groups is established by means of the selection ration index (I), an extension of chi-square (McCaulley, 1985).

Results

The eight indices of the Francis Psychological Type Scales all achieved satisfactory internal consistency reliability in terms of the alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951): extraversion and introversion, $\alpha = .80$; sensing and intuition, $\alpha = .71$; thinking and feeling, $\alpha = .70$; judging and perceiving, $\alpha = .77$.

- insert tables 1 and 2 about here -

Table 1 presents the type distribution for the 161 women engaged in the cathedral congregation. These data demonstrate preferences for introversion (57%) over extraversion (44%), for sensing (54%) over intuition (46%), for thinking (53%) over feeling (47%), and for judging (85%) over perceiving (15%). The hierarchy of dominant type preferences are dominant sensing (29%), followed by dominant intuition (29%), dominant feeling (21%), and dominant thinking (21%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, the four predominant types are INTJ (16%), ISTJ (14%), ISFJ (14%) and ESTJ (12%).

Table 1 also draws attention to the ways in which women engaged in the cathedral congregation differ from women engaged in parish church congregations. In terms of dichotomous preferences, significant differences emerge in the perceiving process (sensing and intuition) and in the judging process (thinking and feeling), but neither in the orientations (extraversion and introversion) nor in the attitudes (judging and perceiving). While in the church congregation 19% of the women preferred intuition, the proportion rose to 46% in the cathedral congregation. While in the church congregation 30% of the women preferred thinking, the proportion rose to 53% in the cathedral congregation. In terms of dominant type preferences, among women in the cathedral congregation, compared with church congregations, there are a higher proportion of dominant intuitive types (29% compared with 10%), and of dominant thinking types (21% compared with 14%), and lower proportions of dominant sensing types (29% compared with 42%) and dominant feeling types (21% compared with 35%). In terms of temperament theory, among women in the cathedral congregation there is a lower proportion of SJs (49% compared with 73%).

Table 2 presents the type distribution for the 120 men engaged in the cathedral congregation. These data demonstrate preferences for introversion (60%) over extraversion (40%), for sensing (59%) over intuition (41%), for thinking (58%) over feeling (43%) and for judging (86%) over perceiving (14%). The hierarchy of dominant type preferences are dominant sensing (29%), followed by dominant intuition (25%), dominant thinking (24%) and dominant feeling (22%). In terms of the 16 complete types, the four predominant types are ISTJ (18%), ESTJ (15%), INTJ (14%), and ESFJ (13%).

Table 2 also draws attention to the ways in which men engaged in the cathedral congregation differ from men engaged in parish church congregations. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, significant differences emerge in the perceiving process (sensing and intuition), but not in the judging process (thinking and feeling), the orientations

(extraversion and introversion) and the attitudes (judging and perceiving). While in the church congregations 22% of the men preferred intuition, the proportion rose to 41% in the cathedral congregation. In terms of dominant type preferences among men in the cathedral congregation, compared with church congregations, there is a higher proportion of dominant intuitive types (25% compared with 13%) and a lower proportion of dominant sensing types (29% compared with 49%). In terms of temperament theory, among men in the cathedral congregation there is a lower proportion of SJs (58% compared with 71%).

Conclusion

The research question addressed by the present study was framed against a body of knowledge concerning the psychological type profile of men and women attending Anglican church services in England reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011) and in light of the findings of Walker (2012) who reported on the psychological type profile of men and women attending carol services in an Anglican cathedral in England. Walker found that the cathedral carol service attracted higher proportions of intuitive types and thinking types. What is not clear from Walker's study is whether these differences in psychological type profile reflect the specific attraction of the carol service or may reflect the attraction of cathedral services more generally.

In order to address this research question data were provided by 120 men and 161 women aged twenty or over who attended the Sunday services in Southwark Cathedral on one Sunday during late September 2013. Three main conclusions emerge from these data set alongside the data provided by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011) provided by 1,169 men and 2,135 women who attended Anglican parish churches.

The first conclusion concerns the perceiving process. Compared with church congregations, the cathedral congregation attracted a higher proportion of intuitive types, not only at the carol service but also at the regular Sunday morning service. This finding may

suggest that some people who prefer intuition may deliberately seek out the cathedral in preference to the parish church. Intuitive types may be seeking a particular kind of worship environment for which the architecture, the ceremony and the music may all contribute an imaginative gateway into transcendence. Intuitive types may also be seeking a particular kind of teaching ministry in which questions may be more attractive than answers and a liberal interpretation of the Christian message may be more attractive than a conservative presentation (see Francis & Village, 2008).

The second conclusion concerns the judging process. Compared with church congregations, the cathedral attracted a higher proportion of thinking types. This was the case for both men and women at the regular Sunday morning service. This finding may suggest that some people who prefer thinking may deliberately seek out the cathedral in preference to the parish church. Thinking types may be seeking a particular kind of worship environment where the objective approach of the liturgy carries more weight than the relational activity of the participants. Thinking types may also be seeking a particular kind of teaching ministry in which more weight is given to the analysis of theological issues than to the human story within the gospel narrative (see Francis & Village, 2008).

The third conclusion concerns the temperaments. Compared with church congregations, the cathedral attracted a lower proportion of SJs, not only at the carol service but also at the regular Sunday morning service. The SJ temperament is styled by Oswald and Kroeger (1988) as the 'guardian'. Here are people who are concerned to safeguard the tradition and to resist innovation and change. Because the SJ temperament is so dominant in church congregations (accounting for over 70% of the participants), individuals shaped by other temperament preferences may find it difficult to feel that they really fit in with these congregations. In particular it is the NF and NT temperaments that seem to make their way from the local parish churches and into the cathedral congregation. In this sense cathedrals

may provide greater opportunities for innovation, experimentation, development and change than is the case in many parish churches. The fact, however, that over half of the people in cathedral congregations are shaped by SJ temperaments suggests plenty of opportunity for conflict, opposition and misunderstanding between the NF and NT tendency to welcome innovation and change and the SJ tendency to resist innovation and change.

The main limitation with the present study is that the data have been drawn from just one cathedral and it would be misleading to assume that Southwark Cathedral may be representative of all cathedrals. The findings are, nonetheless, intriguing and the study properly deserves replication within other cathedrals in order to test the generalisability of what has been found in this one place.

References

- Ball, I. L. (2008). Australian data on the distribution of psychological types. *Bulletin of Psychological Type, 31*, 53-55.
- Bramer, P. D. G., & Ross, C. F. J. (2012). Type patterns among evangelical Protestants in Ontario. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 997-1007.
- 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.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334.
- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990). Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members. *Journal of Psychological Type, 20*, 25-33.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2013). The psychological type profile of a church: A case study. *Comprehensive Psychology, 2*, 6.
- Francis, L. J., Annis, J., Robbins, M., ap Sion, T., & Williams, E. (2012). National heritage and spiritual awareness: A study in psychological type theory among visitors to St Davids Cathedral. In F-V. Anthony, & H-G. Ziebertz (Eds.), *Religious identity and national heritage: Empirical theological perspectives*. (pp. 123-147). Leiden: Brill.
- 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., 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., Mansfield, S., Williams, E., & Village, A. (2010). Applying psychological type theory to Cathedral visitors: A case study of two cathedrals in England and Wales. *Visitor Studies, 13*, 175-186.
- Francis, L. J., & Richter, P. (2007). *Gone for good? Church-leaving and returning in the twenty-first century*. Peterborough: Epworth.
- Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (2012). Not fitting in and getting out. Psychological type and congregational satisfaction among Anglican churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 1023-1035
- 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., 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., Williams, E., Annis, J., & Robbins, M. (2008). Understanding cathedral visitors: Psychological type and individual differences in experience and appreciation, *Tourism Analysis, 13*, 71-80.
- 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.
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

- Lewis, C. A. (2012). Psychological type, religion, and culture: Theoretical and empirical perspectives. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 817-821.
- McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The Selection Ratio Type Table: A research strategy for comparing type distributions. *Journal of Psychological Type, 10*, 46-56.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: 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. (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., & Francis, L.J. (2012). The psychological type profile of Australian Catholic congregations: Psychological theory and congregational studies. In A. W. Ata (Ed.), *Catholics and Catholicism in contemporary Australia: Challenges and achievements* (pp. 262-281). Melbourne, Victoria: David Lovell Publishing.
- Robbins, M., Francis, L.J., & Powell, R. (2012). Congregational bonding social capital and psychological type: An empirical enquiry among Australian churchgoers. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 1009-1022.
- 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.
- Village, A. (2011). Introduction to special section: Psychological type and Christian ministry. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 157-164.
- Village, A., Baker, S., & Howat, S. (2012). Psychological type profiles of churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 969-978.
- Walker, D (2012). O Come all ye thinking types: The wider appeal of the cathedral carol service. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 987-995.

Table 1

Type distribution for women in cathedral congregation compared with female churchgoers

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 22 (13.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.11 +++++ +++++ +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 22 (13.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.55** +++++ +++++ +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 11 (6.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.97* +++++ +++++ ++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 25 (15.5%) <i>I</i> = 6.13*** +++++ +++++ +++++ +	E <i>n</i> = 70 (43.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.86	I <i>n</i> = 91 (56.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	
				S <i>n</i> = 87 (54.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.67***	N <i>n</i> = 74 (46.0%) <i>I</i> = 2.45***	
				T <i>n</i> = 85 (52.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.75***	F <i>n</i> = 76 (47.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.68***	
				J <i>n</i> = 137 (85.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	P <i>n</i> = 24 (14.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	
				Pairs and Temperaments		
ISTP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.5%) <i>I</i> = 3.12* +++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.20 +	INFP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.36 +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.89 +	IJ <i>n</i> = 80 (49.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.15	IP <i>n</i> = 11 (6.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.07	EP <i>n</i> = 13 (8.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.99
				EJ <i>n</i> = 57 (35.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.83		
				ST <i>n</i> = 45 (28.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.16	SF <i>n</i> = 42 (26.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.46***	NF <i>n</i> = 34 (21.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.65**
				NT <i>n</i> = 40 (24.8%) <i>I</i> = 4.17***		
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ESFP <i>n</i> = 3 (1.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.43 ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 6 (3.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.28 ++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.5%) <i>I</i> = 3.79** +++	SJ <i>n</i> = 79 (49.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.67***	SP <i>n</i> = 8 (5.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.59	NP <i>n</i> = 16 (9.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.64*
				NJ <i>n</i> = 58 (36.0%) <i>I</i> = 2.84***		
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 19 (11.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.10 +++++ +++++ +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 16 (9.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.40*** +++++ +++++ +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 13 (8.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.76* +++++ +++++ +++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 9 (5.6%) <i>I</i> = 2.65** +++++ +++++ +	TJ <i>n</i> = 75 (46.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.68***	TP <i>n</i> = 10 (6.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.60**	FP <i>n</i> = 14 (8.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.72
				FJ <i>n</i> = 62 (38.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.67***		
				IN <i>n</i> = 42 (26.1%) <i>I</i> = 3.07***	EN <i>n</i> = 32 (19.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.94***	IS <i>n</i> = 49 (30.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.74**
				ES <i>n</i> = 38 (23.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.59***		
				ET <i>n</i> = 32 (19.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.44*	EF <i>n</i> = 38 (23.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.64***	IF <i>n</i> = 38 (23.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.71*
				IT <i>n</i> = 53 (32.9%) <i>I</i> = 2.02***		

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	28	17.4	1.35	I-TP	6	3.7	2.56*	Dt.T	34	21.1	1.48*
E-FJ	29	18.0	0.61**	I-FP	5	3.1	0.63	Dt.F	34	21.1	0.61***
ES-P	3	1.9	0.41	IS-J	44	27.3	0.74*	Dt.S	47	29.2	0.70**
EN-P	10	6.2	1.74	IN-J	36	22.4	3.73***	Dt.N	46	28.6	2.99***

Note: N = 161

NB: + = 1% of N

* *p* < .05

** *p* < .01

*** *p* < .001

Table 2

Type distribution for men in cathedral congregation compared with male churchgoers

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences							
ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ	E	I	S					
<i>n</i> = 22 (18.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.64*	<i>n</i> = 13 (10.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.63	<i>n</i> = 8 (6.7%) <i>I</i> = 2.29*	<i>n</i> = 17 (14.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.24***	<i>n</i> = 48 (40.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.04	<i>n</i> = 72 (60.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.97	<i>n</i> = 71 (59.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.76***					
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	N	<i>n</i> = 49 (40.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.83***	<i>I</i> = 1.83***					
+++++	+++++	++	+++++	T	<i>n</i> = 69 (57.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.99	<i>I</i> = 0.99					
+++++	+		++++	F	<i>n</i> = 51 (42.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.01	<i>I</i> = 1.01					
+++				J	<i>n</i> = 103 (85.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	<i>I</i> = 1.00					
				P	<i>n</i> = 17 (14.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.02	<i>I</i> = 1.02					
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP	Pairs and Temperaments							
<i>n</i> = 1 (0.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.51	<i>n</i> = 1 (0.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.44	<i>n</i> = 4 (3.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.77	<i>n</i> = 6 (5.0%) <i>I</i> = 4.50***	IJ	<i>n</i> = 60 (50.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.91	<i>I</i> = 0.91					
+	+	+++	+++++	IP	<i>n</i> = 12 (10.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.54	<i>I</i> = 1.54					
				EP	<i>n</i> = 5 (4.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.57	<i>I</i> = 0.57					
				EJ	<i>n</i> = 43 (35.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.16	<i>I</i> = 1.16					
				ST	<i>n</i> = 41 (34.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.75*	<i>I</i> = 0.75*					
				SF	<i>n</i> = 30 (25.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.78	<i>I</i> = 0.78					
				NF	<i>n</i> = 21 (17.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.78**	<i>I</i> = 1.78**					
				NT	<i>n</i> = 28 (23.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.87***	<i>I</i> = 1.87***					
				SJ	<i>n</i> = 69 (57.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.81**	<i>I</i> = 0.81**					
				SP	<i>n</i> = 2 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.24*	<i>I</i> = 0.24*					
				NP	<i>n</i> = 15 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.80*	<i>I</i> = 1.80*					
				NJ	<i>n</i> = 34 (28.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.84***	<i>I</i> = 1.84***					
				TJ	<i>n</i> = 61 (50.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.97	<i>I</i> = 0.97					
				TP	<i>n</i> = 8 (6.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.16	<i>I</i> = 1.16					
				FP	<i>n</i> = 9 (7.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	<i>I</i> = 0.92					
				FJ	<i>n</i> = 42 (35.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	<i>I</i> = 1.03					
				IN	<i>n</i> = 35 (29.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.38***	<i>I</i> = 2.38***					
				EN	<i>n</i> = 14 (11.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.16	<i>I</i> = 1.16					
				IS	<i>n</i> = 37 (30.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.62***	<i>I</i> = 0.62***					
				ES	<i>n</i> = 34 (28.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	<i>I</i> = 1.00					
				ET	<i>n</i> = 23 (19.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.95	<i>I</i> = 0.95					
				EF	<i>n</i> = 25 (20.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.15	<i>I</i> = 1.15					
				IF	<i>n</i> = 26 (21.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	<i>I</i> = 0.90					
				IT	<i>n</i> = 46 (38.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.02	<i>I</i> = 1.02					
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	22	18.3	1.07	I-TP	7	5.8	2.13	Dt.T	29	24.2	1.21
E-FJ	21	17.5	1.27	I-FP	5	4.2	1.11	Dt.F	26	21.7	1.24
ES-P	0	0.0	0.00*	IS-J	35	29.2	0.63***	Dt.S	35	29.2	0.59***
EN-P	5	4.2	1.06	IN-J	25	20.8	2.26***	Dt.N	30	25.0	1.90***

Note: N = 120

NB: + = 1% of N

* *p* < .05

** *p* < .01

*** *p* < .001