

**Original citation:**

Francis, Leslie J., Clymo, Judy and Robbins, Mandy. (2014) Fresh expressions : reaching those psychological types conventional forms of church find it hard to reach? Practical Theology, 7 (4). pp. 252-267.

**Permanent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/81767>

**Copyright and reuse:**

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

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

**Publisher's statement:**

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Practical Theology on 21 Apr 2015, available online:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1179/1756073X14Z.00000000045>

**A note on versions:**

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

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

Fresh Expressions: Reaching those psychological types conventional forms  
of church find it hard to reach?

Leslie J Francis\*

University of Warwick, UK

Judy Clymo

Queen's College, Birmingham, UK

Mandy Robbins

Glyndŵr University, UK

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

**Abstract**

The Fresh Expressions movement aims to extend the reach of church life among groups less well accessed by conventional church. This pilot study tests that claim within the framework of psychological type theory. A sample of 74 women and 49 men attending Fresh Expressions completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales to enable their profile to be set alongside the profile of 2,135 women and 1,169 men attending conventional Anglican congregations reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011). The data provided some support for the view that Fresh Expressions were reaching psychological types other forms of church find it harder to reach.

*Keywords:* Fresh Expressions, psychological type, congregation studies, psychology of religion.

## Introduction

### Introducing Fresh Expressions

‘Fresh Expressions of Church’ is a term coined by the Church of England (2004) in the report *Mission-shaped Church: Church planting and fresh expressions of church in a changing context*. The report took seriously recent research on church-leaving (Richter & Francis, 1998) and urged the Church to be creative in exploring a variety of ways through which to engage with people in changing social contexts. Chapter four of the report provided snapshots of 12 different kinds of Fresh Expressions of church which it characterised as: Alternative worship communities, Base Ecclesial Communities, Café church, Cell church, Churches arising out of community initiatives (both out of community projects, and the restructuring or re-founding of an existing church to serve a community), Multiple and midweek congregations, Network-focused churches, School-based and school-linked congregations and churches, Seeker church, Traditional church plants, Traditional forms of church inspiring new interest, and Youth congregations. Each fresh expression in its own way seems motivated to reach people less well accessed by conventional church. On the Fresh Expressions current website Bishop Graham Cray points to a surfers church on Polzeath beach, a Eucharist for Goths in central Cambridge, and a youth congregation based on a skate park.

The Fresh Expressions movement was given further impetus by a series of studies, including *Mission-shaped spirituality* (Hope, 2006), *Mission-shaped and rural* (Gaze, 2006), *Mission-shaped children* (Withers, 2006), *Mission-shaped parish* (Bayes & Sledge, 2006), *Mission-shaped youth* (Sudworth, Cray, & Russell, 2007), *God-shaped mission* (Smith, 2008), *Mission-shaped questions* (Croft, 2008), *Church for every context* (Moynagh, 2012), and *Fresh: An introduction to fresh expressions of church and pioneer ministry* (Goodhew, Roberts, & Volland, 2012). The Fresh Expressions movement has also attracted appropriate

critique and commentary, as evidenced by Hull (2006), Milbank (2008), Nelstrop and Percy (2008), Davison and Milbank (2010), and Percy (2010).

Although there has been rich description of the wide range of initiatives within the Fresh Expressions movement, there has been relatively little detailed empirical research into the diverse motivations and the diverse outcomes of these initiatives. The value of such empirical enquiry has been indicated, however, by studies like Wright (2008), Hunt (2008), Drane and Drane (2011), and Rolph, Rolph, and Cole (2011).

Wright (2008) offers two sources of empirical insight (quantitative and qualitative) into the experience of *i-church*, a Fresh Expressions initiative within the Diocese of Oxford. The quantitative data reveal that the membership (nearly 300) is 58% UK-based, with 19% from the USA, and with others stretching across the world in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Sudan, China, Thailand, and Singapore, as well as throughout Europe. Members join for various reasons: 44% join to supplement their conventional church, 16% see this as their main church, 13% are exploring faith, 16% are just curious, and 12% are unsure why they joined. Over 60% are male and 84% are under the age of 58. Nearly 50% currently attend conventional church regularly, and 93% have regularly attended conventional church at some stage of their lives. The qualitative data reveal a range of personal stories, many of which demonstrate the creative and restorative experience of participation in this form of Fresh Expression.

I joined *i-church* as a last chance to re-build my faith.... I felt I was hanging on by a thread to Christian belief. In *i-church* I was listened to with patience as I went over and over my experience, trying to make sense of it. So many people mentored me and helped me to belong. Soon my faith was more alive than it had ever been. (p. 130)

Hunt (2008) applies quantitative insights from his earlier research on the *Alpha course* (Hunt, 2004) within the broader context of Fresh Expressions. The empirical evidence

suggests that alpha may not be moving that far beyond the walls of conventional church. Nearly 60% of those enlisted were already members of the churches running the course and a further 14% were on the fringes of the church. Only 8% designated themselves as non-believers, and a third of these had some experience of church as a child or teenager. Over 85% were from professional, clerical and administrative backgrounds. Twice as many women as men were attracted to Alpha. One in five had a degree or professional qualification and a further 32% had been educated to certificate or diploma level.

Drane and Drane (2011) describe a significant research initiative commissioned by the Church of Scotland that involved in-depth ethnographic studies of four Fresh Expressions related to children and youth: *Hot Chocolate* at the Steeple Church in the city centre of Dundee, *Citylife* in Wester Hailes, Edinburgh, *Fridays in Faith*, in Annan as a collaborative venture of Annandale Churches Together, and *The ARK* in Newmains, Lanarkshire. Each of these four studies listened carefully to the perceptions of the providers and to the perceptions of the participants. The strength of such ethnographic studies is their ability to get inside the lived-experiences of diverse initiatives and to examine closely the connections and contradictions between objectives and achievements.

Rolph, Rolph, and Cole (2011) conducted interviews with the lead Methodist ministers and others involved in setting up four Methodist Fresh Expressions in rural areas, two in the north-east and two in the south-west of England. The interviewees were invited to describe their specific Fresh Expression, and to define its aims and resources. Then they were asked the following questions. Which groups in your community are you trying to reach? Have you evidence that the initiative is reaching people previously untouched by the church? How do you see your activities relating to the existing local churches in your areas? The strength of such interview studies is that they allowed the voices of the key informants not only to be heard but to be properly interrogated.

Working within the Church of England's Church Growth Research Project, the Church Army's Research Unit (2013) examined over 1,000 cases of Fresh Expressions supplied from ten dioceses (Blackburn, Bristol, Canterbury, Chelmsford, Derby, Leicester, Liverpool, Norwich, Portsmouth, and Ripon and Leeds). Employing ten clearly defined parameters of what counts as Fresh Expressions, 518 of these cases qualified for further examination as legitimate examples. Employing data that came from interviewing the leaders of these Fresh Expressions, the evidence suggested that these examples made up 15% of a diocese's church communities and 10% of overall attendance; the average size is usually smaller than average parish church congregations. For seven of the ten dioceses, the numbers of people participating in those Fresh Expressions equated to reversing the decline in average weekly attendance in these dioceses between 2006 and 2011, and in two other dioceses nearly did so. As part of this project the leaders were invited to estimate the proportion of participants in Fresh Expressions representing three different categories, styled as Christians (25%), de-churched (35%) and non-churched (40%). The report properly acknowledges that such categorisation is somewhat crude, and that a richer and more accurate account of the background and trajectory of participants would be obtained from surveying these individuals rather than relying on the impression of the leaders.

### **Research agenda**

The case for building on this small body of research is made well by Male (2008) in a chapter entitled, 'Who are Fresh Expressions really for?'

When I knew I would be writing this chapter I rang up a leading researcher on Fresh Expressions and asked him if he could direct me to research on this issue of whether Fresh Expressions were really reaching unchurched people. To my surprise he replied that he could not.... It does seem imperative that research is undertaken to help us

know what is really happening in terms of Fresh Expressions of church truly connecting with unchurched people. (p. 151)

The general thesis that Fresh Expressions are capable of reaching groups of people less well accessed by conventional church may be tested within a range of sociologically-informed conceptual frameworks concerned with categories like sex, age, ethnicity, social class, income level or educational level. For example, a conceptual framework concerned with sex differences in participation rates might record the generally observed phenomenon that conventional church congregations comprise more women and men (Francis, 1997; Francis & Penny, 2013) and propose that Fresh Expressions may attract a higher proportion of men to redress this sex imbalance.

A somewhat different, but potentially useful conceptual framework, rooted not in sociological theory but in psychological theory and now quite well-established in congregational studies is that of psychological type theory. Psychological type theory has been applied in congregational studies by empirical research: conducted in North America by Gerhardt (1983), Rehak (1998), (Delis-Bulhoses, 1990), Ross (1993, 1995), and Bramer and Ross (2012); conducted in the United Kingdom by Craig, Francis, Bailey, and Robbins (2003), Francis, Duncan, Craig, and Luffman (2004), Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007), Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011), Village, Baker, and Howat (2012), Francis and Robbins (2012), and Francis (2013); and conducted in Australia by Robbins and Francis (2011, 2012), and Robbins, Francis, and Powell (2012).

### **Psychological type theory**

Psychological type theory has its roots in the pioneering work of Carl Jung (1971) and has been developed and popularised through a series of type indicators, type sorters or type scale. The most frequently employed of these measures in church-related research and congregational studies are the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS: Keirsey & Bates, 1978),

the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator (MBTI: Myers & McCaulley, 1985), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). At its core psychological type theory distinguishes between two orientations, two perceiving functions, two judging functions, and two attitudes toward the outer world. In each of these four areas, psychological type theory conceptualises difference in terms of two discrete categories (or types) rather than in terms of a continuum stretching between two poles.

In psychological type theory, the two orientations are concerned with contrasting energy sources and distinguish between introversion (I) and extraversion (E). Introverts are energised by the inner world. When tired they prefer to go inwards to regain energy. Extraverts are energised by the outer world. When tired they prefer to congregate with other people to regain energy. Introverts enjoy their own company and appreciate silence. Extraverts enjoy the company of others and prefer to engage in conversation. A congregation shaped by introverts may seem somewhat strange to extraverts, while a congregation shaped by extraverts may seem somewhat strange to introverts.

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

In psychological type theory, the two judging functions are concerned with contrasting ways of evaluating situations and distinguish between thinking (T) and feeling

(F). Thinking types are concerned with the objective evaluation of a situation, and with identifying the underlying logic. Feeling types are concerned with the subjective evaluation of a situation, and with identifying the underlying values. Thinking types are more concerned with supporting effective systems. Feeling types are concerned with supporting interpersonal relationships. A congregation shaped by thinking types may seem somewhat strange to feeling types, while a congregation shaped by feeling types may seem somewhat strange to thinking types.

In psychological type theory, the two attitudes toward the outer world are concerned with which of the two psychological processes is employed in the outer world and distinguishes between judging (J) and perceiving (P). Judging types employ their preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) in the outer world. Perceiving types employ their preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) in the outer world. Judging types display a planned, orderly and organised profile to the outer world. Perceiving types display a flexible, spontaneous and unplanned profile to the outer world. A congregation shaped by judging types may seem somewhat strange to perceiving types, while a congregation shaped by perceiving types may seem somewhat strange to judging types.

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

complementing the dominant function, leading to eight dominant-auxiliary pairs: dominant sensing with thinking, dominant sensing with feeling, dominant intuition with thinking, dominant intuition with feeling, dominant feeling with sensing, dominant feeling with intuition, dominant thinking with sensing, and dominant thinking with intuition. Third, all four preferred components of psychological type theory cohere to generate 16 complete types, usually identified by their initial letter (for example INTJ or ESFP).

### **Psychological type theory in congregational studies**

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

The major shortcoming with the study reported by Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007) concerned the interpretative weight carried by a sample of only 185 churchgoers. A more recent study, reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011), addressed this shortcoming by assembling data from 2,135 women and 1,169 men surveyed in the context of Anglican church services in England and by (again) comparing the psychological

type profile of these churchgoers with the population norms for the UK published by Kendall (1998). The findings from this larger study are remarkably similar to some of the findings from the smaller study (especially among the women). Among the female churchgoers there were strong preferences for sensing (81%), for feeling (70%) and for judging (85%), with a balance between introversion (49%) and extraversion (51%). In this study 25% of the women reported ISFJ and 25% reported ESFJ. Among the male churchgoers there were preferences for introversion (62%), for sensing (78%), for thinking (58%) and for judging (86%). In this study 17% of the men reported ISFJ and 11% reported ESFJ.

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

Overall, when the profiles of the men and women are added together from the three studies (giving a sample of 5,016), the ISFJ profile of churchgoers is confirmed with introversion (54%), sensing (80%), feeling (58%), and judging (86%). Given the

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

### **Research question**

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to examine the psychological type profile of a sample of women and men attending Fresh Expressions and to compare their profile with the profile of 2,135 women and 1,169 men attending conventional Anglican congregations reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011). Given that conventional congregations are weighted towards introverts, sensing types, feeling types, and judging types the four specific hypotheses tested by this study are that Fresh Expressions will attract:

- a higher proportion of extraverts;
- a higher proportion of intuitive types;
- a higher proportion of thinking types;
- a higher proportion of perceiving types.

## **Method**

### **Procedure**

A number of Fresh Expressions were contacted by the second author and agreed to invite their participants to complete a brief questionnaire in the context of one of their meetings. Participation was voluntary, anonymous, and confidential. Completed questionnaires were submitted by 74 women and by 49 men.

### **Sample**

The 123 participants comprised 4 individuals under the age of twenty, 21 in their twenties, 19 in their thirties, 40 in their forties, 19 in their fifties, 15 in their sixties, and 5 in their seventies. Of these participants, 73 attended meetings at least once a week, a further 29 attended at least twice a month and 7 attended at least once a month, leaving just 14 who attended less than monthly.

### **Instrument**

*Psychological type* was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). This is a 40-item instrument comprising four sets of 10 forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). Recent studies have demonstrated that this instrument functions well in church-related contexts. For example, Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported alpha coefficients of .83 for the EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale. Participants were asked for each pair of characteristics to check the 'box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if you feel both characteristics apply to you. Tick the characteristics that reflect the real you, even if other people see you differently'.

### **Data analysis**

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

### Results

The eight indices of the Francis Psychological Type Scales all achieved satisfactory internal consistency reliability in terms of the alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951): extraversion and introversion,  $\alpha = .79$ ; sensing and intuition,  $\alpha = .78$ ; thinking and feeling,  $\alpha = .68$ ; judging and perceiving,  $\alpha = .73$ .

- insert tables 1 and 2 about here -

Table 1 presents the type distribution for the 74 women engaged in Fresh Expressions. These data demonstrate preferences for extraversion (64%) over introversion (36%), for sensing (65%) over intuition (35%), for feeling (62%) over thinking (38%), and for judging (85%) over perceiving (15%). The hierarchy of dominant type preferences are dominant feeling (35%), followed by dominant sensing (27%), dominant intuition (19%), and dominant

thinking (19%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, the four predominant types are ESFJ (24%), ESTJ (14%), ISFJ (14%) and ISTJ (11%).

Table 1 also draws attention to the ways in which women engaged in Fresh Expressions differ from women engaged in conventional church. In terms of the dichotomous preferences significant differences occur in the orientations and the perceiving functions, but not in the judging functions and the attitudes. While 51% of women engaged in conventional church prefer extraversion, the proportion rises to 64% of those engaged in Fresh Expressions; and while 49% of women engaged in conventional church prefer introversion, the proportion falls to 37% in Fresh Expressions. While 19% of women engaged in conventional church prefer intuition, the proportion rises to 35% in Fresh Expressions; and while 81% of women engaged in conventional church prefer sensing, the proportion falls to 65% in Fresh Expressions. In terms of dominant type preference among women engaged in Fresh Expressions there is a higher proportion of dominant intuitive types (19% compared with 10%) and a lower proportion of dominant sensing types (27% compared with 42%). In terms of the 16 complete types, there is one type that is significantly less represented in Fresh Expressions than in conventional congregations, ISFJ (14% compared with 25 %) and one type that is significantly more represented in Fresh Expressions than in conventional congregations, ENFP (8% compared with 3%).

Table 2 presents the type distribution for the 49 men engaged in Fresh Expressions. These data demonstrate preferences for introversion (67%) over extraversion (33%), for intuition (65%) over sensing (35%), for thinking (63%) over feeling (37%) and for judging (74%) over perceiving (27%). The hierarchy of dominant type preferences are dominant intuition (41%), followed by dominant sensing (29%), dominant thinking (20%) and dominant feeling (10%). In terms of the 16 complete types, the two predominant types are INTJ (24%), and ISTJ (18%).

Table 2 also draws attention to the ways in which men engaged in Fresh Expressions differ from men engaged in conventional church. In terms of the dichotomous preference, significant differences occur in the perceiving functions and in the attitudes, but not in the orientations and the judging functions. While 22% of men engaged in conventional church prefer intuition, the proportion rises to 65% of those engaged in Fresh Expressions; and while 78% of men engaged in conventional church prefer sensing, the proportion falls to 35% in Fresh Expressions. While 14% of men engaged in conventional church prefer perceiving, the proportion rises to 27% among those engaged in Fresh Expression; and while 86% of men engaged in conventional church prefer judging, the proportion falls to 74% in Fresh Expressions. In terms of dominant type preferences among men engaged in Fresh Expressions, there is a higher proportion of dominant intuitive types (41% compared with 13%) and a lower proportion of dominant sensing types (27% compared with 49%). In terms of the 16 complete types, there are two types that are significantly less represented in Fresh Expressions than in conventional congregations, ESTJ (4% compared with 14%) and ESJF (2% compared with 11%), and four types that are significantly more represented in Fresh Expressions than conventional congregations, INTJ (20% compared with 6%), INFJ (8% compared with 3%), INTP (8% compared with 1%) and ENFP (8% compared with 2%).

### **Discussion**

This study proposed that psychological type theory could provide a conceptual framework within which to evaluate the effectiveness of the Fresh Expressions movement in extending the reach of church life among groups less well accessed by conventional church. A review of what is currently known about the psychological type profile of those engaged with conventional church drew two main conclusions. First, among conventional churchgoers some sectors of the general population are especially under-represented. In particular extraverts and perceiving types are under-represented among both men and women.

Additionally thinking types are under-represented among men. Second, conventional church congregations nurture a community that is shaped primarily by the preferences of introversion, sensing, feeling and judging. As a consequence extraverts, intuitive types, thinking types, and perceiving types feel less at home in and less satisfied with conventional church.

On the basis of these observations it was proposed that, if Fresh Expressions were to reach those psychological types conventional forms of church find it harder to reach, there would be among those engaged with Fresh Expressions higher proportions of extraverts, intuitive types, thinking types and perceiving types, compared with those engaged with conventional church. In the present study this theory was tested against new data provided by a sample of 74 women and 49 men attending Fresh Expressions who completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales. The data provided some support for the view that Fresh Expressions were reaching psychological types other forms of church find it hard to reach.

First, there was clear support for the view that Fresh Expressions were attracting a higher proportion of intuitive types than conventional church. This finding was true among both women and men. Intuitive types are the people who like to try new things, who like to experiment and who are not tied to the traditional and to the conventional. It seems that Fresh Expressions may be well placed to engage the interest and support of intuitive types.

Second, there is some support for the view that Fresh Expressions were attracting a higher proportion of extraverts than conventional church. This was true for women, but not for men. Extraverts are the people who are energised by social engagement and by activities. It seems that Fresh Expressions may be well placed to encourage participation, activities, and social engagement, at least in a way that appeals to extravert women. The kind of participation, activities and social engagement seem, however, to be less attractive to extravert men.

Third, there is some support for the view that Fresh Expressions were attracting a higher proportion of perceiving types than conventional church. This was true for men, but not for women. Perceiving types are people who dislike being tied down to routine and who prefer a flexible environment that allows for spontaneity, for creativity, and for fun. It seems that Fresh Expressions may be well placed to create a flexible form of church, at least in a way that appeals to perceiving type men. The kind of flexibility offered, seems however, to be less attractive to perceiving type women.

Fourth, there is no support for the view that Fresh Expressions were attracting a higher proportion of thinking types than conventional church. This was true for both men and for women. The difference between the thinking preference and the feeling preference is a profound difference and one that it may be particularly difficult for the conventional church (that is giving rise to Fresh Expressions) to grasp. There are two aspects to this profound difference. The first aspect concerns the ways in which thinking types and feeling types engage with the domain of religion. Thinking types engage first with their heads and are concerned with examining the logical coherence of religious teaching and religious beliefs. Feeling types engage first with their hearts and are concerned with experiencing and with participating in the community of interpersonal relationships and values that characterise the religious community. Fresh Expressions may be better at modelling the relational approach to faith than modelling the critical approach. The second aspect concerns the clear connection between the thinking preference and masculinity and between the feeling preference and femininity. According to Kendall (1998) in the UK population 70% of women prefer feeling, while 65% of men prefer thinking. Conventional church has become captured, not only by women (who generally comprise between 60% and 70% of the congregation) but by the feeling preferences. Even the men who attend conventional church are more likely to prefer feeling than men in the general population. Moreover, the male leaders of conventional

churches are much more likely to prefer feeling even than men in the congregations (see Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011). Indeed, even the present study of those engaged in Fresh Expressions found three women for every two men. It seems that Fresh Expressions may not as yet have broken the stereotype of church as a place mainly for women and mainly for feeling types.

### **Conclusion**

The present study set out to test the extent to which Fresh Expressions were reaching those psychological types conventional forms of church find it harder to reach. The data provide some support for the view that this is indeed the case, but also some evidence that the support is only partial. Two implications follow from these findings for future research, one empirical and one conceptual.

The implication for future empirical research is this. The present study was established as a pilot project to test whether the theoretical framework itself was worth exploring. As a pilot project the present study has two related limitations: the sample size is small and there has been no attempt to differentiate between different forms of Fresh Expressions. Nonetheless, the findings are sufficiently revealing and sufficiently promising to justify building on a larger and more substantial study on the basis of this pilot project.

The implication for future conceptual research is this. The present study has proposed a specific conceptual framework within which to evaluate Fresh Expressions that may well not have been in mind when the movement was developed and implemented. The church is generally more familiar with employing sociological categories rather than psychological categories. On this account, reaching groups of people less well accessed by conventional church may have been conceived in terms of factors like sex, age, educational level, income level, ethnicity, and so on. Future conceptual research within the framework of the Fresh Expressions movement might benefit from giving further attention to psychological

categories and to exploring more fully the kinds of initiatives that might be more successful in engaging those psychological types that conventional church finds it hard to reach, including (perhaps especially) thinking types.

### References

- Ball, I. L. (2008). Australian data on the distribution of psychological types. *Bulletin of Psychological Type*, 31, 53-55.
- Bayes, P., & Sledge, T. (2006). *Mission-shaped parish: Traditional church in a changing context*. London: Church House Publishing.
- Bramer, P. D. G., & Ross, C. F. J. (2012). Type patterns among evangelical Protestants in Ontario. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 997-1007.
- Church Army's Research Unit (2013). *Analysis of Fresh Expressions of Church and church plants began in the period 1992-2012*. Sheffield: Church Army.
- Church of England (2004). *Mission-shaped church: Church planting and fresh expressions of church in a changing context*. London: Church House Publishing.
- 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.
- Croft, S. (2008). *Mission-shaped questions: Defining issues for today's church*. London: Church House Publishing.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- Davison, A., & Milbank, A. (2010). *For the parish: A critique of fresh expressions*. London: SCM Press.
- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990). Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 20, 25-33.
- Drane, J., & Drane, O. F. (2011). *Reformed, reforming, emerging, and experimenting: A study in contextual theology reflecting the experiences of initiatives in emerging ministry being funded by the Church of Scotland*. Edinburgh: Church of Scotland.

- Francis, L.J. (1997). The psychology of gender differences in religion: A review of empirical research. *Religion*, 27, 81-96.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2013). *The psychological type profile of a church: A case study*. *Comprehensive Psychology*, 2, 6.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., & Hall, G. (2008). Psychological type and attitude toward Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 23, 181-191.
- Francis, L. J., Duncan, B., Craig, C. L., & Luffman, G. (2004). Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England. *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, 1, 66-77.
- Francis, L.J., & Penny, G. (2013). Gender differences in religion. In V. Saroglou (Ed.). *Religion, personality and social behaviour* (pp. 191-209). New York. Psychology Press.
- Francis, L. J., & Richter, P. (2007). *Gone for good? Church-leaving and returning in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Peterborough: Epworth.
- Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (2012). Not fitting in and getting out. Psychological type and congregational satisfaction among Anglican churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 1023-1035
- Francis, L.J., Robbins, M., & Craig, C.L. (2011). The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: Compatible or incompatible with their clergy? *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 15, 243-259.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Williams, A., & Williams, R. (2007). All types are called, but some are more likely to respond: The psychological profile of rural Anglican churchgoers in Wales. *Rural Theology*, 5, 23-30.

- Gaze, S. (2006). *Mission-shaped and rural: Growing churches in the countryside*. London: Church House Publishing.
- Gerhardt, R. (1983). Liberal religion and personality type. *Research in Psychological Type*, 6, 47-53.
- Goodhew, D. Roberts, A., & Volland, M. (2012). *Fresh: An introduction to fresh expressions of church and pioneer ministry*. London: SCM Press.
- Hope, S. (2006). *Mission-shaped spirituality: The transforming power of mission*. London: Church House Publishing.
- Hull, J. M. (2006). *Mission-shaped church: A theological response*. London: SCM.
- Hunt, S. (2004). *The Alpha enterprise: Evangelism in a post-Christian era*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hunt, S. (2008). Packing them in the aisles? Some observations on the Alpha course. In L. Nelstop & M. Percy (Eds.), *Evaluating fresh expressions: Explorations in emerging church* (pp. 161-174). Norwich: Canterbury Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works*, (volume 6). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Male, D. (2008). Who are fresh expressions really for? Do they really reach the unchurched? In L. Nelstop & M. Percy (Eds.), *Evaluating fresh expressions: Explorations in emerging church* (pp. 148-160). Norwich: Canterbury Press.
- McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The Selection Ratio Type Table: A research strategy for comparing type distributions. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 10, 46-56.

- Millbank, J. (2008). Stale expressions: The management-shaped church. *Studies in Christian Ethics*, 21, 117-128.
- Moynagh, M. (2012). *Church for every context: An introduction to theology and practice*. London: SCM.
- 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.
- Nelstop, L., & Percy, M. (2008). *Evaluating fresh expressions: Explorations in emerging church*. Norwich: Canterbury Press.
- Percy, M. (2010). *Shaping the church: The promise of implicit theology*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Rehak, M.C. (1998). Identifying the congregation's corporate personality. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 44, 39-44.
- Richter, P., & Francis, L. J. (1998). *Gone but not forgotten: Church leaving and returning*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Robbins, M., & Francis, L. J. (2011). All are called, but some psychological types are more likely to respond: Profiling churchgoers in Australia. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 213-229.
- Robbins, M., & Francis, L.J. (2012). The psychological type profile of Australian Catholic congregations: Psychological theory and congregational studies. In A. W. Ata (Ed.), *Catholics and Catholicism in contemporary Australia: Challenges and achievements* (pp. 262-281). Melbourne, Victoria: David Lovell Publishing.
- Robbins, M., Francis, L.J., & Powell, R. (2012). Congregational bonding social capital and psychological type: An empirical enquiry among Australian churchgoers. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 1009-1022.
- Rolph, P., Rolph, J., & Cole, J. (2011). Methodist Fresh Expressions: Listening to leaders of specific rural initiatives in England. *Rural Theology*, 9, 129-142.

- 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.
- Smith, A. (2008). *God-shaped mission: Theological and practical perspectives from the rural church*. Norwich: Canterbury Press.
- Sudworth, T., Cray, G., & Russell, C. (2007). *Mission-shaped youth: Rethinking young people and the church*. 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.
- Withers, M. (2006). *Mission-shaped children: Moving towards a child-centred church*. London: Church House Publishing.
- Wright, A. (2008). i-church: The unfolding story of a fresh expressions of church [www.i-church.org](http://www.i-church.org). In L. Nelstop & M. Percy (Eds.), *Evaluating fresh expressions: Explorations in emerging church* (pp. 123-134). Norwich: Canterbury Press.

Table 1

*Type distribution for women engaged in Fresh Expressions*

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences							
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 8 (10.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.88 +++++ +++++ +	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 10 (13.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.55* +++++ +++++ +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 3 (4.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.17 ++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 4 (5.4%) <i>I</i> = 2.14 +++++	E <i>n</i> = 47 (63.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.26*	I <i>n</i> = 27 (36.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.74*	S <i>n</i> = 48 (64.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.80***	N <i>n</i> = 26 (35.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.87***				
				T <i>n</i> = 28 (37.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.26	F <i>n</i> = 46 (62.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.89	J <i>n</i> = 63 (85.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	P <i>n</i> = 11 (14.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.02				
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ISFP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	INFP <i>n</i> = 2 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.48 +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00 +++++	Pairs and Temperaments							
				IJ <i>n</i> = 25 (33.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.78	IP <i>n</i> = 2 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.42	EP <i>n</i> = 9 (12.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.49	EJ <i>n</i> = 38 (51.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.21				
				ST <i>n</i> = 19 (25.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.06	SF <i>n</i> = 29 (39.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.69**	NF <i>n</i> = 17 (23.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.79**	NT <i>n</i> = 9 (12.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.04*				
ESTP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.4%) <i>I</i> = 4.80 +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.31 +	ENFP <i>n</i> = 6 (8.1%) <i>I</i> = 2.79** +++++ +++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.4%) <i>I</i> = 2.06 +	SJ <i>n</i> = 46 (62.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.85*	SP <i>n</i> = 2 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.32	NP <i>n</i> = 9 (12.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.01*	NJ <i>n</i> = 7 (23.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.81**				
				TJ <i>n</i> = 26 (35.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.27	TP <i>n</i> = 2 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.13	FP <i>n</i> = 9 (12.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	FJ <i>n</i> = 37 (50.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.87				
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 10 (13.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.26 +++++ +++++ ++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 18 (24.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.97 +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 6 (8.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.76 +++++ +++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 4 (5.4%) <i>I</i> = 2.56 +++++	IN <i>n</i> = 9 (12.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.43	EN <i>n</i> = 17 (23.0%) <i>I</i> = 2.24***	IS <i>n</i> = 18 (24.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.59**	ES <i>n</i> = 30 (40.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.01				
				ET <i>n</i> = 16 (21.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.57	EF <i>n</i> = 31 (41.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	IF <i>n</i> = 15 (20.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.61*	IT <i>n</i> = 12 (16.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.99				
Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	14	18.9	1.47	I-TP	0	0.0	0.00	Dt.T	14	18.9	1.32
E-FJ	24	32.4	1.10	I-FP	2	2.7	0.55	Dt.F	26	35.1	1.02
ES-P	2	2.7	0.59	IS-J	18	24.3	0.66*	Dt.S	20	27.0	0.65**
EN-P	7	9.5	2.65**	IN-J	7	9.5	1.58	Dt.N	14	18.9	1.98**

Note: N = 74

(NB: + = 1% of N)

Table 2

*Type distribution for men engaged in Fresh Expressions*

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences							
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 9 (18.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.64 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 4 (8.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.47 +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 4 (8.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.81* +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 10 (20.4%) <i>I</i> = 3.22*** +++++	E <i>n</i> = 16 (32.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.85	I <i>n</i> = 33 (67.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.09	S <i>n</i> = 17 (34.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.45***	N <i>n</i> = 32 (65.3%) <i>I</i> = 2.93***				
+++++	+++	+++	+++++	T <i>n</i> = 31 (63.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.09	F <i>n</i> = 18 (36.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.87	J <i>n</i> = 36 (73.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.85**	P <i>n</i> = 13 (26.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.91**				
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ISFP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	INFP <i>n</i> = 2 (4.1%) <i>I</i> = 2.17 ++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 4 (8.2%) <i>I</i> = 7.34*** +++++	Pairs and Temperaments							
				IJ <i>n</i> = 27 (55.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	IP <i>n</i> = 6 (12.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.88	EP <i>n</i> = 7 (14.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.94	EJ <i>n</i> = 9 (18.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.59				
				ST <i>n</i> = 11 (22.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.49**	SF <i>n</i> = 6 (12.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.38**	NF <i>n</i> = 12 (24.5%) <i>I</i> = 2.49***	NT <i>n</i> = 20 (40.8%) <i>I</i> = 3.27***				
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ESFP <i>n</i> = 1 (2.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.99 ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 4 (8.2%) <i>I</i> = 3.53** +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 2 (4.1%) <i>I</i> = 2.51 ++++	SJ <i>n</i> = 16 (32.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.46***	SP <i>n</i> = 1 (2.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.29	NP <i>n</i> = 12 (24.5%) <i>I</i> = 3.53***	NJ <i>n</i> = 20 (40.8%) <i>I</i> = 2.65***				
				TJ <i>n</i> = 25 (51.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.98	TP <i>n</i> = 6 (12.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.14	FP <i>n</i> = 7 (14.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.76	FJ <i>n</i> = 11 (22.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.66				
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 2 (4.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.30* ++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 1 (2.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.18* ++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 2 (4.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.49 ++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 4 (8.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.39 +++++	IN <i>n</i> = 20 (40.8%) <i>I</i> = 3.34***	EN <i>n</i> = 12 (24.5%) <i>I</i> = 2.43***	IS <i>n</i> = 13 (26.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.54**	ES <i>n</i> = 4 (8.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.29**				
				ET <i>n</i> = 8 (16.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.81	EF <i>n</i> = 8 (16.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	IF <i>n</i> = 10 (20.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.85	IT <i>n</i> = 23 (46.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.24				
Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	6	12.2	0.71	I-TP	4	8.2	2.98*	Dt.T	10	20.4	1.02
E-FJ	3	6.1	0.44	I-FP	2	4.1	1.08	Dt.F	5	10.2	0.58
ES-P	1	2.0	0.60	IS-J	13	26.5	0.58*	Dt.S	14	28.6	0.58**
EN-P	6	12.2	3.11**	IN-J	14	28.6	3.09***	Dt.N	20	40.8	3.10***

Note: N = 49 (NB: + = 1% of N)