

**Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript**

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

**Persistent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/148131>

**How to cite:**

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

**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:**

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

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

The psychological type profile of Salvation Army officers working within the  
United Kingdom: Diversity, strengths, and weaknesses in ministry

Tomos G. ap Sion

University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Scotland

Leslie J. Francis\*

Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research

University of Warwick, Coventry, England

Author note:

\*Corresponding author:

Leslie J. Francis

Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research (CEDAR)

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Email: [leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk)

### **Abstract**

This study draws on psychological type theory that has its origins in the work of Carl Jung to explore the psychological profile of Salvation Army officers serving within the UK. Data provided on the Francis Psychological Type Scales by 269 female officers and by 165 male officers draw attention to the distinctive psychological characteristics of these officers and to the ways in which they differ from the population of the UK as a whole. The female officers show clear preference for introversion (68%), sensing (75%), feeling (66%), and judging (86%). The male officers show clear preference for introversion (76%), sensing (62%), thinking (60%), and judging (86%). This study discusses the strengths brought to active ministry by these psychological characteristics, but also draws attention to the weaknesses and vulnerabilities.

*Keywords:* psychology, religion, Salvation Army, ministry, clergy

## **Introduction**

Psychological type theory, as conceived by Jung (1923) and refined by Myers and Myers (1980) and by Myers and McCaulley (1985), provides a structure for understanding and explaining the observed similarities and differences between individuals, suggesting that seemingly chance surface behavioural characteristics observed within individuals can be interpreted as manifestations of a few deep-seated covert differences in psychological type.

Within a Christian context, psychological type theory has been widely applied to inform both research and practice. This is evidenced by, but is not limited to, the following applications of psychological type theory within the Christian context. Psychological type theory has been applied to help deepen Christian self-knowledge (Francis & Jones 1998, 2000; Repicky, 1981), to help explore theological differences among Christians (Francis, 2005; Osborn & Osborn, 1991), to help shape styles of prayer (Clarke, 1983; Fowke, 1997; Martínez, 2001; Michael & Norrisey, 1984; Ware, Knapp, & Schwarzin, 1989), to help guide the interpretation and proclamation of scripture (Francis, 2003; Francis & Atkins, 2000, 2001, 2002;), to help understand congregation compositions and dynamics (Craig et al., 2003; Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1993, 1995; Francis et al., 2004), to help address work-related psychological health among clergy (Brewster, Francis, & Robbins, 2011; Francis & Crea, 2015; Francis, Payne, & Robbins, 2013; Robbins, Francis, & Powell, 2012; ), and to help understand and develop Christian leaders (Francis & Whinney, 2019; Francis, Whinney, & Robbins, 2013; Osborne, 2016; Oswald & Kroeger, 1988; Ross & Francis, 2020).

One particular area of research in which psychological type theory has been widely applied is in the characterisation of the psychological type profiles of individuals who constitute identifiable groups, as defined, for example, by occupation, professional position, current course in education, and life context. Examples of this tradition can be seen in studies of the psychological type profiles of managers and leaders (Hautala, 2008; Hawkins,

Williams, & Hawkins, 1990; Reynierse & Harker, 1995;), higher education students (Capretz, 2008; Chesborough, 2009; Zimmerman, 2001), and professional occupations, including teachers (Francis, 2006; Provost, Carson, & Beidler, 1987; Willing, Guest, & Morford, 2001;), health and wellbeing professionals (Daub et al., 2000; Henderson & Harris, 1991; Shewchuk & O'Connor, 1995;), and accountants (Scarborough, 1993; Stetson, 2007).

Within this context, previous studies focusing on religious professionals serving in the UK have mapped the psychological type profiles of Anglican clergy serving in the Church of England (Francis et al., 2007; Goldsmith & Wharton, 1993;), Presbyterian clergy serving in the Church of Scotland (Irvine, 1989), male Anglican clergy serving in the Church in Wales (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001; Payne & Lewis, 2015), male church leaders from a range of evangelical denominations (Francis & Robbins, 2002), and Methodist circuit ministers serving in England (Burton, Francis, & Robbins, 2010).

Working within this research tradition, the present study aims to report data on the psychological type profile of Salvation Army officers in the UK, and to explore the implications of these data for potential strengths and weaknesses relevant for their work and ministry. This aim will be fulfilled through the following four objectives. First, this study will introduce psychological type theory. Second, this study will review what is currently known about the psychological type profiles of religious professionals in the UK. Third, this study will establish the psychological type profiles of Salvation Army officers serving in the UK, comparing these profiles with the psychological type profiles of the UK general population. Finally, this study will reflect on the implications of these data for the Salvation Army's work and mission, focusing on the psychological type profiles of Salvation Army officers, and on how the psychological type profiles of Salvation Army officers differ from that of the wider UK population, and on how the psychological type profiles of Salvation Army officers differ from that of other religious professionals serving in the UK.

### **Introducing psychological type theory**

Psychological type theory identifies four dichotomous psychological preferences that are hypothesised to have an observable impact on behaviours. The four psychological preferences are: extraversion (E) and introversion (I), sensing (S) and intuition (N), thinking (T) and feeling (F), and judging (J) and perceiving (P). Each of these four dichotomous preferences of psychological type theory can then be combined to form a four-letter designation that is referred to as a *complete psychological type* (for example, INTP – **I**ntroversion, **i**Ntuition, **T**hinking, **P**erceiving).

Extraversion (E) and introversion (I) describe the two *orientations* related to where individuals primarily invest and gain psychological energy, either internally in their own minds or externally in the world of people and things. Extraverts prefer to root themselves in the world external to their own minds, prioritising external action over prior internal reflection. They usually prefer to learn through trial and error. They often enjoy socially energetic environments, disliking long periods of silence and solitude. They often prefer to vocalise and discuss problems and ideas rather than to reflect on matters privately. They tend to be open and talkative individuals who are easy to get to know. Introverts, in contrast, prefer to root themselves in their own minds, prioritising internal reflection over external action. They usually prefer to learn and understand things through reading and quiet reflection. They enjoy peaceful and quiet environments that facilitate reflection. They often feel tired after prolonged interaction with other people. They tend to appear reserved and can be difficult to get to know.

Sensing (S) and intuition (N) describe the two *functions* related to the way in which individuals use their perceiving process, the way they acquire information. Sensing types prefer to prioritise information acquired directly through their five senses, focusing on the data directly perceived. They tend to focus on the specific details of a situation rather than on

the bigger picture, disliking abstract ideas and concepts that are not strictly factual. They are often practical, preferring the established and the conventional rather than the unknown and untested. They tend to gravitate towards traditional approaches that have been established through experience. Intuitive types, in contrast, prefer to prioritise information acquired indirectly through the use of their unconscious mind, focusing on the possibilities and relationships perceived. They tend to focus on the bigger picture rather than on the specific facts of a situation, developing a keen insight into complexity as well as abstract and theoretical concepts. They are often imaginative, preferring to explore the unknown and bringing change to established conventions. They are often inspired by the possibilities they perceive, sometimes making them seem like idealistic dreamers.

Thinking (T) and feeling (F) describe the two *functions* related to the way in which individuals use their judging process, the way they evaluate information and make judgments. Thinking types prefer to make judgments using objective and analytical logic, preferring to be emotionally detached and impartial when evaluating information. This leads to a preference for being fair and candid when making judgments, and to the prioritisation of honesty and directness over tactfulness when interacting with others. A focus on objective and analytical logic enables thinking types to excel at making tough decisions by allowing them to be distanced, reasonable, and unbiased. Feeling types, in contrast, prefer to make judgments utilising personal and subjective values, recognising what is of value to themselves and others. This leads to a preference for being considerate of other people's feelings and values when making judgments, usually resulting in the prioritisation of harmony and tactfulness over truth and honesty. A focus on personal and subjective values enables feeling types to excel at making decisions that may try to satisfy everyone.

Judging (J) and perceiving (P) describe the two dichotomous *processes* as directed toward the external world; this index draws attention to the two different ways in which

people engage with the world around them. Judging types prefer to engage with the world around them through the use of their preferred judging *function* (either thinking or feeling). This predisposes judging types to prefer organisation and planning in their external lives. When interacting with the outside world they tend not to be satisfied until a decision has been made. Once they have made a decision, they usually prefer not to revise that decision. This preference enables them to be punctual and organised, and as a consequence they may find unexpected disruptions to their plans uncomfortable. Perceiving types, in contrast, prefer to engage with the world around them through the use of their preferred perceiving *function* (either sensing or intuition). This predisposes perceiving types to prefer flexibility and openness in their lives, reflected in a more explorative and spontaneous approach to life. When interacting with the outside world they prefer to not make fixed decisions, leaving decisions open for further improvement and refinement. This often enables them to be adaptive and good at dealing with the unexpected, and as a consequence they may find schedules restrictive and deadlines hard to meet.

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

Focusing on the psychological type profile of Christian clergy within the UK, seven studies are of particular interest. An early study by Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) provides a limited report on the psychological type profiles of four samples of Anglican clergy in the UK. Their study does not provide full details on the number of participants, the backgrounds of the participants, or the details of the 16 complete psychological types within their samples. Within their first sample, labelled curates in a British province, they reported that 71% of the curates preferred introversion over extraversion, 52% preferred sensing over intuition, 60% preferred feeling over thinking, and 55% preferred judging over perceiving. Within their second sample, labelled as clergy involved in post-ordination training in a single English diocese, they reported that 62% of the clergy preferred introversion over extraversion, 74%



preferred intuition over sensing, 64% preferred feeling over thinking, and 70% preferred judging over perceiving. Within their third sample, labelled as clergy involved in post-ordination training in another English diocese, they reported that 67% of the clergy preferred introversion over extraversion, 67% preferred intuition over sensing, 56% preferred feeling over thinking, and 72% preferred judging over perceiving. Within their fourth sample, labelled as clergy in an English diocese, 69% preferred introversion over extraversion, 72% preferred intuition over sensing, 72% preferred feeling over thinking, and 66% preferred judging over perceiving. Taken together these findings suggest that generally higher numbers of Anglican clergy may present as introverts, intuitive types, feeling types, and judging types.

In a more fully documented study, Francis et al. (2007) reported on the psychological type profiles of a sample of 626 male Anglican clergy and 237 female Anglican clergy who participated within a wide range of personal and professional development programmes within England. Within the sample of male Anglican clergy, Francis et al. (2007) reported that 57% of male clergy preferred introversion over extraversion, 62% preferred intuition over sensing, 54% preferred feeling over thinking, and 68% preferred judging over perceiving. The three predominant types reported within the sample of male clergy were INTJ (11%), INFP (10%), and ISTJ (10%). Within the sample of female Anglican clergy, they reported that 54% of female clergy preferred introversion over extraversion, 65% preferred intuition over sensing, 74% preferred feeling over thinking, and 65% preferred judging over perceiving. The three predominant types reported within the sample of female clergy were ENFJ (15%), INFP (14%), and ISFJ (12%). These findings, reported separately for male and female clergy tend to support the earlier findings of Goldsmith and Wharton (1993).

Irvine (1989) presented the psychological type profile of a sample of 147 Presbyterian clergy serving in the Church of Scotland. Irvine's study does not include details of the 16

complete psychological types within his sample. Irvine (1989) reported within his sample that 58% of the clergy preferred introversion over extraversion, 61% preferred sensing over intuition, 69% preferred feeling over thinking, and 72% preferred judging over perceiving.

Francis, Payne, and Jones (2001) presented the psychological type profile of a sample of 427 male Anglican clergy serving in the Church in Wales. Francis, Payne, and Jones (2001) reported within their sample that 59% of the clergymen preferred introversion over extraversion, 57% preferred sensing over intuition, 69% preferred feeling over thinking, and 68% preferred judging over perceiving. The three predominant types reported within this sample were ISFJ (20%), ESFJ (13%), and ISTJ (10%).

Supporting the initial findings reported by Francis, Payne, and Jones (2001), Payne and Lewis (2015) presented the psychological type profile of another sample of 268 male Anglican clergy serving in the Church in Wales. Payne and Lewis (2015) confirm within their sample that male clergy in the Church in Wales prefer introversion (65%) over extraversion, sensing (57%) over intuition, feeling (68%) over thinking, and judging (78%) over perceiving. The three predominant types discovered within this sample were ISFJ (22%), ISTJ (13%), and ESFJ (11%).

Francis and Robbins (2002) presented the psychological type profile of a sample of 57 male church leaders from a range of evangelical denominations. Francis and Robbins (2002) reported within their sample that 51% of the church leaders preferred introversion over extraversion, 53% preferred sensing over intuition, 56% preferred feeling over thinking, and 68% preferred judging over perceiving. The predominant types discovered within this sample were ESFJ (18%) and ISFJ (11%).

Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010) presented the psychological type profiles of 693 male Methodist circuit ministers and 311 female Methodist circuit ministers in England. Within the sample of male Methodist circuit ministers, Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010)

reported that 61% preferred introversion over extraversion, 54% preferred sensing over intuition, 64% preferred feeling over thinking, and 70% preferred judging over perceiving. The three predominant types reported within the sample of male Methodist circuit ministers were ISFJ (18%), ISTJ (11%), and ESFJ (10%). Within the sample of female Methodist circuit ministers, they reported that 53% preferred introversion over extraversion, 52% preferred sensing over intuition, 77% preferred feeling over thinking, and 70% preferred judging over perceiving. The three predominant types reported within the sample of female Methodist circuit ministers were ISFJ (19%), ESFJ (15%), and ENFJ (10%).

Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010), Francis et al. (2007), Francis, Payne, and Jones (2001), Francis and Robbins (2002), Goldsmith and Wharton (1993), Irvine (1989), and Payne and Lewis (2015) all suggest that religious professionals serving within the UK tend to prefer introversion over extraversion, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving. It seems, however, that location as well as denomination might have an impact on whether these religious professionals prefer sensing or intuition as their perceiving function.

Focusing on the discrepancies in the perceiving process among the studies, paying particular attention to location, two of the studies conducted by Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) and the study conducted by Francis et al. (2007) suggest that clergy serving within the Church of England prefer intuition over sensing. Irvine (1989) suggests that clergy serving in the Church of Scotland prefer sensing over intuition. Francis, Payne, and Jones (2001) and Payne and Lewis (2015) suggest that clergy serving in the Church in Wales also prefer sensing over intuition. As such, it seems that clergy serving in the Church of England prefer intuition over sensing, while clergy serving in the Church of Scotland and the Church in Wales prefer sensing over intuition. As the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, and the Church in Wales are autonomous organisations, with their own selection procedures for clergy and their own ministry training programmes, it is possible that these organisations

employ different criteria for shaping Christian ministry and that such criteria either draw or discourage certain individuals, resulting in the different psychological type preferences visible in these data.

Focusing on the discrepancies in the perceiving process among the studies, paying particular attention to denomination, Francis and Robbins (2002) suggest that Evangelical church leaders in the UK prefer sensing over intuition. Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010) suggest that Methodist circuit ministers in the UK prefer sensing over intuition. Comparing these results with what we know about clergy serving in England, Scotland, and Wales a picture arises that indicates that religious professionals in the UK generally prefer sensing as their perceiving function, with the exception of clergy serving within the Church of England. It is possible that there could be additional factors found within different denominations that might draw or discourage certain individuals resulting in the pattern visible in these data, although further research is required to clarify these discrepancies.

### **Research aim**

Against this background, the aim of the current study is to build on the existing literature and to contribute to a richer and more diverse picture of the psychological type preferences of religious professionals in the UK by exploring the psychological type profile of this hitherto unexplored group of religious leaders; namely Salvation Army officers serving in the UK. The Salvation Army is an evangelical-based organisation which positions itself at the forefront of Christian social action (Busby, 2001, p. 59), aiming to transform the lives of individuals on a global scale (Busby, 2001, p. 61) and to focus on the needs of the poorest within society (Salvation Army, 2018a). Salvation Army officers play a fundamental role in the organisational, as well as spiritual leadership of the Salvation Army (Salvation Army, 2018b).

### **Method**

**Procedure**

As part of its 2018 annual conference for personnel engaged in active ministry in the UK, the Salvation Army invited all participants to complete a detailed survey on aspects of wellbeing and resilience in ministry. Participation was voluntary, anonymous and confidential. The administration of the survey was overseen by the Wellbeing Unit, and staff members from this unit were in attendance to answer questions about the survey, to encourage participation, and to deal with any personal issues raised by the survey in the minds of participants. The study received approval from the St Mary's Centre Ethics Committee (SMC17ECOO11).

**Instrument**

Psychological type was assessed by the 40-item Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS; Francis, 2005). The FPTS utilises a forced-choice format to determine an individual's preferences between the four dichotomous indices of psychological type theory: extraversion or introversion, sensing or intuition, thinking or feeling, and judging or perceiving. Francis, Laycock, and Brewster (2017, p. 935) support the factor structure and internal consistency reliability of the FPTS.

**Participants**

A total of 434 participants at the conference completed the FPTS, among whom 269 were female and 165 male; 2% of these participants were in their twenties, 11% in their thirties, 22% in their forties, 45% in their fifties, 20% in their sixties; 78% of these participants held a current appointment in the corps, 4% in chaplaincy, and 17% in headquarters.

**Analysis**

Within the scientific literature concerned with analysing and presenting psychological type data, the distinctive type tables provide information about the 16 complete 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. Inclusion of this full table facilitates detailed comparison with other studies established in the literature.

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 differences between two groups is established by means of the selection ratio index (*I*), an extension of chi-square (McCaulley, 1985). In tables 1 and 2 the data are displayed for the male and for the female Salvation Army officers who participated in the survey and these data are compared with the profile for the UK male and female population published by Kendall (1998).

### Results

- insert tables 1 and 2 about here -

The psychological type distribution of the 269 female Salvation Army officers is displayed in table 1. Focusing on the four dichotomous preferences, female Salvation Army officers display a clear preference for introversion over extraversion (68% compared with 32%), a clear preference for sensing over intuition (75% compared with 25%), a clear preference for feeling over thinking (66% compared with 34%), and a clear preference for judging over perceiving (86% compared with 14%). The three predominant complete types are ISFJ (32%), ISTJ (18%), and ESFJ (13%).

The psychological type distribution of the 165 male Salvation Army officers is displayed in table 2. Focusing on the four dichotomous preferences, male Salvation Army officers display a clear preference for introversion over extroversion (76% compared with 24%), a clear preference for sensing over intuition (62% compared with 38%), a clear preference for thinking over feeling (60% compared with 40%), and a clear preference for

judging over perceiving (86% compared with 15%). The three predominant complete types are ISTJ (32%), ISFJ (17%), and INTJ (10%).

Table 1 compares the psychological type distribution of female Salvation Army officers with the psychological type distribution of female UK population norms provided by Kendall (1998). Focusing on the four dichotomous preferences, female Salvation Army officers display significantly higher proportions of introversion (68% compared with 43%) and judging (86% compared with 62%) than are seen in the female population norms. Referencing the three predominant complete types, there are significantly more female Salvation Army officers preferring the complete types of ISFJ (32% compared with 18%), and ISTJ (18% compared with 9%) than are seen in the female population norms.

Table 2 compares the psychological type distribution of male Salvation Army officers with the psychological type distribution of male UK population norms provided by Kendall (1998). Focusing on the four dichotomous preferences, male Salvation Army officers display significantly higher proportions of introversion (76% compared with 53%), intuition (38% compared with 27%) and judging (86% compared with 55%) than are seen in the male population norms. Referencing the three predominant complete types, there are significantly more male Salvation Army officers preferring the complete types of ISTJ (32% compared with 20%), ISFJ (17% compared with 7%), and INTJ (10% compared with 3%) than are seen in the male population norms.

### **Discussion**

An analysis of the psychological type profiles of male and female Salvation Army officers leads to three main conclusions relevant for their work and ministry. The first conclusion focuses on the findings that both male and female officers demonstrate a clear preference for introversion over extraversion, for sensing over intuition, and for judging over perceiving. The only large difference between male and female officers regarding the four

dichotomous indices of psychological type is that male officers demonstrate a preference for thinking over feeling and female officers demonstrate a preference for feeling over thinking. This basic difference results in male officers demonstrating a clear preference for the complete psychological type of ISTJ at 32% of the male officer sample and female officers demonstrating a clear preference for the complete psychological type of ISFJ at 32% of the female officer sample.

Myers and Myers (1980) illustrate some useful insights regarding general behavioural characteristics shared by the two complete psychological types of ISTJ (as demonstrated by the male officers) and ISFJ (as demonstrated by the female officers):

[The complete types of ISTJ and ISFJ] are made remarkably dependable by their combination of preferences. They use their favourite process, sensing, in their inner life, and they base their ideas on a deep, solid accumulation of stored impressions, which gives them some almost unshakable ideas. Then they use their preferred kind of judgment, thinking or feeling, to run their outer life. Thus, they have a complete, realistic, practical respect for both the facts and for whatever responsibilities these facts create. Sensing provides the facts, and after the introverts' characteristic pause for reflection, their judgment accepts the responsibilities. (Myers & Myers, 1980, p. 102)

Focusing on the four dichotomous indices of psychological type individually will allow us to gain a deeper understanding of potential strengths and weaknesses characterised by the ISTJ and ISFJ complete psychological types. Focusing on the first dichotomous preference of psychological type, both male and female officers demonstrate a clear preference for introversion over extraversion, male officers preferring introversion at 76% of the male officer sample and female officers preferring introversion at 68% of the female officer sample. There are clear potential strengths that come from preferring introversion over



extraversion relevant for the Salvation Army's work and ministry. Salvation Army officers would be likely to consider carefully a given situation before acting, reflecting on the facts they have accumulated over time. This could help ensure that any action carried out by the Salvation Army is carefully thought through and meticulously planned. On a personal level, Salvation Army officers would be likely to excel at one-to-one encounters with other people, allowing them the capacity to understand and relate patiently to the needs of the individuals whom they are serving. However, there are some potential concerns that arise from preferring introversion over extraversion. Salvation Army officers would be likely to feel tired and drained by the more social aspects of their ministry. For example, if they were required to provide sustained assistance to large groups of individuals they might begin to feel drained, needing introverted solitude and reflection through which to recover. If they were required to provide sustained extraverted assistance over a long period of time, Salvation Army officers might begin to suffer negative effects such as fatigue that could be debilitating, as illustrated by Jung (1923, p. 415), and Myers and Myers (1980, p. 181). As such, it might be beneficial for Salvation Army officers preparing for duties that require concentrated extraversion to be fully prepared during their initial officer training and continuing professional development. This will allow them to be ready for the duties required of them, as well as allow them to develop strategies to re-energise after the task, minimising the risk of negative effects such as fatigue.

Focusing on the second dichotomous preference of psychological type, both male and female officers demonstrate a clear preference for sensing over intuition, male officers preferring sensing at 62% of the male officer sample and female officers preferring sensing at 75% of the female officer sample. There are clear potential strengths that come from preferring sensing over intuition relevant for the Salvation Army's work and ministry. Salvation Army officers would tend to be practical, excelling at providing real services that

people require. Using the facts they have gathered through experience, Salvation Army officers would tend naturally to develop and hone effective methods of serving that visibly contribute to the Salvation Army's mission. However, there are some potential concerns that arise from preferring sensing over intuition. As Myers and Myers (1980, p. 102) illustrate, the complete types of ISTJ and ISFJ can utilise their preferred perceiving function of sensing in such a way that results in 'some almost unshakable ideas'. Referring to this study's data, it is clear that the two most prominent complete types in the sample for both male and female officers are ISTJ and ISFJ – male officers preferring either ISTJ or ISFJ totalling to 49% of the male officer sample and female officers preferring either ISTJ or ISFJ totalling to 50% of the female officer sample. Therefore, out of the sixteen complete types, half of the sample of Salvation Army officers utilise their sensing function in the way Myers and Myers (1980, p. 102) illustrate with the complete types of ISTJ and ISFJ. This leads to the risk that Salvation Army officers might form fixed ideas that are not optimal in all contexts and have difficulty adapting their ideas when the situation requires it. For example, an officer might utilise a method for serving others that has worked successfully for years, but as the context changes the officer might begin to find that the established methodology ceases to function as effectively as it did in the past. Instead of adapting, the officer might try to continue using the established methodology, not perceiving why the method has ceased to function as expected. This could be to the possible detriment of the Salvation Army's mission. As such, it would be beneficial for Salvation Army officers during initial officer training and continuing professional development to explore and to experience the benefits of being adaptable when the context requires it. Doing so could both retain the advantages of the practical and established function of sensing and at the same time protect against a resistance to employ the function of intuition when required.

Focusing on the third dichotomous preference of psychological type, male and female officers differ in their preferred judging function. Male officers demonstrate a clear preference for thinking over feeling at 60% of the male officer sample and female officers demonstrate a clear preference for feeling over thinking at 66% of the female officer sample. There are clear potential strengths that come from preferring thinking over feeling relevant for the Salvation Army's work and ministry. Male officers would prefer to make judgments using objective and analytical logic, solving problems in a reasonable and fair way. This could help ensure that the Salvation Army provides fair and effective assistance to those whom they serve. There are also clear potential strengths that come from preferring feeling over thinking relevant for the Salvation Army's work and ministry. Female officers would prefer to make judgments based on people's values. This could help ensure that the Salvation Army factors in the values and commitments of those whom they serve, demonstrating compassion and kindness. Combined, male and female officers could provide an effective pairing capable of making decisions that take into account a wide range of priorities. However, there are potential concerns regarding the difference in the judging preference demonstrated by male officers preferring thinking and female officers preferring feeling. In their ministry those male officers who prefer feeling over thinking might be expected to make tough and impartial decisions that they do not feel comfortable making, while in their ministry those female officers who prefer thinking over feeling might find themselves expected to be kind and compassionate when they prefer to make objective and logical decisions. As such, it would be beneficial for those responsible for the initial training, for the continued professional development, and for the deployment of officers in the Salvation Army to remain aware that some individuals may have strengths that differ from what might be conventionally seen as characterising and differentiating between male and female

officers. This would help ensure that Salvation Army officers are comfortable in their positions and are being deployed in ways that makes best use of their strengths.

Focusing on the fourth dichotomous preference of psychological type, both male and female officers demonstrate a clear preference for judging over perceiving at 86% of the sample. There are clear potential strengths that come from preferring judging over perceiving relevant for the Salvation Army's work and ministry. Salvation Army officers would tend to be highly organised, establishing effective plans and carrying them out with care. This would imbue the Salvation Army with the virtue of reliability, making the Salvation Army a highly dependable and tightly managed organisation. However, there are potential concerns that arise from preferring judging over perceiving. Salvation Army officers might feel uncomfortable dealing with unexpected and unfamiliar problems that require immediate attention. As such, it could be beneficial for Salvation Army officers during initial officer training and continuing professional development to experience dealing with unexpected problems. This could be done by including timed planning activities in the officer training curriculum designed to give trainee officers practice making quick decisions in a range of different but relevant scenarios.

The second conclusion focuses on the finding that the psychological type profiles of both male and female Salvation Army officers differ in significant ways from the UK male and female population norms. Both male and female officers demonstrate a higher preference for introversion over extraversion and a higher preference for judging over perceiving than is seen in the UK population. This is also represented by male officers demonstrating a higher rate of preference for the complete types of ISTJ, ISFJ, and INTJ, and female officers demonstrating a higher rate of preference for the complete types of ISFJ and ISTJ than is seen in the UK population. Introversion and judging configured in the way demonstrated by these complete types could enable the Salvation Army to provide a solid and dependable

support structure both within their citadels and their social centres, something especially important for those who find order and structure particularly difficult. However, judging and sensing configured in the way demonstrated by the complete types of ISTJ and ISFJ could make Salvation Army officers appear conservative or old-fashioned to people in the wider community who prefer novel and flexible approaches, perhaps particularly the younger generations. This concern might be addressed by the relatively high proportion of the complete type of INTJ among the male officers who might be able to offer the intuitive drive to adapt to the demands of tomorrow's world.

The third conclusion focuses on comparing the psychological type profiles of Salvation Army officers with what is known about other religious professionals serving in the UK. Focusing on the four dichotomous preferences, Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010), Francis et al. (2007), Francis, Payne, and Jones (2001), Francis and Robbins (2002), Goldsmith and Wharton (1993), Irvine (1989), and Payne and Lewis (2015) all suggested that religious professionals serving within the UK tend to prefer introversion over extraversion, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving, with there being less consensus on whether religious professionals prefer sensing or intuition as their perceiving function. Referencing this study's data, both male and female Salvation Army officers follow the pattern demonstrated by the other religious professionals in the UK when it comes to a preference for introversion over extraversion and a preference for judging over perceiving. Where there is less consensus with other religious professionals is in the male Salvation Army officer's preference for thinking over feeling. Francis, Payne and Jones (2001), Francis et al. (2007), Burton, Francis and Robbins (2010), and Payne and Lewis (2015) specifically suggest that male religious professionals demonstrate a clear preference for feeling over thinking. This seems to suggest that the role the Salvation Army performs in the UK attracts more men preferring thinking over feeling to become officers. This could be ascribed to the

specific role the Salvation Army fulfils in society, engaging with matters of social action and requiring individuals comfortable with the organisation and management of teams of Salvation Army soldiers efficiently delivering aid to those who require it. The Salvation Army's preference for sensing over intuition supports this hypothesis also, suggesting that the demands of the tasks that Salvation Army officers perform attracts more individuals preferring sensing over intuition. Further research is now required to ascertain whether the role the Salvation Army appears to perform attracts or dissuades certain psychological types from joining. This could allow the Salvation Army to shape how it appears to the UK population in order to attract psychological types deemed beneficial to the work and mission of the Salvation Army.

### **Conclusion**

This study set out to report new data gathered on the psychological type profiles of female and male Salvation Army officers in the UK, drawing attention to potential strengths and weaknesses relevant for their work and ministry. This study fulfilled its aim through the following four objectives. First, this study discussed the structure of psychological type theory. Second, this study reviewed what we currently know about the psychological type profiles of religious professionals in the UK. Third, this study established the psychological type profiles of Salvation Army officers in the UK comparing these profiles with the psychological type profiles of the UK general population. Last, this study offered an interpretation of the data, generating hypotheses relevant for the Salvation Army's work and mission focusing on the psychological type profiles of Salvation Army officers, how the psychological type profiles of Salvation Army officers differ from that of the wider UK population, and how the psychological type profiles of Salvation Army officers differ from that of other religious professionals serving in the UK.

Real strengths of the present study were that it was conducted at the annual conference arranged for Salvation Army personnel under the auspices of the Wellbeing Unit, that it attracted a good response rate from the participants at the conference, and that the Wellbeing Unit expressed the intention of learning from and acting on the evidence produced. From a research perspective, the data generated can be accepted as providing the best available account of the psychological type profiles of the current generation of female and male Salvation Army officers engaged in UK local ministry.

This said, further research is still needed to build on the foundation established by the present study. In particular, three strategies could be most beneficial. First, since the present data were collected at the national conference in 2018, a replication study conducted in the near future would verify the reliability and stability of the present findings. Second, routine assessment of the psychological type profile of candidates coming into officer training in the UK would provide an useful indicator of how the pool of psychological profiles within the Salvation Army may change or remain constant. Third, there would be value in extending this model of research to other territories to establish whether this study's findings on the Salvation Army in the UK are representative of the wider Salvation Army.

The information generated by this present study should also be of strategic and practical value to the Salvation Army in the UK. Strategically, the data offer Salvation Army HQ a realistic assessment of the psychological type profile of their current officer workforce. It is against this information that the viability of current and future strategy can be assessed. When there is a mismatch between strategic vision and the psychological preferences within the workforce, either the strategy needs adapting or the workforce needs developing.

Practically, the data offer a rich potential for facilitating the continuing professional development of the current workforce. Experience within different church settings (as documented by Smith, 2015, 2018; Smith & Francis, 2015; Francis & Smith, 2015, 2016,

2017) demonstrates how professionally delivered type-awareness programmes can equip religious leaders to appreciate and affirm their own strengths, to acknowledge and to address their own weaknesses, and to appreciate and benefit from collaboration with colleagues who display complementary strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, experience in type awareness programmes can enhance respect for differences and improve conflict management.

### References

- Brewster, C. E., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2011). Maintaining a public ministry in rural England: Work-related psychological health and psychological type among Anglican clergy serving in multi-church benefices. In H-G. Ziebertz, & L. J. Francis (Eds.), *The public significance of religion*. (pp. 241-265). Brill.  
doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207066.i-495.90
- Burton, L., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers in Britain: Similarities with and differences from Anglican clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 23, 64-81. doi.org/10.1163/157092510X503020
- Busby, J. A. (2001). Heart to God and hand to man: A brief historical presentation on the Salvation Army. *Evangelical Journal*, 19, 55-67.
- Capretz, L. F. (2008). Psychological types of Brazilian software engineering students. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 68, 39-42.
- Chesborough, S. (2009). Do social work students learn differently? MBTI implications of teaching strategies that address social work students' current learning styles. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 69, 23-41.
- Clarke, T. E. (1983). Jungian types and forms of prayer. *Review for Religious*, 42, 661-667.
- 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.



- Daub, C., Friedman, S. M., Cresci, K., & Keyser, R. (2000). Frequencies of MBTI types among nursing assistants providing care to nursing home eligible individuals. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 54, 12-16.
- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990). Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 20, 25-33.
- Fowke, R. (1997). *Finding your prayer personality*. Abingdon Press.
- Francis, L. J. (2003). Psychological type and biblical hermeneutics: SIFT method of preaching. *Rural Theology*, 1, 13-23. doi.org/10.1179/rut\_2003\_1\_1\_002
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2006). Psychological types of female trainee primary school teachers in Wales: Teaching in a changing educational climate. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 66, 7-13.
- Francis, L. J. & Atkins, P. (2000). *Exploring Luke's Gospel: A guide to the gospel readings in the Revised Common Lectionary*. Mowbray.
- Francis, L. J. & Atkins, P. (2001). *Exploring Matthew's Gospel: A guide to the gospel readings in the Revised Common Lectionary*. Mowbray.
- Francis, L. J. & Atkins, P. (2002). *Exploring Mark's Gospel: An aid for readers and preachers using year B of the Revised Common Lectionary*. Continuum.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological typology of Anglican clergy in England: Diversity, strengths, and weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 11, 266-284. doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2007.17
- Francis, L. J., & Crea, G. (2015). Work-related psychological health and psychological type: A study among Catholic priests in Italy. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18, 593-604. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.963996

- 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. doi.org/10.1558/jate.1.1.65.36058
- 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., Laycock, P., & Brewster, C. (2017). Exploring the factor structure of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS) among a sample of Anglican clergy in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 20, 930-941. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2017.1375469
- 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., Payne, V. J., & Robbins, M. (2013). Psychological type and susceptibility to burnout: A study among Anglican clergymen in Wales. In B. R. Doolittle (Ed.) *Psychology of burnout: New research* (pp. 179-192). Nova Science. doi.org/10.1037/e591202013-001
- Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2002). Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders. *Journal of Belief and Values*, 23, 217-220. doi.org/10.1080/1361767022000010860
- Francis, L. J., & Smith, G. (2015). Exploring organised and visionary approaches to designing an Advent Fun Day in an educational setting. *International Journal of Christianity and Education*, 19, 57-72. doi.org/10.1177/2056997115575643
- Francis, L. J., & Smith, G. (2016). Introverts and extraverts reflecting on the experience of parish ministry: Conversation between training incumbents and curates. *Journal of*

*Research on Christian Education*, 25, 76-85.

doi.org/10.1080/10656219.2016.1139999

Francis, L. J., & Smith, G. (2017). Learning relationships: Church of England curates and training incumbents applying the SIFT approach to the Road to Emmaus. *HTS Theological Studies*, 73(4), article 4546, 1-11. doi.org/10.4102/hts.v73i4.4546

Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., & Robbins, M. (2013). Who is called to be a bishop? A study in psychological type profiling of bishops in the Church of England. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 34, 135-151. doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2013.801647

Francis, L. J., & Whinney, M. (2019). The psychological profile of Church of England male archdeacons at the beginning of the twenty-first century: Drawing on psychological type and temperament theory. *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 17, 74-92.  
doi.org/10.1017/S1740355318000256

Goldsmith, M., & Wharton, M. (1993). *Knowing me knowing you*. SPCK.

Hautala, T. (2008). TJ leaders as transformational leaders: Followers' and leaders' appraisals. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 68, 78-88.

Hawkins, C. A., Williams, M. S., & Hawkins II, R. C. (1990). Psychological types of social service managers. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 19, 44-49.

Henderson, R. S., & Harris, D. L. (1991). Psychological types of emergency physicians as measured by the MBTI. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 21, 59-61.

Irvine, A. L. (1989). *Isolation and the parish ministry*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of St Andrews.

Jung, C. G. (1923). *Psychological types or the psychology of individuation*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

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

- Martínez, P. (2001). *Prayer life: How your personality affects the way you pray*. Paternoster.
- McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The selection ratio type table: A research strategy for comparing type distributions. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 10, 46-57.
- Michael, C. P., & Norrissey, M. C. (1984). *Prayer and temperament: Different prayer forms for different personality types*. The Open Door.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I. B., & Myers, P. B. (1980). *Gifts differing*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Osborne, G. (2016). *Be a better leader: Personality type and difference in ministry*. SPCK.
- Osborn, L., & Osborn, D. (1991). *God's diverse people: Personality and the Christian life*. Daybreak.
- Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality type and religious leadership*. The Alban Institute.
- Payne, V. J., & Lewis, C. A. (2015). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in Wales: A ministry for sensing types. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18, 535-543. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.963999
- Provost, J. A., Carson, B. H., & Beidler, P. G. (1987). Teaching excellence and type. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 13, 23-33.
- Repicky, R. A. (1981). Jungian typology and Christian spirituality. *Review for Religious*, 40, 422-435.
- Reynierse, J. H., & Harker, J. B. (1995). The psychological types of line and staff management: Implications for the J-P preference. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 34, 8-16.

- Robbins, M., Francis, L. J., & Powell, R. (2012). Work-related psychological health among clergywomen in Australia. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15, 933-944.  
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.698044
- 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. (2020). *Personality, religion, and leadership: The spiritual dimensions of psychological type theory*. Lexington Books.
- Salvation Army (2018a). The Salvation Army, Accessed October 23, 2018.  
<https://www.salvationarmy.org.uk/>.
- Salvation Army (2018b). Being a Salvationist, Accessed October 23, 2018.  
<https://www.salvationarmy.org.uk/being-salvationist>.
- Scarbrough, D. P. (1993). Psychological types and job satisfaction of accountants. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 25, 3-10.
- Shewchuk, R. M., & O'Connor, S. J. (1995). Health care executives: Subjective well-being as a function of psychological type. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 32, 23-29.
- Smith, G. (2015). Psychological type and the training relationship: An empirical study among curates and training incumbents. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18, 556-565.  
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.963998
- Smith, G. (2018). Valuing the learning style of curates: Implications for training ministers. *Rural Theology*, 16, 123-131. doi.org/10.1080/14704994.2018.1523633

Smith, G., & Francis, L. J. (2015). Experiencing and reflecting on thinking and feeling in pastoral care: Deploying psychological type theory in continuing ministerial

formation. *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, 12, 69-78.

doi.org/10.1179/1740714115Z.000000000037

Stetson, T. E. (2007). Rules versus principles: Accountants' cognitive styles and professional penalties. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 67, 115-128.

Ware, R., Knapp, C. R., & Schwarzin, H. (1989). Prayer form preferences of Keirsey temperaments and psychological types. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 17, 39-42.

Willing, D. C., Guest, K., & Morford, J. (2001). Who is entering the teaching profession? MBTI profiles of 525 master in teaching students. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 59, 36-44.

Zimmerman, A. (2001). Personality types of students and graduates at a 2-year technical college. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 56, 10-18.

Table 1

*Type distribution for female Salvation Army officers*

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences							
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 49 (18.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.13*** +++++ +++++ +++++ +++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 87 (32.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.83*** +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 16 (5.9%) <i>I</i> = 3.43*** +++++ +	INTJ <i>n</i> = 11 (4.1%) <i>I</i> = 8.84*** ++++	E  I  S  N   T  F   J  P	<i>n</i> = 86 <i>n</i> = 183  <i>n</i> = 202 <i>n</i> = 67    <i>n</i> = 91 <i>n</i> = 178   <i>n</i> = 232 <i>n</i> = 37	(32.0%) (68.0%)  (75.1%) (24.9%)    (33.8%) (66.2%)   (86.2%) (13.8%)	<i>I</i> = 0.56*** <i>I</i> = 1.59***  <i>I</i> = 0.95 <i>I</i> = 1.20    <i>I</i> = 1.14 <i>I</i> = 0.94   <i>I</i> = 1.40*** <i>I</i> = 0.36***				
ISTP <i>n</i> = 6 (2.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.88 ++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.19*** ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 9 (3.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.21 +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.36	Pairs and Temperaments							
				IJ IP EP EJ	<i>n</i> = 163 <i>n</i> = 20 <i>n</i> = 17 <i>n</i> = 69	(60.6%) (7.4%) (6.3%) (25.7%)	<i>I</i> = 2.13*** <i>I</i> = 0.52** <i>I</i> = 0.26*** <i>I</i> = 0.78*				
				ST SF NF NT	<i>n</i> = 71 <i>n</i> = 131 <i>n</i> = 47 <i>n</i> = 20	(26.4%) (48.7%) (17.5%) (7.4%)	<i>I</i> = 1.09 <i>I</i> = 0.88 <i>I</i> = 1.14 <i>I</i> = 1.40				
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00***	ESFP <i>n</i> = 6 (2.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.20*** ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 9 (3.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.45* +++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.36 +	SJ SP NP NJ	<i>n</i> = 186 <i>n</i> = 16 <i>n</i> = 21 <i>n</i> = 46	(69.1%) (5.9%) (7.8%) (17.1%)	<i>I</i> = 1.28*** <i>I</i> = 0.24*** <i>I</i> = 0.58* <i>I</i> = 2.35***				
				TJ TP FP FJ	<i>n</i> = 82 <i>n</i> = 9 <i>n</i> = 28 <i>n</i> = 150	(30.5%) (3.3%) (10.4%) (55.8%)	<i>I</i> = 1.51*** <i>I</i> = 0.36*** <i>I</i> = 0.36*** <i>I</i> = 1.35***				
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 16 (5.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.63 +++++ +	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 34 (12.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.68* +++++ +++++ +++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 13 (4.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.44 +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 6 (2.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.29 ++	IN EN IS ES	<i>n</i> = 37 <i>n</i> = 30 <i>n</i> = 146 <i>n</i> = 56	(13.8%) (11.2%) (54.3%) (20.8%)	<i>I</i> = 2.29*** <i>I</i> = 0.76 <i>I</i> = 1.48*** <i>I</i> = 0.49***				
				ET EF IF IT	<i>n</i> = 24 <i>n</i> = 62 <i>n</i> = 116 <i>n</i> = 67	(8.9%) (23.0%) (43.1%) (24.9%)	<i>I</i> = 0.52*** <i>I</i> = 0.57*** <i>I</i> = 1.43*** <i>I</i> = 1.98***				
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	8.2	0.73	I-TP	7	2.6	0.73	Dt.T	29	10.8	0.73
E-FJ	47	17.5	0.80	I-FP	13	4.8	0.45**	Dt.F	60	22.3	0.69***
ES-P	6	2.2	0.15***	IS-J	136	50.6	1.93***	Dt.S	142	52.8	1.29***
EN-P	11	4.1	0.43**	IN-J	27	10.0	4.57***	Dt.N	38	14.1	1.20

Note: *N* = 269 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Table 2

*Type distribution for male Salvation Army officers*

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 52 (31.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.60*** +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 28 (17.0%) <i>I</i> = 2.44*** +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 13 (7.9%) <i>I</i> = 4.91*** +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 17 (10.3%) <i>I</i> = 4.06*** +++++	E <i>n</i> = 39 (23.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.50***	I <i>n</i> = 126 (76.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.44***	S <i>n</i> = 103 (62.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.85**	N <i>n</i> = 62 (37.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.40**
ISTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.60*** +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.32 +	INFP <i>n</i> = 5 (3.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.84 +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 8 (4.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.17 +++++	T <i>n</i> = 99 (60.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.93	F <i>n</i> = 66 (40.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	J <i>n</i> = 141 (85.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.56***	P <i>n</i> = 24 (14.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.32***
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00***	ESFP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.10** +	ENFP <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.36 ++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.67 ++	Pairs and Temperaments			
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 9 (5.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.47* +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 10 (6.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.01 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 4 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.21 ++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 8 (4.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.13 +++++	IJ <i>n</i> = 101 (66.7%) <i>I</i> = 2.17***	IP <i>n</i> = 16 (9.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.43***	EP <i>n</i> = 8 (4.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.21***	EJ <i>n</i> = 31 (18.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.79
				ST <i>n</i> = 62 (37.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.75**	SF <i>n</i> = 41 (24.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.09	NF <i>n</i> = 25 (15.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.23	NT <i>n</i> = 37 (22.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.54*
				SJ <i>n</i> = 99 (60.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.36***	SP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.08***	NP <i>n</i> = 20 (12.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.74	NJ <i>n</i> = 42 (25.5%) <i>I</i> = 2.44***
				TJ <i>n</i> = 86 (52.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.37***	TP <i>n</i> = 13 (7.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.29***	FP <i>n</i> = 11 (6.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.36***	FJ <i>n</i> = 55 (33.3%) <i>I</i> = 2.01***
				IN <i>n</i> = 43 (26.1%) <i>I</i> = 2.19***	EN <i>n</i> = 19 (11.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.77	IS <i>n</i> = 83 (50.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.22*	ES <i>n</i> = 20 (12.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.38***
				ET <i>n</i> = 21 (12.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.46***	EF <i>n</i> = 18 (10.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.57*	IF <i>n</i> = 48 (29.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.83***	IT <i>n</i> = 78 (47.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.27*
Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)			
<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>	
E-TJ	17	10.3	0.65	I-TP	9	5.5	0.36***
E-FJ	14	8.5	1.06	I-FP	7	4.2	0.58
ES-P	1	0.6	0.04***	IS-J	80	48.5	1.82***
EN-P	7	4.2	0.49	IN-J	30	18.2	4.39***
Dominant Types				<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>	
Dt.T	26	15.8	0.51***				
Dt.F	21	12.7	0.83				
Dt.S	81	49.1	1.20				
Dt.N	37	22.4	1.75**				

Note: *N* = 165 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$