

Original citation:

Francis, Leslie J., Whinney, Michael and Robbins, Mandy. (2013) Who is called to be a bishop? A study in psychological type profiling of bishops in the Church of England. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, Volume 34 (Number 2). pp. 135-151.

Permanent WRAP url:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/61840>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this 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.

Publishers statement:

This is an Author's Original Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis Group in *Journal of Beliefs & Values* on 26/11/2014 available online:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13617672.2013.801647>

A note on versions:

The version presented here is a working paper or pre-print that may be later published elsewhere. If a published version is known of, the above WRAP url will contain details on finding it.

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



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

Who is called to be a bishop? A study in psychological type profiling of bishops in the
Church of England

Leslie J Francis *

University of Warwick, England

Michael Whinney

St Mary's Centre, Wales

Mandy Robbins

Glyndŵr University, Wales

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Institute of Education

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

A sample of 168 bishops, serving or retired, in the Church of England completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales. The psychological type profile of these bishops was compared with that of 626 Anglican clergymen. The bishops differed significantly from the clergymen on three of the four aspects of psychological type. The bishops were more likely to prefer extraversion (53% compared with 43%), more likely to prefer sensing (49% compared with 38%), and more likely to prefer judging (88% compared with 68%). Overall the SJ temperament was preferred by 47% of the bishops compared with 31% of the clergymen. Moreover, there was a significant difference between diocesan bishops and suffragan bishops in terms of the judging process. While 37% of the suffragan bishops preferred thinking, the proportion rose to 56% among the diocesan bishops. These findings are discussed in light of the Anglican ordinal and in light of the strengths brought to ministry by different psychological types.

Key words: psychology, religion, bishops, personality, psychological type

Introduction

Questions concerning the characteristics of those receiving preferment to the ecclesiastical office of bishop within the Church of England have been approached not only from theological (Sykes, 2001) and legal (Beesley, 2001) perspectives, but also from biographical, historical and sociological perspectives (see , for example, Beeson, 2002; Davies & Guest, 2007, Keulemans, 2009). Such studies draw attention in particular to the influence of social class and educational backgrounds: historically speaking, the major public schools and the ancient universities of Cambridge and Oxford have been well represented among the bishops of the Church of England. For example, profiling the diocesan bishops in office in the Church of England in 1905 Keulemans (2009, p.66) noted from *Crockford's Clerical Directory* that

Not all 32 bishops divulged details about their education before university, but of the 26 who did, no less than 21 (81%) had attended public schools, 11 (42%) of them the three most prestigious institutions of Eton, Harrow, and Winchester. Only three (12%) had attended grammar schools and two had been educated at home.

The aim of the present study is to frame the question, 'Who is called be a bishop in the Church of England?' within a very different conceptual framework, drawing on a psychological perspective. The research problem (together with the research hypothesis) posed by this study is framed by the consideration of two issues: consideration of the theology and psychology of individual differences, and consideration of what defines the office of a bishop.

Theology and psychology of individual differences

Psychological type theory provides an original and insightful lens through which to view individual differences within the context of religious faith. The theory has its origins

within the sphere of analytical psychology in the pioneering work of Carl Jung (see Jung, 1971) and has been integrated more widely within the sphere of the psychology of personality and individual differences through the development of a series of type indicators, temperament sorters and type scales, including the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). Seen as a psychological construct, psychological type theory has made a significant impact on the psychology of religion (see Francis, 2009).

The notion of psychological type has also been taken seriously as a theological construct, for example by Francis and Village (2008) who argue that the level of individual differences accessed by the theory are commensurate with the level of individual differences accessed by sex and ethnicity. Building on a doctrine of creation implied by Genesis 1: 27, where sex differences are part of the divine intentionality in creation, reflecting the difference and diversity within the creator God, the theology of individual differences posits ethnic differences and psychological type differences as also reflecting differences within and diversity within the creator God. Seen as a theological construct, psychological type theory has made a significant impact on empirical theology (see Francis, Robbins, & Astley, 2009).

At its core, psychological type theory identifies four key psychological differences that are deep-seated and as unchangeable as an individual's sex or ethnicity. Each of these four differences is conceptualised as binary polar opposites (like male and female). The two orientations, defined as extraversion and introversion, are concerned with the source of energy. Extraverts gain their energy from the outer world of people and things; introverts gain their energy from the inner world. The two perceiving functions, defined as sensing and intuition, are concerned with ways in which information is gathered: sensing types begin with the detailed information (facts) and build up to the bigger picture; intuitive types begin with the bigger picture (theories) and draw in the details. The two judging functions, defined as

thinking and feeling, are concerned with ways in which information is evaluated. Thinking types base judgement in the head, using objective and logical analysis; feeling types base judgement in the heart, giving weight to the human subjectivity within the situation. The two attitudes, defined as judging and perceiving, are concerned with the way in which the outer world is operated. Judging types employ their preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) in the outer world and model a structured external environment; perceiving types employ their preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) in the outer world and model a flexible external environment.

A series of studies has employed psychological type theory to investigate church congregations, including studies in North America (Gerhardt, 1983; Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1993, 1995; Rehak, 1998), in the UK (Craig, Francis, Bailey, & Robbins, 2003; Francis, Duncan, Craig, & Luffman, 2004; Francis, Robbins, Williams, & Williams, 2007; Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011; Village, Baker, & Howat, 2012), and Australia (Robbins & Francis, 2011). The key conclusion to be drawn from these studies is that church congregations do not represent the psychological type profile of the populations from which they have been drawn. Church congregations, overall, appeal more to introverts than extraverts, more to feeling types than to thinking types, and more to judging types than to perceiving types. Theologically speaking, God may be assumed to call all types equally. Empirically speaking, it seems either that some types are more likely to respond or that some types are more likely to be welcomed by and integrated into the churches.

A second series of studies has employed psychological type theory to investigate the call to authorised ministries within the Churches. Such studies emerged in North America during the 1980s (Cabral, 1984; Harbaugh, 1984; Holsworth, 1984; Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault, & Avis, 1988) and flourished in the UK during the 2000s, including studies among Bible College students (Francis, Penson, & Jones, 2001), evangelical church leaders

(Francis & Robbins, 2002; Craig, Francis, & Robbins, 2004), missionary personal (Craig, Horsfall, & Francis, 2005), evangelical lay church leaders (Francis, Craig, Horsfall, & Ross, 2005), Roman Catholic priests (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006), youth ministers (Francis, Nash, Nash, & Craig, 2007), evangelical Anglican seminarians (Francis, Craig, & Butler, 2007), Assemblies of God theological college students (Kay, Francis, & Craig, 2008; Kay & Francis, 2008), leaders within the Newfrontiers network of churches (Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009; Francis, Robbins, & Ryland, 2012), Anglican clergy serving in Wales (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001; Francis, Littler, & Robbins, 2010), Anglican clergy serving in England (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007; Francis, Robbins, Duncan, & Whinney, 2010), and leaders within the Apostolic network of churches (Kay, Francis, & Robbins, 2011). The key conclusion to be drawn from these studies is that there are both some consistent psychological type patterns among clergy making them significantly different from the general population and also some significant differences between clergy representing different denominations (say, Assemblies of God or Presbyterian), different theological traditions (say, liberal or conservative) and different church orientations (say, evangelical or catholic).

Within the broader context of research concerning the psychological type profile of clergy and church leaders in the UK, two studies have focused specifically on clergy serving in the Church of England. In the first study, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) studied 626 clergymen and 247 clergywomen. For the purposes of the present paper, it is the profile of the clergymen that is of particular interest, since at present within the Church of England it is only from among the male clergy that bishops can be selected. In this study, clergymen were found to have preferences for introversion (57%) over extraversion (43%), for intuition (62%) over sensing (38%), for feeling (54%) over thinking (47%), and for judging (68%) over perceiving (32%). In the second study, Francis, Robbins, Duncan, &

Whinney (2010) studied 622 clergymen. In this study, they also found preferences for introversion (64%) over extraversion (36%), for intuition (67%) over sensing (33%), for feeling (56%) over thinking (44%), and for judging (73%) over perceiving (27%). Given the close similarities between the findings from the two independent studies it is reasonable to speak of the strengths of Church of England clergymen as characterised by introversion, intuition, feeling and judging. Clergy who prefer introversion may bring particular strength to the reflective face of ministry, but feel less comfortable with the public and social face of ministry. Clergy who prefer intuition may bring particular strength to the developmental potential within ministry, but feel less comfortable with safeguarding the tradition and passing on the established practices unchallenged and unchanged. Clergy who prefer feeling may bring particular strengths of empathy and sensitivity to human situations and to pastoral provision, but feel less comfortable with tackling issues of controversy, conflict and challenge. Clergy who prefer judging may bring particular strengths to the organisational and structural aspects of ministry, but feel less comfortable with handling spontaneity, flexibility and unpredictability.

It is against this background that the present study proposes to explore, from both theoretical and empirical perspectives the extent to which the psychological type profile of bishops may vary from that of clergymen.

The office of bishop

Recent discussion of the office of bishop within the Church of England makes it clear that there is room for a variety of interpretation and development (see, for example, Norris, 1988; Beeson, 2002; Podmore, 2006; Davies & Guest, 2007; Grundy, 2011). This observation is perhaps no more evident than in the consideration concerning the episcopal ordination of women, or the episcopal ordination of those in stable same-sex relationships, and in the discussion with other Churches, including Methodists and Nordic Lutherans.

Within the Anglican tradition, one way in which to try to understand and to track the expectations placed on bishops is by giving close attention to the language employed in the ordinal (see Podmore, 2006). Indeed clear reference is made to the ordinal by recent Anglican investigations of the episcopacy, including Mellows (2001).

In this context the foundation liturgy is provided by the *Book of Common Prayer 1662*. The tone of the 1662 ordinal for the consecration of bishops projects the office into which they are to be ordained as requiring an STJ predisposition. The SJ disposition is reflected in the call to ‘Government in the Church’; and ‘to the Administration’. Within the SJ framework of management skills, the particular qualities of the T disposition are required to fulfil the following clauses:

- instruct the people committed to your charge,
- banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine,
- maintain and set forward ... quietness, love and peace among all men; and such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous, within your Diocese, correct and punish.

Here the 1662 ordinal seems to have been a clear call to tasks that draw on the strengths of the STJ profile.

The more recent ordinal for the consecration of bishops set out by *Common Worship* (Church of England, 2000) provides greater detail, and generally this detail reinforces the need for the STJ management style, but now the added emphasis on the outgoing nature of the office promotes weighting in favour of ESTJ leadership over ISTJ leadership. The management style favouring J is understood by designations like:

- principle ministers of word and sacrament,
- chief pastors.

The particular strengths of the SJ temperament are focused by requirements like:

- be guardians of the faith,

- follow the rules,
- accept the discipline of this Church,
- govern Christ's people.

The particular strengths of the STJ style are called out by the following injunctions:

- offer to God your best powers of mind,
- teach the doctrine and refute error,
- confront injustice and work for righteousness,
- teach the doctrine of Christ as the Church of England has received it.

The exclusive emphasis on the T disposition is, however, qualified in the *Common Worship* ordinal and tempered by some appeal to F:

- be merciful but with firmness,
- minister discipline but with compassion,
- be gentle and merciful to those in need,
- love and pray for those committed to their charge.

The distinctive strengths of the E disposition may be preferred to effect the following tasks:

- leading God's people in mission,
- knowing their people and being known by them,
- proclaim the gospel boldly,
- make your home a place of hospitality and welcome.

Here the contemporary ordinal of the Church of England seems to be describing an office that draws on the strengths of the ESTJ profile.

A second source of insights into the expectations associated with the office of bishop in the Church of England may be provided by the Canons of the Church. Canon C18 'Of diocesan bishops' concentrates entirely on the STJ requirements of the office. Here the requirements of the office are set out:

- to teach,
- to uphold sound and wholesome doctrine,
- to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange opinions,
- to set forward and maintain quietness, love, and peace among all men.

The bishop is concerned with:

- ordering, controlling, and authorising all services in churches,
- consecrating new churches, churchyards, and burial grounds,
- instituting to vacant benefices,
- admitting persons into holy orders,
- celebrating the rite of confirmation, as often and in as many places,
- correct and punish all such as be unquiet, disobedient, or criminous within his diocese.

Within Canon C18 there is mention neither of the pastoral heart that would call out the F function, nor of the strategic vision that would call out the N function. Here is the task profile shaped for the STJ disposition.

The foregoing discussion of the office of bishop (as conceived within the ordinal and canons of the Church of England) leads to the formulation of the following four hypotheses. If the selection process for bishops takes into account the qualities implied within the ordinal and the canons, compared with the established profile of clergy, it is hypothesised that among bishops there will be:

- a higher proportion of extraverts,
- a higher proportion of sensing types,
- a higher proportion of thinking types,
- a higher proportion of judging types.

These hypotheses may, however, be contaminated by one further factor. While the ordinal and the canon both imply that there is just one category of bishop in the Church of England, in practice there are clearly two *main* categories, diocesan bishops and suffragan bishops, as well as a few bishops styled area bishops or assistant bishops. Archbishops also retain their function as diocesan bishop. The key distinction between diocesan bishops and suffragan bishops is that diocesan bishops are appointed to the administrative responsibility of a diocese, while suffragan bishops are appointed to carry out tasks delegated to them by the diocesan bishops. The document *Resourcing Bishops* offers the following clarification between diocesan bishops and suffragan bishops.

The legal differentiation naturally involves differences in function. The position varies from diocese to diocese, but in general the evidence reveals a clear difference in the weight of responsibility between that borne by a diocesan and that borne by a suffragan. (Mellows Report, 2001, p. 23)

Although it is difficult to identify publicly accessible descriptions of the specific requirements and expectations of suffragan bishops, it may be the case that diocesan bishops who prefer thinking deliberately choose to promote to suffragan status clergymen who appear to be more interested in and better equipped to carry out pastoral tasks of care and compassion. The Perry Report (2001) on the process of choosing diocesan bishops offers the following significant observation regarding the difference between diocesan bishops and suffragan bishops exercising different roles.

We do not believe that translation from a suffragan to a diocesan see is necessarily a natural progression ... Just as there are excellent suffragan bishops who are not suitable for translation to diocesan sees, it is argued, so there are also men who would not be suited to the position of suffragan bishop but would be excellent diocesans. (p. 17)

This discussion leads to the formulation of the fifth hypothesis. If diocesan bishops are appointing suffragan bishops to bring a deeper depth of pastoral concern and a wider range of pastoral skills to their senior staff team, compared with the profile brought by the diocesan bishops themselves, it is hypothesised that among suffragan bishops there will be:

- a higher proportion of feeling types.

Method

Procedure

All bishops, active or retired, recorded on the Church Commissioners' database as serving or having served in the Church of England were invited to complete a short questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent by post under a personalised covering letter from Bishop Michael Whinney and returned by freepost to the administrator of the St Mary's Centre. The bishops were assured of anonymity and confidentiality. A total of 258 questionnaires were dispatched, and 168 were returned, making a highly satisfactory response rate of 65%.

Instrument

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). This 40-item instrument comprises four sets of ten 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 this instrument to function well in church-related contexts. For example, Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported alpha coefficients of .83 and for EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale.

Sample

Of the 168 who participated in the survey, 75 were currently in office, 66 had retired but remained in active service, and 27 had retired and were no longer in active service; 4 were in their forties, 35 in their fifties, 47 in their sixties, 51 in their seventies, and 31 were aged 80 or over. Of the total sample, 72 were serving or had served as diocesan bishops, 70 as suffragan bishops, and 26 as assistant or area bishops.

Data analysis

In the following analyses comparisons are made between the 626 Church of England clergymen reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007), all 168 Bishops who responded to the present survey, the 72 bishops responding to the present survey who had served or were serving as diocesan bishops, and the 70 bishops responding to the present survey who had served or were serving as suffragan bishops and had never served as diocesan bishops. The scientific literature concerned with psychological type has developed a distinctive way of presenting type-related data. The conventional format of ‘type tables’ has been used in the present paper to allow the findings from this study to be compared with other relevant studies in the literature. In these tables the statistical significance of differences in the psychological type profiles of different groups is tested by means of the Selection Ratio Index (*I*), an extension of the classic chi-square test (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

Results

Table 1 reproduces the psychological type profile of the sample of 626 anglican clergymen published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). This table

– insert table 1 about here –

profiles a group of men who prefer introversion (57%) over extraversion (43%), intuition (62%) over sensing (38%), feeling (54%) over thinking (47%), and judging (68%) over perceiving (32%). The dominant type preferences, in descending order were intuition (29%), feeling (28%), thinking (22%), and sensing (21%).

Table 2 presents the psychological type profile of all 168 bishops and compares them

– insert table 2 about here –

with the profile of the 626 clergymen. The bishops differ from the clergymen on three of the four aspects of psychological type: the bishops are more likely to prefer extraversion (53% compared with 43%), more likely to prefer sensing (49% compared with 38%), and more likely to prefer judging (88% compared with 68%). These differences are reflected in some types being more in evidence among bishops than among clergymen, including ESFJ (14% compared with 7%), ESTJ (12% compared with 7%), and ISFJ (13% compared with 8%). Other types are less in evidence among bishops than among clergymen, including ISTP (0% compared with 2%), INFP (4% compared with 10%), and INTP (1% compared with 5%). Overall, the SJ temperament is significantly more prevalent among bishops than among clergymen (47% compared with 31%), and the NF temperament significantly less prevalent (24% compared with 55%).

Table 3 presents the profile of 72 diocesan bishops, and table 4 presents the profile of

– insert table 3 about here –

70 suffragan bishops, compared with the diocesan bishops. The significant difference between these two groups of bishops concerns the judging process. While 63% of the suffragan bishops prefer feeling, the proportion falls to 44% among diocesan bishops; while 37% of the suffragan bishops prefer thinking, the proportion rises to 56% among the diocesan bishops. While 19% of the suffragan bishops are dominant thinkers, the proportion rises to 33% among the diocesan bishops.

Discussion

The present study set out to examine the psychological profile of those called to serve in the office of bishops within the Church of England, distinguishing between those who serve as diocesan bishops and those who serve as suffragan bishops. Drawing on the

expectations associated with the office of bishop within the ordinal and the canons of the Church of England, certain predictions were advanced regarding ways in which those called to the office of bishop would differ from clergymen serving in the Church of England in terms of psychological type theory. These predictions, formulated as hypotheses, were tested by comparing data provided by 168 bishops with the psychological type profile profile of 626 clergymen published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). Five main conclusions emerge from these analyses.

The first hypothesis suggested that the office of the bishop (particularly as profiled by the ordinal within *Common Worship*) would privilege the strengths of extraversion. This hypothesis was confirmed by the data that found a significantly higher proportion of extraverts among the bishops than among the clergymen. The second hypothesis suggested that the office of the bishop would privilege the strengths of sensing. This hypothesis was confirmed by the data that found a significantly higher proportion of sensing types among the bishops than among the clergymen. The third hypothesis suggested that the office of the bishop would privilege the strengths of judging. This hypothesis was confirmed by the data that found a significantly higher proportion of judging types among the bishops than among the clergymen. The fourth hypothesis suggested that the office of bishop would privilege the strengths of thinking. This hypothesis was not confirmed by the first analysis of the data that found no significant difference between the proportions of thinking types found among the bishops and among the clergymen.

The fifth hypothesis suggested that the role of diocesan bishop would privilege thinking, while the role of suffragan bishop would privilege feeling. This hypothesis was confirmed and illustrates why, as a whole, the group of 168 bishops did not differ significantly in levels of preference for thinking from the 626 clergymen. When suffragan bishops are distinguished from diocesan bishops, the following pattern emerges. Preference

for thinking is expressed by 56% of diocesan bishops, 47% of clergymen, and 37% of suffragan bishops. The startling finding is that diocesan bishops are more likely to prefer thinking than the clergymen and the suffragan bishops are less likely to prefer thinking than the clergymen.

Conclusion

The theoretical analysis and empirical findings from the present study lead to three main conclusions, and to a challenge.

The first conclusion concerns the power of psychological type theory to illuminate and to test the physical characteristics associated with those called to the office of diocesan bishop. For this office the Church is appointing clergymen who prefer extraversion, sensing, thinking, and judging. These are individuals noted for good skills in managing systems, and who will safeguard the traditions and structures. They may not be so good at handling people, envisioning innovative developments, or embracing change. They may represent 'a steady pair of hands' rather than visionary leadership.

The second conclusion concerns the power of psychological type theory to illuminate and to test the difference in the psychological characteristics associated with those called to the office of suffragan bishop and those called to the office of diocesan bishop. The main difference is between appointing the system-centred head to the diocesan post and the person-centred heart to the suffragan post. In management terms, it may make a great deal of sense to seek the different skills of complementary personality types within the episcopal office within a diocese. Unless this strategy is made explicit, however, the strategy may seem to be unfair to those suffragan bishops who see their appointment as a stepping stone to diocesan responsibilities but then subsequently discover that they are relegated to a 'junior' episcopacy for life. In essence this may be an issue concerned with unconscious ambition that needs to be recognised as not an infrequent human characteristic. However, if seen as a structural

opportunity with the church, the issue could be dealt with both by objective advice on appointment and by emphasising a career trajectory for suffragan bishops outside the expectation of elevation to a diocesan post. Such a trajectory needs to be visible among laity and among clergy as well as among bishops.

The third conclusion concerns inviting the church to consider accepting the routine application of psychological type theory within its human resource strategy, and to do so for three reasons. The first reason is in the name of transparency. The present study (and the wider research literature on which it builds) makes it plain that certain aspects of personnel selection involve implicit criteria that map in predictable ways onto the theological and psychological constructs proposed by psychological type theory. To acknowledge this practice would lead to creating greater transparency, to promoting a sense of fairness, and to fostering more realistic expectations among clergy. The second reason is in the name of objectivity. If the Church were to have a clear view of the psychological characteristics required to promote effective ministry and mission at different levels of its structure, it is likely that appropriate psychological assessment could aid in the selection process.

Underpinning this final conclusion, however, is a profound theological issue concerning the relative weight given to divine intervention in the Church and to the divine call for intelligent human collaboration in establishing the Reign of God. The debate touches the great doctrines of creation, fall, redemption, and sanctification. Engaging in this debate, it is worth recalling the established Anglican emphasis on human reason.

The conclusions from this research study into the psychological type profile of bishops may also prompt a challenge to the Church of England, at least to pose the following question. As the Church of England selects the next generation of diocesan bishops to steer their dioceses well into the twenty-first century, will the Church be best served by continuing to place confidence in the STJ profile, with its strong emphasis on preserving the traditions of

the organisation? Or might the Church be better served (in some dioceses at least) by, say, the ENFP profile of bishops who are equipped to function confidently with public visibility, to shape a vision for the future, to motivate the hearts of men and women to catch that vision, and to respond to the changing contours of a vision-led Church? Episcopal leadership of this nature would be neither scary nor unpredictable, if supported and complemented by an ISTJ/ESTJ team equipped to maintain the essential diocesan infrastructure, including Diocesan Secretary, Archdeacon, Cathedral Dean, Accountant and Chair of the Board of Finance.

The present study may well be worth repeating after a new generation of diocesan bishops have come into post following current changes to the appointment procedures.

References

- Beesley, P. (2001). The legal role of bishops. In Mellows Report, *Resourcing Bishops* (pp. 227-249). London: Church House Publishing.
- Beeson, T. (2002). *The Bishops*. London: SPCK.
- Bigelow, E. D., Fitzgerald, R., Busk, P., Girault, E., & Avis, J. (1988). Psychological characteristics of Catholic sisters: relationships between the MBTI and other measures. *Journal of Psychological Type, 14*, 32-36.
- Cabral, G. (1984). Psychological types in a Catholic convent: applications to community living and congregational data. *Journal of Psychological Type, 8*, 16-22.
- Cameron Report (1990). *Episcopal ministry: Report on the Archbishops' Group on the Episcopate*. London: Church House Publishing.
- Church of England. (2000). *Common Worship: Services and prayers for the Church of England*.
- Craig, C L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L.J. (2006). Psychological type preferences of Roman Catholic priests in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 27*, 157-164.
- Craig, C. L., Francis, L. J., Bailey, J., & Robbins, M. (2003). Psychological types in Church in Wales congregations. *The Psychologist in Wales, 15*, 18-21.
- Craig, C., Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (2004). Psychological type and sex differences among church leaders in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 25*, 3-13.
- Craig, C. L., Horsfall, T., & Francis, L. J. (2005). Psychological types of male missionary personnel training in England: A role for thinking type men? *Pastoral Psychology, 53*, 475-482.
- Davies, D. J. & Guest, M. (2007). *Bishops, wives and children: Spiritual capital across the generations*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990). Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members. *Journal of Psychological Type, 20*, 25-33.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2009). Psychological type theory and religious and spiritual experience. In M. De Souza, L. J. Francis, J. O'Higgins-Norman, & D. G. Scott (Eds.), *International Handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing* (pp 125-146). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Francis, L.J., Craig, C.L., & Butler, A. (2007). Psychological types of male evangelical Anglican seminarians in England. *Journal of Psychological Type, 67*, 11-17.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Horsfall, T., & Ross, C. F. J. (2005). Psychological types of male and female evangelical lay church leaders in England, compared with United Kingdom population norms. *Fieldwork in Religion, 1*, 69-83.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology, 11*, 266-284.
- Francis, L. J., Duncan, B., Craig, C. L., & Luffman, G. (2004). Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England. *Journal of Adult Theological Education, 1*, 66-77.
- Francis, L. J., Gubb, S., & Robbins, M. (1999). Psychological type profile of Lead Elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 30*, 61-69.

- Francis, L. J., Littler, K., Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type and Offa's Dyke: Exploring differences in the psychological type profile of Anglican clergy serving in England and Wales. *Contemporary Wales*, 23, 240-251.
- Francis, L. J., Nash, P., Nash, S., & Craig, C.L. (2007). Psychology and youth ministry: Psychological type preferences of Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Youth Ministry*, 5(2), 73-90.
- Francis, L. J., Payne, V. J., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 56, 19-23.
- Francis, L. J., Penson, A.W., & Jones, S.H. (2001). Psychological types of male and female Bible College students in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 4, 23-32.
- Francis, L. J. & Robbins, M. (2002). Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders. *Journal of Belief and Values*, 23, 217-220.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Astley, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Empirical theology in texts and tables: Qualitative, quantitative and comparative perspectives*. Leiden: Brill.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Craig, C. L. (2011). The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: Compatible or incompatible with their clergy? *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 15, 243-259.
- Francis, L.J. Robbins, M., Duncan, B., & Whinney, M. (2010). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in England: A ministry for intuitives. In B. Ruelas and V. Briseno (Eds.), *Psychology of Intuition* (pp. 211-219). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Ryland (2012). Called for leadership: Psychological type profile of leaders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 40, 220-228.

- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Williams, A., & Williams, R. (2007). All types are called, but some are more likely to respond: The psychological profile of rural Anglican churchgoers in Wales. *Rural Theology*, 5, 23-30.
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2008). *Preaching with all our souls*. London: Continuum.
- Gerhardt, R. (1983). Liberal religion and personality type. *Research in Psychological Type*, 6, 47-53.
- Grundy, M. (2011). *Leadership and oversight: New models for episcopal ministry*. London: Mowbray.
- Harbaugh, G. L. (1984). The person in ministry: Psychological type and the seminary. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 23-32.
- Holsworth, T. E. (1984). Type preferences among Roman Catholic seminarians. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 33-35.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kay, W. K., & Francis, L. J. (2008). Psychological type preferences of female Bible College students in England. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 29, 101-105.
- Kay, W. K., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2008). 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, 6-20.
- Kay, W. K., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2011). A distinctive leadership for a distinctive network of churches? Psychological type theory and the Apostolic Networks. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 20, 306-322.
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis.

Keulemans, M. (2009). *The development of the Anglican Episcopate in mainland Britain*.

Unpublished DMin dissertation. University of Wales, Bangor.

Mellows Report (2001). *Resourcing Bishops: The first report of the Archbishops' Review Group on Bishops; needs and resources*. London: Church House Publishing.

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Norris, R. A. (1988). Episcopacy. In S. Sykes and J. Booty (Eds.), *The Study of Anglicanism* (pp. 296-312). London: SPCK.

Perry Report. (2001). *Working with the Spirit: Choosing diocesan bishops*. London: Church House Publishing.

Podmore, C. (2006). The Church of England's understanding of episcopacy. *Theology*, 109, 117-138.

Rehak, M.C. (1998). Identifying the congregation's corporate personality. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 44, 39-44.

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

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.

Sykes, S. (2001). A theology of episcopacy. In Mellows Report, *Resourcing Bishops* (pp. 217-226). London: Church House Publishing.

Village, A., Baker, S., & Howat, S. (2012). Psychological type profiles of churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 969-978.

Table 1

Type distribution for male Anglican clergy

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| ISTJ <i>n</i> = 62 (9.9%) +++++ | ISFJ <i>n</i> = 49 (7.8%) +++++ | INFJ <i>n</i> = 57 (9.1%) +++++ | INTJ <i>n</i> = 69 (11.0%) +++++ | E <i>n</i> = 270 (43.1%) | I <i>n</i> = 356 (56.9%) |
| +++++ | +++++ | +++++ | +++++ | S <i>n</i> = 240 (38.3%) | N <i>n</i> = 386 (61.7%) |
| +++++ | +++ | ++++ | +++++ | T <i>n</i> = 291 (46.5%) | F <i>n</i> = 335 (53.5%) |
| | | | + | J <i>n</i> = 427 (68.2%) | P <i>n</i> = 199 (31.8%) |
| ISTP <i>n</i> = 14 (2.2%) ++ | ISFP <i>n</i> = 9 (1.4%) + | INFP <i>n</i> = 63 (10.1%) +++++ | INTP <i>n</i> = 33 (5.3%) +++++ | Pairs and Temperaments | |
| | | +++++ | | IJ <i>n</i> = 237 (37.5%) | IP <i>n</i> = 119 (19.0%) |
| | | +++++ | | EP <i>n</i> = 80 (12.8%) | EJ <i>n</i> = 190 (30.4%) |
| ESTP <i>n</i> = 7 (1.1%) + | ESFP <i>n</i> = 15 (2.4%) ++ | ENFP <i>n</i> = 42 (6.7%) +++++ | ENTP <i>n</i> = 16 (2.6%) +++ | ST <i>n</i> = 124 (19.8%) | SF <i>n</i> = 116 (18.5%) |
| | | +++++ | | NF <i>n</i> = 219 (35.0%) | NT <i>n</i> = 167 (26.7%) |
| | | ++ | | SJ <i>n</i> = 195 (31.2%) | SP <i>n</i> = 45 (7.2%) |
| ESTJ <i>n</i> = 41 (6.5%) +++++ | ESFJ <i>n</i> = 43 (6.9%) +++++ | ENFJ <i>n</i> = 57 (9.1%) +++++ | ENTJ <i>n</i> = 49 (7.8%) +++++ | NP <i>n</i> = 154 (24.6%) | NJ <i>n</i> = 232 (37.1%) |
| +++++ | +++++ | +++++ | +++++ | TJ <i>n</i> = 221 (35.3%) | TP <i>n</i> = 70 (11.2%) |
| ++ | ++ | ++++ | +++ | FP <i>n</i> = 129 (20.6%) | FJ <i>n</i> = 206 (32.9%) |
| | | | | IN <i>n</i> = 222 (35.5%) | EN <i>n</i> = 164 (26.2%) |
| | | | | IS <i>n</i> = 134 (21.4%) | ES <i>n</i> = 106 (16.9%) |
| | | | | ET <i>n</i> = 113 (18.1%) | EF <i>n</i> = 157 (25.1%) |
| | | | | IF <i>n</i> = 178 (28.4%) | IT <i>n</i> = 178 (28.4%) |

| Jungian Types (E) | | | Jungian Types (I) | | | Dominant Types | | | <i>Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley and Slater</i> |
|--------------------------|----------|------|--------------------------|----------|------|-----------------------|----------|------|---|
| | <i>n</i> | % | | <i>n</i> | % | | <i>n</i> | % | |
| E-TJ | 90 | 14.4 | I-TP | 47 | 7.5 | Dt.T | 137 | 21.9 | |
| E-FJ | 100 | 16.0 | I-FP | 72 | 11.5 | Dt.F | 172 | 27.5 | |
| ES-P | 22 | 3.5 | IS-J | 111 | 17.7 | Dt.S | 133 | 21.2 | |
| EN-P | 58 | 9.3 | IN-J | 126 | 20.1 | Dt.N | 184 | 29.4 | |

Note: N = 626

NB: + = 1% of N

*Type distribuion for male
Anglican clergy*

Table 2

Type distribution for bishops compared with clergymen

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| ISTJ | ISFJ | INFJ | INTJ | E | I | S |
| <i>n</i> = 13 (7.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.78 +++++ | <i>n</i> = 22 (13.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.67* +++++ | <i>n</i> = 12 (7.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.78 +++++ | <i>n</i> = 21 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.13 +++++ | <i>n</i> = 89 (53.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.23* | <i>n</i> = 79 (47.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.83* | <i>n</i> = 83 (49.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.29** |
| +++ | +++++ | ++ | +++++ | <i>n</i> = 85 (50.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.82** | | <i>n</i> = 85 (50.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.82** |
| | +++ | | ++ | T | F | J |
| | | | | <i>n</i> = 77 (45.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.99 | <i>n</i> = 91 (54.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.01 | <i>n</i> = 147 (87.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.28*** |
| | | | | P | | <i>n</i> = 21 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.39*** |
| | | | | Pairs and Temperaments | | |
| ISTP | ISFP | INFP | INTP | IJ | IP | EP |
| <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.01* | <i>n</i> = 2 (1.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.81 + | <i>n</i> = 7 (4.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.41* ++++ | <i>n</i> = 2 (1.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.23* + | <i>n</i> = 68 (40.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.07 | <i>n</i> = 11 (6.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.34*** | <i>n</i> = 10 (5.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.47* |
| | | | | EJ | ST | SF |
| | | | | <i>n</i> = 79 (47.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.55*** | <i>n</i> = 33 (19.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.99 | <i>n</i> = 50 (29.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.61*** |
| | | | | NT | NF | NT |
| | | | | <i>n</i> = 44 (26.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.98 | <i>n</i> = 41 (24.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.70** | <i>n</i> = 44 (26.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.98 |
| | | | | SJ | SP | NP |
| | | | | <i>n</i> = 79 (47.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.51*** | <i>n</i> = 4 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.33* | <i>n</i> = 17 (10.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.41*** |
| | | | | NJ | | NJ |
| | | | | <i>n</i> = 68 (41.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.09 | | <i>n</i> = 68 (41.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.09 |
| | | | | TJ | TP | FP |
| | | | | <i>n</i> = 74 (44.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.25* | <i>n</i> = 3 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.16*** | <i>n</i> = 18 (10.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.52** |
| | | | | FJ | | FJ |
| | | | | <i>n</i> = 73 (43.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.32** | | <i>n</i> = 73 (43.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.32** |
| | | | | IN | EN | IS |
| | | | | <i>n</i> = 42 (25.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.70** | <i>n</i> = 43 (25.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.98 | <i>n</i> = 37 (22.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.03 |
| | | | | ES | | ES |
| | | | | <i>n</i> = 46 (27.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.62** | | <i>n</i> = 46 (27.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.62** |
| | | | | ET | EF | IF |
| | | | | <i>n</i> = 41 (24.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.35 | <i>n</i> = 48 (28.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.14 | <i>n</i> = 43 (25.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.90 |
| | | | | IT | | IT |
| | | | | <i>n</i> = 36 (21.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.75 | | <i>n</i> = 36 (21.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.75 |

| Jungian Types (E) | | | Jungian Types (I) | | | Dominant Types | | | Type distribution for bishops compared with clergymen | | |
|-------------------|----|--------------|-------------------|------|--------------|----------------|--------|--------------|--|------|------|
| <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | | | |
| E-TJ | 40 | 23.8 | 1.66** | I-TP | 2 | 1.2 | 0.16** | Dt.T | 42 | 25.0 | 1.14 |
| E-FJ | 39 | 23.2 | 1.45* | I-FP | 9 | 5.4 | 0.47* | Dt.F | 48 | 28.6 | 1.04 |
| ES-P | 2 | 1.2 | 0.34 | IS-J | 35 | 20.8 | 1.17 | Dt.S | 37 | 22.0 | 1.04 |
| EN-P | 8 | 4.8 | 0.51 | IN-J | 33 | 19.6 | 0.98 | Dt.N | 41 | 24.4 | 0.83 |

Note: N = 168

NB: + = 1% of N

* *p* < .05

** *p* < .01

*** *p* < .001

Table 3

Type distribution for diocesan bishops

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | |
|---|--|---|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| ISTJ <i>n</i> = 7 (9.7%) +++++ +++++ | ISFJ <i>n</i> = 8 (11.1%) +++++ +++++ + | INFJ <i>n</i> = 5 (6.9%) +++++ ++ | INTJ <i>n</i> = 8 (11.1%) +++++ +++++ + | E <i>n</i> = 39 (54.2%) | I <i>n</i> = 33 (45.8%) |
| ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) | ISFP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) | INFP <i>n</i> = 3 (4.2%) ++++ | INTP <i>n</i> = 2 (2.8%) +++ | S <i>n</i> = 34 (47.2%) | N <i>n</i> = 38 (52.8%) |
| ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) | ESFP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) | ENFP <i>n</i> = 3 (4.2%) ++++ | ENTP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.4%) + | T <i>n</i> = 40 (55.6%) | F <i>n</i> = 32 (44.4%) |
| ESTJ <i>n</i> = 11 (15.3%) +++++ +++++ +++++ | ESFJ <i>n</i> = 8 (11.1%) +++++ +++++ + | ENFJ <i>n</i> = 5 (6.9%) +++++ ++ | ENTJ <i>n</i> = 11 (15.3%) +++++ +++++ + | J <i>n</i> = 63 (87.5%) | P <i>n</i> = 9 (12.5%) |
| | | | | Pairs and Temperaments | |
| | | | | IJ <i>n</i> = 28 (38.9%) | IP <i>n</i> = 5 (6.9%) |
| | | | | EP <i>n</i> = 4 (5.6%) | EJ <i>n</i> = 35 (48.6%) |
| | | | | ST <i>n</i> = 18 (25.0%) | SF <i>n</i> = 16 (22.2%) |
| | | | | NF <i>n</i> = 16 (22.2%) | NT <i>n</i> = 22 (30.6%) |
| | | | | SJ <i>n</i> = 34 (47.2%) | SP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) |
| | | | | NP <i>n</i> = 9 (12.5%) | NJ <i>n</i> = 29 (40.3%) |
| | | | | TJ <i>n</i> = 37 (51.4%) | TP <i>n</i> = 3 (4.2%) |
| | | | | FP <i>n</i> = 6 (8.3%) | FJ <i>n</i> = 26 (36.1%) |
| | | | | IN <i>n</i> = 18 (25.0%) | EN <i>n</i> = 20 (27.8%) |
| | | | | IS <i>n</i> = 15 (20.8%) | ES <i>n</i> = 19 (26.4%) |
| | | | | ET <i>n</i> = 23 (31.9%) | EF <i>n</i> = 16 (22.2%) |
| | | | | IF <i>n</i> = 16 (22.2%) | IT <i>n</i> = 17 (23.6%) |

| Jungian Types (E) | | Jungian Types (I) | | Dominant Types | | <i>Type distribution for diocesan bishops</i> | | |
|--------------------------|----|--------------------------|------|-----------------------|------|---|----|------|
| <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | | | |
| E-TJ | 22 | 30.6 | I-TP | 2 | 2.8 | Dt.T | 24 | 33.3 |
| E-FJ | 13 | 18.1 | I-FP | 3 | 4.2 | Dt.F | 16 | 22.2 |
| ES-P | 0 | 0.0 | IS-J | 15 | 20.8 | Dt.S | 15 | 20.8 |
| EN-P | 4 | 5.6 | IN-J | 13 | 18.1 | Dt.N | 17 | 23.6 |

Note: N = 72

NB: + = 1% of N

Table 4

Type distribution for suffragan bishops compared with diocesan bishops

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| ISTJ <i>n</i> = 4 (5.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.59 +++++ | ISFJ <i>n</i> = 12 (17.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.56 +++++ | INFJ <i>n</i> = 5 (7.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.03 +++++ | INTJ <i>n</i> = 9 (12.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.16 +++++ | E <i>n</i> = 36 (51.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.95 | I <i>n</i> = 34 (48.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.06 | S <i>n</i> = 41 (58.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.24 | N <i>n</i> = 29 (41.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.78 |
| | | | | T <i>n</i> = 26 (37.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.67* | F <i>n</i> = 44 (62.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.41* | J <i>n</i> = 62 (88.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.01 | P <i>n</i> = 8 (11.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.91 |
| | | | | Pairs and Temperaments | | | |
| ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00 | ISFP <i>n</i> = 2 (2.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.00 +++ | INFP <i>n</i> = 2 (2.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.69 +++ | INTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00 | IJ <i>n</i> = 30 (42.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.10 | IP <i>n</i> = 4 (5.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.82 | EP <i>n</i> = 4 (5.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.03 | EJ <i>n</i> = 32 (45.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.94 |
| | | | | ST <i>n</i> = 11 (15.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.63 | SF <i>n</i> = 30 (42.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.93** | NF <i>n</i> = 14 (20.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.90 | NT <i>n</i> = 15 (21.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.70 |
| ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00 | ESFP <i>n</i> = 2 (2.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.00 +++ | ENFP <i>n</i> = 2 (2.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.69 +++ | ENTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00 | SJ <i>n</i> = 37 (52.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.12 | SP <i>n</i> = 4 (5.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.00 | NP <i>n</i> = 5 (5.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.46 | NJ <i>n</i> = 25 (35.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.89 |
| ESTJ <i>n</i> = 7 (10.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.65 +++++ | ESFJ <i>n</i> = 14 (20.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.80 +++++ | ENFJ <i>n</i> = 5 (7.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.03 +++++ | ENTJ <i>n</i> = 6 (8.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.56 +++++ | TJ <i>n</i> = 26 (37.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.72 | TP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00 | FP <i>n</i> = 8 (11.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.37 | FJ <i>n</i> = 36 (51.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.42 |
| | | | | IN <i>n</i> = 16 (22.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.91 | EN <i>n</i> = 13 (18.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.67 | IS <i>n</i> = 18 (25.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.23 | ES <i>n</i> = 23 (32.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.25 |
| | | | | ET <i>n</i> = 13 (18.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.58 | EF <i>n</i> = 23 (32.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.48 | IF <i>n</i> = 21 (30.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.35 | IT <i>n</i> = 13 (18.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.79 |

| | Jungian Types (E) | | | Jungian Types (I) | | | Dominant Types | | | <i>Type distribution for suffragan bishops compared with diocesan bishops</i> | |
|------|-------------------|------|--------------|-------------------|----|--------------|----------------|------|--------------|---|-------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | | |
| E-TJ | 13 | 18.6 | 0.61 | I-TP | 0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | Dt.T | 13 | 18.6 | 0.56* |
| E-FJ | 19 | 27.1 | 1.50 | I-FP | 4 | 5.7 | 1.37 | Dt.F | 23 | 32.9 | 1.48 |
| ES-P | 2 | 2.9 | 0.00 | IS-J | 16 | 22.9 | 1.10 | Dt.S | 18 | 25.7 | 1.23 |
| EN-P | 2 | 2.9 | 0.51 | IN-J | 14 | 20.0 | 1.11 | Dt.N | 16 | 22.9 | 0.97 |

Note: N = 70

NB: + = 1% of N

* *p* < .05

** *p* < .01

*** *p* < .001