



## [BG Research Online](#)

Francis, L.J. and Village, A. (2025) *Comparing the Psychological Profiles of Anglican Clergy and Anglican Churchgoers in the United States*. *Pastoral Psychology*. ISSN 0031 2789

This is an author accepted manuscript of an open access article published by Springer in its final form on 4th April 2025 at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-025-01206-6> and made available under a [CC BY 4.0 Deed](#) | [Creative Commons licence](#).

This version may differ slightly from the final published version.

Accepted 28/01/2025: *Pastoral Psychology*

Comparing the psychological profiles of Anglican clergy  
and Anglican churchgoers in the USA

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>

Andrew Village

School of Humanities  
York St John University, York, UK  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2174-8822>

Author note:

\*Corresponding author:

Leslie J. Francis

Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research (CEDAR)

The University of Warwick

United Kingdom

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

**IMPORTANT NOTE TO COPYEDITOR**

Please note that this paper has been prepared taking into account the provision made by section 8.18 in APA7 style guide to avoid ambiguity in in-text citations. In view of the number of multi-authored references with the same lead author, the convention has been adopted of abbreviating references with four or more names in the form of Name, Name, et al. (date) and allowing references with three authors to stand in the form of Name, Name, and Name (date). Please allow this convention to stand.

### **Abstract**

Psychological type and psychological temperament theory have contributed to the two fields of congregation studies and clergy studies. The present study brings these two fields together drawing on data from an online survey employing the Francis Psychological Type and Emotional Temperament Scales promoted among clergy and laity in the USA. The analyses compare the profiles of 467 clergywomen and 1,910 female churchgoers, and the profiles of 418 clergymen and 859 male churchgoers, affiliated with the Episcopal Church (USA). The data were consistent with findings from earlier research among Anglicans in England and Wales, indicating significant differences in type and temperament between Anglican clergy and the members of their congregations. For example, in terms of temperament theory 66% of female churchgoers and 68% of male churchgoers reported as sensing and judging (SJ), compared with 43% of clergywomen and 48% of clergymen. Appreciation of these differences may help to promote greater understanding between Anglican clergy and laity.

*Keywords:* empirical theology, psychology of religion, psychological type, temperament theory, Episcopal clergy, Episcopal congregations

## Introduction

Psychological type theory was introduced to the field of clergy studies by a series of initiatives from the 1960s onwards, including studies reported by Greenfield (1969), Harbaugh (1984), and Holsworth (1984). With the publication of their classic *Atlas of Type Tables*, Macdaid et al. (1986) drew together 15 studies on clergy available at that time, the two most significant being the profile of 1,554 Protestant ministers and the profile of 1,298 Catholic priests. Placed side-by-side these profiles drew attention to what these two different groups of clergy had in common and to what set them apart. More recently psychological type theory has been discussed in relation to clergy leadership styles by Osborne (2016) and Ross and Francis (2020). Temperament theory was introduced to the field of clergy studies in the 1980s by Oswald and Kroeger (1988) who distinguished among four different styles of religious leadership.

The introduction of psychological type theory and temperament theory to the field of congregation studies has been much slower to develop, but already has begun to offer some insight into ways in which misunderstandings may arise between clergy and their congregations. It is this problem that the present paper has been shaped to address. First, however, it would be helpful to provide a brief introduction to psychological type theory and temperament theory.

### **Introducing psychological type theory and temperament theory**

Unlike the personality theories developed within the individual differences tradition by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975), producing the Three Major Dimension model, or by Costa and McCrae (1985), producing the Big Five Factor model, psychological type theory does not purport to offer an inclusive overview of human personality. Unlike the Three Major Dimension model or the Big Five Factor model, psychological type theory was not rooted in an empirical quest for data reduction, but in a conceptual model of human functioning.

Psychological type theory proposes a model of cognitive functioning nested within a model of psychological energy. The theory begins by differentiating between two core psychological processes, styled the perceiving process (concerned with gathering data) and the judging process (concerned with evaluating data). According to Jung's (1971) theoretical model, each of these two processes is expressed through two contrasting functions. The perceiving process is expressed through the two functions of sensing and intuition. The judging process is expressed through the two functions of thinking and feeling. While Jung's theoretical model conceives all four functions as essential for human flourishing, Jung observed that individuals show a preference for one function within each process, with the consequence that the less preferred function remains less well developed.

Within psychological type theory, as discussed by Francis (2005), these two cognitive processes are contextualised within a theoretical framework that discusses the source of psychological energy (styled orientation) and the direction in which the psychological processes are directed (styled attitude). The sources of psychological energy are expressed through the two orientations of extraversion and introversion. The two attitudes are styled as judging (when the preferred judging function, thinking or feeling, is directed to the external world) and as perceiving (when the preferred perceiving function, sensing or intuition, is directed to the external world).

In terms of the perceiving process, sensing types tend to focus on specific details. They prefer to be concerned with practical matters. They favour the traditional and conventional way of doing things. Intuitive types tend to focus on the bigger picture. They prefer to be concerned with theoretical matters. They favour innovation and change. In terms of the judging process, thinking types make judgements based on impersonal, objective logic. They prize integrity, justice, truthfulness, and fairness. Feeling types make judgements based on personal, subjective values. They prize compassion, mercy, tactfulness, and peace. In

terms of the orientations, extravert types are oriented toward the external world; they are energised by the people and events around them. Introvert types are oriented toward their internal world; they are energised by their inner thoughts and ideas. In terms of the attitudes toward the external world, judging types employ their preferred judging function (feeling or thinking) that brings structure and order to their external world. Perceiving types employ their preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) that keeps their external world open and flexible.

These building blocks of psychological type theory can be used and interpreted in a variety of ways, including discussion of the dichotomous preferences, discussion of the 16 complete types, or discussion of the dominant types (see further Francis, 2005). In terms of dominant types, psychological type theory maintains that one of the four functions (sensing, intuition, feeling, or thinking) takes priority in an individual's development as the dominant function. The dominant function gives shape to that individual. Dominant sensing shapes the practical approach. Dominant intuition shapes the imaginative approach. Dominant feeling shapes the humane approach. Dominant thinking shapes the logical approach.

In a further development, Keirsey and Bates (1978) drew on the building blocks of psychological type theory to differentiate among what they styled as four temperaments. Giving priority to the perceiving process, they distinguished two temperaments associated with sensing: sensing and judging (SJ) they styled the Epimethean Temperament (people who wish to be dutiful and useful to their communities), and sensing and perceiving (SP) they styled the Dionysian Temperament (people who want to be engaged, involved, and doing new things). They also distinguished two temperaments associated with intuition: intuition and feeling (NF) they styled the Apollonian Temperament (people who are idealistic and have great capacity for empathetic listening), and intuition and thinking (NT) they style the

Promethean Temperament (people who strive to understand, to explain, and to shape their world).

Psychological type theory has been operationalised and refined through a series of psychometric instruments, including 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). Among these instruments the Francis Psychological Type Scales were specifically designed for research purposes.

### **Psychological type profile of Anglican clergy in England**

The first major study of the psychological profile of Anglican clergy serving in the Church of England conducted by Francis, Craig, et al. (2007) among 626 clergymen and 237 clergywomen reported preferences among clergymen for introversion (57%), intuition (62%), feeling (54%), and judging (68%), and among clergywomen for introversion (54%), intuition (65%), feeling (74%), and judging (65%). In terms of temperament theory, this study reported in descending order for clergymen, NF (35%), SJ (31%), NT (27%), and SP (7%), and for clergywomen NF (50%), SJ (29%), NT (15%), and SP (6%). The two most startling points within these data concern the high proportion of intuitive types and the relatively low proportion of the SJ Epimethean temperament. These two findings placed Church of England clergy as outliers within the developing atlas of UK clergy type tables where the majority profile favoured sensing and the SJ Epimethean temperament, as evidenced by studies of Apostolic network leaders (Kay et al., 2011), Baptist ministers (Garland & Village, 2022), Free Church ministers (Francis, Whinney, et al., 2011), Methodist ministers (Francis, Haley, & McKenna, 2023), Roman Catholic priests (Francis & Village, 2022), and Salvation Army officers (ap Siôn & Francis, 2022). In order to test the findings of their initial study among Anglican clergy, Francis, Robbins, et al. (2010) and Francis, Robbins, and Whinney (2011)

reported on replication studies among 622 clergymen and 83 clergywomen. The results were remarkably consistent with those of the initial study.

### **Psychological profile of Anglican churchgoers in England**

The first major study of the psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England, conducted by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011) among 2,135 female churchgoers and 1,169 male churchgoers drawn from 140 congregations, reported preferences among female churchgoers for extraversion (51%), sensing (81%), feeling (70%), and judging (85%), and among male churchgoers for introversion (62%), sensing (78%), thinking (58%), and judging (86%). In terms of temperament theory, this study reported in descending order for female churchgoers, SJ (73%), NF (13%), SP (9%), and NT (6%), and for male churchgoers, SJ (71%), NT (13%), NF (10%), and SP (7%). Set alongside the profiles of Anglican clergy, the most startling point within these data concerns the much stronger presence of the Epimethean (SJ) temperament among churchgoers than among the clergy. This finding caused Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011) to raise the question in the subtitle of their paper as to whether the psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers was ‘compatible or incompatible with their clergy’.

### **Research question**

Against this background, the aim of the present study was to revisit data gathered by the *Covid-19 & Church-21* survey conducted among clergy and laity within The Episcopal Church in the USA in order to establish the extent to which the same differences emerge between the psychological profile of clergy and churchgoers as was found in England.

## **Method**

### **Procedure**

The *Covid-19 & Church-21* survey was originally designed in association with the *Church Times* to explore the impact of the pandemic on Anglican clergy and laity in England. It was

opened on the Qualtrics XM platform on 22 January and closed on 23 July 2021. This survey was slightly shortened and adapted to suit the USA context of the Episcopal Church. This revised survey (still hosted on the Qualtrics XM platform in the UK) was publicised and distributed through Virginia Theological Seminary, was live from 1 June to 23 August 2021 and attracted over 5,000 responses from across the USA. An overview of the responses from laity and clergy from the Episcopal Church were published by Village and Francis (2021).

### **Measures**

Psychological type was assessed using the revised version of the Francis Psychological Type and Emotional Temperament Scales, FPTETS-R (Village & Francis, 2022, 2023a, 2023b).

This 50-item instrument comprises four sets of ten forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving), and ten items related to emotional temperament (calm or volatile). Alpha reliabilities in this sample ranged from .77 to .87.

### **Participants**

From participants who self-identified as Anglicans completed type profiles were provided by 467 clergywomen, 418 clergymen, 1,910 laywomen, and 859 laymen. The clergy participants were drawn from 51 USA states. Ten states accounted for half of the clergy participants: California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia. Just over two-fifths (44%) of the clergy participants were from suburban areas, with 30% from towns, 14% from rural areas, and 12% from inner city areas. Among the clergywomen, 92 reported as ethnically white; 3% were in their thirties, 10% in their forties, 18% in their fifties, 34% in their sixties, 29% in their seventies, and 6% were aged eighty and over; 43% were in stipendiary parochial ministry, 4% in stipendiary extra-parochial ministry, 11% in active self-supporting ministry, 33% were retired but in active

ministry, and 5% were fully retired. Among the clergymen, 94% reported as ethnically white; 5% were in their thirties, 9% in their forties, 14% in their fifties, 27% in their sixties, 32% in their seventies, and 14% were aged eighty or over; 49% were in stipendiary parochial ministry, 7% in stipendiary extra-parochial ministry, 16% in active self-supporting ministry, 21% were retired but in active ministry, and 3% were fully retired.

The lay participants were drawn from all 52 USA states (including Puerto Rico). Ten states accounted for half of the lay participants: California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. One third of the lay participants (33%) were in full- or part-time work, and over half (55%) were retired. Just under half (46%) were from suburban areas, with 29% from towns, 13% from rural areas, and 12% from inner city areas. Among the laywomen, 94% reported as ethnically white; 1% were in their twenties, 2% in their thirties, 4% in their forties, 11% in their fifties, 29% in their sixties, 40% in their seventies, and 13% were aged eighty and over. Among the laymen, 92% reported as ethnically white; 2% were in their twenties, 4% in their thirties, 4% in their forties, 10% in their fifties, 31% in their sixties, 37% in their seventies, and 12% were aged eighty and over.

### **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. In the context of type tables, the statistical significance of the difference between two groups is established by means of the selection ratio index (*I*), an extension of chi-square (McCaulley, 1985). The research literature employing type tables routinely publishes separate type tables for male and for female participants in light of established sex differences between men and women, especially in terms of the judging process. For example, according to the UK population norms published by Kendall (1998) among men 65% prefer thinking and 35% prefer feeling, while among women 30% prefer thinking and 70% prefer feeling.

### **Results and discussion**

- insert table 1 about here -

Table 1 presents the psychological type profile of the 1,910 Anglican laywomen. These data show clear preferences for introversion (69%) over extraversion (31%), for sensing (70%) over intuition (30%), for feeling (57%) over thinking (43%), and for judging (87%) over perceiving (13%). In terms of dominant types, 47% reported as dominant sensing types, followed by dominant feeling (21%), dominant intuition (19%), and dominant thinking (13%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, the two most frequently occurring types were ISFJ (22%) and ISTJ (23%). In terms of the four temperaments, two-thirds (66%) reported as Epimethean (SJ), followed by 20% as Apollonian (NF), 9% as Promethean (NT), and 5% as Dionysian (SP).

- insert table 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the psychological type profile of the 467 Anglican clergywomen. These data show clear preferences for introversion (65%) over extraversion (36%), for intuition (55%) over sensing (45%), for feeling (70%) over thinking (30%), and for judging (79%) over perceiving (21%). In terms of dominant types, 31% reported as dominant sensing, followed

by dominant feeling (30%), dominant intuition (29%), and dominant thinking (11%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, the two most frequently occurring types were ISFJ (18%) and INFJ (15%). In terms of the four temperaments, two-fifths (43%) reported as Epimethean (SJ), two-fifths (43%) as Apollonian (NF), 12% as Promethean (NT), and 2% as Dionysian (SP).

Table 2 also draws attention to the statistically significant differences between the profile reported by Anglican clergywomen and Anglican laywomen. Three features of this table deserve commentary. First, in terms of the dichotomous type preferences, Anglican clergywomen are more likely to prefer intuition (55% compared with 30%), more like likely to prefer feeling (70% compared with 57%), and more likely to prefer perceiving (21% compared with 13%). In terms of dominant type preference, Anglican clergywomen are more likely to report dominant intuition (29% compared with 19%) and dominant feeling (30% compared with 21%), and less likely to report dominant sensing (31% compared with 47%). In terms of the four temperaments, Anglican clergywomen are more likely to report Apollonian (NF) temperament (43% compared with 20%), and less likely to report Epimethean (SJ) temperament (43% compared with 66%).

- insert table 3 about here -

Table 3 presents the psychological type profile of the 859 Anglican laymen. These data show clear preferences for introversion (65%) over extraversion (35%), for sensing (71%) over intuition (29%), for thinking (66%) over feeling (34%), and for judging (92%) over perceiving (8%). In terms of dominant types, 45% reported as dominant sensing types, 24% as dominant thinking types, 17% as dominant intuitive types, and 14% as dominant feeling types. In terms of the sixteen complete types, the two most frequently occurring types were ISTJ (34%) and ESTJ (16%). In terms of the four temperaments, two-thirds (68%)

reported as Epimethean (SJ), followed by 15% as Apollonian (NF), 14% as Promethean (NT), and 3% as Dionysian (SP).

- insert table 4 about here -

Table 4 presents the psychological type profile of the 418 Anglican clergymen. These data show clear preferences for introversion (66%) over extraversion (34%), for feeling (59%) over thinking (41%), and for judging (84%) over perceiving (16%), but with a close balance between sensing (51%) and intuition (49%). In terms of dominant types, 34% reported as dominant sensing types, 29% as dominant intuitive types, 23% as dominant feeling types, and 13% as dominant thinking types. In terms of the sixteen complete types, the three most frequently occurring types were ISTJ (19%), ISFJ (15%), and INFJ (15%). In terms of the four temperaments, half (48%) reported as Epimethean (SJ), followed by 36% as Apollonian (NF), 14% as Promethean (NT), and 3% as Dionysian (SP).

Table 4 also draws attention to the statistically significant differences between the profile reported by Anglican clergymen and Anglican laymen. Three features of the table deserve commentary. First, in terms of the dichotomous type preferences, Anglican clergymen are more likely to prefer intuition (49% compared with 29%), more likely to prefer feeling (59% compared with 34%), and more likely to prefer perceiving (16% compared with 8%). In terms of dominant type preferences, Anglican clergymen are more likely to report dominant intuition (29% compared with 17%), and more likely to report dominant feeling (23% compared with 14%). Anglican clergymen are less likely to report dominant sensing (34% compared with 45%), and less likely to report dominant thinking (13% compared with 24%). In terms of the four temperaments, Anglican clergymen are more likely to report Apollonian (NF) temperament (36% compared with 15%) and less likely to report Epimethean (SJ) temperament (48% compared with 68%).

### **Conclusion**

Building on earlier research conducted among Anglican clergy and churchgoers in the Church of England, the present study was designed to compare the psychological type and temperament profiles of Anglican clergy and churchgoers within the Episcopal Church in the USA. The main conclusion to be drawn from this study is that the two Anglican Churches (in England and in the USA) share much in common regarding the psychological profiles of their clergy and their churchgoers. This conclusion will be examined first in terms of the four dichotomous preferences and then in terms of the four temperaments.

In terms of the orientations, the Anglican culture is shaped by a preference for introversion. Introverts are energised by their own inner world, they tend to be reserved and somewhat private individuals. In the USA 69% of female churchgoers and 65% of male churchgoers, 65% of clergywomen and 68% of clergymen prefer introversion. In England the picture is less extreme, with 49% of female churchgoers and 62% of male churchgoers, 54% of clergywomen and 57% of clergymen preferring introversion. In terms of orientation there is overall compatibility between clergy and churchgoers with a general preference for introversion.

In terms of attitude toward the outside world, the Anglican culture is shaped by a preference for judging, that is to say by a preference for exercising a judging function (thinking or feeling) in the external world. Judging types need structure, order, and predictability in their outward-facing lives. In the USA 87% of female churchgoers and 92% of male churchgoers, 79% of clergywomen and 84% of clergymen prefer judging. In England the picture is less extreme, with 85% of female churchgoers and 86% of male churchgoers, 65% of clergywomen and 68% of clergymen preferring judging. In both countries the clergy are significantly less likely than the laity to prefer judging, and more so in England. The balance, however, is clear that the Anglican Church is organised and run by judging types for judging types.

In terms of the perceiving process, Anglican congregations are shaped by a preference for sensing. Sensing types are practical people, down to earth, and rooted in the reality of the present situation. In the USA 70% of female churchgoers and 71% of male churchgoers prefer sensing. In England 81% of female churchgoers and 78% of male churchgoers prefer sensing. Anglican clergy, however, are shaped by a preference for intuition. Intuitive types are imaginative people, with an eye on future possibilities and speculative aspirations. In the USA 55% of female clergy and 49% of male clergy prefer intuition. In England 65% of female clergy and 62% of male clergy prefer intuition. In both countries there are real possibilities that largely sensing congregations may be led by intuitive clergy and more so in England.

In terms of the judging process, Anglican clergy are shaped by a preference for feeling. Feeling types are warm-hearted people who seek for harmony and peace. In the USA 70% of female clergy and 59% of male clergy prefer feeling. In England, 74% of female clergy and 54% of male clergy prefer feeling. What is remarkable about these figures is the high proportion of male clergy who prefer feeling. According, for example, to the UK population norms published by Kendall (1998), only 35% of men prefer feeling compared with 70% of women. In other words, feeling is a highly gendered construct. Turning attention to the profile of female churchgoers, in the USA 57% prefer feeling and in England 70% prefer feeling. By way of comparison, among male churchgoers in the USA 34% prefer feeling and in England 42% prefer feeling.

The foregoing examination of the four dichotomous preferences has drawn attention to the way in which some psychological types (introverts, sensing types, feeling types, and judging types) are over-represented in Anglican congregations, while other psychological types (extraverts, intuitive types, thinking types, and perceiving types) are less in evidence. This finding raises questions concerning how extraverts, intuitive types, thinking types, and

perceiving types may experience being part of these congregations. Research on the motivations of former churchgoers for ceasing church attendance and becoming religiously disaffiliated reported by Richter and Francis (1998) and Francis and Richter (2007) identified high on the list the sense of 'not fitting in'. In order to test the hypothesis that psychological type may be implicated in the sense of 'not fitting in and getting out', Francis and Robbins (2012) invited individuals attending 72 congregations to complete the Francis Psychological Type Scales (2005) together with a nine-item measure of congregational satisfaction. Data provided by 1,867 participants found that the lowest level of satisfaction was reported by ENTPs, the mirror image of the ISFJ culture.

In terms of the four temperaments, the Epimethean (SJ) temperament holds a powerful grasp over Anglican congregations. The Epimethean temperament is strongly committed to conserving the inherited traditions. In the USA 66% of female churchgoers and 68% of male churchgoers report this temperament. In England 73% of female churchgoers and 71% of male churchgoers report this temperament. The Epimethean (SJ) temperament is, however, less strongly evidenced among the Anglican clergy. In the USA 43% of clergywomen and 48% of clergymen report this temperament. In England 29% of clergymen and 31% of clergywomen report this temperament. The trend is in the same direction in both countries, but less pronounced in the USA. It is this clash of temperament that may be at the root of some conflict between congregations and their clergy. When clergy shaped by a preference for intuition begin to form vision for the future that indicates fundamental change, the Epimethean core of the congregation may be roused into offering significant challenges. It is at this point that these diverging temperaments may collide, with neither group fully understanding the other (see further Ross & Francis, 2020).

The main limitation with the present study concerns the way in which the sample was generated by the online survey. As a consequence of this limitation no claims have been

made to suggest that this is a representative sample of all Episcopal clergy and Episcopal laity and the primary research question was set to compare the profiles of clergy and laity captured within the same online survey. The close resemblance of the findings from these data with earlier studies in England is nonetheless sufficiently intriguing to commend a replication study employing a more rigorous sampling approach among both clergy and congregations.

### **Acknowledgements**

We thank Jennifer McKenzie and the Virginia Theological Seminary for promoting the survey among the Episcopal Church.

### **Disclosure statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

### **Funding**

There were no funders for this study.

### **Ethical approval**

Ethical approval was granted by the Research Ethics Committee for the School of Humanities, Religion and Philosophy at York St John University (approval code: HRP-RS-AV-0240-01). All participants had to affirm they were 18 or over and given their informed consent by ticking a box that gave access to the rest of the survey.

### 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.  
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2021.1884211
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*. Psychological Assessment Resources. doi.org/10.1037/t07564-000
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (adult and junior)*. Hodder and Stoughton. doi.org/10.1037/t05462-000
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. 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., 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. doi.org/10.1163/9789004544574\_007
- 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. & Richter, P. (2007). *Gone for good? Church-leaving and returning in the twenty-first century*. 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 & Culture*, 15(10), 1023-1035. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.676260
- 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 & V. Briseno (Eds.), *Psychology of intuition* (pp. 211-219). Nova Science Publishers.
- 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., & 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., 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
- 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
- Greenfield, M. (1969). Typologies of persisting and non-persisting Jewish clergymen. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 16(4), 368-372. doi.org/10.1037/h0027708

- Harbaugh, G. L. (1984). The person in ministry: Psychological type and the seminary. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 23-32.
- Holsworth, T. E. (1984). Type preferences among Roman Catholic seminarians. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 33-35.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works*, (volume 6). 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*. Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Macdaid, G. P., McCaulley, M. H., & Kainz, R.I. (1986). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Atlas of type tables*. Centre for Application of Psychological Type Inc.
- McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The Selection Ratio Type Table: A research strategy for comparing type distributions. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 10, 46-56.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Osborne, G. (2016). *To be a better leader: Personality type and difference in ministry*. SPCK.
- Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality type and religious leadership*. The Alban Institute.
- Richter, P., & Francis, L. J. (1998). *Gone but not forgotten: Church-leaving and returning*. Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Ross, C. F. J., & Francis, L. J. (2020). *Personality, religion, and leadership: The spiritual dimensions of psychological type theory*. Lexington Books.

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2021). *TEC survey: Initial analyses of the data*. York St John University.

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2022). Factorial structure and validity of the Francis Psychological Type and Emotional Temperament Scales (FPTETS). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 25(9), 897-909. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2022.2026311

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2023a). Introducing the Francis Psychological Type and Emotional Temperament Scales (FPTETS): A study among church leaders and church members. *Religion, Brain & Behavior*, 13(4), 399-419. doi.org/10.1080/2153599X.2022.2160800

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2023b). Revising the Francis Psychological Type and Emotional Temperament Scales (FPTETS). Online first. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2023.2232330

Table 1

*Type distribution for female Anglican laity*

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences				
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 444 (23.2%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 423 (22.1%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 183 (9.6%) +++++ +++++ +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 111 (5.8%) +++++ +	E <i>n</i> = 597 (31.3%) I <i>n</i> = 1313 (68.7%) S <i>n</i> = 1345 (70.4%) N <i>n</i> = 565 (29.6%) T <i>n</i> = 828 (43.4%) F <i>n</i> = 1082 (56.6%) J <i>n</i> = 1667 (87.3%) P <i>n</i> = 243 (12.7%)				
ISTP <i>n</i> = 16 (0.8%)	ISFP <i>n</i> = 45 (2.4%) ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 70 (3.7%) ++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 21 (1.1%) +	<b>Pairs and Temperaments</b> IJ <i>n</i> = 1161 (60.8%) IP <i>n</i> = 152 (8.0%) EP <i>n</i> = 91 (4.8%) EJ <i>n</i> = 506 (26.5%) ST <i>n</i> = 650 (34.0%) SF <i>n</i> = 695 (36.4%) NF <i>n</i> = 387 (20.3%) NT <i>n</i> = 178 (9.3%) SJ <i>n</i> = 1259 (65.9%) SP <i>n</i> = 86 (4.5%) NP <i>n</i> = 157 (8.2%) NJ <i>n</i> = 408 (21.4%) TJ <i>n</i> = 772 (40.4%) TP <i>n</i> = 56 (2.9%) FP <i>n</i> = 187 (9.8%) FJ <i>n</i> = 895 (46.9%)				
ESTP <i>n</i> = 5 (0.3%)	ESFP <i>n</i> = 20 (1.0%) +	ENFP <i>n</i> = 52 (2.7%) +++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 14 (0.7%) +					
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 185 (9.7%) +++++ +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 207 (10.8%) +++++ +++++ +	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 82 (4.3%) ++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 32 (1.7%) ++	IN <i>n</i> = 385 (20.2%) EN <i>n</i> = 180 (9.4%) IS <i>n</i> = 928 (48.6%) ES <i>n</i> = 417 (21.8%) ET <i>n</i> = 236 (12.4%) EF <i>n</i> = 361 (18.9%) IF <i>n</i> = 721 (37.7%) IT <i>n</i> = 592 (31.0%)				
Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)		Dominant Types				
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%			
E-TJ	217	11.4	I-TP	37	1.9	Dt.T	254	13.3
E-FJ	289	15.1	I-FP	115	6.3	Dt.F	404	21.2
ES-P	25	1.3	IS-J	867	45.4	Dt.S	892	46.7
EN-P	66	3.5	IN-J	294	15.4	Dt.N	360	18.8

Note: *N* = 1,910 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

Table 2

Type distribution for female Anglican clergy compared with female Anglican laity

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 61 (13.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.56*** +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 84 (18.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.81* +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 71 (15.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.59*** +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 26 (5.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.96 +++++	E <i>n</i> = 166 (35.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	I <i>n</i> = 301 (64.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.94	S <i>n</i> = 211 (45.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.64***	N <i>n</i> = 256 (54.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.85***
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	T <i>n</i> = 141 (30.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.70***	F <i>n</i> = 326 (69.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.23***	J <i>n</i> = 370 (79.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.91***	P <i>n</i> = 97 (20.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.63***
+++++	+++++	+++++	+	<b>Pairs and Temperaments</b>			
+++	+++++	+++++		IJ <i>n</i> = 242 (51.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.85***	IP <i>n</i> = 59 (12.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.59***	EP <i>n</i> = 38 (8.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.71**	EJ <i>n</i> = 128 (27.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.03
ISTP <i>n</i> = 3 (0.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.77 +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 7 (1.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.64 ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 43 (9.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.51*** +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 6 (1.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.17 +	ST <i>n</i> = 86 (18.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.54***	SF <i>n</i> = 125 (26.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.74***	NF <i>n</i> = 201 (43.0%) <i>I</i> = 2.12***	NT <i>n</i> = 55 (11.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.26
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ESFP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.20	ENFP <i>n</i> = 32 (6.9%) <i>I</i> = 2.52*** +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 5 (1.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.46 +	SJ <i>n</i> = 200 (42.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.65***	SP <i>n</i> = 11 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.52*	NP <i>n</i> = 86 (18.4%) <i>I</i> = 2.24***	NJ <i>n</i> = 170 (36.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.70***
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 22 (4.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.49*** +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 33 (7.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.65* +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 55 (11.8%) <i>I</i> = 2.74*** +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 18 (3.9%) <i>I</i> = 2.30** ++++	TJ <i>n</i> = 127 (27.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.67***	TP <i>n</i> = 14 (3.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.02	FP <i>n</i> = 83 (17.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.82***	FJ <i>n</i> = 243 (52.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.11*
	++	+++++		IN <i>n</i> = 146 (31.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.55***	EN <i>n</i> = 110 (23.6%) <i>I</i> = 2.50***	IS <i>n</i> = 155 (33.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.68***	ES <i>n</i> = 56 (12.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.55***
		+++++		ET <i>n</i> = 45 (9.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.78	EF <i>n</i> = 121 (25.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.37***	IF <i>n</i> = 205 (43.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.16*	IT <i>n</i> = 96 (20.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.66***
		++					

  

	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	40	8.6	0.75	I-TP	9	1.9	0.99	Dt.T	49	10.5	0.79
E-FJ	88	18.8	1.25*	I-FP	50	10.7	1.78***	Dt.F	138	29.6	1.40***
ES-P	1	0.2	0.16*	IS-J	145	31.0	0.68***	Dt.S	146	31.3	0.67***
EN-P	37	7.9	2.29***	IN-J	97	20.8	1.35**	Dt.N	134	28.7	1.52***

Note: *N* = 467 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)  
 \**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001

Table 3

*Type distribution for male Anglican laity*

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 292 (34.0%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 88 (10.2%) +++++ +++++ +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 68 (7.9%) +++++ +++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 63 (7.3%) +++++ ++	E <i>n</i> = 301 (35.0%) I <i>n</i> = 558 (65.0%)  S <i>n</i> = 609 (70.9%) N <i>n</i> = 250 (29.1%)  T <i>n</i> = 564 (65.7%) F <i>n</i> = 295 (34.3%)  J <i>n</i> = 788 (91.7%) P <i>n</i> = 71 (8.3%)	
ISTP <i>n</i> = 11 (1.3%) +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 4 (0.5%) +	INFP <i>n</i> = 19 (2.2%) ++	INTP <i>n</i> = 13 (1.5%) ++	<b>Pairs and Temperaments</b> IJ <i>n</i> = 511 (59.5%) IP <i>n</i> = 47 (5.5%) EP <i>n</i> = 24 (2.8%) EJ <i>n</i> = 277 (32.2%)  ST <i>n</i> = 443 (51.6%) SF <i>n</i> = 166 (19.3%) NF <i>n</i> = 129 (15.0%) NT <i>n</i> = 121 (14.1%)  SJ <i>n</i> = 587 (68.3%) SP <i>n</i> = 22 (2.6%) NP <i>n</i> = 49 (5.7%) NJ <i>n</i> = 201 (23.4%)  TJ <i>n</i> = 535 (62.3%) TP <i>n</i> = 29 (3.4%) FP <i>n</i> = 42 (4.9%) FJ <i>n</i> = 253 (29.5%)  IN <i>n</i> = 163 (19.0%) EN <i>n</i> = 87 (10.1%) IS <i>n</i> = 395 (46.0%) ES <i>n</i> = 214 (24.9%)  ET <i>n</i> = 185 (21.5%) EF <i>n</i> = 116 (13.5%) IF <i>n</i> = 179 (20.8%) IT <i>n</i> = 379 (44.1%)	
ESTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.1%)	ESFP <i>n</i> = 6 (0.7%) +	ENFP <i>n</i> = 13 (1.5%) ++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 4 (0.5%) +		
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 139 (16.2%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 68 (7.9%) +++++ +++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 29 (3.4%) +++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 41 (4.8%) +++++		
Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)		Dominant Types	
	<i>n</i> %		<i>n</i> %		<i>n</i> %
E-TJ	180    21.0	I-TP	24     2.8	Dt.T	204    23.7
E-FJ	97     11.3	I-FP	23     2.7	Dt.F	120    14.0
ES-P	7      0.8	IS-J	380    44.2	Dt.S	387    45.1
EN-P	17     2.0	IN-J	131    15.3	Dt.N	148    17.2

Note: *N* = 859 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

Table 4

Type distribution for male Anglican clergy compared with male Anglican laity

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 79 (18.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.56 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 62 (14.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.45*	INFJ <i>n</i> = 63 (15.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.90***	INTJ <i>n</i> = 34 (8.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.11 +++++	E <i>n</i> = 143 (34.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.98	I <i>n</i> = 275 (65.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.01	S <i>n</i> = 212 (50.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.72***	N <i>n</i> = 206 (49.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.69***
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	T <i>n</i> = 170 (40.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.62***	F <i>n</i> = 248 (59.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.73***	J <i>n</i> = 353 (84.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.92***	P <i>n</i> = 65 (15.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.88***
ISTP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.75 +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 5 (1.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.57 +	INFP <i>n</i> = 24 (5.7%) <i>I</i> = 2.60 +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.63 +	<b>Pairs and Temperaments</b>			
				IJ <i>n</i> = 238 (56.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.96	IP <i>n</i> = 37 (8.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.62*	EP <i>n</i> = 28 (6.7%) <i>I</i> = 2.40***	EJ <i>n</i> = 115 (27.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.85
				ST <i>n</i> = 113 (27.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.52***	SF <i>n</i> = 99 (23.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.23	NF <i>n</i> = 149 (35.6%) <i>I</i> = 2.37***	NT <i>n</i> = 57 (13.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.97
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ESFP <i>n</i> = 3 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.03 +	ENFP <i>n</i> = 23 (5.5%) <i>I</i> = 3.64*** +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.03 +	SJ <i>n</i> = 200 (47.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.70***	SP <i>n</i> = 12 (2.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.12	NP <i>n</i> = 53 (12.7%) <i>I</i> = 2.22***	NJ <i>n</i> = 153 (36.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.56***
				TJ <i>n</i> = 160 (38.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.61***	TP <i>n</i> = 10 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.71	FP <i>n</i> = 55 (13.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.69***	FJ <i>n</i> = 193 (46.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.57***
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 30 (7.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.44*** +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 29 (6.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.88 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 39 (9.3%) <i>I</i> = 2.76*** +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 17 (4.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.85 ++++	IN <i>n</i> = 125 (29.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.58***	EN <i>n</i> = 81 (19.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.91***	IS <i>n</i> = 150 (35.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.78***	ES <i>n</i> = 62 (14.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.60***
++	++	++++		ET <i>n</i> = 49 (11.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.54***	EF <i>n</i> = 94 (22.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.67***	IF <i>n</i> = 154 (36.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.77***	IT <i>n</i> = 121 (28.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.66***

  

	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	47	11.2	0.54***	I-TP	8	1.9	0.69	Dt.T	55	13.2	0.55***
E-FJ	68	16.3	1.44*	I-FP	29	6.9	2.59***	Dt.F	97	23.2	1.66***
ES-P	3	0.7	0.88	IS-J	141	33.7	0.76***	Dt.S	144	34.4	0.76***
EN-P	25	6.0	3.02***	IN-J	97	23.2	1.52***	Dt.N	122	29.2	1.69***

Note: *N* = 418 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)  
 \**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001