



Lincoln Bishop
University

[LB Research Online](#)

Francis, L.J. and Village, A. (2026) *Is the psychological type profile of stipendiary parochial clergy in the Church of England changing? Exploring data from 2020-2021*. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*. ISSN 1367-4676

This is an author accepted manuscript of an open access article published by Taylor & Francis in its final form on 8th June 2026 at <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2024.2446793> and made available under a [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 Deed | Creative Commons licence](#).

This version may differ slightly from the final published version.

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Accepted 12/12/2024: *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*

Is the psychological type profile of stipendiary parochial clergy in the Church of England
changing? Exploring data from 2020-2021

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

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

During 2020 and 2021 591 clergymen and 486 clergywomen serving in stipendiary parochial ministry in the Church of England completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales. These data were compared with the profiles of 626 clergymen and 237 clergywomen published in 2007. Four significant differences were found between the two samples, with the more recent data showing among both clergymen and clergywomen higher levels of sensing, thinking, and judging, and a significant increase in the SJ temperament (31% to 42% among clergymen and 29% to 42% among clergywomen) with a consequent decline in the NF temperament. The implications of these changes are discussed for preferred styles of ministry.

Keywords: psychology, clergy, Anglican ministry, empirical theology, Church of England

Introduction

The studies published within the past decade by Voas and Watt (2014), by Francis and Smith (2018), and by Francis, Knight, and McKenna (in press) have suggested that a significant change is taking place in the psychological type profile of stipendiary parochial clergy serving within the Church of England when compared with an earlier foundation study published by Francis, Craig, et al. (2007). This change in psychological type profile is associated with a more conserving, less imaginative, and less flexible approach to ministry. The aim of the present study is to examine whether the trend identified by Voas and Watt (2014) and by Francis and Smith (2018) continues to be evidenced in a more recent survey. It does so by drawing on a new study of stipendiary parochial clergy in the Church of England conducted during 2020-2021. First, however, the context for this research needs to be set by a description and discussion of psychological type theory.

Introducing psychological type theory

Situated broadly within the field concerning the psychology of individual differences (see Chamorro-Premuzic, 2014), psychological type theory has been particularly influential in the twin areas of occupational psychology and the empirical psychology of religion (Village, 2011a; Lewis, 2012, 2015, 2021a, 2021b, 2022), making the discussion of psychological type theory of special relevance for the science of clergy studies and religious leadership (Oswald & Kroeger, 1988; Osborne, 2016; Ross & Francis, 2020). Psychological type theory has its roots in the theoretical work of Jung (1971) and in the operationalisation of theory in 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).

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. Psychological type theory focuses on cognitive functioning nested within a model of psychological energy. The theory begins by differentiation 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 theoretical model each of these 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 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, discussion of the dominant types, or discussion of the four temperaments as proposed by Keirsey and Bates (1978).

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 terms of temperament theory, Keirsey and Bates (1978) drew on the building blocks 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).

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.

Introducing psychological type theory to clergy studies

Working within the boarder field of occupational psychology, and 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.

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 (Kay et al., 2011); Baptist ministers (Garland &

Village, 2022); Church in Wales clergy (Francis, Littler, & Robbins, 2010; Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001; Payne & Lewis, 2015); Church of England clergy (Francis, Craig, et al., 2007; Francis, Robbins, et al., 2010; Francis, Robbins, & Whinney, 2011; Francis & Smith, 2018; Francis, Village, & Voas, 2020; Rutledge, 2021; Tilley et al., 2011; Village, 2011b); Church of England Local Ordained Ministers (Francis & Holmes, 2011; Francis, Robbins, & Jones, 2012; Francis & Village, 2012); Church of England full-time hospital chaplains (Francis, Hancocks, et al., 2009); Church of England bishops (Francis, Whinney, & Robbins, 2013); Church of England archdeacons (Francis & Whinney, 2019); Church of England readers (Francis, Jones, & Robbins, 2014; Francis, Jones, & Village, 2021); Free Church Ministers (Francis, Whinney, et al., 2011); Methodist ministers (Burton, Francis, & Robbins, 2010; Francis, Haley, & McKenna, 2023); Methodist local preachers (Francis & Stevenson, 2018); Newfrontiers network of churches (Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009; Francis, Robbins, & Ryland, 2012); Roman Catholic priests (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006; Francis & Village, 2022); Salvation Army Officers (ap Siôn & Francis, 2022); and United Reformed Church ministers (Lewis et al., 2022).

Exploring the psychological type profile of Anglican clergy

The developing atlas of type tables mapping the psychological type profile of clergy (and lay church leaders) serving churches within the UK draws attention to the distinctive profile of Church of England stipendiary clergy. An initial study reported 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 stipendiary clergy as outliers within the developing atlas of UK clergy type tables where the majority profile favoured sensing and the SJ Epimethean temperament.

In order to test the findings of their initial study, 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. Among clergymen preferences were for introversion (64%), intuition (67%), feeling (56%), and judging (73%), and with the following temperaments: NF (39%), NT (28%), SJ (27%), and SP (6%). Among clergywomen preferences were for introversion (63%), intuition (60%), feeling (76%), and judging (55%), with the following temperaments: NF (49%), SJ (33%), NT (11%), and SP (7%).

This profile for Church of England clergy stood in clear contrast with the profile of those serving in Ordained Local Ministry in the Church of England (OLMs). In an initial study among 39 OLMs, Francis and Holmes (2011) reported preferences for introversion (51%), sensing (64%), feeling (80%), and judging (87%), with the following temperaments: SJ (56%), NF (31%), SP (8%), and NT (5%). In a larger study among 144 clergywomen serving as OLMs, Francis, Robbins, and Jones (2012) reported preference for introversion (59%), sensing (70%), feeling (79%), and judging (83%), with the following temperaments: SJ (65%), NF (24%), NT (6%), and SP (5%). In a third study among 135 OLMs (79 clergywomen and 56 clergymen) Francis and Village (2012) reported among clergymen preferences for introversion (63%), sensing (64%), feeling (77%), and judging (79%), with the following temperaments: SJ (57%), NF (27%), NT (9%), and SP (7%); and among clergywomen preferences for introversion (62%), sensing (58%), feeling (75%), and judging (85%), with the following temperaments: SJ (54%), NF (29%), NT (13%), and SP (4%).

This profile for Church of England stipendiary clergy also stood in clear contrast with Anglican clergy serving in parochial ministry within the Church in Wales. In an initial study among 427 clergymen in Wales, Francis, Payne, and Jones (2001) reported preferences for introversion (59%), sensing (57%), feeling (69%), and judging (68%), with the following temperaments: SJ (48%), NF (29%), NT (14%), and SP (9%). These basic findings were confirmed by two replication studies. Among a sample of 231 clergymen, Francis, Littler, and Robbins (2010) reported preferences for introversion (69%), sensing (64%), feeling (55%), and judging (78%), with the following temperaments: SJ (55%), NF (19%), NT (17%), and SP (9%). Among a sample of 268 clergymen, Payne and Lewis (2015) reported preferences for introversion (65%), sensing (57%), feeling (68%), judging (78%), with the following temperaments: SJ (50%), NF (29%), NT (13%), and SP (7%).

Research problem

As part of the Church Growth Research Programme in 2013, Voas and Watt (2014) collected the psychological type profiles of 1,164 clergymen and 307 clergywomen serving in stipendiary parochial ministry, using the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). Drawing on these data and employing temperament theory, Francis, Village, and Voas (2020) reported on higher proportions of the Epimethean SJ temperament than reported by Francis, Craig, et al. (2007) among both clergymen (from 31% to 39%) and clergywomen (from 29% to 40%) indicating a movement toward a more conserving and less adventurous approach to ministry.

As part of a wider study into the relationship between curates and their training incumbents, Francis and Smith (2018) employed the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005) among those ordained to the diaconate in 2009 and 2010. Drawing on data from 90 males and 35 females ordained to stipendiary ministry under the age of forty, this

study found that 52% of clergymen and 40% of clergywomen reported the Epimethean SJ temperament.

In order to test the findings reported by Francis, Village, and Voas (2020) on data collected in 2013, Francis, Knight, and McKenna (in press) examined samples of 188 male and 124 female Church of England parochial clergy surveyed in 2017-2018. Compared with the original study reported by Francis, Craig, et al. (2007) these data reported higher proportions of the Epimethean SJ temperament among both clergymen from 31% to 42% and among clergywomen from 29% to 37%.

Taking seriously the suggested change in the profile of stipendiary clergy in the Church of England, the aim of the present study is to draw on new data collected during 2020-2021 and set these data alongside the profiles for clergymen and clergywomen published by Francis, Craig, et al. (2007) to address the question, 'Is the psychological type profile of stipendiary clergy in the Church of England changing?'

Method

Procedure

During the Covid-19 pandemic two online surveys were promoted by the *Church Times* and by some Church of England dioceses. The first survey, *Coronavirus, Church & You*, was live between 8 May and 23 July 2020. The second survey, *Covid 19 & Church 21*, was live between 22 January and 23 July 2021. Among the responses to these two surveys the measure of psychological type was completed by 1,077 Church of England clergy serving in stipendiary parochial ministry, 591 clergymen and 486 clergywomen.

Participants

In terms of age 2% of the clergymen were in their twenties, 14% in their thirties, 21% in their forties, 34% in their fifties, 29% in their sixties, and 1% in their seventies; 1% of the

clergywomen were in their twenties, 7% in their thirties, 26% in their forties, 38% in their fifties, and 28% in their sixties.

Instrument

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.

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).

Results

- insert table 1 about here -

Table 1 presents the type distribution for the 591 Church of England stipendiary clergymen who participated in the surveys in 2020 and 2021. The data indicate that these clergymen prefer introversion (61%) over extraversion (39%), intuition (53%) over sensing (48%), thinking (53%) over feeling (47%), and judging (76%) over perceiving (24%), with the following temperaments: SJ (42%), NF (28%), NT (24%), and SP (16%).

Table 1 also presents the statistical significance tests comparing the group of Church of England clergymen with the data reported by Francis, Craig, et al. (2007). These data indicate some significant differences between the two sets of dichotomous preference. The weighting toward intuition has dropped from 62% to 52%. The weighting toward feeling has dropped from 54% to 47%. The weighting toward judging has increased from 68% to 76%. No significant change has taken place in the weighting toward introversion (57% and 61%). The strength of the SJ temperament has increased from 31% to 42% with consequent decrease in the NF temperament from 35% to 28%. Inspection of the 16 complete type indicates that the main shift has concentrated on increasing the proportion of ISTJ clergymen serving in stipendiary parochial ministry from 10% to 21%.

- insert table 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the type distribution for the 486 Church of England stipendiary clergywomen who participated in the surveys 2020-2021. The data indicate that these clergywomen prefer introversion (58%) over extraversion (42%), intuition (54%) over sensing (46%), feeling (66%) over thinking (34%), and judging (77%) over perceiving (23%), with the following temperaments: SJ (42%), NF (37%), NT (16%), and SP (5%).

Table 2 also presents the statistical significance tests comparing this group of Church of England clergywomen with the data reported by Francis, Craig, et al. (2007). These data indicate some significant differences between the two sets of dichotomous preferences. The weighting toward intuition has dropped from 65% to 54%. The weighting toward feeling has dropped from 74% to 66%. The weighting toward judging has increased from 65% to 77%. No significant change has taken place in the weighting toward introversion (54% and 58%). The strength of the SJ temperament has increased from 29% to 42%, with consequent decrease in the NF temperament from 50% to 37%. Inspection of the 16 complete types

indicates that the main shift has concentrated on increasing the proportion of ISTJ clergywomen serving in stipendiary parochial ministry from 5% to 13%

Discussion and conclusion

This study set out to explore whether the psychological type profile of stipendiary parochial clergy in the Church of England is changing. This question was addressed by comparing the psychological type profiles of 591 clergymen and 486 clergywomen who responded to an online survey during 2020-2021, with the psychological type profiles of 625 clergymen and 237 clergywomen reported by Francis, Craig, et al. (2007). The comparison identified significant changes in the dichotomous preferences, the four temperaments, and the 16 complete types. Each of these three areas will be discussed in turn, drawing attention to the implications for the exercise of parish ministry.

Dichotomous preferences

Among the four dichotomous preferences, the only area in which significant change was not detected concerned the orientations. In both studies similar levels of preference for introversion were expressed by clergymen (61% and 57%) and by clergywomen (54% and 58%). Clergy who prefer introversion may be energised by many aspects of ministry, including private study and preparation for events and services, solitude for silent prayer and reflection, one-on-one pastoral encounters and focusing on interior spiritual issues. As a consequence they may tend to nurture churches that reflect their preferred spiritual journey. They may be less adept at facilitating social events, assuming a high public profile in the community, and engaging with newcomers to their social world.

Uncharacteristically among the various Churches in England, a high proportion of Church of England clergy reported preference for intuition in the original study (62% of clergymen and 65% of clergywomen). In the second study this proportion had dropped significantly to 53% among clergymen and 54% among clergywomen. This suggests a shift

in culture. Clergy who prefer intuition are leaders who are inspired by change, innovation, and by reimagining the future. Clergy who prefer sensing are more cautious about change and innovation and more concerned to stay with what they are already familiar.

Alongside many of the other Churches in England, a high proportion of Church of England clergymen reported preference for feeling in the original study (54%). According to the UK population norms provided by Kendall (1998) feeling is a form of evaluation much more prevalent among women (70%) than among men (35%). Given that there are generally two women for every one man in Church of England congregations (Francis & Lankshear, 2021), the prominence of feeling among clergymen tends to characterise the evaluative culture of Anglican churches as somewhat feminine, with the consequence that men who prefer thinking may feel out of step with that culture. The preference for feeling values harmony and peace, but at the cost of not confronting the root causes of conflict and disagreement. Thinking types may become frustrated working within this culture. In the second study, the proportion of clergymen who preferred feeling dropped from 54% to 47%. At the same time, the weighting toward feeling dropped from 74% to 66% among clergywomen. This, too, suggests a culture shift, this time toward a more toughminded approach.

In the original study around two-thirds of Church of England clergy reported preference for judging (68% of clergymen and 65% of clergywomen). The preference for judging increased significantly in the second study to 76% among clergymen and 77% among clergywomen. Clergy who prefer judging may be energised by many aspects of ministry, including establishing sound organisational structures for both their personal lives and their parishes. As a consequence they may be less adept at aspects of ministry requiring flexibility, spontaneity, and responsiveness to unanticipated crises. The increase in preference for judging suggests a culture shift to a more structured and tightly managed Church.

Temperaments

The increased weighting to judging and the movement away from intuition and feeling generated significant changes in the distribution of the four temperaments among Church of England clergy. The most important of these changes concerned the significant growth in the proportion of the SJ Epimethean temperament with its emphasis on preserving tradition (from 31% to 42% among clergymen and from 29% to 42% among clergywomen) and the significant decline in the proportion of the NF Apollonian temperament (from 35% to 28% among clergymen and from 50% to 37% among clergywomen).

In their characterisation of the different styles of religious leadership shaped by the four temperaments, Oswald and Kroeger (1988) associated the Epimethean temperament (SJ) with ‘the conserving, serving pastor’. They argued that SJ clergy tend to be the most traditional of all clergy temperaments, bringing stability and continuity in whatever situation they are called to serve. They proclaim a simple and straightforward faith, committed to down-to-earth rules for the Christian life. They serve as protectors and conservers of the traditions inherited from the past. If change is to take place, it emerges by evolution, not revolution. They excel at building community, fostering a sense of loyalty and belonging. They bring order and stability to their congregations, creating plans, developing procedures and formulating policies; and they are keen that these procedures should be followed. They can be trusted for their reliability, punctuality and efficiency. They are effective pastors, showing particular concern for the young, the elderly, and the weak. They are realists who offer practical and down-to-earth solutions to pastoral problems. It is this style of leadership that is growing among Church of England clergy.

Oswald and Kroeger (1988) associated the Apollonian temperament (NF) with ‘the authenticity-seeking, relationship-oriented pastor’. They argued that NF clergy tend to be the most idealistic and romantic of all clergy temperaments, attracted to helping roles that deal

with human suffering. They want to meet the needs of others and to find personal affirmation in so doing. They can be articulate and inspiring communicators, committed to influencing others by touching their hearts. They have good empathic capacity, interpersonal skills, and pastoral counselling techniques. They find themselves listening to other people's problems in the most unlikely contexts, and really caring about them. NF clergy tend to be high on inspiration, but lower on the practical down-to-earth aspects of ministry. They are able to draw the best out of people and work well as the catalyst or facilitator in the congregation as long as others are on hand to work with and to implement their vision. They are at their best when leading in people-related projects, such as starting a project for the elderly or for youth. They are most comfortable in unstructured meetings where they are good at facilitating group decision-making processes. It is this style of leadership that is declining among Church of England clergy.

16 complete types

In terms of the 16 complete types there was one type that was significantly more prominent in the second study than in the first study. Among clergymen the proportion of ISTJs increased from 10% to 21%; among clergywomen the proportion of ISTJs increased from 5% to 13%. In other words one in five clergymen and one in seven clergywomen are ISTJs. It is worth examining, therefore, what the literature has to say about this particular profile. In her *Introduction to types*, Myers (1998, p. 7) describes the ISTJ profile in the following terms.

Serious, quiet, earn success by concentration and thoroughness. Practical, orderly, matter-of-fact, logical, realistic and dependable. See to it that everything is well organised. Take responsibility. Make up their own minds about what should be accomplished and work towards it steadily, regardless of protests or distractions.

ISTJs are moving into the ascendancy to shape the Church of England's future.

Accounting for difference

When compared with the foundation study published by Francis, Craig, et al. (2007), the significant differences in the psychological type profile of stipendiary clergy serving in the Church of England – as evidenced by Francis, Village, and Voas (2020), by Francis and Smith (2018), and by Francis, Knight, and McKenna (in press) and as now confirmed by the present study in terms of dichotomous preferences, temperaments, and the 16 complete types – is unlikely to have occurred entirely by chance. During the past decade in particular, the Church of England has been on a transformational journey, involving change of emphasis in the management, funding and oversight of ministry, as well as changes in practice for initial ministerial formation. The detailed changes in the psychological type profile of stipendiary parochial clergy is consistent with a Church placing higher priority on management skills, compliance with procedures and practices, and with the centralization of initiatives, as evidenced for example in recent discussions by Foulger (2023), Milbank (2023), and Percy (2021, 2023). ISTJ leaders, and more generally those with a preference for the Epimethean (SJ) temperament, are ideally suited to deliver on that agenda. Meanwhile, clergy who score high on intuition, high on perceiving, and high on feeling may begin to feel ill-prepared for and uncomfortable operating in that environment. For them early retirement or a move either into other forms of ministry or into secular employment may seem an attractive escape. However, further research with a somewhat different focus is now needed to test the sustainability of such speculative conclusions.

Limitations

The major limitation with the present study, as indeed with the original study reported by Francis, Craig, et al. (2007), resides in reliance on opportunity sampling. The first study drew on data provided in the context of a range of personal and professional development programmes, and the second study drew on data provided in the context of an online survey. The assumption has to be made that both approaches captured a representative group of

Church of England clergy serving in stipendiary parochial ministry. There are limitations, however, that affect all similar survey-type research.

Should insights from psychological type theory seem of value to the Anglican Church, one way in which complete and useful data could be obtained and the insights effectively applied would be through inviting those who wish their vocation to ordained ministry to be tested to complete a recognised measure of psychological type. While these data would not be used in the assessment process, such data would hold both practical and research benefit. From a practical perspective the data could facilitate the processes of initial and continuing formation and training and offer a further route for promoting self-insight. From a research perspective the data could generate insights into the connections between psychological type and trajectories in ministry.

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-0420-01). All participants had to affirm they were 18 or over and give their informed consent by ticking a box that gave access to the rest of the survey.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

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
- Burton, L., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers in Britain: Similarities with and differences from Anglican clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 23(1), 64-81. doi.org/10.1163/157092510X503020
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2014). *Personality and individual differences*. John Wiley.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*. 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(2), 157-164. doi.org/10.1080/13617670600849812
- 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
- Foulger, W. (2023). *Present in every place? The Church of England's new churches and the future of the parish*. SCM Press.
- 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., 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*(1), 61-69. doi.org/10.1080/13617670902784568
- Francis, L. J., Haley, J. M., & McKenna, U. (2023). Work-related psychological wellbeing and conservative Christian belief among Methodist circuit ministers in Britain: Distinguishing between emotional exhaustion and satisfaction in ministry. *Journal of Religion and Health, 62*, 1636-1657. doi.org/10.1007/s10943-022-01637-y
- Francis, L. J., Hancocks, G., Swift, C., & Robbins, M. (2009). Distinctive call, distinctive profile: The psychological type profile of Church of England full-time hospital chaplains. *Practical Theology 2*(2), 269-284. doi.org/10.1558/prth.v2i2.269
- Francis, L. J., & Holmes, P. (2011). Ordained Local Ministers: The same Anglican orders, but of different psychological temperaments? *Rural Theology, 9*(2), 151-160. doi.org/10.1558/ruth.v9i2.151
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & Robbins, M. (2014). The psychological type profile of Readers in the Church of England: Clones of the clergy or distinctive voices? *Journal of Anglican Studies, 12*(2), 165-184. doi.org/10.1017/S1740355313000077
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & Village, A. (2021). Psychological type and psychological temperament among readers within the Church of England: A complementary ministry? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 24*(4), 389-403. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1764517
- Francis, L. J., Knight, D., & McKenna, U. (in press). Monitoring the changing psychological profile of Church of England parochial clergy. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*.
- Francis, L. J., & Lankshear, D. W. (2021). Profiling adult churchgoers within the Diocese of Southwark: An overview. In L. J. Francis & D. W. Lankshear (Eds.), *The science of*

congregation studies: Searching for signs of growth (pp. 19-41). Palgrave Macmillan.

doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-76107-3_2

Francis, L. J., Laycock, P., & Brewster, C. (2017). Exploring the factor structure of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS) among a sample of Anglican clergy in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 20(9), 930-941.

doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2017.1375469

Francis, L. J., Littler, K., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type and Offa's Dyke: Exploring differences in the psychological type profile of Anglican clergy serving in England and Wales. *Contemporary Wales*, 23, 240-251.

Francis, L. J., Payne, V. J., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 56, 19-23.

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., 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., & Jones, S. H. (2012). The psychological type profile of clergywomen in ordained local ministry in the Church of England: Pioneers or custodians? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15(9), 919-932.

doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.698449

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Ryland, A. (2012). Called for leadership: Psychological type profile of leaders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 40(3), 220-228.

doi.org/10.1177/009164711204000305

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Whinney, M. (2011). Women priests in the Church of England: Psychological type profile. *Religions*, 2(3), 389-397. doi.org/10.3390/rel2030389

- Francis, L. J., & Smith, G. (2018). Changing patterns in recruitment to stipendiary ministry: A study in psychological profiling. *Theology*, *121*(4), 268-277.
doi.org/10.1177/0040571X18765426
- Francis, L. J., & Stevenson, A. (2018). Profiling Methodist leadership. *Holiness*, *4*(1), 7-26.
doi.org/10.2478/holiness-2018-0001
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2012). The psychological temperament of Anglican clergy in ordained local ministry (OLM): The conserving, serving pastor? *Journal of Empirical Theology*, *25*(1), 57-76. doi.org/10.1163/157092512X635743
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2022). Psychological type profile and temperament of Catholic priests serving in England, Wales, and Ireland. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, *25*(9), 897-909. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2021.2017420
- Francis, L. J., Village, A., & Voas, D. (2020). The changing psychological type profile and psychological temperament of Church of England clergy. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, *31*, 93-110. doi.org/10.1163/9789004443969_007
- Francis, L. J., & Whinney, M. (2019). The psychological profile of Church of England male archdeacons at the beginning of the twenty-first century: Drawing on psychological type and temperament theory. *Journal of Anglican Studies*, *17*(1), 74-92.
doi.org/10.1017/S1740355318000256
- Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., Burton, L., & Robbins, M. (2011). Psychological type preferences of male and female Free Church Ministers in England. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, *22*, 251-263. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.55
- Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., & Robbins, M. (2013). Who is called to be a bishop? A study in psychological type profiling of bishops in the Church of England. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, *34*(2), 135-151. doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2013.801647

- Garland, G., & Village, A. (2022). Psychological type profiles and temperaments of ministers in the Baptist Union of Great Britain (BUGB). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 25(9), 860-874. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2021.1908974
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works*, (volume 6). 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.
- Lewis, C. A. (2012). Psychological type, religion, and culture: Theoretical and empirical perspectives. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15(9), 817-821. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.721534
- Lewis, C. A. (2015). Psychological type, religion, and culture: Further empirical perspectives. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18(7), 531-534. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2015.1103520
- Lewis, C. A. (2021a). Psychological type, religion, and culture: Further empirical perspectives (Part III). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 24(4), 227-230. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2021.1929892
- Lewis, C. A. (2021b). Psychological type, religion, and culture: Further empirical perspectives (Part IV). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 24(6), 533-534. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2021.1943650

- Lewis, C. A. (2022). Psychological type, religion, and culture: Further empirical perspectives (Part V). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 25(10), 953-955.
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2023.2215092
- Lewis, C. A., Burgess, J. H., & Francis, L. J. (2022). Psychological profile of Ministers of Word and Sacrament within the United Reformed Church (URC). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 25(9), 921-930. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2022.2037536
- 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.
- Milbank, A. (2023). *The once and future parish*. SCM Press.
- 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 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). *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.
- Payne, V. J., & Lewis, C. A. (2015). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in Wales: A ministry for sensing types. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18(7), 535-543. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.963999
- Percy, M. (2021). *The humble church: Becoming the body of Christ*. Canterbury Press.
- Percy, M. (2023). *The precarious church: Redeeming the body of Christ*. Canterbury Press.

- 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. (2011a). Introduction to special section: Psychological type and Christian ministry. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 157-164.
doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.28
- Village, A., (2011b). 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
- Village, A. (2021). Testing the factor structure of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS): A replication among Church of England clergy and laity. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 24(4), 336-346. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1780575
- 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 and Behaviour*, 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). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*. Online first.

doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2023.2232330

Voas, D., & Watt, L. (2014). *Numerical change in church attendance: National, local and individual factors. (The Church Growth Research Programme: Report on strands 1 and 2)*. Church of England.

Table 1

Type distribution for Church of England stipendiary clergymen surveyed in 2020-2021

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 121 (20.5%) <i>I</i> = 2.07*** +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 57 (9.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.23 +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 51 (8.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.95 +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 70 (11.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.07 +++++	E <i>n</i> = 229 (38.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	I <i>n</i> = 362 (61.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.08	S <i>n</i> = 281 (47.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.24***	N <i>n</i> = 310 (52.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.85***
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	T <i>n</i> = 311 (52.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.13*	F <i>n</i> = 280 (47.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.89*	J <i>n</i> = 451 (76.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.12**	P <i>n</i> = 140 (23.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.75**
+++++	+++++	+++++	++	Pairs and Temperaments			
+				IJ <i>n</i> = 299 (50.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.34***	IP <i>n</i> = 63 (10.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.56***	EP <i>n</i> = 77 (13.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.02	EJ <i>n</i> = 152 (25.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.85
ISTP <i>n</i> = 4 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.30* +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 13 (2.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.53 ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 30 (5.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.50*** +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 16 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.51* +++	ST <i>n</i> = 169 (28.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.44***	SF <i>n</i> = 112 (19.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.02	NF <i>n</i> = 168 (28.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.81*	NT <i>n</i> = 142 (24.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.90
ESTP <i>n</i> = 7 (1.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.06 +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 10 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.71 ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 45 (7.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.13 +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 15 (2.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.99 +++	SJ <i>n</i> = 247 (41.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.34***	SP <i>n</i> = 34 (5.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.80	NP <i>n</i> = 106 (17.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.73**	NJ <i>n</i> = 204 (34.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.93
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 37 (6.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.96 +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 32 (5.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.79 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 42 (7.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.78 +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 41 (6.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.89 +++++	TJ <i>n</i> = 269 (45.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.29***	TP <i>n</i> = 42 (7.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.64*	FP <i>n</i> = 98 (16.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.80	FJ <i>n</i> = 182 (30.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.94
+		++	++	IN <i>n</i> = 167 (28.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.80**	EN <i>n</i> = 143 (24.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	IS <i>n</i> = 195 (33.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.54***	ES <i>n</i> = 86 (14.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.86
				ET <i>n</i> = 100 (16.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.94	EF <i>n</i> = 129 (21.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.87	IF <i>n</i> = 151 (25.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	IT <i>n</i> = 211 (35.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.26**

	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	78	13.2	0.92	I-TP	20	3.4	0.45**	Dt.T	98	16.6	0.76*
E-FJ	74	12.5	0.78	I-FP	43	7.3	0.63*	Dt.F	117	19.8	0.72**
ES-P	17	2.9	0.82	IS-J	178	30.1	1.70***	Dt.S	195	33.0	1.55***
EN-P	60	10.2	1.10	IN-J	121	20.5	1.02	Dt.N	181	30.6	1.04

Note: *N* = 591 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)
 p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001

Table 2

Type distribution for Church of England stipendiary clergywomen surveyed in 2020-2021 compared with data published by Francis et al. (2007)

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences							
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 65 (13.4%) <i>I</i> = 2.88*** +++++ +++++ +++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 82 (16.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.38 +++++ +++++ +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 52 (10.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.01 +++++ +++++ +	INTJ <i>n</i> = 32 (6.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.98 +++++ ++	E <i>n</i> = 202 (41.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	I <i>n</i> = 284 (58.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.08	S <i>n</i> = 225 (46.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.31**	N <i>n</i> = 261 (53.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.83**	T <i>n</i> = 167 (34.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.31*	F <i>n</i> = 319 (65.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.89*	J <i>n</i> = 376 (77.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.20***	P <i>n</i> = 110 (22.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.64***
				Pairs and Temperaments							
ISTP <i>n</i> = 3 (0.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.73 +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 8 (1.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.49 ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 38 (7.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.56** +++++ +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 4 (0.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.89 +	IJ <i>n</i> = 231 (47.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.39***	IP <i>n</i> = 53 (10.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.55***	EP <i>n</i> = 57 (11.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.75	EJ <i>n</i> = 145 (29.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.98	ST <i>n</i> = 88 (18.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.59*	SF <i>n</i> = 137 (28.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.17	NF <i>n</i> = 182 (37.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.75**	NT <i>n</i> = 79 (16.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.10
ESTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.98	ESFP <i>n</i> = 9 (1.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.10 ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 34 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.66 +++++ ++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 12 (2.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.84 +++	SJ <i>n</i> = 203 (41.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.43***	SP <i>n</i> = 22 (4.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.72	NP <i>n</i> = 88 (18.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.62***	NJ <i>n</i> = 173 (35.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	TJ <i>n</i> = 146 (30.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.48**	TP <i>n</i> = 21 (4.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.73	FP <i>n</i> = 86 (18.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.62***	FJ <i>n</i> = 230 (47.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.07
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 18 (3.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.68 ++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 38 (7.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.16 +++++ +++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 58 (11.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.81 +++++ +++++ ++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 31 (6.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.89 +++++ +	IN <i>n</i> = 126 (25.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.79*	EN <i>n</i> = 135 (27.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.88	IS <i>n</i> = 158 (32.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.54***	ES <i>n</i> = 67 (13.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.96	ET <i>n</i> = 63 (13.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.06	EF <i>n</i> = 139 (28.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.85	IF <i>n</i> = 180 (37.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	IT <i>n</i> = 104 (21.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.54*

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	49	10.1	1.14	I-TP	7	1.4	0.57	Dt.T	56	11.5	1.01
E-FJ	96	19.8	0.92	I-FP	46	9.5	0.55**	Dt.F	142	29.2	0.75**
ES-P	11	2.3	1.07	IS-J	147	30.2	1.79***	Dt.S	158	32.5	1.71***
EN-P	46	9.5	0.70	IN-J	84	17.3	1.00	Dt.N	130	26.7	0.87

Note: *N* = 486 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)
p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001