

Journal Article

Assessing the psychological type profile of Canadian Baptist youth : a study employing the Francis Psychological Type Scales for Adolescents (FPTSA)

Fawcett, B, Francis, L.J., Linkletter, J., Robbins, M. and Stairs, D.

This article is published by [Springer Verlag](https://www.springer.com). The definitive version of this article is available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11089-016-0732-2>

Recommended citation:

Fawcett, B, Francis, L.J., Linkletter, J., Robbins, M. and Stairs, D. (2017) Assessing the psychological type profile of Canadian Baptist youth : a study employing the Francis Psychological Type Scales for Adolescents (FPTSA), *Pastoral Psychology*, 66 (2). pp. 213-223.

Assessing the psychological type profile of Canadian Baptist youth: A study employing the
Francis Psychological Type Scales for Adolescents (FPTSA)

Bruce Fawcett

Crandall University, Canada

Leslie J Francis*

University of Warwick

Jody Linkletter

Acadia Divinity College, Canada

Mandy Robbins

Glyndŵr University, UK

Dale Stairs

Acadia Divinity College, Canada

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Centre for Education Studies

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

A growing body of international research employing psychological type theory within the context of congregation studies has drawn attention to the way in which churches draw larger numbers of feeling types than thinking types (among both men and women). These studies have focused on adult churchgoers. The present study extends this field of research among 1,630 Canadian Baptist youth attending church-based summer youth programmes (aged 12 to 19 years) who completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales for Adolescents. In this new study 87% of male youth and 93% of female youth preferred feeling. The implications of these findings are assessed for the ministry of the Church among thinking types.

Keywords: psychological type, congregation studies, Baptist Church, young people, psychology of religion

Introduction

The notion of the theology of individual differences provides a theoretical and empirical framework within which churches are able to reflect on the psychological profile of their members and participants. The theology of individual differences, as developed by Francis (2005) and Francis and Village (2008), draws on a strong doctrine of creation rooted in Genesis 1: 27 to suggest that certain human individual differences reflect the image of God and the intentionality of the Divine Creator. The God who created both male and female in the image of God intended neither one nor the other to reflect less adequately the divine image. Such clear and visible differences are not the consequence of the fall. The theology of individual differences is concerned to identify other fundamental human individual differences that may be similarly posited to reflect the divine image. In this regard, Francis and Village (2008) suggest that visible ethnic differences and less visible differences in psychological type may also reflect diversity within the divine image. The theology of individual differences has clear implications for the way in which churches reflect on their experiences of ministry among men *and* women, among people of different ethnicity, and among people of different psychological types.

The notion of psychological type on which the theology of individual differences draws has its roots in the pioneering work of Jung (1971) as subsequently developed and operationalised in a series of psychological type measures including the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). The point about psychological type theory is that it is concerned with identifying deep-seated individual differences that are, in principle, as value free as sex differences or ethnic differences. In this regard, psychological type theory proposes four fundamental psychological differences which it discusses in binary terms. The theory speaks in terms of two orientations, two perceiving

functions, two judging functions, and two attitudes. The theory suggests that, while individuals have access to and need to draw on both opposing forms of each factor, they naturally tend to prefer one over the other, to develop one over the other, and to rely on one more than the other.

The orientations are concerned with the ways in which people gather psychological energy. Extraverts (E) draw their energy from the outer world of events, people, and things, and focus their attention on that outer world. Introverts (I) draw their energy from the inner world of thoughts and reflections, and focus their attention on that inner world.

The perceiving functions are concerned with the ways in which people receive information. Sensing types (S) focus on perceptions received through the five senses, and are concerned with facts, details, and practical realities in the here and now. Intuitive types (N) focus on perceptions received through intuition, and are concerned with inspirations, meanings, and possibilities for the future.

The judging functions are concerned with the ways in which people make decisions and judgements. Thinking types (T) make judgements on objective, impersonal logic, and tend to value truthfulness and fairness. Feeling types (F) make judgements based on subjective, personal values, and tend to value harmony and compassion.

The attitudes toward the outer world are concerned with which process (Judging T/F or Perceiving S/N) is preferred for dealing with the outside world. Judging types (J) are orderly, decisive, and organised, as they judge stimuli from the outer world in order to reach conclusions and make decisions swiftly. Perceiving types (P) are open, spontaneous, and flexible, as they perceive stimuli from the outer world in order to continue gathering information as long as possible before reaching conclusions and making decisions.

These four dichotomous indices combine to produce 16 discrete psychological types from which it is possible to define an individual's dominant and auxiliary functions and

whether these functions are introverted or extraverted. The dominant function is the function that is most preferred and the auxiliary function is the second preferred function, which may be consciously used to support the dominant function. Each of the perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) and each of the judging functions (thinking and feeling) can be extraverted (used in the outer world) or introverted (used in the inner world). Whichever of the two perceiving functions is extraverted, the other is introverted. Likewise, whichever of the two judging functions is extraverted, the other is introverted. Judging types extravert their preferred judging function (that is, thinking or feeling) and perceiving types extravert their preferred perceiving function (that is, sensing or intuition). Introverts employ their dominant function in their inner world and use their auxiliary function in the outer world. In contrast, extraverts employ their dominant function in their outer world and use their auxiliary function in their inner world.

One way in which psychological type theory has been fruitfully employed within practical theology is in the field of congregation studies. From the early 1980s a small, but growing, number of studies has introduced psychological type theory to the field of congregation studies. In some early studies from North America, Gerhardt (1983) reported on 83 adult Unitarian Universalists, Delis-Bulhoes (1990) on 48 Catholics and 154 Protestants, Ross (1993, 1995) on 116 Anglicans and 175 Catholics, Rehak (1998) on 76 Evangelical Lutherans, and Bramer and Ross (2012) on 177 evangelical Protestants. Although the samples were small, the data suggested that there may be ways in which different psychological types are attracted to or retained by different denominations or different styles of services.

More recent studies in England and Wales have reported on 101 Anglicans (Craig, Francis, Bailey, & Robbins, 2003), 372 Anglicans (Francis, Duncan, Craig, & Luffman, 2004), 158 Anglicans (Francis, Butler, Jones, & Craig, 2007), 185 Anglicans (Francis,

Robbins, Williams, & Williams, 2007), 290 Anglicans (Village, Francis, & Craig, 2009), 3,304 Anglicans (Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011), 1,156 churchgoers from a range of denominations (Village, Baker, & Howart, 2012), 105 Greek Orthodox Christians (Lewis, Varvatsoulis, & Williams, 2012), 403 attenders at a cathedral carol service (Walker, 2012), 76 Anglicans (Francis, 2013), and 281 attenders at a cathedral Sunday service (Lankshear & Francis, 2015). In Australia studies have been reported on 1,527 churchgoers across 18 denominations (Robbins & Francis, 2011) and 1,476 Roman Catholics (Robbins & Francis, 2012).

Three main conclusions emerge from this growing body of international data. The first conclusion concerns the way in which church congregations are not representative of the populations from which they are drawn. Overall, introverts, feeling types and judging types are over-represented in church congregations to the exclusion of some extraverts, thinking types and perceiving types. The theological challenge that emerges from this finding concerns whether it is God's plan to call some types more actively than other types, or whether the churches have become content to focus God's call more effectively for some types rather than others.

The second conclusion concerns the way in which church congregations not only attract more women than men, but tend to attract more people of both sexes who prefer more feminine personality characteristics. In psychological type theory the preference for feeling is strongly associated with femininity. In the UK population 70% of women prefer feeling compared with 35% of men (Kendall, 1998). The men who attend church, however, are much more likely to prefer feeling than men in the population as a whole. Churches have become places not only for women but for men and women who feel at home in a feminised (feeling) environment. The theological challenge that emerges from this finding concerns whether the

Christian Gospel really is intended more for women than for men, or whether churches have become content to shape the Gospel as more accessible to women than to men.

The third conclusion concerns the way in which there are significant differences between the psychological types attracted to different forms of church. For example, in the field of congregation studies, Village, Francis, and Craig (2009), concentrating on the Church of England, found that Anglican Catholic congregations attracted a significantly higher proportion of intuitive types compared with Anglican Evangelical congregations. In the field of church leadership studies, Francis, Robbins, and Ryland (2012) found that churches associated with the Newfrontiers Network attracted a significantly higher proportion of thinking types with leadership (both men and women) compared with the situation in Anglican churches (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007), Methodist churches (Burton, Francis, & Robbins, 2010), Presbyterian churches (Francis, Robbins, & Wulff, 2011), and Catholic churches (Francis, Powell, & Robbins, 2012). The theological challenge that emerges from this finding concerns the ways in which the ecumenical landscape is perceived and evaluated. In the light of the developing field of the theology of individual differences, the finding that different forms of church may work more effectively among different types of people may encourage churches to respect and to maintain significant differences in the ecumenical landscape as a strength, rather than as a weakness, and to conceive collaboration and co-operation in a positive and non-competitive light. This is consistent with the ecumenical model of the 'multiplex church' proposed by Francis and Richter (2007).

The emphasis of congregation studies employing psychological type theory has been on researching adult worshippers, largely as a consequence of available type measures having been established and tested among adults. An attempt to extend this research tradition among teenage churchgoers has been reported by Fawcett, Francis, and Robbins (2009, 2011) among

755 religiously committed young people between the ages of 12 and 18 attending Tidal Impact in 2002 (a week-long youth mission and service event sponsored by the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches in Eastern Canada). In one of these two studies, Fawcett, Francis, and Robbins (2011) described the process by which the Francis Psychological Type Scales for Adolescents were developed and evaluated the psychometric properties of this new instrument. The four ten-item scales recorded satisfactory levels of internal consistency reliability as reported by the alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951).

In the other of these two studies, Fawcett, Francis, and Robbins (2009) employed the Francis Psychological Type Scales for Adolescents in order to draw and to comment on the psychological type profile of the 479 female and 274 male participants in the project. Three core findings emerged from this presentation of the data: among both male and female participants there were more intuitive types than sensing types; among both male and female participants there were more feeling types than thinking types; among both male and female participants there was a balance between introverts and extraverts.

Research question

The problem with generalising from the findings of the survey conducted among the young participants in Tidal Impact in 2002 concerns the highly specific nature of this programme and the way in which it may have called out distinctive qualities in the participants. The aim of the present project, therefore, is to draw on data provided by a larger sample of young people participating in a wider range of events sponsored by the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches in Eastern Canada. These data will be interrogated to address two specific research questions: concerning the psychometric properties of the Francis Psychological Type Scales for Adolescents in terms of internal consistency reliability; and concerning the psychological type profile of the male and female participants.

Method

Procedure

All the young people attending the week-long summer youth programme sponsored by the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches in Eastern Canada during three consecutive years were invited to complete a detailed questionnaire in the context of an afternoon worship session. Following an explanation of the nature of the survey and assurances of confidentiality and anonymity, the questionnaires were distributed to the young people. Participation was voluntary, but the overall level of interest in the topic meant that very few young people failed to complete the exercise. A total of 1,630 questionnaires were thoroughly completed and suitable for analysis.

Measure

Psychological type was assessed by the Adolescent Form of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Fawcett, Francis, & Robbins, 2011). This 40-item instrument comprises four sets of 10 forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). Fawcett, Francis, & Robbins (2011) reported alpha coefficients of .82 for the EI scale, .67 for the SN scale, .69 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale.

Sample

Of the 1,630 participants, 604 were male and 1,026 were female; 213 were twelve years of age, 338 were thirteen, 310 were fourteen, 304 were fifteen, 237 were sixteen, 144 were seventeen, 65 were eighteen, and 19 were nineteen or over. In terms of frequency of church attendance, 83% attended weekly and a further 5% at least once a month, leaving 11% who attended less than monthly. In terms of frequency of personal prayer, 52% prayed daily and a further 23% at least once a week, leaving 25% who prayed less than weekly. In terms

of frequency of Bible reading, 16% read the Bible daily, 25% at least once a week, and a further 13% at least once a month, leaving 46% who read the Bible less than once a month.

Data analysis

The research literature concerned with 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 this present study in order to integrate the new data within the established literature and to provide all the detail necessary for secondary analysis and for further interpretation of these data within the rich theoretical framework afforded by psychological type. Type tables are designed to provide information about the 16 discrete 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 in the present paper will be restricted, however, to the sixteen discrete types, dichotomous preferences, and dominant preferences.

Results

The first step in data analysis explored the scale properties of the eight measures proposed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales for Adolescents. All eight measures achieved satisfactory levels of internal consistency reliability as assessed by the alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951): introversion and extraversion, $\alpha = .77$; sensing and intuition, $\alpha = .69$; thinking and feeling, $\alpha = .68$; judging and perceiving, $\alpha = .76$.

- insert table 1 about here -

Table 1 presents the type distribution for Canadian Baptist male youth. These data demonstrate a strong preference for feeling (87%) over thinking (13%), a strong preference for extraversion (73%) over introversion (27%), a preference for judging (59%) over perceiving (41%), and a slight preference for intuition (53%) over sensing (47%). In terms of dominant type preferences, 49% were dominant feeling types, 27% dominant intuitive types,

18% dominant sensing types, and 6% dominant thinking types. In terms of the sixteen complete types, the most frequently represented types were ESFJ (22%), ENFJ (20%), and ENFP (18%).

- insert table 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the type distribution for Canadian Baptist female youth. These data demonstrate a strong preference for feeling (93%) over thinking (7%), a strong preference for extraversion (76%) over introversion (24%), a strong preference for judging (73%) over perceiving (27%), and a preference for intuition (54%) over sensing (46%). In terms of dominant type preferences, 58% were dominant feeling types, 23% dominant intuitive types, 16% dominant sensing types, and 3% dominant thinking types. In terms of the sixteen complete types, the most frequently represented types were ESFJ (27%), ENFJ (26%), and ENFP (16%).

Discussion and conclusion

Set within the broader context of congregation studies the present study was designed to address two specific research questions. The first research question concerned the stability of the psychometric properties of the Francis Psychological Type Scales for Adolescents in terms of internal consistency reliability. The data supported the findings of the foundation study reported by Fawcett, Francis, and Robbins (2011) with similar satisfactory alpha coefficients reported among the original sample of 755 adolescents between the ages of 12 and 18 years and among the present sample of 1,630 adolescents between the ages of 12 and 19 years (introversion and extraversion, $\alpha = .82$ and $.77$; sensing and intuition, $\alpha = .67$ and $.69$; thinking and feeling, $\alpha = .69$ and $.68$; judging and perceiving, $\alpha = .79$ and $.76$). These statistics commend the stability and reliability of the continuous scales proposed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales for Adolescents. While every attempt has been made to retain in the adolescent form of the instrument the balanced and nuanced concepts applied in

the original adult version of the instrument, the adolescent form has not yet been independently validated either alongside or separately from the adult version. This work remains to be undertaken by future studies. Until that work has been completed the use of the continuous scale score to generate discrete psychological type needs to be interpreted with appropriate caution.

The second research question concerned the psychological type profile of male and female participants within the week-long summer youth programme sponsored by the Convention of Atlantic Baptists Churches in Eastern Canada. Again, the data suggested the main finding of the foundation study reported by Fawcett, Francis, and Robbins (2009). In both studies, conducted among 755 adolescents and among 1,630 adolescents, who were closely involved in the life and ministry of the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches in Eastern Canada, the number of feeling types out-weighed the number of thinking types among both men and women. This finding is consistent with the general consensus found by research among adult churchgoers and within adult church congregations both in England and Wales and in Australia. This finding also extends previous research by demonstrating that what a number of previous studies have documented among adult churchgoers is also true among adolescent churchgoers.

This consistent finding, namely that Christian congregations and Christian youth groups recruit and retain more effectively among feeling types and women than among thinking types and men, poses a considerable challenge both to ministers of Christian congregations and to leaders of Christian youth groups. If the basic principle proposed by the theology of individual differences as advanced by Francis and Village (2008) holds true, namely that God loves and calls both thinking types and feeling types with equal integrity as being created in the divine image, then ministers of Christian congregations and leaders of Christian youth groups need to explore why their ministry and leadership appears so much

more effective among feeling types than among thinking types. The answer might be that feeling types and thinking types hear and respond to God's call in different and distinctive ways and seek communities within which their way of hearing and responding may be properly validated.

Psychologically, feeling types are attracted to and respond to qualities that are reflected in encouraging others, trusting others, being sensitive to others, being warm-hearted, caring about others' feelings, showing kindness, expressing sympathy, and preferring agreement (Fawcett, Francis, & Robbins, 2011). Theologically these qualities are exemplified by the God of mercy and by churches that prioritise such qualities. Psychologically, thinking types are attracted to and respond to qualities that are reflected in being fair minded, testing others, caring about others' rights, engaging in debate, remaining firm to principles, being hard when necessary, correcting others when they are wrong, and tending to critique both issues and people (Fawcett, Francis, & Robbins, 2011). Theologically these qualities are exemplified by the God of justice and by churches that prioritise such qualities. There is clear potential both for conflict between these distinctive theological perspectives and for dialogue between them. Psychological type theory suggests that deep appreciation of the complementarity of contrasting types (thinking and feeling) emerges and stabilises at best later in life. During adolescence and young adulthood it may prove especially difficult for thinking types to feel at home within an environment clearly shaped by the feeling preference. Ministers of Christian congregations and leaders of Christian youth groups may just need to face this issue and audit their activities and approaches alongside the criteria that characterise thinking and feeling and plan strategically to remedy any deficit in meeting the thinking criteria.

The limitations with the present study comprise the developmental and provisional nature of the Francis Psychological Type Scales for Adolescents and the reliance on just one

group of adolescent participants, namely young people engaged in the week-long summer youth programme sponsored by the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches in Eastern Canada. Further studies could usefully be conducted among adolescents associated with other Christian groups. Given the findings from previous studies that the Newfrontiers Network of Churches attracts higher proportions of thinking types both among male Lead Elders (Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009) and among the male members of female leadership teams (Francis, Robbins, & Ryland, 2012), adolescents associated with the Newfrontiers Network of Churches might offer a fruitful starting point.

References

- Bramer, P. D. G., & Ross, C. F. J. (2012). Type patterns among evangelical Protestants in Ontario. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 997-1007.
- Burton, L., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers in Britain: Similarities with and differences from Anglican clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology, 23*, 64-81.
- 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.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334.
- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990). Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members. *Journal of Psychological Type, 20*, 25-33.
- Fawcett, B., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2009). Psychological type profile of religiously committed male and female Canadian Baptist youth: a study among participants at Tidal Impact. *Journal of Youth Ministry, 8*, 25-38.
- Fawcett, B., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2011). The scale properties of the Adolescent form of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTSA) among Canadian Baptist Youth. *Pastoral Psychology, 60*, 201-216.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2013). The psychological type profile of a church: A case study. *Comprehensive Psychology, 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 and Culture, 10*, 435-443.

- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology, 11*, 266-284.
- Francis, L. J., Duncan, B., Craig, C. L., & Luffman, G. (2004). Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England. *Journal of Adult Theological Education, 1*, 66-77.
- Francis, L. J., Gubb, S., & Robbins, M. (2009). Psychological type profile of Lead Elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Belief and Values, 30*, 61-69.
- Francis, L.J., Powell, R., & Robbins, M. (2012). Profiling Catholic priests in Australia: An empirical study applying psychological type theory. In A. W. Ata (Ed.), *Catholics and Catholicism in contemporary Australia: Challenges and achievements* (pp. 282-298). Melbourne, Victoria: David Lovell Publishing.
- Francis, L. J., & Richter, P. (2007). *Gone for good? Church-leaving and returning in the twenty-first century*. Peterborough: Epworth.
- 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*, 243-259.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Ryland, A. (2012). Called for leadership: Psychological type profile of leaders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 40*, 220-228.
- 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*, 23-30.

- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Wulff, K. (2011). Psychological type profile of male and female clergy serving in The Presbyterian Church (USA): Implications for strengths and weaknesses in ministry. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 22*, 192-211.
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2008). *Preaching with all our souls*. London: Continuum.
- 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). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Lankshear, D. W., & Francis, L. J. (2015). Inside Southwark Cathedral: A study in psychological type profiling. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture* xxxx.
- Lewis, C. A., Varvatsoulis, G., & Williams, E. (2012). Psychological type profile of practising Greek Orthodox churchgoers in London. *Mental, Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 979-986.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Rehak, M. C. (1998). Identifying the congregation's corporate personality. *Journal of Psychological Type, 44*, 39-44.
- 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.

- 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). Melbourne, Victoria: 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.
- Village, A., Baker, S., & Howat, S. (2012). Psychological type profiles of churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 969-978.
- Village, A., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2009). Church tradition and psychological type preferences among Anglicans in England. *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 7, 93-109.
- Walker, D. S. (2012). O Come all ye thinking types: The wider appeal of the cathedral carol service. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 987-995.

Table 1

Type distribution for Canadian Baptist male youth

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 17 (2.8%) +++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 41 (6.8%) +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 34 (5.6%) +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 3 (0.5%) +	E <i>n</i> = 439 (72.7%)	I <i>n</i> = 165 (27.3%)
	++	+		S <i>n</i> = 282 (46.7%)	N <i>n</i> = 322 (53.3%)
				T <i>n</i> = 81 (13.4%)	F <i>n</i> = 523 (86.6%)
				J <i>n</i> = 355 (58.8%)	P <i>n</i> = 249 (41.2%)
				Pairs and Temperaments	
ISTP <i>n</i> = 12 (2.0%) ++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 23 (3.8%) ++++	INFP <i>n</i> = 23 (3.8%) ++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 12 (2.0%) ++	IJ <i>n</i> = 95 (15.7%)	IP <i>n</i> = 70 (11.6%)
				EP <i>n</i> = 179 (29.6%)	EJ <i>n</i> = 260 (43.0%)
				ST <i>n</i> = 42 (7.0%)	SF <i>n</i> = 240 (39.7%)
				NF <i>n</i> = 283 (46.9%)	NT <i>n</i> = 39 (6.5%)
ESTP <i>n</i> = 7 (1.2%) +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 46 (7.6%) +++++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 107 (17.7%) +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 19 (3.1%) +++	SJ <i>n</i> = 194 (32.1%)	SP <i>n</i> = 88 (14.6%)
	+++	+++++		NP <i>n</i> = 161 (26.7%)	NJ <i>n</i> = 161 (26.7%)
		+++++		TJ <i>n</i> = 31 (5.1%)	TP <i>n</i> = 50 (8.3%)
		+++++		FP <i>n</i> = 199 (32.9%)	FJ <i>n</i> = 324 (53.6%)
		+++++		IN <i>n</i> = 72 (11.9%)	EN <i>n</i> = 250 (41.4%)
	++	+++++		IS <i>n</i> = 93 (15.4%)	ES <i>n</i> = 189 (31.3%)
		+++++		ET <i>n</i> = 37 (6.1%)	EF <i>n</i> = 402 (66.6%)
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 6 (1.0%) +	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 130 (21.5%) +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 119 (19.7%) +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 5 (0.8%) +	IF <i>n</i> = 121 (20.0%)	IT <i>n</i> = 44 (7.3%)
	+++++	+++++			
	+++++	+++++			
	+++++	+++++			
	++	+++++			

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%
E-TJ	11	1.8	I-TP	24	4.0	Dt.T	35	5.8
E-FJ	249	41.2	I-FP	46	7.6	Dt.F	295	48.8
ES-P	53	8.8	IS-J	58	9.6	Dt.S	111	18.4
EN-P	126	20.9	IN-J	37	6.1	Dt.N	163	27.0

Note: *N* = 604 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

Table 2

Type distribution for Canadian Baptist female youth

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 12 (1.2%) +	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 118 (11.5%) +++++ +++++ ++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 50 (4.9%) +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 6 (0.6%) +	E <i>n</i> = 775 (75.5%)	I <i>n</i> = 251 (24.5%)	
				S <i>n</i> = 471 (45.9%)	N <i>n</i> = 555 (54.1%)	
				T <i>n</i> = 70 (6.8%)	F <i>n</i> = 956 (93.2%)	
				J <i>n</i> = 745 (72.6%)	P <i>n</i> = 281 (27.4%)	
				Pairs and Temperaments		
ISTP <i>n</i> = 5 (0.5%)	ISFP <i>n</i> = 19 (1.9%) ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 31 (3.0%) +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 10 (1.0%) +	IJ <i>n</i> = 186 (18.1%)	IP <i>n</i> = 65 (6.3%)	EP <i>n</i> = 216 (21.1%)
				EJ <i>n</i> = 559 (54.5%)		
				ST <i>n</i> = 29 (2.8%)	SF <i>n</i> = 442 (43.1%)	NF <i>n</i> = 514 (50.1%)
				NT <i>n</i> = 41 (4.0%)		
ESTP <i>n</i> = 3 (0.3%)	ESFP <i>n</i> = 33 (3.2%) +++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 163 (15.9%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +	ENTP <i>n</i> = 17 (1.7%) ++	SJ <i>n</i> = 411 (40.1%)	SP <i>n</i> = 60 (5.8%)	NP <i>n</i> = 221 (21.5%)
				NJ <i>n</i> = 334 (32.6%)		
				TJ <i>n</i> = 35 (3.4%)	TP <i>n</i> = 35 (3.4%)	FP <i>n</i> = 246 (24.0%)
				FJ <i>n</i> = 710 (69.2%)		
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 9 (0.9%) +	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 272 (26.5%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 270 (26.3%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 8 (0.8%) +	IN <i>n</i> = 97 (9.5%)	EN <i>n</i> = 458 (44.6%)	IS <i>n</i> = 154 (15.0%)
				ES <i>n</i> = 317 (30.9%)		
				ET <i>n</i> = 37 (3.6%)	EF <i>n</i> = 738 (71.9%)	IF <i>n</i> = 218 (21.2%)
				IT <i>n</i> = 33 (3.2%)		

	Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)		Dominant Types			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
E-TJ	17	1.7	I-TP	15	1.5	Dt.T	32	3.1
E-FJ	542	52.8	I-FP	50	4.9	Dt.F	592	57.7
ES-P	36	3.5	IS-J	130	12.7	Dt.S	166	16.2
EN-P	180	17.5	IN-J	56	5.5	Dt.N	236	23.0

Note: *N* = 1,026 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)