



[BG Research Online](#)

Cook, C.C.H, Francis, L.J. and McKenna, U. (2024) *The psychological type and temperament profile of ordinands at Cranmer Hall, Durham, 2008-2016*. Journal of Empirical Theology. ISSN 0922-2936

This is an author accepted manuscript of an open access article published by Brill Academic Publishing in its final form on 3rd October 2024 at <https://doi.org/10.1163/15709256-20240010> and made available under a [CC BY 4.0 Deed | Creative Commons licence](#).

This version may differ slightly from the final published version.

The psychological type and temperament profile of ordinands
at Cranmer Hall, Durham, 2008-2016

Christopher C. H. Cook*

Institute for Medical Humanities
Durham University, Durham, UK
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7700-7639>

Leslie J. Francis

Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research (CEDAR)
University of Warwick, Coventry, UK
World Religions and Education Research Unit
Bishop Grosseteste University, Lincoln, UK
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2946-9980>

Ursula McKenna

World Religions and Education Research Unit
Bishop Grosseteste University, Lincoln, UK
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2625-7731>

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Christopher C. H. Cook

Department of Theology and Religion

Durham University, Abbey House, Palace Green, Durham, DH1 3RS

Email: c.c.h.cook@durham.ac.uk

Abstract

This study explores the psychological type and temperament profile of 117 male and 80 female ordinands training at Cranmer Hall, Durham, over a nine-year period alongside earlier studies of Church of England stipendiary clergy. The data confirm the prominence of the Apollonian (NF) Temperament accounting for 41% of male and 54% of female ordinands. Among male ordinands there were preferences for extraversion (58%), intuition (70%), feeling (61%), and judging (60%). Among female ordinands there were preferences for extraversion (56%), intuition (64%), feeling (74%), and judging (74%). The implications of these findings are discussed for the future shape of ministry.

Keywords: Church of England, clergy studies, psychological type, temperament theory, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, ministry training

Introduction

Psychological type theory as originally proposed by Jung (1971) and temperament theory as originally proposed by Keirsey and Bates (1978) have offered fruitful lenses through which to observe and to understand differing approaches to Christian ministry, both across denominations and within denominations. Building on the notion advanced by Mcdaid, McCaulley, and Kainz (1986) of compiling an atlas of type tables, an initiative emerged in Britain during the mid 2000s to compile an atlas of type tables to map the psychological type and temperament profiles of lay and ordained religious leaders across and within denominations (see table 1).

- insert table 1 about here -

Psychological type theory, as operationalised through the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005; Francis, Laycock, & Brewster, 2017), is conveyed conventionally in type tables. Type tables publish the dichotomous preferences (introversion or extraversion, sensing or intuition, thinking or feeling, and judging or perceiving), the sixteen complete types (for example, ISTJ), the four dominant types (dominant sensing, dominant intuition, dominant thinking, and dominant feeling), the eight Jungian function orientations (extraverted sensing, introverted sensing, extraverted intuition, introverted intuition, extraverted thinking, introverted thinking, extraverted feeling, and introverted feeling) and the pairs and temperaments. While each of these components provides helpful insights into potential connections between personality and ministry, the potentially most fruitful focus may be provided by applying the lens of temperament theory.

The core insight of temperament theory, as proposed by Keirsey and Bates (1978), was to prioritise the perceiving process that distinguished between the functions of sensing

and intuition. Keirsey and Bates (1978) then distinguished between two expressions of sensing according to the orientation in which it was expressed: extraverted sensing (SP) and introverted sensing (SJ). They also distinguished between two expressions of intuition according to the judging function with which it was paired: intuition with feeling (NF) and intuition with thinking (NT). In their formulation of temperament theory, Keirsey and Bates (1978) linked each of these four temperaments with insights from classic mythology.

In Keirsey and Bates' account, the SJ temperament was linked to Epimetheus: the Epimethean Temperament characterises people who long to be dutiful and to serve the social units and the customs to which they belong. The SP temperament was linked to Dionysus: the Dionysian Temperament characterises people who long to be engaged, involved, and doing new things. The NT temperament was linked to Prometheus: the Promethean Temperament characterises people who try to understand, explain, shape, and predict the realities of their world, people who prize personal competence. The NF temperament was linked to Apollo: the Apollonian Temperament characterises people who long for self-actualisation and authenticity, people who are idealistic and show capacity for empathetic listening.

Temperament theory was introduced to the field of clergy studies by Oswald and Kroeger (1988) who built on Keirsey and Bates (1978) characterisation of all four temperaments to create profiles of how these four temperaments may shape four contrasting styles of religious leadership. For Oswald and Kroeger (1988), the Epimethean (SJ) Temperament led to 'the conserving, serving pastor'. Epimethean clergy tend to be traditionalists who are able to bring stability and continuity to the communities within their charge. They serve as conservators and protectors of the traditions that they have inherited from the past. Within that framework, they nurture a sense of community connected with the past, and a sense of loyalty and belonging to that community. Their skill in developing

procedures, formulating plans, and establishing policies brings a sense of order and stability within their churches, and they tend to be rigorous in ensuring that their procedures and policies are followed. They tend to proclaim a simple and straightforward faith linked to clear rules for the Christian way of life. They tend to be effective pastors aware of the specific needs of the vulnerable, the young, the elderly, and the weak. As realists they offer practical and down-to-earth solutions to pastoral problems.

For Oswald and Kroeger (1988), the Dionysian (SP) Temperament led to ‘the action-orientated pastor’. Dionysian clergy possess an almost compulsive need to be active, constantly engaged in one thing or another. They tend to be fun loving, flexible and spontaneous individuals who welcome (and seem to discover) the unplanned and unpredictable aspects of church life. They seem to be able to bring their church to life with activities engaging different groups of people. They are well predisposed to working with children and young people who may share their love for spontaneity. They are good at starting fun initiatives, although somewhat less good at maintaining them. They are seen as entertainers and as performers who can grasp the opportunities of the moment. They may shine in a crisis and bring unexpected resolution from conflict. They show little interest in the theoretical and abstract aspects of theology.

For Oswald and Kroeger (1988), the Promethean (NT) Temperament led to the ‘intellectual, competence-seeking pastor’. Promethean clergy tend to be intellectually and academically grounded, motivated by the search for meaning, for the truth, and for future possibilities. They tend to enjoy academic aspects of their faith. They make good teachers, good preachers, and good advocates for social justice. They tend to draw their congregations into serious engagement with exploring and studying the faith. In their analysis of the scriptures, they tend to focus on the underlying ideas and principles rather than on the applications for Christian living. In pastoral situations they are more concerned with

establishing the truth than with fostering compromise and harmony. Because they can often see the value in opposing views, they may prefer to set out alternative visions rather than espousing a single solution. Here are clergy who need to face challenges in their ministry and may seem to move comfortably from one challenge to another.

For Oswald and Kroeger (1988), the Apollonian (NF) Temperament led to the ‘authenticity-seeking, relationship-orientated pastor’. Apollonian clergy tend to be idealistic in their approach to ministry, attracted to supporting others and to dealing with human suffering. They long to meet the needs of others and find personal fulfilment and affirmation in so doing. They tend to have good empathic capacity, good interpersonal skills, and good pastoral counselling techniques. Apollonian clergy may find themselves listening to other people’s problems in the most unlikely contexts and caring deeply about them. They can be inspiring and articulate communicators who naturally touch the hearts of others. As a consequence they may be able to draw the best out of other people. They work well as catalyst or facilitator in the congregation. While they are good at inspiring others, they may themselves be less good on the down-to-earth and practical aspects of ministry. They need others to work with them in order to bring their vision to fruition.

When the focus is on temperament theory, the developing atlas of clergy type tables draws attention to Church of England stipendiary clergy as outliers alongside the more general clergy temperament profile. Overall, among religious leaders in Britain the predominant temperament is that of the Epimethean pastor, ‘the conserving, serving pastor’ as characterised by Oswald and Kroeger (1988). Here are religious leaders committed as guardians of the tradition. For example, Francis and Village (2022) found that 55% of Catholic priests reported the Epimethean Temperament, and ap Siôn & Francis (2022) found that within the Salvation Army 60% of male and 69% of female officers reported the Epimethean Temperament.

The first major study of the psychological type profile of Church of England clergy published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007), drawing on 626 clergymen and 237 clergywomen, reported 35% of the clergymen as NF (compared with 31% SJ, 27% NT, and 7% SP) and 50% of the clergywomen as NF (compared with 29% SJ, 15% NT, and 6% SP). In the spirit of scientific replication, these findings were checked in two subsequent studies. Drawing on data from 622 Church of England clergymen, Francis, Robbins, Duncan, and Whinney (2010) reported 39% as NF, compared with 28% NT, 27% SJ, and 6% SP. Drawing on data from 83 Church of England clergywomen, Francis, Robbins, and Whinney (2011) reported 49% as NF, compared with 33% SJ, 11% NT, and 7% SP.

A more recent study, however, reported by Francis, Village, and Voas (2021), drawing on data provided by 1,164 clergymen and 307 clergywomen, mostly with incumbent status in the Church of England, who participated in the 2013 survey that was part of the Church Growth Research Programme (Voas & Watt, 2014), reported 32% of the clergymen as NF (compared with 39% SJ, 22% NT, and 6% SP) and 33% of the clergywomen as NF (compared with 40% SJ, 23% NT, and 4% SP). These data suggested a move away from the NF temperament, especially among clergywomen. Some further support for this trend was offered by Francis and Smith (2018) when they analysed the psychological type profile of 90 male and 35 female curates under the age of 40 ordained into stipendiary ministry in 2009 and 2010. Among the 90 clergymen the NF temperament fell to 19%, compared with 52% SJ, 23% NT, and 6% SP; among the 35 clergywomen the NF temperament fell to 31%, compared with 40% SJ, 20% NT, and 9% SP. Francis and Smith (2018) concluded that these shifts in temperament ‘promise a Church for the future that is more tightly managed but less inspirational and less responsive to transformative development’ (p. 208).

The predominance of the NF temperament among Church of England stipendiary clergy is particularly interesting when set alongside two other sets of studies, the first

concerning Ordained Local Ministers (OLMs) in the Church of England, and the second concerning stipendiary Anglican clergy in the Church in Wales. In respect of OLMs, an initial study conducted among 39 OLMs (male and female considered together) by Francis and Holmes (2011), reported 31% NF, compared with 56% SJ, 8% SP and 5% NT. In a larger study conducted among 79 females and 56 male recently ordained OLMs, Francis and Village (2012) reported among clergymen 27% NF, compared with 57% SJ, 9% NT, and 7% SP; and among clergywomen 29% NF, compared with 54% SJ, 13% NT, and 4% SP. In a third study among 144 female OLMs, Francis, Robbins, and Jones (2012) reported 24% NF, compared with 65% SJ, 6% NT, and 5% SP.

In respect of stipendiary Anglican clergy in the Church in Wales, in an initial study conducted among 427 clergymen by Francis, Payne, and Jones (2001) 29% reported NF, compared with 48% SJ, 14% NT, and 9% SP. In a first replication by Francis, Littler, and Robbins (2010) among 231 clergymen, 19% reported NF, compared with 55% SJ, 17% NT, and 9% SP. In a second replication by Payne and Lewis (2015) among 268 clergymen, 29% reported NF, compared with 50% SJ, 14% NT, and 7% SP.

Research aim

Against this background, the aim of the present paper is to analyse data available from ordinands training at Cranmer Hall, Durham, during the period 2008 to 2016 with the specific intention of focussing on the temperament profiles presented by these candidates.

Method

Procedure

Over a nine-year period from 2008 to 2016 Church of England ordinands training at Cranmer Hall, Durham, were invited to complete a measure of psychological type as part of their professional formation. Permission was given for the fully anonymised data to be used for research purposes.

Measures

Psychological type was assessed by the 126-item Form G (Anglicised) of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). This instrument proposes forced-choice questions to distinguish between the two orientations (introversion and extraversion), the two attitudes (judging and perceiving), the two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), and the two judging functions (thinking and feeling). Introversion and extraversion are distinguished by questions such as: When you are with a group of people, would you rather join in the talk of the group (E), or talk with one person at a time (I)? Judging and perceiving are distinguished by questions such as: When you go somewhere for the day, would you rather plan what you will do and when (J), or just go (P)? Sensing and intuition are distinguished by questions such as: If you were a teacher, would you rather teach fact-based courses (S), or courses involving theory (N)? Thinking and feeling are distinguished by questions such as: Do you more often let your heart rule your head (F), or your head rule your heart (T)? Satisfactory psychometric properties for this instrument in studies among clergy were supported by Francis and Jones (1999).

Participants

Over the nine years the MBTI was completed by 197 Anglican ministry training candidates, 117 men and 80 women. For two years the ages of the participants had not been recorded. From the other seven years, 40% of men were in their twenties, 39% in their thirties, 13% in their forties, 7% in their fifties, and 1% in his sixties; 34% of the women were in their twenties, 24% in their thirties, 34% in their forties, and 7% in their fifties.

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 these tables will, however, be restricted to those aspects of the data strictly relevant to the research question.

Results

- insert table 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the psychological type distribution for the 117 male ordinands who participated between 2008 and 2016. Four features of these data merit commentary. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, there was clear preference for extraversion (58%) over introversion (42%), for intuition (70%) over sensing (30%), for feeling (61%) over thinking (39%), and for judging (60%) over perceiving (40%). In terms of the dominant types, the largest group preferred dominant intuition (37%), followed by dominant feeling (29%), dominant thinking (18%), and dominant sensing (16%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, the two most prevalent types were ENFJ (14%) and ENFP (12%). In terms of the four temperaments, 41% reported NF, followed by 29% NT, 21% SJ, and 9% SP.

- insert table 3 about here -

Table 3 presents the psychological type distribution for the 80 female ordinands who participated between 2008 and 2016. Four features of these data merit commentary. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, there was clear preference for extraversion (56%) over introversion (44%), for intuition (64%) over sensing (36%), for feeling (74%) over thinking (26%), and for judging (74%) over perceiving (26%). In terms of the dominant types, the largest group preferred dominant feeling (40%), followed by dominant intuition (31%),

dominant sensing (16%), and dominant thinking (13%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, the two most prevalent types were ENFJ (20%) and ENFP (14%). In terms of the four temperaments, 54% reported NF, followed by 33% SJ, 10% NT, and 4% SP.

Discussion

The present study was designed to analyse the psychological type and temperament profile of the cohort of Anglican ordinands training at Cranmer Hall, Durham, during the period 2008 to 2016, set alongside previous studies that had drawn attention to the distinctive profile of Church of England stipendiary clergy. In this context particular attention was drawn to the prominence of the Apollonian (NF) Temperament among this group of clergy. Three key observations emerge from these analyses pertinent to appreciating the role of Cranmer Hall within the tapestry of ministry training provision within the Church of England.

The first key observation concerns the temperament profile of Cranmer Hall ordinands. Here are future clergy, selected for ordination training in the established tradition of Anglican parochial ministry, with an emphasis placed on the Apollonian (NF) Temperament. Their vision is set on the future and their heart is set on serving and developing people. Their leadership generates a particular style of church distinctive from the one grounded in the Epimethean (SJ) Temperament.

Although Cranmer Hall has a broadly evangelical Anglican tradition, it trains ordinands from all branches of the Church of England. It is possible that, if we had studied ordinands at a theological college from a different tradition (e.g., Anglo-Catholic) we might have found different results. Ordinands arrive at Cranmer (or any other comparable theological educational institution) as a result of two selection processes: one operating centrally through bishops and their advisory structures, the other through a process of dialogue between those selected by this process and their advisors (directors of ordinands, college principals, other students, etc). It is possible that NF ordinands select Cranmer, rather

than the other way around, although this would seem less plausible, given what we know about the type preferences of evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics (Village et al, 2009).

The second key observation concerns profiling each of the four dichotomous preferences in turn. In terms of the perceiving process, with their strong preference for intuition (70% of male and 64% of female ordinands), clergy trained in Cranmer Hall may stand in the tradition of Anglican parochial clergy (see Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007) and be seen as high on diverse visions for the future, but low on practical investment in the present, high on aspiration, but low on detail. The challenge that they will face in ministry is working with congregations in which nearly 80% of the participants prefer sensing (see Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011). While intuitive types in leadership may seek change, sensing types in congregations may resist such innovation.

In terms of the judging process, with their strong preference for feeling (61% of male and 74% of female ordinands), clergy trained in Cranmer Hall may stand in the tradition of Anglican parochial clergy (see Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007) and be seen as high on pastoral care but low on strategic management. The challenge that they will face in ministry is shaping a church that will be equally accessible to men and to women. In the UK population 35% of men prefer feeling, compared with 70% of women (Kendall, 1998).

Anglican congregations tend to include twice as many women as men (see Francis & Lankshear, 2021) and the men in the congregations are more likely to prefer feeling than men in the population as a whole (see Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011). With a predominance of feeling types in leadership, Anglican churches develop into organisations that privilege a feminine way of making judgments and that unintentionally exclude men. It remains then for other streams of church that privilege thinking to emerge as more attractive to men, for example the Newfrontiers network of churches (see Francis, Gibb, & Robbins, 2009; Francis, Robbins, & Ryland, 2012).

In terms of the attitudes, the preference for judging (60% of male and 74% of female ordinands) is roughly in line with earlier studies of Church of England clergy (see Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007), somewhat higher than within the general population (Kendall, 1998), and lower than among other groups of clergy (see ap Siôn & Francis, 2022; Francis & Village, 2022). In parish ministry, the problem faced by clergy is that of both accommodating the high preference for judging among congregations, 86% according to Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011), and welcoming perceiving types into the rhythm of church life.

In terms of the orientations, the preference for extraversion (58% of male and 56% of female ordinands) is out of step with previous studies of Anglican clergy. For example, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) reported that 57% of clergymen and 54% of clergywomen preferred introversion, and Francis, Village and Voas (2021) reported that 55% of clergymen and 60% of clergywomen preferred introversion. On the other hand, Francis, Whinney, and Robbins (2013) found that Church of England bishops were more likely to prefer extraversion than clergy in general. Clergy trained in Cranmer Hall may then, be on a trajectory for an episcopal future.

The third key observation concerns the identification of ENFJ as the most prevalent of the sixteen complete types. One in seven (14%) of the male ordinands and one in five (20%) of the female ordinands reported an ENFJ. In her thumbnail sketch of the ENFJ profile, Myers (1998) writes as follows:

Responsive and responsible. Feel real concern for what others think or want, and try to handle things with due regard to others' feelings. Can present a proposal or lead a group discussion with ease and tact. Sociable, popular, sympathetic. Responsive to praise and criticism. Like to help others and enable people to achieve their potential. (Myers, 1998, p. 7)

In their study concerning the connections between personality and religious leadership, Ross and Francis (2020) drew on the eight function-orientation model of psychological type theory as developed by Beebe (2016) that takes into account the four functions of the conscious personality (dominant, auxiliary, tertiary, and fourth) and the four functions of the shadow personality (dominant shadow, auxiliary shadow, tertiary shadow, and fourth shadow). Applied to the ENFJ leader, Ross and Francis (2020, pp. 151-162) characterise their dominant function of extraverted feeling as a concern to maintain relationships and social networks, seeking to co-ordinate people and material resources to achieve harmoniously group and individual goals. For them the cost of dominant extraverted feeling is that they suffer deeply when conflict cannot be resolved. Within this model of psychological type theory, the weakest function, the fourth shadow function, can be the most troublesome and the source of most trouble in ministry. For ENFJ leaders the fourth shadow function is extraverted thinking that emerges in direct conflict with the dominant function of extraverted feeling. It is the exercise of extraverted thinking in others that draws out this conflict. As a consequence ENFJ leaders need to be aware of how they read and how they respond especially to those for whom extraverted thinking is their dominant function (ENTJs and ESTJs). On this matter, it is interesting to note from the study of the psychological profile of bishops by Francis, Whinney, and Robbins (2013) how the Church of England has tended to recruit ESTJs into the pool of diocesan bishops.

In its selection processes, the Church of England, like other Christian churches, engages in an intensive process of discernment, designed to determine whether or not a particular candidate is called by God to a vocation of ordained ministry (McChlery 2021). This raises the interesting question as to whether God predominantly calls people of a certain type, or whether people of a certain type (and churches of a certain type) discern God's

calling of others in a particular, Augustinian, image? Needless to say, this is beyond the scope of our research and beyond the scope of any empirical theological method.

Conclusion

The present study undertook the systematic collection of data from Anglican ordinands training for ministry at Cranmer Hall, Durham, over a nine-year period from 2008 to 2016, employing the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). The data were analysed in the light of psychological type theory, as proposed by Jung (1971) and developed by Myers and McCaulley (1985), and temperament theory, as proposed by Keirse and Bates (1978) and developed by Oswald and Kroeger (1988), and set alongside earlier studies of Church of England clergy, published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) and Francis, Village, and Voas (2021).

The three key findings are: that ordinands training at Cranmer Hall during this period followed in the tradition of the earlier studies, maintaining the distinctive profile of Church of England clergy as privileging the Apollonian (NF) Temperament; that there are more extraverts among ordinands at Cranmer Hall than generally serving among Church of England clergy; and that the deficit of thinking types among ordinands perpetuates the difficulty experienced by the Church of England in respect of engaging an effective ministry among men.

The limitations with the present study are that the data collection was restricted to nine years within one centre for ministry training. These limitations could be redressed by resuming the study at Cranmer Hall and by extending it to other theological education institutions (TEIs). The findings from the present study are sufficiently intriguing to commend further research.

Acknowledgements

Conflict of interest

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

The research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sector.

Data availability

Anonymised data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Ethical approval

This study received ethical approval from the Departmental Ethics Committee of the Department of Theology and Religion at the University of Durham (2008).

Informed consent

All participants were over the age of 18 and gave informed consent by participation in the project.

References

- ap Siôn, T. G., & Francis, L. J. (2022). The psychological type profile of Salvation Army officers working within the United Kingdom: Diversity, strengths, and weaknesses in ministry. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 25(9), 842-859.
- Beebe, J. (2016). *Energies and patterns in psychological type: The reservoir of consciousness*. London: Routledge.
- Burton, L., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers in Britain: Similarities with and differences from Anglican clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 23(1), 64-81. doi.org/10.1163/157092510X503020
- 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(2), 157-164. doi.org/10.1080/13617670600849812
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological typology of Anglican clergy in England: Diversity, strengths, and weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 11(2), 266-284. doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2007.17
- Francis, L. J., Gubb, S., & Robbins, M. (2009). Psychological type profile of Lead Elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 30(1), 61-69. doi.org/10.1080/13617670902784568
- Francis, L. J., Haley, J. M., & McKenna, U. (2023). Psychological type profile of Methodist ministers in Britain: Contributing to the Atlas of Clergy Type Tables. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 33, 102-125. Leiden: Brill. doi.org/10.1163/9789004544574_007

- Francis, L. J., Hancocks, G., Swift, C., & Robbins, M. (2009). Distinctive call, distinctive profile: The psychological type profile of Church of England full-time hospital chaplains. *Practical Theology* 2(2), 269-284. doi.org/10.1558/prth.v2i2.269
- Francis, L. J., & Holmes, P. (2011). Ordained Local Ministers: The same Anglican orders, but of different psychological temperaments? *Rural Theology*, 9(2), 151-160. doi.org/10.1558/ruth.v9i2.151
- Francis, L. J., & Jones, S. H. (1999). The scale properties of the MBTI Form G (Anglicised) among adult churchgoers. *Pastoral Sciences*, 18, 107-126.
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & Robbins, M. (2014). The psychological type profile of Readers in the Church of England: Clones of the clergy or distinctive voices? *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 12(2), 165-184. doi.org/10.1017/S1740355313000077
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & Village, A. (2021). Psychological type and psychological temperament among Readers within the Church of England: A complementary ministry? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 24(4), 389-403. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1764517
- Francis, L. J., & Lankshear, D. W. (2021). Profiling adult churchgoers within the Diocese of Southwark: An overview. In L. J. Francis & D. W. Lankshear (Eds.), *The science of congregation studies: Searching for signs of growth* (pp. 19-41). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Francis, L. J., Laycock, P., & Brewster, C. (2017). Exploring the factor structure of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS) among a sample of Anglican clergy in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 20(9), 930-941. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2017.1375469

- 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., 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., 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(2), 243-259. doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2011.036
- 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., & Jones, S. H. (2012). The psychological type profile of clergywomen in ordained local ministry in the Church of England: Pioneers or custodians? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15(9), 919-932. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.698449
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Ryland, A. (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(3), 220-228. doi.org/10.1177/009164711204000305
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Whinney, M. (2011). Women priests in the Church of England: Psychological type profile. *Religions*, 2, 389-397. doi.org/10.3390/rel2030389
- Francis, L. J., & Smith, G. (2018). Changing patterns in recruitment to stipendiary ministry: A study in psychological profiling. *Theology*, 121(4), 268-277. doi.org/10.1177/0040571X18765426

- Francis, L. J., & Stevenson, A. (2018). Profiling Methodist leadership. *Holiness*, 4(1), 7-26.
doi.org/10.2478/holiness-2018-0001
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2012). The psychological temperament of Anglican clergy in ordained local ministry (OLM): The conserving, serving pastor? *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 25(1), 57-76. doi.org/10.1163/157092512X635743
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2022). Psychological type profile and temperament of Catholic priests serving in England, Wales, and Ireland. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 25(9), 897-909. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2021.2017420
- Francis, L. J., Village, A., & Voas, D. (2021). Psychological type theory, femininity and the appeal of Anglo-Catholicism: A study among Anglican clergymen in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 24(4), 352-365.
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1767557
- Francis, L. J., & Whinney, M. (2019). The psychological profile of Church of England male archdeacons at the beginning of the twenty-first century: Drawing on psychological type and temperament theory. *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 17(1), 74-92.
doi.org/10.1017/S1740355318000256
- Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., Burton, L., & Robbins, M. (2011). Psychological type preferences of male and female Free Church Ministers in England. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 251-263. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.55
- Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., & Robbins, M. (2013). Who is called to be a bishop? A study in psychological type profiling of bishops in the Church of England. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 34(2), 135-151. doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2013.801647

- Garland, G., & Village, A. (2022). Psychological type profiles and temperaments of ministers in the Baptist Union of Great Britain (BUGB). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 25(9), 860-874. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2021.1908974
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works*, (volume 6). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- 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(2), 306-322. doi.org/10.1163/174552511X597170
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. London: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Lewis, C. A., Burgess, J. H., & Francis, L. J. (2022). Psychological profile of Ministers of Word and Sacrament within the United Reformed Church (URC). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 25(9), 921-930.
- Macdaid, G. P., McCaulley, M. H., & Kainz, R.I. (1986). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Atlas of type tables*. Gainesville, FL: Centre for Application of Psychological Type Inc.
- McChlery, L. (2021). *How do you know it's God? Discerning a Vocation to Ministry in Churches*. London, SCM.
- Myers, I. B. (1998). *Introduction to type: A guide to understanding your results on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (fifth edition, European English version). Oxford: Oxford Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality type and religious leadership*. Washington, DC: The Alban Institute.

- Payne, V. J., & Lewis, C. A. (2015). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in Wales: A ministry for sensing types. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*(7), 535-543. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.963999
- Ross, C. F. J., & Francis, L. J. (2020). *Personality, religion, and leadership: The spiritual dimensions of psychological type theory*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Rutledge, C. J. (2021). Psychological type and psychological temperament of non-stipendiary Anglican clergy: Appropriate to meet the needs of the twenty-first century? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 24*(4), 366-376. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1758647
- Tilley, D., Francis, L. J., Robbins M., & Jones, S. H. (2011). Apprentice clergy? The relationship between expectations in ministry and the psychological type profile of training incumbents and curates in the Church of England. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 22*, 286-305. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.65
- Village, A., Francis, L.J., & Craig, C. (2009). Church Tradition and Psychological Type Preferences among Anglicans in England. *Journal of Anglican Studies* 7(1): 93-109.
- Village, A., (2011). Gifts differing? Psychological type among stipendiary and non-stipendiary clergy. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 22*, 230-250. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.49
- Voas, D., & Watt, L. (2014). *Numerical change in church attendance: National, local and individual factors. (The Church Growth Research Programme: Report on strands 1 and 2)*. London, Church of England.

Table 1

Studies of Psychological Type and Temperament of Lay and Ordained Religious Leaders in different Christian Denominations in the UK

Authors / Date	Subjects	Male	Female	Total
Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001	Church in Wales clergy	427	0	427
Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006	Roman Catholic Priests	79	0	79
Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007	Church of England clergy	626	237	863
Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009	Newfrontiers Lead Elders	134	0	134
Francis, Hancocks, Swift, & Robbins, 2009	C of E Full-time Hospital Chaplains	62	39	101
Burton, Francis, & Robbins, 2010	Methodist Ministers	693	311	1004
Francis, Littler, & Robbins, 2010	Church in Wales clergy	213	0	213
Francis, Robbins, Duncan, & Whinney, 2010	Church of England clergy	622	0	622
Kay, Francis, & Robbins, 2011	Apostolic network leaders	164	0	164
Francis & Holmes, 2011	C of E Local Ordained Ministers	17	22	39
Francis, Robbins, & Whinney, 2011	Church of England clergy	0	83	83
Francis, Whinney, Burton, & Robbins, 2011	Free Church Ministers	148	41	189
Tilley, Francis, Robbins, & Jones, 2011	C of E Training incumbents	NK	NK	97
	C of E Curates	45	53	98
Village, 2011	Church of England clergy	529	518	1047
Francis, Robbins, & Jones, 2012	C of E Local Ordained Ministers	0	144	144
Francis, Robbins, & Ryland, 2012	New Frontiers Church Leaders	68	84	154*
Francis & Village, 2012	C of E Local Ordained Ministers	56	79	135
Francis, Whinney, & Robbins, 2013	C of E Bishops (serving or retired)	168	0	168
Francis, Jones, & Robbins, 2014	C of E Readers	108	128	236
Payne & Lewis, 2015	Church in Wales clergy	268	0	268
Francis & Smith, 2018	C of E Curates <40 years of age	90	35	125
Francis & Stevenson, 2018	Methodist Local Preachers	80	62	142
Francis & Whinney, 2019	C of E Archdeacons (serving or retired)	186	0	186
Francis, Jones, & Village, 2021	C of E Readers	59	96	155
Francis, Village, & Voas, 2021	Church of England clergy	1164	307	1471
Rutledge, 2021	Church of England clergy (stipendiary)	NK	NK	77
	Church of England clergy (non-stipendiary)	NK	NK	53
Francis & Village, 2022	Roman Catholic Priests	190	0	190
Garland & Village, 2022	Baptist ministers	232	51	283
Lewis, Burgess, and Francis, 2022	United Reform Church ministers	55	38	93
ap Siôn & Francis, 2022	Salvation Army Officers	165	269	434
Francis, Haley, & McKenna, 2023	Methodist Ministers	619	312	931

Note: * Gender of two subjects unknown

NK, not known

Table 2

Psychological type distribution for male ordinands

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences				
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 4 (3.4%) +++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 8 (6.8%) +++++ ++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 10 (8.5%) +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 10 (8.5%) +++++	E <i>n</i> = 68 (58.1%)	I <i>n</i> = 49 (41.9%)			
ISTP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.7%) ++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.7%) ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 8 (6.8%) +++++ ++	INTP <i>n</i> = 5 (4.3%) ++++	S <i>n</i> = 35 (29.9%)	N <i>n</i> = 82 (70.1%)			
ESTP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.7%) ++	ESFP <i>n</i> = 5 (4.3%) ++++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 14 (12.0%) +++++ +++++ ++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 9 (7.7%) +++++ +++	T <i>n</i> = 46 (39.3%)	F <i>n</i> = 71 (60.7%)			
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 4 (3.4%) +++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 8 (6.8%) +++++ ++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 16 (13.7%) +++++ +++++ ++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 10 (8.5%) +++++	J <i>n</i> = 70 (59.8%)	P <i>n</i> = 47 (40.2%)			
				Pairs and Temperaments				
				IJ <i>n</i> = 32 (27.4%)	IP <i>n</i> = 17 (14.5%)			
				EP <i>n</i> = 30 (25.6%)	EJ <i>n</i> = 38 (32.5%)			
				ST <i>n</i> = 12 (10.3%)	SF <i>n</i> = 23 (19.7%)			
				NF <i>n</i> = 48 (41.0%)	NT <i>n</i> = 34 (29.1%)			
				SJ <i>n</i> = 24 (20.5%)	SP <i>n</i> = 11 (9.4%)			
				NP <i>n</i> = 36 (30.8%)	NJ <i>n</i> = 46 (39.3%)			
				TJ <i>n</i> = 28 (23.9%)	TP <i>n</i> = 18 (15.4%)			
				FP <i>n</i> = 29 (24.8%)	FJ <i>n</i> = 42 (35.9%)			
				IN <i>n</i> = 33 (28.2%)	EN <i>n</i> = 49 (41.9%)			
				IS <i>n</i> = 16 (13.7%)	ES <i>n</i> = 19 (16.2%)			
				ET <i>n</i> = 25 (21.4%)	EF <i>n</i> = 43 (36.8%)			
				IF <i>n</i> = 28 (23.9%)	IT <i>n</i> = 21 (17.9%)			
Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%
E-TJ	14	12.0	I-TP	7	6.0	Dt.T	21	17.9
E-FJ	24	20.5	I-FP	10	8.5	Dt.F	34	29.1
ES-P	7	6.0	IS-J	12	10.3	Dt.S	19	16.2
EN-P	23	19.7	IN-J	20	17.1	Dt.N	43	36.8

Note: *N* = 117 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

Table 3

Psychological type distribution for female ordinands

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 6 (7.5%) +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 6 (7.5%) +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 9 (11.3%) +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 5 (6.3%) +++++	E	<i>n</i> = 45	(56.3%)
	+++	+++++	+	I	<i>n</i> = 35	(43.8%)
		+		S	<i>n</i> = 29	(36.3%)
				N	<i>n</i> = 51	(63.8%)
				T	<i>n</i> = 21	(26.3%)
				F	<i>n</i> = 59	(73.8%)
				J	<i>n</i> = 59	(73.8%)
				P	<i>n</i> = 21	(26.3%)
				Pairs and Temperaments		
ISTP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.3%) +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.3%) +	INFP <i>n</i> = 7 (8.8%) +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) ++++	IJ	<i>n</i> = 26	(32.5%)
				IP	<i>n</i> = 9	(11.3%)
				EP	<i>n</i> = 12	(15.0%)
				EJ	<i>n</i> = 33	(41.3%)
				ST	<i>n</i> = 13	(16.3%)
				SF	<i>n</i> = 16	(20.0%)
				NF	<i>n</i> = 43	(53.8%)
				NT	<i>n</i> = 8	(10.0%)
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	ESFP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.3%) +	ENFP <i>n</i> = 11 (13.8%) +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) +++++	SJ	<i>n</i> = 26	(32.5%)
				SP	<i>n</i> = 3	(3.8%)
				NP	<i>n</i> = 18	(22.5%)
				NJ	<i>n</i> = 33	(41.3%)
				TJ	<i>n</i> = 20	(25.0%)
				TP	<i>n</i> = 1	(1.3%)
				FP	<i>n</i> = 20	(25.0%)
				FJ	<i>n</i> = 39	(48.8%)
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 6 (7.5%) +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 8 (10.0%) +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 16 (20.0%) +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 3 (3.8%) ++++	IN	<i>n</i> = 21	(26.3%)
+++	+++++	+++++		EN	<i>n</i> = 30	(37.5%)
		+++++		IS	<i>n</i> = 14	(17.5%)
		+++++		ES	<i>n</i> = 15	(18.8%)
		+++++		ET	<i>n</i> = 9	(11.3%)
				EF	<i>n</i> = 36	(45.0%)
				IF	<i>n</i> = 23	(28.8%)
				IT	<i>n</i> = 12	(15.0%)

	Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)		Dominant Types			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
E-TJ	9	11.3	I-TP	1	1.3	Dt.T	10	12.5
E-FJ	24	30.0	I-FP	8	10.0	Dt.F	32	40.0
ES-P	1	1.3	IS-J	12	15.0	Dt.S	13	16.3
EN-P	11	13.8	IN-J	14	17.5	Dt.N	25	31.3

Note: *N* = 80 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)