



**Lincoln Bishop
University**

[LB Research Online](#)

Francis, L.J., Davis, F. and McKenna, U. (2026) *The psychological type profile of lay Catholic followers of Bishop Barron: a replication study*. Journal of Religious Education. ISSN 1442-6200

This is an author accepted manuscript of an open access article published by Springer in its final form on 22nd April 2026 at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40839-026-00293-8> and made available under a [CC BY 4.0 Deed | Creative Commons licence](#).

This version may differ slightly from the final published version.

Accepted 22.2.2026: *Journal of Religious Education*

The psychological type profile of lay Catholic followers of Bishop Barron:

A replication study

Leslie J. Francis*

Centre for Research in Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (CIDD)
University of Warwick, Coventry, UK
World Religions and Education Research Unit
Lincoln Bishop University, Lincoln, UK
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2946-9980>

Francis Davis

Edward Cadbury Centre, Department of Religion and Theology
University of Birmingham, UK
World Religions and Education Research Unit
Lincoln Bishop University, Lincoln, UK
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6510-0091>

Ursula McKenna

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

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J. Francis

Centre for Research in Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (CIDD)

The University of Warwick

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

IMPORTANT NOTE TO COPYEDITOR

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

Abstract

In this study 362 lay Catholic participants attending Bishop Barron's London conference in February 2025 completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales. Rooted in psychometric segmentation theory these data were compared with data provided by 460 lay Catholic participants attending Bishop Barron's London conference in February 2023 and with the profile of 1,474 attendees at Catholic churches. The replication study in 2025 confirmed the findings from 2023. Compared with Catholic churchgoers, Bishop Barron attracts higher proportions of intuitive types (N) and thinking types (T) and a lower proportion of the Epimethean temperament (SJ). Planted back in local congregations, here are people with the capacity either to transform or to unsettle these congregations.

Keywords: psychological type, temperament theory, congregation studies, empirical theology, psychology of religion, Catholic churchgoers

Introduction

The ministry of Bishop Robert Barron, together with the Word on Fire Catholic Ministries that he launched in 2000, has attracted international attention. Here is a significant and distinctive evangelistic outreach programme that ‘proclaims Christ in the culture’ and ‘harnesses beauty, goodness and truth to draw people into or back into the Catholic faith’. Here is a powerful online presence, complemented by in-person events, that may have the capacity to engage audiences less readily accessed by established church congregations.

Within the context of the science of congregation studies there are routine ways of profiling established church congregations against which the profile of those attracted to innovative and distinctive evangelistic outreach programmes can be assessed. For example, Francis and Lankshear (2021) demonstrated the value of basic demographic profiling for understanding the nature of Anglican congregations within the Diocese of Southwark. These congregations were characterised by the over-representation of women, older people, graduates, and those living within conventional family structures. Within this context, younger people, men, the less well educated, and single people may feel less at home and less easily integrated. Within the science of congregation studies and complementing demographic data, a developing body of research is drawing attention to the value of employing psychographic segmentation theory for enriching and extending congregational profiling, drawing on psychological type theory and temperament theory.

Psychological type theory

Psychological type theory has its origins in the writings of Carl Jung (1971) and has been developed, modified, and extended by several 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). The core of psychological type theory distinguishes

between two psychological processes, styled the perceiving process and the judging process. Both processes are expressed in two contrasting functions.

The perceiving process is concerned with the ways in which people see the world in which they live and how they gather and assemble information about their world. Jung (1971) spoke of the perceiving process as the 'irrational process' precisely because it is concerned with gathering information without applying evaluation. The two contrasting functions of the perceiving process are styled as sensing and as intuition. Sensing types (S) are concerned with the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. Intuitive types (N) are concerned with the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships.

The judging process is concerned about the ways in which people evaluate and make judgements about the information assembled by the perceiving process. Jung (1971) spoke of the judging process as the 'rational process' precisely because it is concerned with applying evaluation. The two contrasting functions of the judging process are styled as thinking and as feeling. Thinking types (T) are concerned to form judgements and decisions based on impersonal, objective logic. Feeling types (F) are concerned to form judgements and decisions based on personal, subjective values.

In psychological type theory these two core psychological processes (perceiving and judging) operate within the environment of two contrasting orientations and two contrasting attitudes toward the outer world. The orientations are concerned with the direction of psychological energy, and make a distinction between introversion and extraversion. Extraverts (E) are orientated toward the outer world; they draw energy from the events and people around them. Introverts (I) are orientated toward their inner world; they draw energy from their own inner ideas and inner life.

The attitudes toward the outer world are concerned with which psychological process (perceiving or judging) is exercised in the outer world. Judging types (J) engage their

preferred judging function (either thinking or feeling) in the outer world. They operate best with routine and established patterns. Perceiving types (P) engage their preferred perceiving function (either sensing or intuition) in the outer world. They operate best when the outer world is flexible, and open.

Psychological type theory holds a distinctive position within the wider family of theories concerned with personality and individual differences, in three ways. First, the 16 Personality Factor model (Cattell et al., 1993), the Three Major Dimensions model (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991), and the Big Five Factor model (Costa & McCrae, 1985) were all derived empirically through processes of data summary and reduction. The psychological type model was rooted in observation and conceptual analysis of mental functioning. Second, the 16 Personality Factor model, the Three Major Dimensions model, and the Big Five Factor model embrace a wide range of human behaviours, including sub-pathological behaviours (indicative of neurotic and psychotic disorders) and indicators of character. For example, in the Big Five Factor model, the names of the factors (neuroticism, openness, agreeableness) make the nature of evaluation explicit. In this system even introversion is characterised as an undesirable lack of extraversion (Lloyd, 2015). The psychological type model is explicitly descriptive and non-evaluative (Lloyd, 2015). Third, while the other three models are calibrated as continua, the psychological type model is calibrated as typology.

Temperament theory

Working with the building blocks of psychological type theory, Keirsey and Bates (1978) proposed distinguishing among four temperaments. These temperaments prioritised the perceiving process, distinguishing between sensing (S) and intuition (N) and then identified two different ways in which each of these perceiving functions is expressed. Keirsey and Bates (1978) paired sensing with the orientation in which it was expressed, distinguishing between SJ types and SP types. They paired intuition with the preferred judging function with

which it was coupled, distinguishing between NT types and NF types. Oswald and Kroeger (1988) built on Keirse and Bates' (1978) characterisation of the four temperaments to create profiles of how these four temperaments may shape four very different styles of religious leadership. Then Francis, Wright, and Robbins (2016) built on Oswald and Kroeger's (1988) work to create profiles of how these four temperaments may shape four very different styles of churchgoers.

SJ types comprised the Epimethean temperament. Francis, Wright, and Robbins (2016) suggested that the Epimethean temperament would tend to shape the most traditional of all churchgoers, the people who long for stability and continuity in the life of their church. They are attracted by a simple and straightforward faith, and they are committed to down-to-earth rules for the Christian life. They want to protect and conserve for future generations the traditions that they have inherited from previous generations.

SP types comprised the Dionysian temperament. Francis, Wright, and Robbins (2016) suggested that the Dionysian temperament would tend to shape the most action-oriented and fun-loving of all churchgoers, the people who long for the church to engage them in activities. They have little interest in the abstract, theoretical and non-practical aspects of theology and church life. They are flexible and spontaneous people who welcome unplanned and unpredictable aspects of church life.

NT types comprised the Promethean temperament. Francis, Wright, and Robbins (2016) suggested that the Promethean temperament would tend to shape the most academically curious and intellectually grounded of all churchgoers, people who are motivated by their search for truth and for possibilities opened up by their faith. They tend to be visionaries who expect their local church to look for new ways of doing things and to apply rigorous testing of strategies and teaching. They enjoy the academic study and analysis of the faith. They may have an appetite for theological study.

NF types comprised the Apollonian temperament. Francis, Wright, and Robbins (2016) suggested that the Apollonian temperament would tend to shape the most idealistic of all churchgoers, people concerned with making life better for others. They want to meet the needs of others and to find personal affirmation in the process. They can be articulate people, with good empathetic capacity and interpersonal skills. As members of the congregation they want to be engaged in a visionary and pastorally effective community, and may take on an unobtrusive pastoral role in that community.

Congregational profiles

Psychological type theory was introduced to congregation studies during the 1980s and has now been employed in a series of studies in North America (Bramer & Ross, 2012; Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Gerhardt, 1983; Rehak, 1998; Ross, 1993, 1995; Royle et al., 2021), in England and Wales (Craig et al., 2003; Francis, 2013; Francis, Butler, et al., 2007; Francis, Duncan, et al., 2004; Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011; Francis, Robbins, et al., 2007; Francis, Wright, & Robbins, 2016; Lewis et al., 2021, 2012; Village et al., 2012, 2009), and in Australia (Robbins & Francis, 2011, 2012).

The largest and most authoritative study of the psychological type profile of congregations in England was provided by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011), on data provided by 3,304 participants attending 140 Anglican congregations. This study reported on the type profiles of male and female churchgoers separately and compared these profiles with the population norms provided by Kendall (1998). Such comparisons made it clear just how much Anglican congregations in England appeal to some types more than to other types. Compared with the population norms, Anglican congregations attract an over-representation of introverts, sensing types, feeling types, and judging types (ISJFs). As a consequence, extraverts, intuitive types, thinking types, and perceiving types (ENFPs) may feel less at home in these congregations. Testing that theory, Francis and Robbins (2012) designed a

survey to assess congregational satisfaction alongside a measure of psychological type. Data provided by 1,867 churchgoers in England demonstrated that when the satisfaction scores were rank ordered for the 16 complete types, the lowest score was recorded by ENTPs.

The idea that different expressions of church may attract a different psychological type and temperament profile of participants has been given some support by a series of studies that have profiled participants and distinctive Fresh Expressions of Church (Francis, Clymo, & Robbins, 2014; Francis, Wright, & Robbins, 2016; Village, 2015) and at Cathedral carol services (Francis, Edwards, et al., 2021; Francis, Jones, & McKenna, 2020, 2021; Walker, 2012).

Psychographic segmentation among lay Catholics

As yet in England there has been no study of Catholic congregations comparable with the study of Anglican congregations reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011). However, Robbins and Francis (2012) reported on the psychological type profile of Catholic congregations in Australia, drawing on data provided by 593 male Catholic churchgoers and 881 female Catholic churchgoers. The data from this survey of Catholic churchgoers in Australia were remarkably similar to the data reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011) among Anglican churchgoers in England. This can be illustrated by comparing the temperament profiles of the two groups. Among female churchgoers in Australia: 76% reported Epimethean temperament (SJ) and so did 73% in England; 11% reported Apollonian temperament (NF) and so did 13% in England; 8% reported Dionysian temperament (SP) and so did 9% in England; 5% reported Promethean temperament (NT) and so did 6% in England. Among male Catholic churchgoers in Australia: 77% reported Epimethean temperament (SJ) and so did 71% in England; 10% reported Promethean temperament (NT) and so did 13% in England; 7% reported Dionysian temperament (SP) and so did 7% in England; 6% reported Apollonian temperament (NF) and so did 10% in England.

Working within this tradition, Francis, Davis, and McKenna (2024) reported on the psychological type and temperament profile of lay participants who attended a one-day conference convened in central London on 11 February 2023, animated by Bishop Barron. At this event data were provided by 460 participants (168 men and 292 women) who identified as lay Catholics and who thoroughly completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005; Francis, Laycock, & Brewster, 2017). In terms of age, 8 were under the age of twenty, 74 were in their twenties, 71 in their thirties, 64 in their forties, 93 in their fifties, 100 in their sixties, 42 in their seventies, 7 were aged eighty or above, and just one failed to provide information about age. The psychological type profiles of these 168 men and 292 women were then compared with the profiles of the 593 male Catholic churchgoers and 881 female Catholic churchgoers reported by Robbins and Francis (2012). The main conclusion derived from these data was as follows. Consideration of the four sets of binary pairs proposed by the psychological type profile of the participants demonstrates that the appeal of Bishop Barron embraced key groups who are less well accessed by inherited church. Among the participants there were significantly more intuitive types (35% compared with 16%) and significantly more thinking types (45% compared with 35%). Intuitive types have the capacity to bring to the Church visions for the future, together with a tendency to question and to unsettle the *status quo*. Thinking types have the capacity to bring to the Church strategic thinking and a tendency to unsettle complacency and to disrupt satisfaction with a *laissez faire* approach. However, consideration of the full set of four binary pairs also demonstrates that, while the appeal of Bishop Barron widens the reach of the Catholic Church in terms of the two fundamental psychological processes, it does so within the established orientations and attitudes familiar within the inherited expressions of church. The appeal of Bishop Barron is failing to engage more extraverts among both men and women and failing to engage more perceiving types among women. The appeal works best among

introverts (those inclined to value the inner life, internal processing, and solitude) and best among judging types (those inclined to value an ordered and structured engagement with the external world).

Research aim

A clear commitment within the science of congregation studies as conceptualised by Francis and Lankshear (2021) is to the patient replication of studies. Following the so-called ‘replication crisis in psychology’ as recently discussed by Fletcher (2021), Plucker and Makel (2021) and Pennington (2023), the specific aim of the present study is to repeat the study reported by Francis, Davis, and McKenna (2024) at Bishop Barron’s visit to London in 2023, now within the context of Bishop Barron’s visit to London on 21-22 February 2025 for the event styled ‘Evangelisation and culture: The Bible’.

Method

Procedure

Participants attending the London conference were invited to complete a survey that offered a demographic profile and included a recognised measure of psychological type. A total of 477 participants aged 18 years and over accepted that invitation. Participants were guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity, and by submitting the survey they gave consent for their information to be used as research data and for research publications.

Instrument

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005; Francis, Laycock, & Brewster, 2017). This is a 40-item instrument comprising four sets of 10 forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type theory: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). 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'.

Participants

The present analyses were based on the 362 participants (128 men and 234 women) who identified as lay Catholics and who thoroughly completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales. In terms of age, 4 were under the age of twenty, 45 were in their twenties, 64 in their thirties, 42 in their forties, 68 in their fifties, 98 in their sixties, 38 in their seventies, and 3 were aged eighty or above. In terms of marital status, 35% were single, 48% married, 4% widowed, 6% divorced, 1% separated, 1% divorced and remarried, 2% living with a partner, and 2% preferred not to provide information about marital status. In terms of ethnicity, 42% reported as White British, 11% as White Irish, and 20% as White Other; 4% reported as Black African, and 1% as Black Other; 11% reported as Asian, 3% as Chinese, 5% as Mixed Ethnicity, and 3% as Other. In terms of employment status, 50% reported as in full-time work, 17% in part-time work, 23% as retired, 4% as homemaker/carer, 4% as students, and 2% as unemployed. In terms of education, 43% held bachelor degrees, 33% master degrees, and 8% doctorates. In terms of mass attendance, 59% reported attending at least once a week, and 37% as attending at least three times a week.

Analysis

The research literature concerning the empirical investigation of psychological type has developed a highly distinctive method for analysing, handling, and displaying statistical data in the form of 'type tables'. This convention has been adopted in the following presentation in order to integrate these new data within the established literature and to provide all the

detail necessary for secondary analysis and further interpretation within the rich theoretical framework afforded by psychological type. Type tables have been designed to provide information about the sixteen discrete psychological types, about the four dichotomous preferences, about the six sets of pairs and temperaments, about the dominant types, and about the introverted and extraverted Jungian types. Commentary on these tables will, however, be restricted to those aspects of the data strictly relevant to the research question. In the context of type tables, the statistical significance of the difference between two groups is established by means of the selection ratio index (*I*), an extension of chi-square (McCaulley, 1985). In the present study the following alpha coefficients were recorded by the four scales: .82 for the EI Scale, .68 for the SN Scale, .66 for the TF Scale, and .76 for the JP Scale.

Results and discussion

- insert table 1 about here -

The demographic profiles of the participants were similar in both the original study and this replication study: in terms of sex, 63% and 65% were female; in terms of age, 47% and 43% were under the age of fifty; in terms of ethnicity, 73% and 73% were British; in terms of marital status, 39% and 35% were single, in terms of education, 84% and 84% were graduates; and in terms of religious practice, 99% and 96% reported attending mass at least once a week. The following discussion of psychological type profile can therefore be grounded in common demographics. Table 1 presents the psychological type profile for the 234 female lay Catholic participants compared with the profile of 292 female lay Catholic participants reported by Francis, Davis, and McKenna (2024). In terms of the four dichotomous preference these data show strong preferences for judging (86%) over perceiving (14%) and for sensing (69%) over intuition (31%), clear preference for introversion (59%) over extraversion (41%) and slight preference for feeling (53%) over thinking (47%). None of these preferences were significantly different from those reported in the earlier study. In

terms of dominant type preferences, these data show that 42% of the female participants were dominant sensing types, 23% were dominant feeling types, 18% were dominant intuitive types, and 18% were dominant thinking types. None of these preferences were significantly different from those reported in the earlier study. In terms of the 16 complete types, these data show that among the female participants, the four most prevalent psychological types, those accounting for at least 10% of the participants were ISTJ (21%), ISFJ (17%), ESFJ (15%), and ESTJ (10%). The distribution within none of the 16 complete types was significantly different from the earlier study. In terms of the four temperaments, these data show that 62% of the female participants reported Epimethean temperament (SJ), 16% Promethean temperament (NT), 15% Apollonian temperament (NF), and 7% Dionysian temperament (SP). The distribution among the temperaments was not significantly different from the earlier study.

- insert table 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the psychological type profile for the 128 male lay Catholic participants compared with the profile of 168 male lay Catholic participants reported by Francis, Davis, and McKenna (2024). In terms of the four dichotomous preferences, these data show strong preference for judging (90%) over perceiving (10%) and clear preferences for introversion (67%) over extraversion (33%), for thinking (62%) over feeling (38%) and for sensing (60%) over intuition (40%). Only one of these preferences was significantly different from those reported in the earlier study. While in the earlier study 81% preferred judging, in this replication study the proportion increased to 90%. In terms of dominant type preferences, these data show that 45% of the male participants were dominant sensing types, 25% were dominant intuitive types, 18% were dominant thinking types, and 13% were dominant feeling types. None of these preferences were significantly different from those reported in the earlier study. In terms of the 16 complete types, these data show that among

the male participants, the three most prevalent psychological types, those accounting for at least 10% of the participants, were ISTJ (30%), ISFJ (13%), and INTJ (11%). The distribution within only one of the 16 complete types was significantly different from the earlier study. In the present study the proportion of INFJs stood at 10% compared with 3% in the earlier study. In terms of the four temperaments, these data show that 56% of the male participants reported Epimethean temperament (SJ), 22% Promethean temperament (NT), 18% Apollonian temperament (NF), and 4% Dionysian temperament (SP). The distribution among the temperaments was not significantly different from the earlier study.

Conclusion

Situated within the application of psychographic segmentation theory within the science of congregation studies and drawing on Jungian psychological type theory, the present study set out to replicate the earlier study reported by Francis, Davis, and McKenna (2024). The earlier study examined the psychological type and temperament profile of followers of Bishop Barron who attended his 2023 London conference; the present study examined the psychological type and temperament profile of followers of Bishop Barron who attended his 2025 London conference. Analysing the profiles of male and female lay Catholic participants separately, statistically significant differences between the two samples were negligible. Two conclusions follow from this finding. The first conclusion is that there is a consistency in the psychological type and temperament profile of the followers of Bishop Barron (at least among those who attend his events in London). The second conclusion is that weight can be added to the conclusions and recommendations drawn from the earlier study. This is the value of replication studies when the findings are indeed replicated. The following three core points, therefore, stand.

The first point, arising from consideration of the four sets of binary pairs, is that the appeal of Bishop Barron reaches key groups who are less well accessed by traditional

congregations. While only 16% of those attending traditional congregations (considering men and women together) are intuitive types, among the followers of Bishop Barron in the first study 35% were intuitive types and in the second study also 35%. While 35% of those attending traditional congregations are thinking types, among the followers of Bishop Barron in the first study 45% were thinking types and in the second study 52%. In any developing group intuitive types are needed to bring visions for the future and thinking types are needed to bring strategic thinking to the fore. The downside, however, is that intuitive types can unsettle the *status quo* so much loved by the traditional congregation, shaped by sensing types. At the same time, thinking types can ask the hard questions and push feeling types beyond their comfort zone (see further Ross & Francis, 2020).

The second point, arising from consideration of the four sets of binary pairs, is that while the appeal of Bishop Barron widens the reach of the Catholic Church in terms of the two fundamental psychological processes, it does so within the established orientations and attitudes familiar within the inherited expressions of church. The appeal of Bishop Barron is failing to engage more extraverts among both men and women and failing to engage more perceiving types among women. The appeal works best among introverts (those inclined to value the inner life, internal processing, and solitude) and best among judging types (those inclined to value an ordered and structured engagement with the external world). Other forms of innovation may be required to extend the reach to extraverts and to perceiving types.

The third point, arising from consideration of the four temperaments, concerns the core difference between the community of people gathering around Bishop Barron and the community of people gathering in Catholic congregations. The primary temperament shaping the Catholic congregations profile by Robbins and Francis (2012) is the Epimethean temperament (SJ). In that context, considering men and women together, 76% of churchgoers reported the Epimethean temperament. Among people gathering around Bishop Barron the

proportions reporting the Epimethean temperament dropped to 57% in the first study and to 50% in the second study. In their discussion of the Epimethean temperament, Muskett and Village (2015, p. 641) describe these individuals as the ‘guardians’ of the church, as people who ‘have a strong desire to maintain tradition and heritage’. The group of people gathering around Bishop Barron may have the capacity to dilute the overwhelming influence of the Epimethean temperament on congregational life.

Brought into dialogue with research on church-leaving (Francis & Richter, 2007; Richter & Francis, 1998), these data raise an interesting and important question about the future trajectory of these individuals who have been attracted to (and potentially influenced by) Bishop Barron’s ministry. Where do they go back to, and what do they do next? Do they now really fit into inherited congregations and fresh expressions of church? Such questions cannot be addressed by a snapshot survey conducted on the day of a gathered conference, but they could be addressed by a carefully designed panel study that would allow the experiences of individual participants to be documented over time.

Limitations

This study shares in common with similar studies conducted in the context of busy conferences the main limitation that there are multiple pressures on participants’ time, and this is reflected in the fact that of the 477 participants who began the survey, just 362 thoroughly completed the final section comprising the measurement of psychological type. These findings are also limited by the fact that they rest on only two studies, but based on the same location (London). Further replication studies are now needed, conducted within other locations. Moreover, since Bishop Barron’s ministry is delivered primarily to an online audience, further studies are needed to compare the profile of these online participants with the published profile of offline participants.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to Andy Milligan of Trinity College Bristol for assistance with administering the survey.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

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

Data availability

Data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Ethical approval

This study received approval from the St Mary's Centre Ethics Committee (SCM22ECC0011).

References

- Bramer, P. D. G., & Ross, C. F. J. (2012). Type patterns among evangelical Protestants in Ontario. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 15*(10), 997-1007.
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.678577
- Cattell, R. B., Cattell, A. K. S., & Cattell, H. E. P. (1993). *Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire: fifth edition (16PF5)*. NFER-Nelson.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*. Psychological Assessment Resources. doi.org/10.1037/t07564-000
- Craig, C. L., Francis, L. J., Bailey, J., & Robbins, M. (2003). Psychological types in Church in Wales congregations. *The Psychologist in Wales, 15*, 18-21.
- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990). Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members. *Journal of Psychological Type, 20*, 25-33.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1991). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scales*. Hodder and Stoughton.
- Fletcher, S. C. (2021). The role of replication in psychological science. *European Journal for Philosophy of Science, 11*, article 23. doi.org/10.1007/s13194-020-00329-2
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2013). The psychological type profile of a church: A case study. *Comprehensive Psychology, 2*, article 6. doi.org/10.2466/01.09.CP.2.6
- Francis, L. J., Butler, A., Jones, S. H., & Craig, C. L. (2007). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church: a perspective from England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 10*(5), 435-443. doi.org/10.1080/13694670600668382

- Francis, L. J., Clymo, J., & Robbins, M. (2014). Fresh Expressions: Reaching those psychological types conventional forms of church find it hard to reach? *Practical Theology*, 7(4), 252-267. doi.org/10.1179/1756073X14Z.00000000045
- 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(2), 181-191.
doi.org/10.1080/13537900802024543
- Francis, L. J., Davis, F., & McKenna, U. (2024). Who is inspired to follow Bishop Barron? Applying psychological type and psychological temperament theory among lay Catholic participants at an event sponsored in London by the Word on Fire Institute. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*. Online first.
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2023.2293831
- Francis, L. J., Duncan, B., Craig, C. L., & Luffman, G. (2004). Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England. *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, 1(1), 66-77. doi.org/10.1558/jate.1.1.65.36058
- Francis, L. J., Edwards, O. D., & ap Siôn, T. (2021). Applying psychological type and psychological temperament theory to the congregations at cathedral carol services. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 24(4), 412-424.
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1764516
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & McKenna, U. (2020). The Holly Bough service at Liverpool Cathedral and psychological type theory: Fresh expressions or inherited church? *HTS Theological Studies*, 76(3), article 6275, 1-11. doi.org/10.4102/hts.v76i3.6275
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & McKenna, U. (2021). The science of congregation studies and psychometric segmentation: O come all ye thinking types? *HTS Theological Studies*, 77(4), article 6747, 1-10. doi.org/10.4102/hts.v77i4.6747

- Francis, L. J., & Lankshear, D. W. (Eds.) (2021). *The science of congregation studies: Searching for signs of growth*. Palgrave Macmillan. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-76107-3
- Francis, L. J., Laycock, P., & Brewster, C. (2017). Exploring the factor structure of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS) among a sample of Anglican clergy in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 20(9), 930-941. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2017.1375469
- Francis, L. J. & Richter, P. (2007). *Gone for good? Church-leaving and returning in the twenty-first century*. Epworth.
- Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2012). Not fitting in and getting out. Psychological type and congregational satisfaction among Anglican churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15(10), 1023-1035. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.676260
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Craig, C. L. (2011). The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: Compatible or incompatible with their clergy? *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 15(2), 243-259. doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2011.036
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Williams, A., & Williams, R. (2007). All types are called, but some are more likely to respond: The psychological profile of rural Anglican churchgoers in Wales. *Rural Theology*, 5(1), 23-30. doi.org/10.1179/rut_2007_5_1_003
- Francis, L. J., Wright, H., & Robbins, M. (2016). Temperament theory and congregation studies: Different types for different services? *Practical Theology*, 9(1), 29-45. doi.org/10.1080/1756073X.2016.1149679
- Gerhardt, R. (1983). Liberal religion and personality type. *Research in Psychological Type*, 6, 47-53.

- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works* (volume 6). Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- 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., Francis, L. J., & Geary, A. M. (2021). Psychological type profile of Methodist churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 24(6), 638-646. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1846509
- Lewis, C. A., Varvatsoulas, G., & Williams, E. (2012). Psychological type profile of practising Greek Orthodox churchgoers in London. *Mental, Health, Religion & Culture*, 15(10), 979-986. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.720753
- Lloyd, J. B. (2015). Unsubstantiated beliefs and values flaw the Five-Factor model of personality. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 36(2), 156-164. doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2015.1033209
- McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The Selection Ratio Type Table: A research strategy for comparing type distributions. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 10, 46-56.
- Muskett, J. A., & Village, A. (2015). Created to be guardians: Psychological type profiles of members of cathedral friends associations. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18(8), 641-654. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.961249
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality Type and Religious Leadership*. The Alban Institute. doi.org/10.5771/9781566996006

- Pennington, C. R. (2023). *A student's guide to open science: Using the replication crisis to reform psychology*. McGraw Hill Open University Press.
doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/2tqep
- Plucker, J. A., & Makel, M. C. (2021). Replication is important for educational psychology: Recent developments and key issues. *Educational Psychologist, 56*(2), 90-100.
doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1895796
- Rehak, M. C. (1998). Identifying the congregation's corporate personality. *Journal of Psychological Type, 44*, 39-44.
- Richter, P., & Francis, L. J. (1998). *Gone but not forgotten: Church-leaving and returning*. Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Robbins, M., & Francis, L. J. (2011). All are called, but some psychological types are more likely to respond: Profiling churchgoers in Australia. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 22*, 213-229. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.44
- Robbins, M., & Francis, L. J. (2012). The psychological type profile of Australian Catholic congregations: Psychological theory and congregational studies. In A. W. Ata (Ed.), *Catholics and Catholicism in contemporary Australia: Challenges and achievements* (pp. 262-281). David Lovell Publishing.
- Ross, C. F. J. (1993). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church: Comparisons with Catholics, Evangelicals and clergy. *Journal of Psychological Type, 26*, 28-35.
- Ross, C. F. J. (1995). Type patterns among Catholics: Four Anglophone congregations compared with Protestants, Francophone Catholics and priests. *Journal of Psychological Type, 33*, 33-41.

- Ross, C. F. J., & Francis, L. J. (2020). *Personality, religion, and leadership: The spiritual dimensions of psychological type theory*. New York: Lexington Books.
doi.org/10.5771/9781793605832
- Royle, M. H., Norton, J., & Larkin, T. (2021). Psychological type and psychological temperament differences between worshippers at new churches and established ones. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 24(4), 425-435.
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1766847
- Village, A. (2015). Who goes there? Attendance at Fresh Expressions of Church in relation to psychological type preference among readers of the *Church Times*. *Practical Theology*, 8(2), 112-129. doi.org/10.1179/1756074815Y.0000000007
- Village, A., Baker, S., & Howat, S. (2012). Psychological type profiles of churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15(10), 969-978.
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.686479
- Village, A., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2009). Church tradition and psychological type preferences among Anglicans in England. *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 7(1), 93-109.
doi.org/10.1017/S1740355309000187
- Walker, D. S. (2012). O come all ye thinking types: The wider appeal of the cathedral carol service. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15(10), 987-995.
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.707436

Table 1

Type distribution for female lay participants: Time two compared with time one

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 49 (20.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.09 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 39 (16.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.32 +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 16 (6.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.77 +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 18 (7.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.25 +++++	E <i>n</i> = 96 (41.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.86	I <i>n</i> = 138 (59.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.13	S <i>n</i> = 177 (69.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.07	N <i>n</i> = 72 (30.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.87
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	T <i>n</i> = 111 (47.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.05	F <i>n</i> = 123 (52.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.96	J <i>n</i> = 201 (85.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	P <i>n</i> = 33 (14.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.03
+++++	+++++	++	+++	Pairs and Temperaments			
+++++	++			IJ <i>n</i> = 122 (52.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.11	IP <i>n</i> = 16 (6.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.25	EP <i>n</i> = 17 (7.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.88	EJ <i>n</i> = 79 (33.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.86
+				ST <i>n</i> = 74 (31.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.98	SF <i>n</i> = 88 (37.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.16	NF <i>n</i> = 35 (15.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.67	NT <i>n</i> = 37 (15.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.22
ISTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ISFP <i>n</i> = 6 (2.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.50 +++	INFP <i>n</i> = 5 (2.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.04 ++	INTP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.00 ++	SJ <i>n</i> = 146 (62.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	SP <i>n</i> = 16 (6.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.66	NP <i>n</i> = 17 (7.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.76	NJ <i>n</i> = 55 (23.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.92
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ESFP <i>n</i> = 9 (3.8%) <i>I</i> = 2.25 ++++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 6 (2.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.62 +++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.50 +	TJ <i>n</i> = 104 (44.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.08	TP <i>n</i> = 7 (3.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.73	FP <i>n</i> = 26 (11.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.16	FJ <i>n</i> = 97 (41.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.92
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 24 (10.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.83 +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 34 (14.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.88 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 8 (3.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.48 +++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 13 (5.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.62 +++++	IN <i>n</i> = 43 (18.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.98	EN <i>n</i> = 29 (12.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.75	IS <i>n</i> = 95 (40.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.21	ES <i>n</i> = 67 (28.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.92
+++++	+++++	+	+	ET <i>n</i> = 39 (16.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	EF <i>n</i> = 57 (24.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.83	IF <i>n</i> = 66 (28.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.11	IT <i>n</i> = 72 (30.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.14

	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	37	15.9	1.00	I-TP	5	2.1	1.25	Dt.T	42	17.9	1.03
E-FJ	42	17.9	0.76	I-FP	11	4.7	1.25	Dt.F	53	22.6	0.83
ES-P	9	3.8	1.60	IS-J	88	37.6	1.18	Dt.S	97	41.5	1.21
EN-P	8	3.4	0.59	IN-J	34	14.5	0.96	Dt.N	42	17.9	0.86

Note: *N* = 234 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)
 p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001

Table 2

Type distribution for male lay participants: Time two compared with time one

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 38 (29.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.08 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 16 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 2.63 +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 13 (10.2%) <i>I</i> = 3.41** +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 14 (10.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.68 +++++	E <i>n</i> = 42 (32.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.84	I <i>n</i> = 86 (67.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.11	S <i>n</i> = 77 (60.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	N <i>n</i> = 51 (39.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.96
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ISFP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.44 ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.26 +	INTP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.88 ++	J <i>n</i> = 115 (89.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.11*	P <i>n</i> = 13 (10.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.53*	Pairs and Temperaments	
ESTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.66 +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.6%) <i>I</i> = 2.63 ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.38 ++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 3 (2.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.66 ++	IJ <i>n</i> = 81 (63.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.24*	IP <i>n</i> = 5 (3.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.41	EP <i>n</i> = 8 (6.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.66	EJ <i>n</i> = 34 (26.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.89
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 12 (9.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.72 +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 6 (4.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.72 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 7 (5.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.84 +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 9 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.98 +++++	ST <i>n</i> = 51 (39.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.93	SF <i>n</i> = 26 (20.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.31	NF <i>n</i> = 23 (18.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.37	NT <i>n</i> = 28 (21.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.77
				SJ <i>n</i> = 72 (56.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.09	SP <i>n</i> = 5 (3.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.60	NP <i>n</i> = 8 (6.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.50	NJ <i>n</i> = 43 (33.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.15
				TJ <i>n</i> = 73 (57.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	TP <i>n</i> = 6 (4.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.61	FP <i>n</i> = 7 (5.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.48	FJ <i>n</i> = 42 (32.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.90**
				IN <i>n</i> = 30 (23.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.98	EN <i>n</i> = 21 (16.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	IS <i>n</i> = 56 (43.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.19	ES <i>n</i> = 21 (16.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.77
				ET <i>n</i> = 25 (19.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.78	EF <i>n</i> = 17 (13.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.93	IF <i>n</i> = 32 (25.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.75*	IT <i>n</i> = 54 (42.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.91

	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	21	16.4	0.81	I-TP	2	1.6	0.53	Dt.T	23	18.0	0.77
E-FJ	13	10.2	1.07	I-FP	3	2.3	0.36	Dt.F	16	12.5	0.78
ES-P	3	2.3	1.31	IS-J	54	42.2	1.31	Dt.S	57	44.5	1.31
EN-P	5	3.9	0.50	IN-J	27	21.1	1.11	Dt.N	32	25.0	0.93

Note: *N* = 128 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)
 p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001