

Original citation:

Walker, David Stuart. (2012) O Come all ye thinking types : the wider appeal of the cathedral carol service. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15 (10). pp. 987-995.

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/91605>

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 and Culture* on 9 August 2012, available online:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13674676.2012.707436>

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

O Come all ye thinking types: the wider appeal of the cathedral carol service

David Walker

Glyndwr University

Author note:

David S. Walker

Bishop's House

Bishop's Walk

Cradley Heath B64 7RH United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)121 550 3407

Email: bishop.david@cofe-worcester.org.uk

Abstract

Psychological type profiles of Anglican clergy and of Anglican congregations routinely direct attention to the over-representation of feeling types, and to the consequent under-representation of thinking types. The present study of 164 men and 239 women who completed the Francis Psychological Types Scales in the context of a cathedral carol service found a higher proportion of thinking types in this congregation than in the regular Sunday congregations of parish churches. The implications of these findings are discussed for the development of cathedral ministry.

Keywords: religion, psychological type, cathedrals, Christian

Introduction

Church of England cathedrals have in recent years been experiencing a period of sustained growth, with average Sunday attendances up by some 37% over a ten year period (Archbishops' Council, 2011). Against this background a number of studies of cathedrals and their ministry have sought to investigate the nature of their reach using a variety of techniques including those from the field of Psychology of Religion (see for example Walker, in press, a). The aim of this present paper is to test the power of psychological type theory in order to add depth to the understanding of cathedral ministry.

The distinctive feature of psychological type theory, within the broader field of models of personality, is that rather than locate individuals at points along a continuum it seeks to conceptualise the four aspects of the human psyche (the perceiving and judging processes, the orientations and attitudes) by way of polar opposites. Instruments such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI: Myers & McCauley, 1985) and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005) use a series of forced choice questions in order to assign each individual to one or other type for each of the 4 scales: orientation (introvert or extravert); judging process (thinking or feeling); perceiving process (sensing or intuition); attitudes (judging or perceiving). Psychological type theory can be used in this way to compare and contrast populations.

The application of psychological type theory to the study of Anglican churchgoers has looked both at clergy and at their congregations, comparing them with each other and with the wider population norms for the UK described by Kendall (1998). Francis, Robbins and Craig (2011) list a number of findings in earlier research which suggest that, compared with UK population norms, among male Anglican clergy there are considerably higher proportions of intuitives, feelers and judgers (research into female clergy being necessarily at an earlier stage as women have only been ordained in UK Anglican churches for a relatively short

period). Reporting on a sample of 2135 women and 1169 men attending Anglican church services in England who completed the FPTS questionnaire Francis, Robbins and Craig (2011) found that the women there displayed significantly higher proportions of introverts and judgers than in the general population, but no significant differences in terms of the preferences for sensing/intuiting or feeling/thinking. By contrast analysis of the men showed higher proportions of introverts, sensors, feelers and judgers than in the country at large. The most important aspect of these findings concerns the over-representation of feeling types and the under-representation of thinking types among both clergy and congregations.

Francis, Robbins and Craig (2011) give a brief description of the difference between the thinking and feeling type:

For thinking types the preferred way of judging is through objective analysis and dispassionate logic. They are concerned with the good running of systems and organisations and put such strategic issues first. They are logical and fair-minded people who are attracted to the God of justice. (p. 244)

By contrast:

For feeling types the preferred way of judging is through subjective evaluation and personal involvement. They are concerned with good relationships between people and put such inter-personal issues first. They are humane and warm-hearted people who are attracted to the God of mercy. (p. 244)

Kendall's (1998) figures show for the general population some 35% of men are feeling type along with 70% of women, this is by far the largest difference between the sexes on any of the four scales; none of the others exceeds 10%. Hence it is easy to see why an environment containing a high proportion of feeling types might be characterised as feminised. In consequence it may be argued that the environment of an Anglican church in the UK, where approximately two thirds of congregation members are women on a typical

Sunday is distinctly feminised. To this must be added the discrepancy between the male clergy who lead many services and men in general, where two separate studies of male clergy type (Francis, Robbins, Duncan and Whinney, 2010 and Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley and Slater, 2007) found the proportion of feeling types to be 54% and 56% respectively on samples of over 600 in each case. Male churchgoers are presented with predominantly feeling types both in the pews around them and leading the worship.

Research question

The Cathedral carol service has a shape and structure distinct from that of most Anglican acts of worship; it contains less by way of congregational participation and both the formal structure and lack of sermon much reduce the opportunity for those leading it to express their personalities. It has been seen in previous studies to attract younger people, a high proportion of both occasional churchgoers and of men and to have a distinctive profile in terms of religious orientation (Walker, in press, b). The aim of the present study is to examine whether the Cathedral carol service also provides an environment that is less skewed towards the feeling types?

Method

Procedure

A sample of 239 women and 164 men completed a survey distributed on arrival at two Carol services on consecutive nights in Worcester Cathedral in December 2009. Participants were encouraged to complete the survey whilst waiting for the service to commence and to hand it in to a steward before leaving. Pencils were provided. Participation was anonymous. Approximately one third of the total attendees completed the survey sufficiently thoroughly to be included in the analysis of the data.

Instrument

Respondents were invited to complete The Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005), an instrument comprised of 40 forced-choice questions of which 10 explore each of the four aspects of psychological type theory. Previous studies have shown that this instrument is reliable in church related contexts with alpha coefficients all above the .65 threshold.

Sample

With 239 females and 164 males the sample contained 41% men, somewhat higher than most Anglican congregations, where a ratio of about two women per man is common. The cathedral carol service congregation included a wide age spread. Some 18% were below the age of 30 and almost a quarter (23%) between 30 and 49. The greatest concentration was in the 50 to 69 age band which represented just over half (52%) of the sample. Only 8% were aged 70 or over. By comparison with other samples of Anglican churchgoers (see for example Francis, 1996) this showed a much higher proportion of younger adults. This was also a group of people with a wide range of patterns of church attendance: almost half (46%) claimed to go to church less than six times a year whilst around a third (32%) said that they attend nearly every week or more often; the remainder chose to indicate either at least six times a year or at least monthly. This indicated that the cathedral carol service was reaching out both to regular churchgoers and to those who are at best very infrequent attendees. This distinct attendance profile (more men, more young people, many occasional churchgoers) suggests that the service has a distinct appeal which may well extend to psychological type.

Data analysis

In conformity with standard practice in the research literature, the results of the FPTs survey are displayed in the form of 'type tables'. These provide considerably more information about the sample than is necessary for the current study, which will concentrate largely on the dichotomous preferences of the respondents, but their presentation in this

standard form will facilitate secondary analysis and further interpretation. Because of the wide differences in psychological type between women and men in the general population, the tables are presented and interpreted separately for each sex. In these type tables the psychological type profile of those attending the cathedral carol service is set against the profile of Anglican churchgoers reported by Francis, Robbins and Craig (2011), and the statistical significance between the two groups is tested by the self-selection index reported by Myers and McCauley (1985).

Results

The carol service sample

Table 1 sets out the results for the 239 women who took part in the survey, comparing them with the data for the churchgoers. The figures demonstrate clear preferences for judging (85%) over perceiving (15%), for feeling (61%) over thinking (39%), and for sensing (73%) over intuiting (27%), and they also show a slight preference for extraversion (54%) over introversion (46%).

- insert tables 1 and 2 around here -

Table 2 sets out the data for the 164 men who took part in the survey, in the same format. The figures for the men show clear preferences in each of the 4 areas: for introversion (59%), sensing (70%), thinking (69%) and judging (84%).

Comparison with Anglican churchgoers

For women, the orientations of the sample show no significant difference from female churchgoers (51% extraverts). The attitudes of the sample are even closer to the figures reported for female churchgoers with 85% of both samples as judging types. A distinct pattern does, however, emerge with regard to the two processes. For the perceiving process 73% were characterised as preferring sensing compared with 81% of female churchgoers, a significantly smaller proportion, and for the judging process the proportion of thinking types

is considerably higher (39%) than for female churchgoers (30%). In terms of dominant types there are significantly more dominant thinkers and intuitives (19% and 14% respectively) in the carol service congregation than among churchgoers (14% and 10%).

For men, in terms of the orientations there is little difference between the cathedral congregation (42% extraverts) and male churchgoers (38%). The two attitudes again show no significant difference between 84% preferring judging in the cathedral sample and 86% among male churchgoers. The two processes do, as with women, show significant differences from the male churchgoers. For the perceiving process the sample contained a higher proportion of intuitives (30%) compared with male churchgoers (22%). For the judging process the proportion of thinking types (69%) was again significantly higher than for male churchgoers (58%). In terms of dominant types, the proportion of dominant thinkers (28%) was, as for women, significantly higher than in the churchgoing sample (20%) but the percentage for intuitives (14%) was not significantly above that among churchgoers (13%).

Comparison with population norms

Whilst the full type tables comparing the cathedral carol service congregation with the population norms established by Kendall (1998) are not reproduced in the present paper, the figures were calculated and a number of statistically significant differences were found.

For women, the proportion of judging types (85%) at the carol service was significantly higher than the population norm (62%) ($p < .001$). With regard to the two processes, 73% of women in the sample preferred sensing compared with 79% in the population ($p < .05$) and 39% preferred thinking compared with 30% in the whole population ($p < .01$). For men there was a higher proportion of judging types in the sample (84%) compared with the wider male population (55%, $p < .001$). In all other cases the carol service samples did not show significant differences from the population at large.

Discussion

From the results above it is now possible to compare the overall patterns with respect to psychological type of those attending the cathedral carol service with the patterns for regular Anglican churchgoers. One hypothesis for finding a different pattern would be that, as the cathedral congregation takes almost a half of its attendance from among those who only rarely go to church, the personality type results should fall somewhere in between the churchgoer and population norms. However, the brief population comparisons above show that, whilst this is true for both men and women in terms of the orientations, it is not so for any of the other three components. In particular, there are significantly more women thinkers and intuitives at the carol service than in either the congregation sample or the population norm, whilst for both sexes the proportion of judging types was aligned with the congregational figure. The cathedral carol service is attracting a distinct congregation, not simply mixing the norms for churchgoers and others.

For the perceiving process, in comparison with church congregations, the cathedral carol service attracts a significantly higher proportion of those who prefer intuition over sensing, and does so among both men and women. There are two distinct dimensions to the carol service. First, it is a performance with very high production values; a professional quality choir and organist undertake a wide range of music pieces whilst moving around an evocatively lit Grade 1 listed ancient building. There is much for the person who perceives through the senses to engage with. At the same time, the lessons and carols tell 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; a process that fits well with an intuitive style.

The results of this survey suggest that this second and more intuitive aspect of the service reaches out to those who are not touched by the normal fare of Anglican worship. Moreover, it should encourage cathedrals in their ministry as evidence that they are not

simply putting on an aesthetic spectacle, but are drawing worshippers into the contemplation of the Christmas mystery.

For both men and women the proportions of those who prefer thinking over feeling as their judging process and whose dominant preference is for thinking, were significantly above the congregation norms; for women the figure was also significantly above the population norm. At first glance it is not at all obvious why a cathedral carol service should appeal to those who prefer 'objective analysis and dispassionate logic' to 'good relationships and interpersonal issues'. It may be important here to set the cathedral carol service within the wider context of Christmas worship. Apart from the Carol Service, the other special services offered around Christmas in Anglican parishes comprise predominantly of Christingle Services, Nativity Services, Family Services and Midnight Mass. When compared with the structure of the Carol Service each of these might be seen to have a more strongly relational atmosphere. Hence it is plausible that the carol service provides a distinctive opportunity which, whilst it makes no direct appeal to logic or analysis, is not couched in a context of emotional and relational engagement and that a service that is not cast in a 'feeling' idiom will attract the thinking type even without the need to cater explicitly for their preferred judging process.

To this should be added the findings of Francis, Robbins and Craig (2011) reported above in relation to Anglican clergy. Over half of male Anglican clergy were seen to have a feeling preference. Alongside this, the increasing numbers of women clergy are drawn from a population with around 70% sharing this preference. Moreover their congregations are made up of men and women who also show a greater preference for feeling than the cathedral sample (42% and 70% respectively). Such data suggest the likelihood that Anglican church services are largely planned and led by feeling types who will have a predisposition to assume that the idiom that works for them is the one to use when devising special occasions.

Behind the questions as to how to plan and lead a carol service in order to attract the types discussed above lurks another. Is the church or cathedral satisfied that on a very occasional basis it is able to extend its reach to include these individuals, or does it wish to draw them into more regular and frequent attendance at worship? For whilst some may be more strongly drawn at Christmas as a respite from the heavily 'feeling' idiom of the secular as well as religious celebration, others may simply find most other church services fail to meet the needs of their psychological type. For those who take the viewpoint that there are at least some potential regular churchgoers who should be reached out to, this paper suggests they should be looking to construct other church services through the year that will match the type appeal of the carol service.

Conclusions

This paper has demonstrated the value of using the construct of psychological type in order to investigate a very particular and relatively unusual service, yet one widely used in Anglican parishes in the UK. It has been seen that for both men and women a distinctive pattern can be observed in the congregation with respect to the perceiving and judging processes when compared to Sunday congregations, with both intuition and thinking more strongly supported.

It has been possible on this basis to reflect on the style of worship offered at the carol service, as well as its context within the celebration of Christmas both within and beyond church, and to see that a combination of the mysterious element of such worship and the avoidance of a style that favours feeling over thinking might be sufficient to attract types who are less drawn to Anglican Sunday worship.

From this issues arise as to the extent to which Anglican worship is planned by specific types for the likeminded, which should be the focus of further research. From a missional perspective it has also raised important questions as to whether churches are ready,

willing and able to add other services with a similar idiom into their programme and see if they also attract the same types as have been found at the carol service.

References

Archbishops' Council (2011). Church of England Cathedrals: headline mission statistics 2010.

<http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1243690/cathedralattendances2000to2010.pdf> (accessed 230412).

Francis, L.J. (1996). *Church watch*. London: SPCK.

Francis, L.J. (2005). *Faith and psychology*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.

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. Robbins, M., Duncan, B., & Whinney, M. (2010). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in England: A ministry for intuitives. In B. Ruelas and V. Brisero (Eds.), *Psychology of intuition* (pp. 211-219). New York: Nova Science.

Francis, L.J., Robbins, M., & Craig, C (2011). The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: Compatible or incompatible with their clergy? *International Journal of Practical Theology, 15*, 243-259.

Kendall, E. (1998), *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Myers, I.B. & McCauley, M.H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs type indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Walker, D.S. (in press,a), Attending the Service of Nine Lessons and Carols at a rural cathedral: An empirical study in religious orientation and motivational style,

Walker, D.S. (in press, b), Attending *The Festival of Nine Lessons and Carols* at the cathedral: a celebration of Christian commitment?

Table 1

Type distribution for female cathedral sample compared with churchgoer norms

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 33 (13.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.12 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 44 (18.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.75*	INFJ <i>n</i> = 8 (3.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.96 +++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 10 (4.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.65 ++++	E <i>n</i> = 130 (54.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.08	I <i>n</i> = 109 (45.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	
				S <i>n</i> = 175 (73.2%) ** <i>I</i> = 0.90	N <i>n</i> = 64 (26.8%) ** <i>I</i> = 1.43	
				T <i>n</i> = 94 (39.3%) ** <i>I</i> = 1.31	F <i>n</i> = 145 (60.7%) ** <i>I</i> = 0.87	
				J <i>n</i> = 203 (84.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.99	P <i>n</i> = 36 (15.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.04	
The Sixteen Complete Types				Pairs and Temperaments		
ISTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.52	ISFP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.54 ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 7 (2.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.60 +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.27 +	IJ <i>n</i> = 95 (39.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	IP <i>n</i> = 14 (5.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	EP <i>n</i> = 22 (9.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.13
				EJ <i>n</i> = 108 (45.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.07		
				ST <i>n</i> = 72 (30.1%) * <i>I</i> = 1.25	SF <i>n</i> = 103 (43.1%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.75	NF <i>n</i> = 42 (17.6%) * <i>I</i> = 1.37
				NT <i>n</i> = 22 (9.2%) * <i>I</i> = 1.55		
ESTP <i>n</i> = 3 (1.3%) <i>I</i> = 4.46*	ESFP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.39*	ENFP <i>n</i> = 13 (5.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.87*	ENTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.27 +	SJ <i>n</i> = 163 (68.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.94	SP <i>n</i> = 12 (5.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.59	NP <i>n</i> = 24 (10.0%) * <i>I</i> = 1.66
				NJ <i>n</i> = 40 (16.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.32		
				TJ <i>n</i> = 86 (36.0%) ** <i>I</i> = 1.30	TP <i>n</i> = 8 (3.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.40	FP <i>n</i> = 28 (11.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.96
				FJ <i>n</i> = 117 (49.0%) ** <i>I</i> = 0.85		
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 35 (14.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.36 +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 51 (21.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.85 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 14 (5.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.27 +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 8 (3.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.59 +++	IN <i>n</i> = 27 (11.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.33	EN <i>n</i> = 37 (15.5%) * <i>I</i> = 1.51	IS <i>n</i> = 82 (34.3%) * <i>I</i> = 0.84
				ES <i>n</i> = 93 (38.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.97		
				ET <i>n</i> = 48 (20.1%) ** <i>I</i> = 1.46	EF <i>n</i> = 82 (34.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.93	IF <i>n</i> = 63 (26.4%) * <i>I</i> = 0.80
				IT <i>n</i> = 46 (19.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.18		

	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	43	18.0	1.40*	I-TP	3	1.3	0.86	Dt.T	46	19.2	1.35*
E-FJ	65	27.2	0.92	I-FP	11	4.6	0.93	Dt.F	76	31.8	0.92
ES-P	7	2.9	0.64	IS-J	77	32.2	0.87	Dt.S	84	35.1	0.84
EN-P	15	6.3	1.76*	IN-J	18	7.5	1.26	Dt.N	33	13.8	1.44*

Note: N = 239; + = 1% of N;

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

Table 2

Type distribution for male cathedral sample compared with churchgoer norms

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 46 (28.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.98 +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 20 (12.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.71 +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 2 (1.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.42 +	INTJ <i>n</i> = 15 (9.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.44 +++++ +++++	E <i>n</i> = 68 (41.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.08	I <i>n</i> = 96 (58.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.95	S <i>n</i> = 115 (70.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	N <i>n</i> = 49 (29.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.34
ISTP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.50 ++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.32 +	INFP <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.97 +	INTP <i>n</i> = 5 (3.0%) <i>I</i> = 2.74* +++	J <i>n</i> = 137 (83.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.97	P <i>n</i> = 27 (16.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.19	Pairs and Temperaments	
ESTP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.78 ++	ESFP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.19 ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.06 ++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.75 +	IJ <i>n</i> = 83 (50.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	IP <i>n</i> = 13 (7.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.22	EP <i>n</i> = 14 (8.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.16	EJ <i>n</i> = 54 (32.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.06
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 23 (14.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.02 +++++ +++++ +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 13 (7.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.72 +++++ +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 4 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.89 ++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 14 (8.5%) <i>I</i> = 2.49** +++++	ST <i>n</i> = 77 (47.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	SF <i>n</i> = 38 (23.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.72	NF <i>n</i> = 13 (7.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.81	NT <i>n</i> = 36 (22.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.76
				SJ <i>n</i> = 102 (62.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.88	SP <i>n</i> = 13 (7.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	NP <i>n</i> = 14 (8.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.23	NJ <i>n</i> = 35 (21.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.39
				TJ <i>n</i> = 98 (59.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.15	TP <i>n</i> = 15 (9.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.60	FP <i>n</i> = 12 (7.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	FJ <i>n</i> = 39 (23.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.70
				IN <i>n</i> = 25 (15.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.25	EN <i>n</i> = 24 (14.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.45	IS <i>n</i> = 71 (43.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.88	ES <i>n</i> = 44 (26.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.95
				ET <i>n</i> = 43 (26.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.30	EF <i>n</i> = 25 (15.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.84	IF <i>n</i> = 26 (15.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.66	IT <i>n</i> = 70 (42.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.13

	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	37	22.6	1.31	I-TP	9	5.5	2.00	Dt.T	46	28.0	1.41*
E-FJ	17	10.4	0.75	I-FP	4	2.4	0.65	Dt.F	21	12.8	0.73
ES-P	8	4.9	1.43	IS-J	66	40.2	0.88	Dt.S	74	45.1	0.91
EN-P	6	3.7	0.93	IN-J	17	10.4	1.12	Dt.N	23	14.0	1.06

Note: N = 164; + = 1% of N;

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