



BISHOP
GROSSETESTE
UNIVERSITY

[BG Research Online](#)

Francis, L.J., Haley, J. M. and 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. ISSN 1046-8064

This is an manuscript published by Brill on 15th June 2023 at:

<https://brill.com/display/title/64742>

This version may differ slightly from the final published version.

Copyright is retained by the author/s and/or other copyright holders.

End users generally may reproduce, display or distribute single copies of content held within BG Research Online, in any format or medium, for personal research & study or for educational or other not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- The full bibliographic details and a hyperlink to (or the URL of) the item's record in BG Research Online are clearly displayed;
- No part of the content or metadata is further copied, reproduced, distributed, displayed or published, in any format or medium;
- The content and/or metadata is not used for commercial purposes;
- The content is not altered or adapted without written permission from the rights owner/s, unless expressly permitted by licence.

For enquiries about BG Research Online email bgro@bishopg.ac.uk.

Psychological type profile of Methodist ministers in Britain:

Contributing to the Atlas of Clergy Type Tables

Leslie J. Francis*

World Religions and Education Research Unit, Bishop Grosseteste University, UK

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2946-9980>

John M. Haley

Methodist Circuit Minister (Presbyter), Torbay, UK

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7910-9425>

Ursula McKenna

World Religions and Education Research Unit, Bishop Grosseteste University, UK

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2625-7731>

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J. Francis

Professor of Religions, Psychology and Education

World Religions and Education Research Unit

Bishop Grosseteste University

Longdales Road, Lincoln LN1 3DY

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

Building on earlier psychological type profiles of clergy serving in Britain, the present study was designed to clarify the psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers, distinguishing between male and female ministers and between superintendent and non-superintendent ministers. Data provided by 619 male ministers demonstrate preferences for introversion (66%), sensing (56%), feeling (59%), and judging (76%). Data provided by 312 female ministers also demonstrated preferences for introversion (67%), sensing (51%), feeling (72%), and judging (78%). Among male ministers, superintendents were significantly more likely to prefer judging (81% compared with 74%) and less likely to include INFPs (4% compared with 9%). Among female ministers there were no significant differences distinguishing the smaller number of superintendents. The implications of these findings are discussed for the expression and experience of ministry within the Methodist Church of Great Britain.

Keywords: psychology, clergy, Methodist psychological type, Britain

Introduction

Psychological profiling may contribute helpfully to understanding and promoting both the personal wellbeing and professional performance of clergy across the denominational range of Christian Churches. Psychological profiling distinguishes between two very different fields of enquiry, one concerned with assessing psychological pathologies and identifying clinical and subclinical disorders, and the other concerned with assessing individual differences within the range of normal and healthy human functioning. The present enquiry is concerned with the latter of these two approaches, rooted within the field of normal personality and individual differences.

Within the tradition of normal personality and individual differences, the personality profiling of clergy has drawn on diverse models of personality assessment, including the Sixteen Personality Factor model proposed by Cattell, Eber, and Tatsuoka (1970), the Major Three Dimensions model proposed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975), the Big Five Factor model proposed by Costa and McCrae (1985), and the Psychological Type model operationalised by a family of instruments including the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). The present enquiry is concerned with the last of these approaches.

Psychological type theory

Psychological type theory has its roots in the conceptualisation of Jung (1971) and has been developed and modified through operationalisation by a range of 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). Psychological type theory comprises four core building blocks: the perceiving process, the judging process, the orientation of psychological energy, and the attitude toward the external world. The distinguishing characteristic of the Jungian approach to these four core psychological constructs is to consider each of them as presenting

in two contrasting modes and to propose that individuals intuitively prefer one of these modes more than the other. It is the preferred mode that is trusted, practised, and developed, to the comparative neglect of the less preferred mode.

The two contrasting modes in which the perceiving process is presented are described as sensing and intuition. Sensing types construct their picture of the world by paying close attention to facts and to details. Intuitive types construct their picture of the world by attending to theories and to the bigger picture. The two contrasting modes in which the judging process are presented are described as feeling and thinking. Feeling types draw on subjective values to judge situations. Thinking types draw on objective logic to judge situations. The two contrasting modes in which the orientations of psychological energy are presented are described as introversion and extraversion. Introverted types gain energy by inner reflection and solitude. Extraverted types gain energy by engagement with others. The two contrasting modes in which the attitudes toward the external world are presented are described as perceiving and judging. Perceiving types deploy their preferred perceiving function in the external world (either sensing or intuition), with the consequence that their external world appears to be flexible and spontaneous. Judging types deploy their preferred judging function in the external world (either feeling or thinking), with the consequence that their external world appears to be well structured and organised.

The four building blocks of psychological type theory can be employed in a number of different ways, with varying degrees of complexity. The variety can be illustrated, for example, by the ways in which psychological type theory has been applied to discussing religious leadership and Christian ministry by Oswald and Kroeger (1988), Osborne (2016), and Ross and Francis (2020). At the simplest level useful information can be derived from considering each binary construct one-by-one. The four binary constructs can be drawn

together to comprise 16 complete types. Type dynamics can be construed to calculate an individual's strongest or dominant function and to identify the weakest or inferior function.

A development from psychological type theory by Keirsey and Bates (1978) proposed four temperaments. Temperaments theory places primary emphasis on the perceiving process and distinguishes between two expressions of the sensing function and two expressions of the intuitive function. Keirsey and Bates (1978) distinguish sensing and judging types (SJ) and sensing and perceiving types (SP). They also distinguished between intuitive and feeling types (NF) and intuitive and thinking types (NT). In the language shaped by Keirsey and Bates (1978), the Epimethean Temperament (SJ) characterises people who long to be dutiful, and who want to be useful to the social units to which they belong. The Dionysian Temperament (SP) characterises people who want to be involved, and who wish to engage in doing new things. The Promethean Temperament (NT) characterises people who want to understand and shape their world, and who prize personal competence. The Apollonian Temperament (NF) characterises people who seek authenticity and self-actualisation, and who are idealistic and empathetic.

For those familiar with the rich nuances of psychological type theory, the diverse levels of information available through psychological type profiling is made accessible through type tables. Type tables have been designed to present information about the four dichotomous preferences, the 16 complete types, the eight Jungian types, the four dominant types, the four temperaments, and a range of paired characteristics. Type tables become particularly useful when a set of type tables can be placed side-by-side and differences among different populations or samples identified.

Atlas of type tables

Building on the distinctive feature of type tables, in their classic *Atlas of Type Tables*, Macdaid, McCaulley, and Kainz (1986) drew together the available research at that time

regarding the psychological type profile of different groups of people whom they classified within the following categories: art and communication; business and management; counselling and mental health; education; engineering; science and technology; government, justice and ministry; health; industry, service and trade; religion; and students. Within the section on business and management, they assembled 53 type tables that distinguished among different relevant groups, for example, illuminating the distinctive profiles of accountants, real estate agents, and human resource managers. Within the section on health, they assembled 41 type tables, distinguishing different grades of doctors, nurses serving in different roles, and a variety of therapists.

In the section on religion, Macdaid, McCaulley, and Kainz (1986) assembled 15 type tables. Among these 15 type tables, the two of most significance were the profile of 1,554 Protestant ministers and the profile of 1,298 Catholic priests. Comparison of these two type tables generates insights into what these two groups shared in common and into ways in which they differed. The two groups shared in common a strong preference for feeling over thinking: 77% of Protestant ministers and 80% of Catholic priests preferred feeling. The significance of this finding emerges when the profile of clergy is placed alongside population studies that show a much lower preference for feeling among men than among women. For example, Kendall (1998) in the UK population norms found that just 35% of men preferred feeling, compared with 70% of women. There was also a shared preference for judging over perceiving: 68% of Protestant ministers and 71% of Catholic priests preferred judging. On the other hand, differences between Protestant ministers and Catholic priests emerged in terms of the orientations and in terms of the perceiving functions: 57% of Protestant ministers preferred extraversion compared with 48% of Catholic priests; 62% of Protestant ministers preferred intuition, compared with 46% of Catholic priests.

The differences in psychological type preferences between Protestant ministers and Catholic priests were also reflected in differences in temperaments. The clearest difference emerged in respect of the Epimethean Temperament (SJ), the position occupied by 32% of Protestant ministers, compared with 46% of Catholic priests. This difference suggests a more conservative approach among Catholic priests than among Protestant ministers.

Alongside these two large samples of Protestant ministers and Catholic priests, Macdaid, McCaulley, and Kainz (1986) also included other large samples: 2,002 sisters in Roman Catholic religious orders; 1,205 candidates for theology education; and 1,147 nuns and other religious workers. It is not, however, only these large samples that make key contributions to the developing atlas of type tables. Macdaid, McCaulley, and Kainz (1986) also included smaller samples: 50 directors of religious education, 51 Roman Catholic seminarians; 79 religious educators across all denominations; 85 Protestants in specialised ministries; 102 ordained Roman Catholic deacons; 114 brothers in Roman Catholic religious orders; 219 priests and monks; 319 rabbis; 534 clergy defined as ‘all denominations, except priests’; and 633 Protestant seminarians.

A new atlas of clergy type tables

Following in the footsteps of Macdaid, McCaulley, and Kainz (1986), a growing body of research has begun to create an atlas of type tables mapping the psychological type profile of clergy (and lay church leaders) serving churches within the UK. Currently these studies comprise: Apostolic network leaders, with 164 male participants (Kay, Francis, & Robbins, 2011); Baptist ministers, with 232 male and 51 female participants (Garland & Village, 2021); Church in Wales clergy, with 427 clergymen (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001); with 213 clergymen (Francis, Littler, & Robbins, 2010); and with 268 clergymen (Payne & Lewis, 2015); Church of England clergy, with 626 clergymen and 237 clergywomen (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007); with 622 clergymen (Francis, Robbins, Duncan, &

Whinney, 2010), with 83 clergywomen (Francis, Robbins, & Whinney, 2011), with 97 training incumbents and 98 curates (Tilley, Francis, Robbins, & Jones, 2011), with 529 clergymen and 518 clergywomen (Village, 2011), with 90 curates under the age of forty (Francis & Smith, 2018), with 1,164 clergymen and 307 clergywomen (Francis, Village, & Voas, 2021), and with 77 stipendiary and 53 non-stipendiary clergy (Rutledge, 2021); Church of England Local Ordained Ministers, with 39 participants (Francis & Holmes, 2011), with 144 clergywomen (Francis, Robbins, & Jones, 2012), and with 56 clergymen and 79 clergywomen (Francis & Village, 2012); Church of England full-time hospital chaplains, with 101 participants (Francis, Hancocks, Smith, & Robbins, 2009); Church of England bishops, with 168 bishops, serving or retired (Francis, Whinney, & Robbins, 2013); Church of England archdeacons, with 186 archdeacons serving or retired (Francis & Whinney, 2019); Church of England readers, with 108 male and 128 female participants (Francis, Jones, & Robbins, 2014), and with 59 male and 96 female participants (Francis, Jones, & Village, 2021); Free Church Ministers, with 148 male and 41 female participants (Francis, Whinney, Burton, & Robbins, 2011); Methodist ministers, with 693 male and 311 female participants (Burton, Francis, & Robbins, 2010); Methodist local preachers, with 80 male and 62 female participants (Francis & Stevenson, 2018); Newfrontiers network of churches, with 134 lead elders (Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009), and 154 leaders (Francis, Robbins, & Ryland, 2012); Roman Catholic priests, with 79 participants (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006); and Salvation Army Officers, with 165 male and 269 female participants (ap Siôn & Francis, in press).

Psychological type profile of Methodist ministers

The Methodist Church of Great Britain traces its origin to John Wesley (1703-1791) who was himself an Anglican priest. John Wesley led an evangelical revival with the intention of reaching people, often relocated as a consequence of the industrial revolution,

who seemed beyond the reach of the conventional structures of the Church of England. After John Wesley's death Methodism became a separate Church. In 1836 the Wesleyan Church ordained its own ministers, breaking with the notion of episcopal ordination, one of the defining characteristics of the Church of England following the English Reformation. Subsequently, Methodism itself became fractured as a consequence of a number of secessions. The Methodist Union of 1932 brought together the Wesleyan Methodists, the Primitive Methodists, and the United Methodists into the Methodist Church of Great Britain (embracing Great Britain, Channel Islands, Isle of Man, Gibraltar, and Malta).

From the 1960s onwards discussions have been undertaken by the Methodist Church and the Church of England to seek ways of working more closely together. A major stumbling block in these discussions concerned the notion of episcopal ordination. Some Anglicans remained reluctant to accept the ministry of Methodist ministers without episcopal ordination. Some Methodists remained reluctant to concede to what they characterised as the reordination of Methodist ministers. In their survey of 1,269 (74% response rate) Methodist ministers in 1997, Haley and Francis (2006) found that 54% would welcome Methodist-Anglican unity and 25% would accept episcopal ordination after their Methodist ordination. In their replication study of 872 (60% response rate) Methodist ministers in 2008, Haley and Francis (under review) found a hardening of attitudes. In 2008, 44% would welcome Methodist-Anglican unity, and 15% would accept episcopal ordination after their Methodist ordination.

While properly acknowledging that there were serious theological and ecclesiological issues separating Methodist ministers and Anglican priests, Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010) proffered the suggestion that there may also be psychological preferences that distinguish the two groups. Taking as their reference point the psychological type profile of Anglican clergy (626 clergymen and 237 clergywomen) published by Francis, Craig,

Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007), Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010) designed a survey to obtain data on the psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers, with the objective of comparing the two groups.

Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010) posted a questionnaire in the late spring of 2004 to all Methodist ministers, both presbyters and probationers, who were in active circuit work in England. A total of 1,728 questionnaires were posted and 1,026 responses were received, making a response rate of 59%. Of the 1,026 returned questionnaires, 1,004 included full responses to the measure of psychological type (from 693 male and 311 female ministers). In this study, the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005) reported the following alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951): .80 for the introversion and extraversion scale; .70 for the sensing and intuition scale; .67 for the thinking and feeling scale; and .80 for the judging and perceiving scale.

For male Methodist circuit ministers, Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010) reported preferences for introversion (61%) over extraversion (40%), for sensing (54%) over intuition (46%), for feeling (64%) over thinking (36%), and for judging (70%) over perceiving (30%). Compared with Anglican clergymen, these data demonstrated that male Methodist ministers are significantly less likely to prefer thinking (36% compared with 47%) and significantly more likely to prefer feeling (64% compared with 54%). Male Methodist ministers are also significantly more likely to prefer sensing (54% compared with 38%) and significantly less likely to prefer intuition (46% compared with 62%). However, there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of preferences for extraversion (40% of Methodists and 43% of Anglicans), for introversion (61% Methodists and 57% of Anglicans), for perceiving (30% of Methodists and 32% of Anglicans), and for judging (70% of Methodists and 68% of Anglicans).

For female Methodist circuit ministers, Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010) reported preferences for introversion (53%) over extraversion (47%), for sensing (52%) over intuition (48%), for feeling (77%) over thinking (23%), and for judging (70%) over perceiving (31%). Compared with Anglican clergywomen, these data demonstrated that female Methodist ministers are significantly more likely to prefer sensing (52% compared with 35%) and significantly less likely to prefer intuition (48% compared with 65%). However, there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of preferences for introversion (53% of Methodists and 54% of Anglicans), for extraversion (47% of Methodists and 46% of Anglicans), for thinking (23% of Methodists and 26% of Anglicans), for feeling (77% of Methodists and 74% of Anglicans), for judging (70% of Methodists and 65% of Anglicans), and for perceiving (31% of Methodists and 35% of Anglicans).

Research problem

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to replicate and to extend the psychological type profiling of Methodist ministers reported by Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010). Replication is important to test the stability of the findings of the earlier study, given that this is the only published study concerning the psychological type profile of Methodist ministers. The profile of Anglican clergy reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) has been replicated and supported by Francis, Robbins, Duncan, and Whinney (2010) and Francis, Robbins, and Whinney (2011). Extension is important because Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010) did not set out to test whether there were significant differences in psychological type profiles among Methodist ministers distinguishing those appointed to the more senior position of superintendent. Among Anglican clergy distinctive psychological type profiles have been identified among bishops (Francis, Whinney, & Robbins, 2013) and among archdeacons (Francis & Whinney, 2019).

Method

Procedure

The *Methodist Circuit Ministers' Survey 2008* was distributed in May by post to the ministers published in the *Minutes of the Annual Conference Directory* for the Methodist Church year 2007-2008. The survey was accompanied by a pre-paid reply envelope. Participants were assured of anonymity and confidentiality. Appropriate follow-up reminder letters resulted in the return of 951 thoroughly completed questionnaires, a response rate of 60%.

Instrument

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005; Francis, Laycock, & Brewster, 2017; Village, 2021). 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'.

Analysis

The data are presented in the classic format designed 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 theory. In this context, the statistical significance of the difference between two groups

is established by means of the selection ratio index (*I*), an extension of chi-square proposed by McCaulley (1985).

Participants

Of the 951 thoroughly completed questionnaires, 872 were returned by individuals who identified themselves as engaged in itinerant ministry and had completed the psychological type scales. This body of itinerant ministers comprised 590 men (281 superintendents, 309 ministers) and 282 women (59 superintendents and 223 ministers). In terms of age, 31 were under the age of 36, 160 were aged between 36 and 45, 331 were aged between 46 and 55, 321 were aged between 56 and 65, and 29 were over 65.

Results

Among this sample of 872 itinerant Methodist ministers the Francis Psychological Type Scales recorded acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability, with the following alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951): .82 for the EI scale, .74 for the SN scale, .69 for the TF scale, and .80 for the JP scale.

Replication

- insert figure 1 about here -

The first objective of the current project was to replicate the presentation offered by Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010) that examined the psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers without differentiating between those serving as superintendents and those serving as ministers. Figure 1 presents the type distribution for the 619 male Methodist ministers. These data demonstrate preferences for introversion (66%) over extraversion (34%), for sensing (56%) over intuition (44%), for feeling (59%) over thinking (41%), and for judging (76%) over perceiving (24%). Similar preferences are reported in the present study and in the earlier study for introversion (66% and 61%), for sensing (56% and 54%), for feeling (59% and 64%), and for judging (76% and 70%). The most prevalent

complete type in the present study was ISFJ (19%), and this was also the case in the earlier study (18%). The most prevalent temperament in the present study was the SJ Epimethean Temperament (49%), and this was also the case in the earlier study (44%).

- insert figure 2 about here -

Figure 2 presents the type distribution for the 312 female Methodist ministers. These data demonstrate preferences for introversion (58%) over extraversion (42%), for sensing (51%) over intuition (49%), for feeling (72%) over thinking (28%), and for judging (78%) over perceiving (22%). Similar preferences are reported in the present study and in the earlier study for introversion (58% and 53%), for sensing (51% and 52%), for feeling (72% and 77%), and for judging (78% and 70%). The most prevalent complete type in the present study was ISFJ (21%), and this was also the case in the earlier study (19%). The most prevalent temperament in the present study was the SJ Epimethean Temperament (47%), and this was also the case in the earlier study (43%).

Extension

- insert figures 3 and 4 about here -

The second objective of the current project was to extend the presentation offered by Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010), this time distinguishing between superintendent and non-superintendent ministers. Figures 3 and 4 present the psychological type profiles respectively of male Methodist ministers (non-superintendent) and male Methodist superintendents. Figure 4 also presents the statistical significance of differences between the two categories of ministers. No significant differences emerge in terms of three of the four dichotomous preferences: 67% of the ministers preferred introversion, and so did 66% of the superintendents; 54% of the ministers preferred sensing, and so did 59% of the superintendents; and 58% of the ministers preferred feeling, and so did 60% of the superintendents. However, there was a significantly higher proportion of judging types

among the superintendents (81%) than among the ministers (74%). In terms of the 16 complete types, just one type was significantly under represented among the superintendents. While INFPs comprised 9% of the male ministers, their proportion dropped to 4% among the male superintendents.

- insert figures 5 and 6 about here -

Figures 5 and 6 present the psychological type profiles respectively of female Methodist ministers (non-superintendent) and female Methodist superintendents. Figure 6 also presents the statistical significance of differences between the two categories of minister. No significant differences emerge in terms of all four dichotomous preferences: 57% of the ministers preferred introversion, and so did 61% of the superintendents; 52% of the ministers preferred sensing, and so did 53% of the superintendents; 72% of the ministers preferred feeling, and so did 70% of the superintendents; and 77% of the ministers preferred judging, and so did 83% of the superintendents. There were no significant differences in terms of any of the 16 complete types.

Discussion

The present study set out to address two research objectives. The first research objective concerned replication of the study reported by Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010) in order to confirm whether these findings provided a stable and reliable psychological type profile of Methodist ministers serving in circuit ministry. The second research objective concerned exploring whether the psychological type profile of superintendent ministers may be distinctive. The data merit discussion in respect of both objectives.

Psychological type profile of Methodist ministers

The similarities between the findings of the present study and the findings reported by Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010) allows confidence to be placed in the emerging psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers. Considering separately the

orientations, the perceiving process, the judging process, and the attitudes toward the external world, the following implications for itinerant ministry may be worth considering.

In terms of the orientations, the data from the present study indicated that two out of every three male ministers prefer introversion (66%), and that there is also a preference for introversion among female ministers (58%). There are many areas of strength associated with an introverted approach to ministry. Ministers who prefer introversion tend to be energised by those aspects of ministry associated with private study and preparation, one-on-one encounters in counselling and spiritual direction, periods of silence for prayer and reflection, and focusing deeply on internal issues. On the other hand, introverts may be drained by other aspects of ministry that are better handled by extraverts, such as attending social events, speaking in public (especially without preparation), talking with strangers (as part of evangelism and outreach), and assuming a high public profile within the circuit. It is these outward looking aspects of ministry that may be undervalued in a church largely shaped by an introverted preference. On the stationing of ministers, a circuit is twice as likely to receive a minister who prefers introversion. If introversion shapes the dominant culture for circuits, ministers who prefer extraversion may feel somewhat out of step with this dominant culture.

In terms of the perceiving process, the data from the present study indicated that there is quite a close balance between sensing types (56% of male ministers and 51% of female ministers) and intuitive types (44% of male ministers and 49% of female ministers). Sensing types and intuitive types bring different strengths to ministry. Sensing type ministers tend to safeguard the *status quo*, while intuitive type ministers tend to prefer to innovate and to initiate change. Sensing type ministers have an eye for detail and may wish to keep a close eye on administration, while intuitive type ministers may be more interested in designing for the future than managing the day-to-day running of the circuit. Sensing type ministers may give serious attention to the problems with the chapel roof, while intuitive type ministers may

be more concerned with less tangible matters. On the stationing of ministers, a circuit has roughly a fifty percent chance of a sensing type minister being replaced by an intuitive type minister. On some occasions it may take church members some time to adjust to the inevitable change in style.

In terms of the judging process, the data from the present study indicated that these are more feeling type ministers (59% of male ministers and 72% of female ministers) than thinking type ministers (41% of male ministers and 28% of female ministers). Ministers who prefer feeling tend to be energised by caring for others, by visiting, by offering pastoral care or counselling. Feeling types wish to support others, to empathise with those in need. They prioritise the importance of interpersonal values in Christian teaching, such as love, harmony, peace, and compassion. On the other hand, ministers who prefer feeling may be drained by other aspects of ministry that are better handled by thinking types, such as having to look at problems objectively and logically, making tough decisions that affect other people's lives, being criticised when necessary, and strategic management. On the stationing of ministers, a circuit is more likely to receive a minister who prefers feeling. If feeling shapes the dominant culture for circuits, ministers who prefer thinking may feel somewhat out of step with the dominant culture.

In terms of the attitudes to the external world, the data from the present study indicated that there are at least three judging type ministers (76% of male ministers and 78% of female ministers) for every one perceiving type minister (24% of male ministers and 22% of female ministers). This finding suggests that there is a clear judging culture within the leadership of Methodist circuits. There are many areas of strength associated with a judging approach to ministry. Ministers who prefer judging may be energised by aspects of ministry associated with well-planned and effective organisation (both in personal life and in professional life), arranging services and planning events well in advance, maintaining

efficient administrative systems, and managing multiple responsibilities. On the other hand, judging types may be drained by other aspects of ministry, such as the need to think on their feet, responding effectively to unexpected crises, and adapting to changing situations. It is these aspects of ministry that may be undervalued in a church shaped largely by a judging preference. On the stationing of ministers, a circuit is three times as likely to receive a minister who prefers judging. If judging shapes the dominant culture for circuits, ministers who prefer perceiving may feel considerably out of step with the dominant culture.

These insights from psychological type theory could either be used by the Methodist Church to influence the strategy for stationing, or to anticipate problems caused by the process.

The distinctive profile of superintendents

The present study found few systematic differences between the psychological type profile of Methodist ministers appointed as superintendents, and those not occupying that role. Among female ministers there were no significant differences, and there were only two significant differences among male ministers. Both of these significant differences make sense within the terms of psychological type theory. First, not only are perceiving types a minority within Methodist ministers (accounting for just 24% of all male ministers) they are less likely to be appointed to serve as superintendents (just 19% of superintendents). Within organisations that are strongly governed by a judging culture, perceiving types may be seen as unreliable and unpredictable. Second, of the 16 complete types, it was only the INFPs who stood out as being under-represented among the superintendents. It is worth looking more closely at the profile of this complete type. Myers (1998, p. 7) sums up the INFP in the following way:

Quiet observers, idealistic, loyal. Important that outer life be congruent with inner values. Curious, quick to see possibilities, often serve as catalysts to implement ideas.

Adaptable, flexible and accepting, unless a value is threatened. Want to understand people and ways of fulfilling human potential. Little concern for possessions or surroundings. (Myers, 1998, p. 7)

In their analysis of the strengths and challenges associated with each of the 16 complete types in the context of religious leadership, Ross and Francis (2020) style the INFP leader as ‘the thoughtful idealist’ and identify the challenge that INFPs presents to SJs. It may not be surprising, therefore, that the dominant SJ culture modelled by the majority of superintendents should exclude INFPs from their ranks.

Conclusion

Following in the footsteps of Macdaid, McCaulley, and Kainz (1986), a growing body of research has begun to create an atlas of type tables mapping the psychological type profile of clergy (and lay church leaders) serving churches within the UK. Within this growing body of research, much is now known about the psychological type profile of clergy serving in the Anglican Church in England and Wales. The findings from these studies have drawn attention to the difference between clergymen and clergywomen (see, for example, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007), the differences between clergy serving in stipendiary ministry, non-stipendiary ministry (see, for example, Rutledge, 2021), and local ordained ministry (see, for example, Francis & Village, 2012), the differences between ordained ministers and lay ministers (see, for example, Francis, Jones, & Robbins, 2014), the difference between clergy serving in the Church of England and in the Church in Wales (see, for example, Francis, Robbins, Duncan, & Whinney, 2010; Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2011), and the difference between parish clergy and bishops (Francis, Whinney, & Robbins, 2013), or archdeacons (Francis & Whinney, 2019). As yet, however, considerably less is known about clergy serving in other denominations in the UK.

Against this background, the present study focused attention on Methodist ministers, complementing and extending the study reported by Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010), who had reported on data gathered from Methodist ministers in 2004. The present study was conducted four years later in 2008, and adds to the original study in two ways. First, two studies conducted just four years apart provided very similar data. It is this close similarity between the findings from the original study and the findings from the replication study that can allow confidence to be placed in the emerging profile of Methodist ministers. Second, these data were analysed in a second way, not originally envisaged by Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010), in order to test for differences between those serving as ministers and those serving as superintendent ministers. It is this second analysis that adds new knowledge about the workings of the Methodist Church.

Alongside the original study reported by Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010), this second study has provided a stronger platform on which subsequent research concerned with the psychological type profile of Methodist ministers can build. The clear limitation with the present foundation of research-based empirical knowledge regarding the psychological type profile of Methodist ministers serving in Britain is that both studies were conducted well over a decade ago. The time is now right for a further replication study to be launched and for an up-to-date profile to be set alongside the two historic profiles currently available.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Ethical approval

This study received ethical approval from the St Mary's Centre Ethics Committee (SMC16EC0011).

References

- ap Siôn, T. G., & Francis, L. J. (in press). The psychological type profile of Salvation Army officers working within the United Kingdom: Diversity, strengths, and weaknesses in ministry. *Mental Health, Religion and Health*.
- 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, 64-81. doi.org/10.1163/157092510X503020
- Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W., & Tatsuoka, M. M. (1970). *Handbook for the sixteen personality factor questionnaire (16PF)*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources. doi.org/10.1037/t07564-000
- Craig, C. L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L. J. (2006). Psychological type preferences of Roman Catholic priests in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 27, 157-164. doi.org/10.1080/13617670600849812
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334. doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (adult and junior)*. London: Hodder and Stoughton. doi.org/10.1037/t05462-000
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- 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.

doi.org/10.1080/13537900802024543

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, 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 Belief and Values*, 30, 61-69. doi.org/10.1080/13617670902784568

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, 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, 151-160.

doi.org/10.1558/ruth.v9i2.151

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, 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 and Culture*.

doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1764517

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, 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., 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 and Culture*, 15, 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, 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, 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, 57-76. doi.org/10.1163/157092512X635743
- 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 and Culture*. 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, 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, 135-151. doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2013.801647
- Garland, G., & Village, A. (2021). Psychological type profiles and temperaments of ministers in the Baptist Union of Great Britain (BUGB). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, online first. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2021.1908974
- Haley, J. M., & Francis, L. J. (2006). *British Methodism: What circuit ministers really think*. Peterborough: Epworth.

Haley, J. M., & Francis, L. J. (under review). The changing face of British Methodism between 1997 and 2008: A study in empirical theology.

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, 306-322. doi.org/10.1163/174552511X597170

Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: 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. (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*. Consulting Psychologists Press.

Osborne, G. (2016). *Be a better leader: Personality type and difference in ministry*. London: SPCK.

Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality Type and Religious Leadership*. 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*, 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*. 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., (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

Figure 1

Type distribution for male Methodist ministers in Britain

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences				
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 94 (15.2%) +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 119 (19.2%) +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 57 (9.2%) +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 60 (9.7%) +++++	E <i>n</i> = 213 (34.4%)	I <i>n</i> = 406 (65.6%)			
ISTP <i>n</i> = 9 (1.5%) ++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 16 (2.6%) +++	INFP <i>n</i> = 41 (6.6%) +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 10 (1.6%) ++	S <i>n</i> = 345 (55.7%)	N <i>n</i> = 274 (44.3%)			
ESTP <i>n</i> = 5 (0.8%) +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 15 (2.4%) ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 33 (5.3%) +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 17 (2.7%) +++	T <i>n</i> = 273 (40.9%)	F <i>n</i> = 366 (59.1%)			
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 36 (5.8%) +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 51 (8.2%) +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 34 (5.5%) +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 22 (3.6%) ++++	J <i>n</i> = 473 (76.4%)	P <i>n</i> = 146 (23.6%)			
				Pairs and Temperaments				
				IJ <i>n</i> = 330 (53.3%)	IP <i>n</i> = 76 (12.3%)			
				EP <i>n</i> = 70 (11.3%)	EJ <i>n</i> = 143 (23.1%)			
				ST <i>n</i> = 144 (23.3%)	SF <i>n</i> = 201 (32.5%)			
				NF <i>n</i> = 165 (26.7%)	NT <i>n</i> = 109 (17.6%)			
				SJ <i>n</i> = 300 (48.5%)	SP <i>n</i> = 45 (7.3%)			
				NP <i>n</i> = 101 (16.3%)	NJ <i>n</i> = 173 (27.9%)			
				TJ <i>n</i> = 212 (34.2%)	TP <i>n</i> = 41 (6.6%)			
				FP <i>n</i> = 105 (17.0%)	FJ <i>n</i> = 261 (42.2%)			
				IN <i>n</i> = 168 (27.1%)	EN <i>n</i> = 106 (17.1%)			
				IS <i>n</i> = 238 (38.4%)	ES <i>n</i> = 107 (17.3%)			
				ET <i>n</i> = 80 (12.9%)	EF <i>n</i> = 133 (21.5%)			
				IF <i>n</i> = 233 (37.6%)	IT <i>n</i> = 173 (27.9%)			
Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
E-TJ	58	9.4	I-TP	19	3.1	Dt.T	77	12.4
E-FJ	85	13.7	I-FP	57	9.2	Dt.F	142	22.9
ES-P	20	3.2	IS-J	213	34.4	Dt.S	233	37.6
EN-P	50	8.1	IN-J	117	18.9	Dt.N	167	27.0

Note: *N* = 619 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

Figure 2

Type distribution for female Methodist ministers in Britain

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences				
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 31 (9.9%) +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 64 (20.5%) +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 43 (13.8%) +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 13 (4.2%) ++++	E <i>n</i> = 132 (42.3%)	I <i>n</i> = 180 (57.7%)			
	+++++	+++++		S <i>n</i> = 160 (51.3%)	N <i>n</i> = 152 (48.7%)			
	+++++	++++		T <i>n</i> = 86 (27.6%)	F <i>n</i> = 226 (72.4%)			
	+++++			J <i>n</i> = 244 (78.2%)	P <i>n</i> = 68 (21.8%)			
	+			Pairs and Temperaments				
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	ISFP <i>n</i> = 6 (1.9%) ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 17 (5.4%) +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 6 (1.9%) ++	IJ <i>n</i> = 151 (48.4%)	IP <i>n</i> = 29 (9.3%)			
				EP <i>n</i> = 39 (12.5%)	EJ <i>n</i> = 93 (29.8%)			
				ST <i>n</i> = 44 (14.1%)	SF <i>n</i> = 116 (37.2%)			
				NF <i>n</i> = 110 (35.3%)	NT <i>n</i> = 42 (13.5%)			
ESTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.6%) +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 7 (2.2%) ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 23 (7.4%) +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 7 (2.2%) ++	SJ <i>n</i> = 145 (46.5%)	SP <i>n</i> = 15 (4.8%)			
		++		NP <i>n</i> = 53 (17.0%)	NJ <i>n</i> = 99 (31.7%)			
				TJ <i>n</i> = 71 (22.8%)	TP <i>n</i> = 15 (4.8%)			
				FP <i>n</i> = 53 (17.0%)	FJ <i>n</i> = 173 (55.4%)			
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 11 (3.5%) ++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 39 (12.5%) +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 27 (8.7%) +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 16 (5.1%)	IN <i>n</i> = 79 (25.3%)	EN <i>n</i> = 73 (23.4%)			
	+++++	++++		IS <i>n</i> = 101 (32.4%)	ES <i>n</i> = 59 (18.9%)			
	+++++			ET <i>n</i> = 36 (11.5%)	EF <i>n</i> = 96 (30.8%)			
	+++			IF <i>n</i> = 130 (41.7%)	IT <i>n</i> = 50 (16.0%)			
Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)		Dominant Types				
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%			
E-TJ	27	8.7	I-TP	6	1.9	Dt.T	33	10.6
E-FJ	66	21.2	I-FP	23	7.4	Dt.F	89	28.5
ES-P	9	2.9	IS-J	95	30.4	Dt.S	104	33.3
EN-P	30	9.6	IN-J	56	17.9	Dt.N	86	27.6

Note: *N* = 312 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

Figure 3

Type distribution for male Methodist ministers (non superintendent)

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 47 (15.2%) +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 55 (17.8%) +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 24 (7.8%) +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 34 (11.0%) +++++	E <i>n</i> = 103 (33.3%)	I <i>n</i> = 206 (66.7%)
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	S <i>n</i> = 168 (54.4%)	N <i>n</i> = 141 (45.6%)
+++++	+++++	+++	+++++	T <i>n</i> = 129 (41.7%)	F <i>n</i> = 180 (58.3%)
+++++	+++++	+	+	J <i>n</i> = 229 (74.1%)	P <i>n</i> = 80 (25.9%)
	+++			Pairs and Temperaments	
ISTP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.3%) +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 8 (2.6%) +++	INFP <i>n</i> = 27 (8.7%) +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 7 (2.3%) ++	IJ <i>n</i> = 160 (51.8%)	IP <i>n</i> = 46 (14.9%)
		++++		EP <i>n</i> = 34 (11.0%)	EJ <i>n</i> = 69 (22.3%)
		+		ST <i>n</i> = 72 (23.3%)	SF <i>n</i> = 96 (31.1%)
				NF <i>n</i> = 84 (27.2%)	NT <i>n</i> = 57 (18.4%)
ESTP <i>n</i> = 3 (1.0%) +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 8 (2.6%) +++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 18 (5.8%) +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 5 (1.6%) ++	SJ <i>n</i> = 145 (46.9%)	SP <i>n</i> = 23 (7.4%)
		+		NP <i>n</i> = 57 (18.4%)	NJ <i>n</i> = 84 (27.2%)
				TJ <i>n</i> = 110 (35.6%)	TP <i>n</i> = 19 (6.1%)
				FP <i>n</i> = 61 (19.7%)	FJ <i>n</i> = 119 (38.5%)
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 18 (5.8%) +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 25 (8.1%) +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 15 (4.9%) +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 11 (3.6%) ++++	IN <i>n</i> = 92 (29.8%)	EN <i>n</i> = 49 (15.9%)
+	+++			IS <i>n</i> = 114 (36.9%)	ES <i>n</i> = 54 (17.5%)
				ET <i>n</i> = 37 (12.0%)	EF <i>n</i> = 66 (21.4%)
				IF <i>n</i> = 114 (36.9%)	IT <i>n</i> = 92 (29.8%)

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%
E-TJ	29	9.4	I-TP	11	3.6	Dt.T	40	12.9
E-FJ	40	12.9	I-FP	35	11.3	Dt.F	75	24.3
ES-P	11	3.6	IS-J	102	33.0	Dt.S	113	36.6
EN-P	23	7.4	IN-J	58	18.8	Dt.N	81	26.2

Note: *N* = 309 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

Figure 4

Type distribution for male Methodist superintendents, compared with non-superintendent male ministers

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 43 (15.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.01 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 62 (22.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.24 +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 30 (10.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.37 +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 25 (8.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.81 +++++	E <i>n</i> = 95 (33.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.01	I <i>n</i> = 186 (66.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.99	S <i>n</i> = 165 (58.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.08	N <i>n</i> = 116 (41.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.90
ISTP <i>n</i> = 5 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.37 ++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 8 (2.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.10 +++	INFP <i>n</i> = 11 (3.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.45*	INTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.31 +	T <i>n</i> = 112 (39.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.95	F <i>n</i> = 169 (60.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	J <i>n</i> = 228 (81.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.09*	P <i>n</i> = 53 (18.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.73*
ESTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.73 +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.55 +	ENFP <i>n</i> = 12 (4.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.73 ++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 9 (3.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.98 +++	Pairs and Temperaments			
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 16 (5.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.98 +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 25 (8.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.10 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 17 (6.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.25 +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 10 (3.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.00 ++++	IJ <i>n</i> = 160 (56.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.10	IP <i>n</i> = 26 (9.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.62*	EP <i>n</i> = 27 (9.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.87	EJ <i>n</i> = 68 (24.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.08
				ST <i>n</i> = 66 (23.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.01	SF <i>n</i> = 99 (35.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.13	NF <i>n</i> = 70 (24.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	NT <i>n</i> = 46 (16.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.89
				SJ <i>n</i> = 146 (52.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.11	SP <i>n</i> = 19 (6.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.91	NP <i>n</i> = 34 (12.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.66*	NJ <i>n</i> = 82 (29.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.07
				TJ <i>n</i> = 94 (33.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.94	TP <i>n</i> = 18 (6.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.04	FP <i>n</i> = 35 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.63*	FJ <i>n</i> = 134 (47.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.24*
				IN <i>n</i> = 68 (24.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.81	EN <i>n</i> = 48 (17.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.08	IS <i>n</i> = 118 (42.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	ES <i>n</i> = 47 (16.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.96
				ET <i>n</i> = 37 (13.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.10	EF <i>n</i> = 58 (20.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.97	IF <i>n</i> = 111 (39.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.07	IT <i>n</i> = 75 (26.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.90

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	26	9.3	0.99	I-TP	7	2.5	0.70	Dt.T	33	11.7	0.91
E-FJ	42	14.9	1.15	I-FP	19	6.8	0.60	Dt.F	61	21.7	0.89
ES-P	6	2.1	0.60	IS-J	105	37.4	1.13	Dt.S	111	39.5	1.08
EN-P	21	7.5	1.00	IN-J	55	19.6	1.04	Dt.N	76	27.0	1.03

Note: *N* = 281 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)
 p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001

Figure 5

Type distribution for female Methodist ministers (non superintendent)

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 23 (10.3%) +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 43 (19.3%) +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 31 (13.9%) +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 9 (4.0%) ++++	E <i>n</i> = 95 (42.6%)	I <i>n</i> = 128 (57.4%)
				S <i>n</i> = 116 (52.0%)	N <i>n</i> = 107 (48.0%)
				T <i>n</i> = 62 (27.8%)	F <i>n</i> = 161 (72.2%)
				J <i>n</i> = 172 (77.1%)	P <i>n</i> = 51 (22.9%)
				Pairs and Temperaments	
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	ISFP <i>n</i> = 5 (2.2%) ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 11 (4.9%) +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 6 (2.7%) +++	IJ <i>n</i> = 106 (47.5%)	IP <i>n</i> = 22 (9.9%)
				EP <i>n</i> = 29 (13.0%)	EJ <i>n</i> = 66 (29.6%)
				ST <i>n</i> = 32 (14.3%)	SF <i>n</i> = 84 (37.7%)
				NF <i>n</i> = 77 (34.5%)	NT <i>n</i> = 30 (13.5%)
ESTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.9%) +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 6 (2.7%) +++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 15 (6.7%) +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 6 (2.7%) +++	SJ <i>n</i> = 103 (46.2%)	SP <i>n</i> = 13 (5.8%)
				NP <i>n</i> = 38 (17.0%)	NJ <i>n</i> = 69 (30.9%)
				TJ <i>n</i> = 48 (21.5%)	TP <i>n</i> = 14 (6.3%)
				FP <i>n</i> = 37 (16.6%)	FJ <i>n</i> = 124 (55.6%)
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 7 (3.1%) +++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 30 (13.5%) +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 20 (9.0%) +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 9 (4.0%) ++++	IN <i>n</i> = 57 (25.6%)	EN <i>n</i> = 50 (22.4%)
				IS <i>n</i> = 71 (31.8%)	ES <i>n</i> = 45 (20.2%)
				ET <i>n</i> = 24 (10.8%)	EF <i>n</i> = 71 (31.8%)
				IF <i>n</i> = 90 (40.4%)	IT <i>n</i> = 38 (17.0%)

	Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)		Dominant Types			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
E-TJ	16	7.2	I-TP	6	2.7	Dt.T	22	9.9
E-FJ	50	22.4	I-FP	16	7.2	Dt.F	66	29.6
ES-P	8	3.6	IS-J	66	29.6	Dt.S	74	33.2
EN-P	21	9.4	IN-J	40	17.9	Dt.N	61	27.4

Note: *N* = 223 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

Figure 6

Type distribution for female Methodist superintendents, compared with non-superintendent female ministers

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 6 (10.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.99 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 15 (25.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.32 +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 7 (11.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.85 +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 4 (6.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.68 +++++	E <i>n</i> = 23 (39.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	I <i>n</i> = 36 (61.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.06	S <i>n</i> = 31 (52.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.01	N <i>n</i> = 28 (47.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.99
	+++++	+++++	++	T <i>n</i> = 18 (30.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.10	F <i>n</i> = 41 (69.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.96	J <i>n</i> = 49 (83.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.08	P <i>n</i> = 10 (16.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.74
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ISFP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.76 ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 3 (5.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.03 +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	Pairs and Temperaments			
				IJ <i>n</i> = 32 (54.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	IP <i>n</i> = 4 (6.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.69	EP <i>n</i> = 6 (10.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.78	EJ <i>n</i> = 17 (28.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.97
				ST <i>n</i> = 8 (13.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.94	SF <i>n</i> = 23 (39.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	NF <i>n</i> = 18 (30.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.88	NT <i>n</i> = 10 (16.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.26
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ESFP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.63 ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 5 (8.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.26 +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	SJ <i>n</i> = 29 (49.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.06	SP <i>n</i> = 2 (3.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.58	NP <i>n</i> = 8 (13.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.80	NJ <i>n</i> = 20 (33.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.10
		+++++		TJ <i>n</i> = 18 (30.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.42	TP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00*	FP <i>n</i> = 10 (16.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.02	FJ <i>n</i> = 31 (52.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.94
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 2 (3.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.08 +++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 6 (10.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.76 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 3 (5.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.57 +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 6 (10.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.52 +++++	IN <i>n</i> = 14 (23.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.93	EN <i>n</i> = 14 (23.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.06	IS <i>n</i> = 22 (37.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.17	ES <i>n</i> = 9 (15.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.76
	+++++			ET <i>n</i> = 8 (13.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.26	EF <i>n</i> = 15 (25.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.80	IF <i>n</i> = 26 (44.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.09	IT <i>n</i> = 10 (16.9%) <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	8	13.6	1.89	I-TP	0	0.0	0.00	Dt.T	8	13.6	1.37
E-FJ	9	15.3	0.68	I-FP	4	6.8	0.94	Dt.F	13	22.0	0.74
ES-P	1	1.7	0.47	IS-J	21	35.6	1.20	Dt.S	22	37.3	1.12
EN-P	5	8.5	0.90	IN-J	11	18.6	1.04	Dt.N	16	27.1	0.99

Note: *N* = 59 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)
 p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001