

Original citation:

Francis, L. J. et al. (2011). The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: compatible or incompatible with their clergy? *International Journal of Practical Theolog*, 5(2), pp. 243-259

Permanent WRAP url:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/49379>

Copyright and reuse:

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

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

Publisher's statement:

"The final publication is available at www.degruyter.com".

A note on versions:

The version presented in WRAP is the published version or, version of record, and may be cited as it appears here.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk



<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/lib-publications>

The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: compatible or incompatible with their clergy?

Leslie J. Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit, Institute of Education
The University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom
Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Mandy Robbins

The University of Warwick, UK

Charlotte Craig

St Mary's Centre at St Deiniol's Library

1. Introduction

Jungian psychological type theory provides a fruitful lens through which to view and to interpret the character and behaviour of local church life, conceptualized within the context of empirical or practical theology, the psychology of religion, and the sociology of religion.¹ Rooted originally in clinical observation² and empirically tested across large and diverse samples³, psychological type theory proposes four key ways in which individuals (and groups of individuals) differ. Two of these four ways focus on the core psychological processes: ways of seeing (the perceiving process) and ways of evaluating (the judging process). Two of these four ways focus on the core psychological context: ways of resourcing psychological energy (the orientations) and ways of relating to the outside world (the attitudes). What distinguishes psychological type theory from other well-known models of personality, including the Five Factor Model proposed by Costa and

-
- 1 Leslie J. Francis, *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*, London (Darton / Longman / Todd) 2005.
 - 2 Carl Gustav Jung, *Psychological types*. The collected works, vol. 6, London (Routledge / Kegan Paul) 1971.
 - 3 Isabel Briggs Myers / Mary H. McCaulley, *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*, Palo Alto, California (Consulting Psychologists Press) 1985.

McCrae,⁴ the Three Dimensional Model proposed by Eysenck and Eysenck⁵ and the Sixteen Factor Model proposed by Cattell, Cattell and Cattell,⁶ is that psychological type theory conceptualizes these four key aspects of the human psyche in terms of polar opposites. While most current personality theories work in terms of locating individuals at points along a psychological continuum, psychological type theory works in terms of locating individuals within distinct type categories.

The perceiving processes are concerned with identifying ways in which individuals take in information. For Jung, the perceiving processes were described as irrational processes because they were not concerned with data evaluation but simply with data gathering. In this area, the two discrete types are defined as sensing and as intuition. For sensing types, the preferred way of perceiving is through the five senses. Sensors are motivated by facts, details and information. They build up to the big picture slowly by focusing first on the component parts. They are most comfortable in the present moment rather than in exploring possibilities. They are realistic and practical people. They are realistic practical people. For intuitive types, the preferred way of perceiving is through their imagination. Intuitives are motivated by theories, ideas and connections. They begin with the big picture and gradually give attention to the component parts. They are more comfortable planning the future than making do with the present. They are inspirational and visionary people.

The judging processes are concerned with identifying ways in which individuals evaluate information. For Jung, the judging processes were described as the rational processes because they were concerned with data evaluation and with decision making. In this area, the two discrete types are defined as thinking and as feeling. 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 organizations and put such strategic issues first. They are logical and fair-minded people who are attracted to the God of justice. For feeling types, the preferred way of judging is through subjective evaluation and personal involvement. They are concerned with the 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.

The orientations are concerned with identifying the sources of psychological energy. In this area, the two discrete types are defined as extraversion and introversion. For extravert types, the source of energy is located in

4 Paul T. Costa / Robert R. McCrae, *The NEO Personality Inventory*, Odessa, Florida (Psychological Assessment Resources) 1985.

5 Hans J. Eysenck / Sybil B. G. Eysenck, *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scale*, London (Hodder and Stoughton) 1991.

6 Raymond B. Cattell / A. Karen Schuettler Cattell / Heather E. P. Cattell, *Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire*. Fifth edition (16PF5), Windsor (NFER-Nelson) 1993.

the outer world of people and things. Extraverts are exhausted by large periods of solitude and silence; and they need to re-energize through the stimulation they receive from people and places. Extraverts are talkative people who feel at home in social contexts. For introvert types, the source of energy is located in the inner world of ideas and reflection. Introverts are exhausted by long periods of social engagements and sounds; and they need to re-energize through the stimulation they receive from their own company and tranquility.

The attitudes (often more fully expressed as the 'attitudes toward the outer world') are concerned with identifying which of the two processes (judging or perceiving) individuals prefer to use in the outer world. In this area, the two discrete types are defined by the name of the preferred process, either judging or perceiving. For judging types, their preferred judging function (either thinking or feeling) is employed in their outer world. Because their outer world is where the rational, evaluating, judging or decision making processes is deployed, judging types appear to others to be well organized decisive people. For perceiving types, their preferred perceiving function (either sensing or intuition) is employed in their outer world. Because their outer world is where the irrational, data gathering process is deployed, perceiving types appear to others to be laid-back, flexible, even disorganized people.

Psychological type theory is a rich conceptual tool that has been operationalized and made accessible for quantitative empirical research through a number of self-report psychological tests, the best known of which in terms of empirical research among religious professionals are the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator,⁷ the Kiersey Temperament Sorter,⁸ and the Francis Psychological Type Scales.⁹ These self-report tests have been employed in a series of recent studies conducted within the United Kingdom as part of a semi-coordinated attempt to illuminate the psychological type profile of religious professionals. These studies include Presbyterian Church of Scotland ministers,¹⁰ male and female Bible College students,¹¹ evangelical church leaders,¹² male missionary personnel,¹³ evangelical lay church lead-

7 Myers / McCaulley (n. 3).

8 David Keirse / Marilyn Bates, *Please understand me*, Del Mar, California (Prometheus Nemes) 1978.

9 Francis (n. 1).

10 Andrew R. Irvine, *Isolation and the parish ministry*, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of St. Andrews, 1989.

11 Leslie J. Francis / Andrew W. Penson / Susan H. Jones, Psychological types of male and female Bible College students in England, *Mental Health, Religion and Culture* 4 (2001), 23–32.

12 Leslie J. Francis / Mandy Robbins, Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders, *Journal of Belief and Values* 23 (2002), 217–220; Charlotte Craig / Leslie J. Francis / Mandy Robbins, Psychological type and sex differences among church leaders in the United Kingdom, *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 25 (2004), 3–13.

ers,¹⁴ Roman Catholic priests,¹⁵ youth ministers,¹⁶ evangelical Anglican seminarians,¹⁷ Assemblies of God theological college students,¹⁸ leaders within the Newfrontiers network of churches¹⁹ and Anglican clergy serving both in Wales²⁰ and in England.²¹

In essence these studies of religious professionals demonstrate that there are significant variations between leaders within different church streams or denominations. In terms of the perceiving process, more liberal traditions tend to appeal more to intuitives, while more conservative traditions tend to appeal more to sensors. For example, while Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater²² found 62 % intuitives among male Anglican clergy, Kay, Francis, and Craig²³ found just 26 % intuitives among male students attending the British Assemblies of God theological college. In terms of the

-
- 13 Charlotte L. Craig / Tony Horsfall / Leslie J. Francis, Psychological types of male missionary personnel training in England. A role for thinking type men? *Pastoral Psychology* 53 (2005), 475–482.
 - 14 Leslie J. Francis / Charlotte L. Craig / Tony Horsfall / Christopher F. J. Ross, Psychological types of male and female evangelical lay church leaders in England, compared with United Kingdom population norms, *Fieldwork in Religion* 1 (2005), 69–83.
 - 15 Charlotte L. Craig / Barry Duncan / Leslie J. Francis, Psychological type preferences of Roman Catholic priests in the United Kingdom, *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 27 (2006), 157–164.
 - 16 Leslie J. Francis / Paul Nash / Sally Nash / Charlotte L. Craig, Psychology and youth ministry. Psychological type preferences of Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom, *Journal of Youth Ministry* 5 (2007), 2, 73–90.
 - 17 Leslie J. Francis / Charlotte L. Craig / Angela Butler, Psychological types of male evangelical Anglican seminarians in England, *Journal of Psychological Type* 67 (2007), 11–17.
 - 18 William Kay / Leslie J. Francis, Psychological type preferences of female Bible College students in England, *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 29 (2008), 101–105; William Kay / Leslie J. Francis / Charlotte L. Craig, Psychological type preferences of male British Assemblies of God Bible College students. Tough minded or tender hearted? *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 28 (2008), 6–20.
 - 19 Leslie J. Francis / Sean Gubb / Mandy Robbins, Psychological type profile of Lead Elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom, *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 30 (2009), 61–69; Andrew Ryland / Leslie J. Francis / Mandy Robbins, Called for leadership. Psychological type profile of leaders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom, in press.
 - 20 Leslie J. Francis / V. John Payne / Susan H. Jones, Psychological types of male Anglican clergy in Wales, *Journal of Psychological Type* 56 (2001), 19–23.
 - 21 Leslie J. Francis / Charlotte L. Craig / Michael Whinney / David Tilley / Paul Slater, 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 (2007), 266–284; Leslie J. Francis / Mandy Robbins / Barry Duncan / Michael Whinney, Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in England. A ministry for intuitives. in: Bartoli Ruelas / Vanessa Briseno (eds.), *Psychology of intuition*, New York (Nova Science Publishers) 2010, 211–219.
 - 22 *Ibid.*
 - 23 Kay / Francis / Craig (n. 18).

judging process, traditions that emphasize the pastoral heart and the God of mercy tend to appeal more to feelers, while traditions that emphasise paths of salvation and the God of justice appeal more to thinkers. For example, while Francis, Payne, and Jones²⁴ found 69 % feelers among male Anglican clergy, Craig, Horsfall, and Francis²⁵ found 70 % thinkers among male missionary personnel. In terms of the orientations, more reflective traditions tend to appeal more to introverts, while more fellowship-orientated traditions tend to appeal more to extraverts. For example, while among male Anglican clergy the preference is in favour of introverts (59 % according to Francis, Payne, & Jones)²⁶, among male lead elders in the Newfrontiers network of churches introverts are less in evidence (48 % according to Francis, Gubb, & Robbins)²⁷. In terms of attitudes toward the outer world, while perceiving types are generally under-represented among religious professionals, they are more likely to be found within more liberal traditions than within more conservative traditions. According to Kendall, 45 % of the male population in the United Kingdom preferred perceiving.²⁸ This proportion fell to 32 % among male Anglican clergy,²⁹ and fell further to 22 % among male lead elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches.³⁰

When the psychological type profile of religious professionals is set against the UK population norms provided by Kendall,³¹ some interesting and important differences become visible. The case of Anglican clergymen serving in England provides a particularly powerful illustration of this point. Not only are the psychological type differences between Church of England clergymen and the United Kingdom norms for men both pronounced and startling, but they have been securely established in two independent and large samples: in the first study, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater³² reported on a sample of 626 clergymen, and in the second study, Francis, Robbins, Duncan, and Whinney³³ reported on a sample of 622 clergymen.

In terms of the perceiving process, Kendall found that just 27 % of the male UK population preferred intuition; in the two studies of Church of England clergymen, the proportion of intuitives rose to 62 % and 67 %.

24 Francis / Payne / Jones (n. 20).

25 Craig / Horsfall / Francis (n. 13).

26 Francis / Payne / Jones (n. 20).

27 Francis / Gubb / Robbins (n. 19).

28 E. Kendall, Myers-Briggs type indicator. Step 1 manual supplement, Palo Alto, California (Consulting Psychologists Press) 1998.

29 Francis / Craig / Whinney / Tilley / Slater (n. 21).

30 Francis / Gubb / Robbins (n. 19).

31 Kendall (n. 28).

32 Francis / Craig / Whinney / Tilley / Slater (n. 21).

33 Francis / Robbins / Duncan / Whinney (n. 21).

In terms of the judging process, Kendall also found that just 35 % of the male UK population preferred feeling; in the two studies of Church of England clergymen, the proportion rose to 54 % and 56 %. In terms of the orientations, Kendall found that 53 % of the male UK population preferred introversion; in the two studies of Church of England clergymen, the proportion rose to 57 % and 64 %. In terms of the attitude toward the outer world, Kendall's study found that 55 % of the male UK population preferred judging; in the two studies of Church of England clergymen, the proportion rose to 68 % and 73 %.³⁴

By way of summary, these data suggest that there are three key differences between the psychological type profile of Church of England clergymen and the wider UK male population. Among the clergymen there are considerably higher proportions of intuitives, feelers, and judges.

There are less extensive data available on Church of England clergywomen, which reflects the fact that women could not be ordained to the priesthood in the Church of England until 1994.³⁵ The two studies reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley and Slater on 237 clergywomen,³⁶ and by Francis, Robbins, and Whinney on 83 clergywomen confirmed the profile of Church of England clergy preferring introversion (54 % and 63 %), intuition (65 % and 60 %), feeling (74 % and 76 %), and judging (65 % and 54 %).³⁷

These psychological type characteristics of the clerical leadership of Anglican congregations in England raise an important question concerning the psychological type profile of the congregations themselves. Are the people who generally attend Church of England services shaped in the same psychological image as those who lead the services, or are they different from their leaders?

Compared with the growing body of research concerned with the psychological type profile of religious professionals, internationally there remains quite a dearth of research concerned with the psychological type profile of those who attend church services, and such research as exists in this field has been limited to quite small samples. In the United States of America, Gerhardt (1983) reported on 83 adult Unitarian Universalists,³⁸ and

34 Kendall (n. 28).

35 Leslie J. Francis / Mandy Robbins, *The long diaconate 1987–1994. Women deacons and the delayed journey to priesthood*, Leominster (Gracewing) 1999; Mandy Robbins, *Clergywomen in the Church of England: A psychological study*, New York (Edwin Mellen) 2008.

36 Francis / Craig / Whinney / Tilley / Slater (n. 21).

37 Leslie J. Francis / Mandy Robbins / Michael Whinney, *Women priests in the Church of England. Psychological type profile*, *Religions* 2 (2011), 389–397.

38 Rolfe Gerhardt, *Liberal religion and personality type*, *Research in Psychological Type* 6 (1983), 47–53.

Rehak (1998) reported on 76 Evangelical Lutherans³⁹. In Canada, Delis-Bulhoes (1990) reported on 48 Catholics and 154 Protestants,⁴⁰ and Ross reported on 116 Anglican and 175 Catholics.⁴¹ In Wales, Craig, Francis, Bailey, and Robbins reported on 101 Anglicans,⁴² and Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams reported on 185 Anglicans.⁴³

Within this context, two studies have reported on the psychological type profile of Anglicans in England. In the first study, Francis, Butler, Jones and Craig (2007) reported on a sample of 93 female and 65 male active members of the Church of England.⁴⁴ Among the women, there were preferences for introversion (56 %), for sensing (55 %), for feeling (79 %), and for judging (72 %). Among the men there were preferences for introversion (54 %), for thinking (57 %), and for judging (79 %), and a balance between sensing (49 %) and intuition (51 %). The problem with this study is that the data were collected in the context of parish development workshops and may not be fully representative of the pool of churchgoers from which the participants were drawn.

In the second study, Francis, Duncan, Craig, and Luffman reported on a study in which the research instrument was systematically administered through the worshippers in five typical Anglican congregations (four in the Diocese of Manchester and one in the Diocese of York).⁴⁵ Useable responses were received from 116 men and 211 women, with the individual congregations providing 49, 56, 65, 70, and 87 participants. Among the women, there were preferences for introversion (56 %), for sensing (75 %), for feeling (73 %), and for judging (67 %). Among the men there were preferences for introversion (66 %), for sensing (68 %), for

-
- 39 Michael C. Rehak, Identifying the congregation's corporate personality, *Journal of Psychological Type* 44 (1998), 39–44.
- 40 Voula Delis-Bulhoes, Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members, *Journal of Psychological Type* 20 (1990), 25–33.
- 41 Christopher F.J. Ross, Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church. Comparisons with Catholics, Evangelicals and clergy, *Journal of Psychological Type* 26 (1993), 28–35; Christopher F.J. Ross, Type patterns among Catholics. Four Anglophone congregations compared with Protestants, Francophone Catholics and priests, *Journal of Psychological Type* 33 (1995), 33–41.
- 42 Charlotte L. Craig / Leslie J. Francis / Jane Bailey / Mandy Robbins, Psychological types in Church in Wales congregations, *The Psychologist in Wales* 15 (2003), 18–21.
- 43 Leslie J. Francis / Mandy Robbins / Angela Williams / Rhys Williams, All types are called, but some are more likely to respond. The psychological profile of rural Anglican churchgoers in Wales, *Rural Theology* 5 (2007), 23–30.
- 44 Leslie J. Francis / Angela Butler / Susan H. Jones / Charlotte L. Craig, Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church. A perspective from England, *Mental Health, Religion and Culture* 10 (2007), 435–443.
- 45 Leslie J. Francis / Barry Duncan / Charlotte L. Craig / George Luffman, Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England, *Journal of Adult Theological Education* 1 (2004), 66–77.

thinking (52 %), and for judging (70 %). The problem with this study is that the participants were drawn from just five congregations.

The two studies on the psychological type profile of Anglicans in England reported by Francis, Butler, Jones, and Craig⁴⁶ and by Francis, Duncan, Craig, and Luffman⁴⁷ both collected their data through the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.⁴⁸ In one sense this is a real strength, since the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is a well-established instrument with good psychometric properties established among religious participants.⁴⁹ In another sense, however, the choice of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator for research purposes in this kind of context may be somewhat problematic. Since the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was designed primarily for individual consultation processes, it appears cumbersome and time-consuming in a research context and may not always attract the attention and care that it needs from the participants.

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to undertake and to report on a much larger sample of Church of England congregations than achieved by previous research and to do so employing a measure of psychological type designed specifically for research purposes, the Francis Psychological Type Scales.⁵⁰ This instrument is both shorter than the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and less cumbersome to administer. The profiles generated by these data will be tested against the psychological type norms for the United Kingdom published by Kendall.⁵¹

2. Method

Procedure

Snowball sampling was employed to attract participation from a wide range of Church of England congregations, generally employing contacts established through the Network for Psychological Type and Christian Faith and through clergy continuing ministerial education programmes. Clergy or laity leading worship within these congregations were scripted to introduce the purpose of the project and to invite everyone present to complete the brief questionnaire at a given point in the service. Participation was voluntary, anonymous and confidential. A total of 140 Church of England congregations had participated in the project at the stage when the

46 Francis / Butler / Jones / Craig (n. 44).

47 Francis / Duncan / Craig / Luffman (n. 45).

48 Myers / McCaulley (n. 3).

49 Leslie J. Francis / Susan H. Jones, The scale properties of the MBTI Form G (Anglicised) among adult churchgoers, *Pastoral Sciences* 18 (1999), 107–126.

50 Francis (n. 1).

51 Kendall (n. 28).

current analyses were undertaken, including a number of very small congregations from rural churches.

Instrument

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS).⁵² 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 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.⁵³

Sample

From the 140 congregations participating in the study, thoroughly completed questionnaires were returned by 2,135 women and 1,169 men. Among the women 3.1 % were under the age of twenty, 5.3 % in their twenties, 9.6 % in their thirties, 14.9 % in their forties, 18.3 % in their fifties, 21.0 % in their sixties, 19.7 % in their seventies, and 8.1 % were aged eighty or over. Among the men 3.1 % were under the age of twenty, 6.5 % in their twenties, 9.4 % in their thirties, 13.0 % in their forties, 19.8 % in their fifties, 21.5 % in their sixties, 20.4 % in their seventies, and 6.3 % were aged eighty or over.

Data analysis

The research literature concerning the empirical investigation of psychological type has developed a highly distinctive method for analyzing, 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

52 Francis (n. 1).

53 Leslie J. Francis / Charlotte L. Craig / Graham Hall, Psychological type and attitude towards Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom. An empirical study, *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 23 (2008), 181–191.

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.

3. Results

The type distribution for the 2,135 female Church of England churchgoers is presented in Table 1. These data demonstrate a clear preference for sensing (81 %) over intuition (19 %), for feeling (70 %) over thinking (30 %), and for judging (85 %) over perceiving (15 %), and an equal balance between extraversion (51 %) and introversion (49 %); in terms of dominant types, 42 % were sensors, 35 % feelers, 14 % thinkers, and 10 % intuitives. The predominant types were ESFJ (25 %) and ISFJ (25 %), followed by ISTJ (12 %) and ESTJ (11 %), indicated that the SJ preference accounted for 73 % of the female churchgoers.

Table 1 also compared the psychological type profile of the 2,135 female churchgoers with normative data published on 865 women within the UK by Kendall,⁵⁴ and tests the statistical significance of the differences between the two groups by means of the selection ratio index (I), an extension of chi-square. These data demonstrate that women churchgoers are more introverted than women in the general population (49 % compared with 43 %), and more inclined to prefer judging (85 % compared with 62 %). On the other hand, there are no significant differences in preferences for sensing by female churchgoers (81 %) and women in the general population (79 %), or in preferences for feeling by female churchgoers (70 %) and women in the general population (70 %). There is a significantly higher proportion of women with the SJ preference in church congregations than in the general population (73 % compared with 54 %).

The type distribution for the 1,169 male Church of England churchgoers is presented in Table 2. These data demonstrate clear preferences for introversion (62 %) over extraversion (38 %), for sensing (78 %) over intuition (22 %), for thinking (58 %) over feeling (42 %), and for judging (86 %) over perceiving (14 %). In terms of dominant types, 49 % were sensors, 20 % thinkers, 18 % feelers, and 13 % intuitives. The predominant types were ISTJ (29 %) and ISFJ (17 %), followed by ESTJ (14 %) and ESFJ (11 %), indicating that the SJ preference accounted for 71 % of the male churchgoers.

Table 2 also compares the psychological type profile of the 1,169 male churchgoers with normative data published on 748 men within the UK by

⁵⁴ Kendall (n. 28).

Table 1
Type distribution for female Church of England churchgoers, compared with population norms
N=2135 (NB +=1 % of N)

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ	E	<i>n</i> =1081 (50.6 %)	*** <i>I</i> =0.88
<i>n</i> =263 (12.3 %)	<i>n</i> =527 (24.7 %)	<i>n</i> =74 (3.5 %)	<i>n</i> =54 (2.5 %)	I	<i>n</i> =1054 (49.4 %)	*** <i>I</i> =1.16
<i>I</i> =1.44**	<i>I</i> =1.40***	<i>I</i> =2.00**	<i>I</i> =5.47***	S	<i>n</i> =1733 (81.2 %)	<i>I</i> =1.02
+++++	+++++	++++	+++	N	<i>n</i> =402 (18.8 %)	<i>I</i> =0.91
+++++	+++++			T	<i>n</i> =644 (30.2 %)	<i>I</i> =1.02
++	+++++			F	<i>n</i> =1491 (69.8 %)	<i>I</i> =0.99
	+++++			J	<i>n</i> =1823 (85.4 %)	*** <i>I</i> =1.39
	+++++			P	<i>n</i> =312 (14.6 %)	*** <i>I</i> =0.38
	+++++					
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP	Pairs and Temperaments		
<i>n</i> =17 (0.8 %)	<i>n</i> =66 (3.1 %)	<i>n</i> =39 (1.8 %)	<i>n</i> =14 (0.7 %)	IJ	<i>n</i> =918 (43.0 %)	*** <i>I</i> =1.51
<i>I</i> =0.31***	<i>I</i> =3.9***	<i>I</i> =0.66	<i>I</i> =0.63	IP	<i>n</i> =136 (6.4 %)	*** <i>I</i> =0.45
+	+++	++	+	EP	<i>n</i> =176 (8.2 %)	*** <i>I</i> =0.34
				EJ	<i>n</i> =905 (42.4 %)	*** <i>I</i> =1.28
				ST	<i>n</i> =515 (24.1 %)	<i>I</i> =0.99
				SF	<i>n</i> =1218 (57.0 %)	<i>I</i> =1.04
				NF	<i>n</i> =273 (12.8 %)	<i>I</i> =0.83
				NT	<i>n</i> =129 (6.0 %)	<i>I</i> =1.14
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP	SJ	<i>n</i> =1552 (72.7 %)	*** <i>I</i> =1.34
<i>n</i> =6 (0.3 %)	<i>n</i> =92 (4.3 %)	<i>n</i> =62 (2.9 %)	<i>n</i> =14 (0.7 %)	SP	<i>n</i> =181 (8.5 %)	*** <i>I</i> =0.34
<i>I</i> =0.08***	<i>I</i> =0.39***	<i>I</i> =0.39***	<i>I</i> =0.36**	NP	<i>n</i> =131 (6.1 %)	*** <i>I</i> =0.46
	++++	+++	+	NJ	<i>n</i> =271 (12.7 %)	*** <i>I</i> =1.74
				TJ	<i>n</i> =591 (27.7 %)	*** <i>I</i> =1.37
				TP	<i>n</i> =53 (2.5 %)	*** <i>I</i> =0.27
				FP	<i>n</i> =259 (12.1 %)	*** <i>I</i> =0.42
				FJ	<i>n</i> =1232 (57.7 %)	*** <i>I</i> =1.40
ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ	IN	<i>n</i> =181 (8.5 %)	* <i>I</i> =1.41
<i>n</i> =229 (10.7 %)	<i>n</i> =533 (25.0 %)	<i>n</i> =98 (4.6 %)	<i>n</i> =45 (2.1 %)	EN	<i>n</i> =221 (10.4 %)	*** <i>I</i> =0.71
<i>I</i> =1.13	<i>I</i> =1.35***	<i>I</i> =1.37	<i>I</i> =1.22	IS	<i>n</i> =873 (40.9 %)	* <i>I</i> =1.12
+++++	+++++	+++++	++	ES	<i>n</i> =860 (40.3 %)	<i>I</i> =0.94
+++++	+++++			ET	<i>n</i> =296 (13.9 %)	* <i>I</i> =0.82
+	+++++			EF	<i>n</i> =785 (36.8 %)	<i>I</i> =0.91
	+++++			IF	<i>n</i> =706 (33.1 %)	<i>I</i> =1.10
	+++++			IT	<i>n</i> =348 (16.3 %)	** <i>I</i> =1.29

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types			<i>L.J Francis, M Robbins</i>			
<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>				
E-TJ	274	12.8	1.14	I-TP	31	1.5	0.41***	Dt. T	305	14.3	0.97	Female Church of England Churchgoers
E-FJ	631	29.6	1.35***	I-FP	105	4.9	0.46***	Dt. F	736	34.5	1.06	
ES-P	98	4.6	0.31***	IS-J	790	37.0	1.41***	Dt. S	888	41.6	1.02	
EN-P	78	3.7	0.38***	IN-J	126	6.0	2.73***	Dt. N	206	9.6	0.82	

Kendall (1998). These data demonstrate that male churchgoers are more introverted than men in the general population (62 % compared with 53 %), more inclined to prefer sensing (78 % compared with 73 %), more inclined to prefer feeling (42 % compared with 35 %), and more inclined to prefer judging (86 % compared with 55 %). There is a significantly higher proportion of men with the SJ preference in church congregations than in the general population (71 % compared with 44 %).

4. Conclusion

The present study set out to establish a reliable and robust profile of the psychological type of Anglican churchgoers in England by means of a substantial survey. The three major distinctive features and strengths of the survey concerned: the commitment and thoroughness of the clergy and lay leaders who introduced the project to the congregations; the method of inviting all attendees to complete the survey while participating in the service; and the use of a measure of psychological type that has been designed specifically for research purposes in this kind of context. Four main conclusions emerge from these new data.

The first conclusion concerns the character of Anglican churchgoers in England conceived in psychological type terms. In this respect, the most important observation concerns the concentration among both male and female churchgoers of four psychological types: ISFJ (male=17 %, female=25 %), ISTJ (male=29 %, female 12 %), ESFJ (male=11 %, and female=25 %), and ESTJ (male=14 %, and female =11 %). Strong concentrations of such individuals may help to shape and to determine the character of the congregation as a whole, since these are the people who will emerge as most visible. In her booklet, *Introducing Type*, Myers provides insightful profiles of these four types. She describes the ISFJ as 'quiet, friendly, responsible, and conscientious'; the ISTJ as 'serious, quiet ... practical, orderly, matter-of-fact, logical, realistic and dependable'; the ESFJ as 'warm-hearted, talkative, popular, conscientious, born co-operators, active committee members'; and the ESTJ as 'not interested in abstract themes, want learning to have direct and immediate application, like to organize and run activities'.⁵⁵

Behind these four psychological types stands the strong attachment to the SJ preference. Above all individuals who prefer SJ have a strong commitment to order, structure and tradition. In his analysis of the SJ preference, Keirse speaks of the 'guardians' who show real reverence for the past.

55 Isobel Briggs Myers, Introduction to type. A guide to understanding your results on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Fifth edition, European English version, Oxford (Oxford University Press) 1998, 7.

This reverence for the past perhaps explains why, more than any of the other types, SJs are creatures of habit, following faithfully the same routines in their daily lives. SJs like to get up the same time every morning, they wash and dress according to the same routines, they drive the same way to work, they eat at the same restaurants at the same times, they shop at the same stores, buy the same brands, and even like to be served by the same salespersons.

Guardians say, 'the old ways are the best ways,' and 'you can't teach an old dog new tricks.'⁵⁶

In their discussion of the implications of the SJ preference for church life, Goldsmith and Wharton speak of the importance of tradition.

Tradition is all-important for SJs. They like things to be the same as they were last year, and the year before . . . right back to their childhood days in fact. Certain people have certain tasks to do, and they are done in pre-determined ways, and on pre-determined days. It is important for them that the past is remembered and maintained, and that they pass a living traditions on to their children. They may not always be good at delegating because that means losing control, and the end result may not be exactly what they had in mind, or it may deviate from the normal way of doing things and that brings uncertainty and breaks the traditions.⁵⁷

The second conclusion concerns the basic similarities between the data provided by the present study among 3,304 Anglican churchgoers in England and the data provided by the much smaller study reported by Francis, Duncan, Craig, and Luffman among 327 Anglican churchgoers in England.⁵⁸ Both studies identified overall preferences for introversion, for sensing, and for judging. Both studies found preferences for feeling among female churchgoers and for thinking among male churchgoers. The similarities between the two studies lend confidence to the subsequent interpretation of the data.

The third conclusion concerns the significant differences between the psychological type profile of churchgoers (church congregations) and the wider population. The first major difference here concerns the significantly higher proportion of judges in church congregations compared with the wider population: 86 % of male churchgoers, compared with 55 % of men in general; and 85 % of female churchgoers, compared with 62 % of women in general. Given a community strongly shaped by individuals with a preference for judging, individuals with a preference for perceiving may experience difficulties accessing or being comfortable in church congregations.

The second major difference between the psychological type profile of churchgoers (church congregations) and the wider population concerns the high visibility of the feeling preference. The preference for feeling charac-

56 *Ibid.*, 92

57 Malcolm Goldsmith / Martin Wharton, *Knowing me knowing you*, London (SPCK) 1993.

58 Francis / Duncan / Craig / Luffman (n. 45).

terises a community concerned with human values, with interpersonal relationships, and with a loving and caring God. Here is a community concerned with peace and with harmony. The UK population norms show that feeling is a feminine preference *par excellence* (reported by 70 % of women and 35 % of men). The present study found that preference for feeling accounted for 70 % of the female and 42 % of the male churchgoers. Not only are the congregations weighted in favour of women (who comprise 65 % of churchgoers), but the male churchgoers contain a significantly higher proportion of feelers than the male population. Given a community shaped by individuals with a preference for feeling, individuals with a preference for thinking may experience difficulties accessing or being comfortable in church congregations.

The fourth conclusion concerns the significant difference between the psychological type profile of churchgoers (church congregations) and the clergy who lead these congregations. Two major differences deserve commentary, one concerning the perceiving process and the other concerning the judging process.

In terms of the perceiving process, church congregations emerged as communities with a strong preference for sensing, and this preference is largely in line with the established population profile for the United Kingdom.⁵⁹ According to the present study, 81 % of female churchgoers prefer sensing (as do 79 % of women in the wider female population). According to the present study 78 % of male churchgoers prefer sensing (even higher than 73 % of the wider male population). By way of contrast, other research has identified clear preferences for intuition among Anglican clergy: 62 % of clergymen and 65 % of clergywomen according to Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater,⁶⁰ 67 % of clergymen according to Francis, Robbins, Duncan, and Whinney,⁶¹ and 60 % of clergywomen according to Francis, Robbins, and Whinney.⁶² Such a pronounced difference between the perceiving preferences of church leaders and members of their congregation may lead to clear difference in expectations and in styles. Put simply, intuitive church leaders are likely to want to stimulate change and development; sensing congregations are likely to want to resist change and development. The consequence is likely to be frustrated leaders and threatened churchgoers.

In terms of the judging processes, church congregations emerged as nearly two-thirds women (65 %) and the majority of female churchgoers prefer feeling (70 %). According to earlier studies, Anglican clergymen are much more likely to prefer feeling than men in the general population:

59 Kendall (n. 28).

60 Francis / Craig / Whinney / Tilley / Slater (n. 21).

61 Francis / Robbins / Duncan / Whinney (n. 21).

62 Francis / Robbins / Whinney (n. 37).

54 %⁶³ and 56 %,⁶⁴ and Anglican clergywomen reflect the female preference for feeling: 74 %⁶⁵ and 76 %.⁶⁶ Although male churchgoers are more likely to prefer feeling than the male population as a whole, there remains a considerable group of thinkers among male churchgoers (58 %). Such a pronounced difference between the judging preference of church leaders and the men in their congregation may lead to clear differences in expectations and in styles. Put simply, feeling church leaders are likely to want to keep the peace and to promote harmony by avoiding direct or confrontational approaches to difficult problems or to difficult individuals; thinking male churchgoers are likely to see such strategies as signs of indecision or weakness and to want to press for clear and speedier solutions, even if this does involve individuals getting hurt.

Although the present study was successful in drawing data from 140 participating congregations, it remains vulnerable to the problems of snowball sampling and may not be properly representative of the Church of England as a whole. The next step would be for a whole diocese to agree to participate in a survey of this nature in order to ensure that the full range of congregations was sampled.

Having focused carefully and closely on one denominational group (Anglicans in England), the present study has established a model of research that could be profitably extended to other church traditions. For example, the two recent studies reported by Francis, Gubb, and Robbins⁶⁷ and by Ryland, Francis, and Robbins⁶⁸ have demonstrated the extent to which the psychological type profile of leaders within the Newfrontiers network of churches differs from the psychological type profile Anglican clergy. The next step would be to establish whether such differences in the psychological type profile of the leadership are reflected in differences in the psychological type profile of the membership. This would require a research design that collected data from churchgoers and from their clergy at the same time.

Abstract

In this study psychological type theory was employed to profile samples of 2,135 women and 1,169 men in the context of Anglican church services in England in order to establish how representative churchgoers are of the wider population and how compatible churchgoers are with their clergy. The women displayed preferences for sensing (82 %), feeling

63 Francis / Craig / Whinney / Tilley / Slater (n. 21).

64 Francis, Robbins, Duncan, & Whinney, Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in England.

65 Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley & Slater, Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England.

66 Francis / Robbins / Whinney (n. 21).

67 Francis / Gubb / Robbins (n. 19).

68 Ryland / Francis / Robbins (n. 19).

(70 %), and judging (85 %), with a balance between extraversion (51 %) and introversion (49 %). The men displayed preferences for introversion (62 %), sensing (78 %), thinking (58 %), and judging (86 %). These characteristics are compared with the United Kingdom population norms to establish the distinctiveness of Anglican churchgoers and compared with previously published data on Anglican clergy to establish the points of similarity, differences and potential tension between Anglican clergy and laity.

Zusammenfassung

In dieser Studie wurde anhand einer Stichprobe von 2135 Frauen und 1169 Männern eine psychologische Typentheorie – der Myer-Briggs-Typen-Indikator – genutzt, um zu überprüfen, inwiefern die Kirchenmitglieder der anglikanischen Kirche einerseits in dieser Hinsicht repräsentativ für die gesamte Bevölkerung sind und andererseits inwiefern sie mit ihren Geistlichen übereinstimmen. Bei den Frauen konnten Präferenzen im Bereich Sensing (82 %), Feeling (70 %) und Judging (85 %) und ein Gleichgewicht zwischen Extraversion (51 %) und Introversion (49 %) analysiert werden. Bei den Männern ließ sich eine Präferenz der Introversion (62 %), des Sensing (78 %) und Thinking (58 %) sowie Judging (86 %) messen. Im Vergleich zur Bevölkerung Groß Britanniens und den anglikanischen Geistlichen wurden dann die spezifischen Charakteristika der anglikanischen Kirchenmitglieder herausgearbeitet und Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede sowie potentielle Spannungen insbesondere zwischen den anglikanischen Geistlichen und den Laien beschrieben.