



University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Leslie J. Francis

Article Title: Five loaves and two fishes: An empirical study in psychological type and biblical hermeneutics among Anglican preachers

Year of publication: 2010

Link to published article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v66i1.811>

Publisher statement: None

Five loaves and two fishes: an empirical study in psychological type and biblical  
hermeneutics among Anglican preachers

Leslie J Francis\*

University of Warwick

Author note:

\*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Institute of Education

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

**Abstract**

The SIFT method of biblical hermeneutics and liturgical preaching has its roots in three fields: a theology of individual differences situated within the doctrine of creation; an application of Jungian psychological type theory; and empirical observation. The present study tests the empirical foundations for this method by examining the psychological type profile of two groups of Anglican preachers (24 licensed readers in England and 22 licensed clergy in Northern Ireland) and by examining the content of their preaching according to their dominant psychological type preferences. These data provide further support for the psychological principles underpinning SIFT method of biblical hermeneutics and liturgical preaching.

*Keywords:* SIFT, hermeneutics, psychological type, psychology, bible, religion

### **Introduction**

The SIFT method of biblical hermeneutics and liturgical preaching was developed and tested in a three volume response to the Gospel readings proposed for the principal Sunday service by the Revised Common Lectionary (Francis & Atkins, 2000, 2001, 2002), grounded in the wider hermeneutical and homiletic debates by Francis and Village (2008), and displayed in a variety of contexts by Francis (1997, 2003, 2006a, 2006b, 2007). While a number of contextual approaches to hermeneutics have drawn on sociological categories (say gender, oppression, or ethnicity), the SIFT method draws on psychological categories which are in turn grounded in a clear theology of individual differences and rooted in a classic Christian doctrine of creation.

Francis (2005) introduces his distinctive notion of the theology of individual differences by drawing on the rich implications of Genesis 1:27. According to that passage both men and women are created in the image of God. According to that passage it is the individual differences between men and women that reflect the divine image. Extrapolating from the importance of sex differences in understanding the divine image, Francis (2005) speculates about other key human individual differences that may, alongside sex differences, be attributed to the divine intentionality (doctrine of creation) rather than to the corruption of human sinfulness (doctrine of fall). Such human individual differences, he argues, include ethnic differences and psychological type difference.

Psychological type theory has its origins in the pioneering and creative work of Carl Jung (see, for example, Jung, 1971), but has been developed, clarified and popularised through a range of psychological assessment devices that have been applied within religious and theological contexts, most notably the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). As generally understood, there are four key

components to psychological type theory, and each of these four components can be experienced and expressed in two distinctive and opposing ways. The theory distinguishes between two orientations (introversion and extraversion), two perceiving processes (sensing and intuition), two judging processes (thinking and feeling), and two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving).

The two orientations are concerned with where energy is drawn from and focused. On the one hand, extraverts are orientated toward the outer world; they are energised by the events and people around them. They enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and exciting environments. They tend to focus their attention on what is happening outside themselves. They are usually open people, easy to get to know, and enjoy having many friends. On the other hand, introverts are orientated toward their inner world; they are energised by their inner ideas and concepts. They enjoy solitude, silence, and contemplation, as they tend to focus their attention on what is happening in their inner life. They may prefer to have a small circle of intimate friends rather than many acquaintances.

The two perceiving functions are concerned with the way in which people perceive information. On the one hand, sensing types focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They tend to concentrate on specific details, rather than on the overall picture. They are concerned with the actual, the real, and the practical, and tend to be down to earth and matter of fact. On the other hand, intuitive types focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. They may feel that perception by the senses is not as valuable as information gained from the unconscious mind as indirect associations and concepts impact on their perception. They focus on the overall picture, rather than on specific facts and data.

The two judging functions are concerned with the criteria which people use to make decisions and judgements. On the one hand, thinking types make judgements based on

objective, impersonal logic. They value integrity and justice. They are known for their truthfulness and for their desire for fairness. They consider conforming to principles to be of more importance than cultivating harmony. On the other hand, feeling types make judgements based on subjective, personal values. They value compassion and mercy. They are known for their tactfulness and for their desire for peace. They are more concerned to promote harmony, than to adhere to abstract principles.

The two attitudes toward the outer world are concerned with which of the two sets of functions (that is, perceiving or judging), is preferred in dealings with the outer world. On the one hand, judging types seek to order, rationalise, and structure their outer world, as they actively judge external stimuli. They enjoy routine and established patterns. They prefer to follow schedules in order to reach established goals and may make use of lists, timetables, or diaries. They tend to be punctual, organised, and tidy. They prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once made. On the other hand, perceiving types do not seek to impose order on the outer world, but are more reflective, perceptive, and open, as they perceive external stimuli. They have a flexible, open-ended approach to life. They enjoy change and spontaneity. They prefer to leave projects open in order to adapt and improve them. Their behaviour may often seem impulsive and unplanned.

Jung's view is that each individual develops one of the perceiving functions (sensing or intuition) at the expense of the other, and one of the judging functions (feeling or thinking) at the expense of the other. Moreover, for each individual either the preferred perceiving function or the preferred judging function takes preference over the other, leading to the emergence of one dominant function which shapes the individual's dominant approach to life. Dominant sensing shapes the practical person. Dominant intuition shapes the imaginative person. Dominant feeling shapes the humane person. Dominant thinking shapes the analytic person. According to Jungian type theory the function paired with the dominant function is

known as the 'inferior function'. It is here that individuals experience most difficulty. The dominant sensors may struggle with intuition; dominant intuitives may struggle with sensing; dominant feelers may struggle with thinking; and dominant thinkers may struggle with feeling.

In essence, the SIFT method of biblical hermeneutics and liturgical preaching addresses to each passage of scripture in a systematic way the four sets of questions posed by the four psychological functions of sensing and intuition (the two perceiving functions) and of thinking and feeling (the two judging functions). The two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) are applied first, since the perceiving process is concerned with gathering information and ideas. This is the irrational process unconcerned with making judgements or with formulating evaluations. The two judging functions (thinking and feeling) are applied second, since the judging process is concerned with evaluating information and ideas. Both feeling and thinking are rational functions.

The first step in the SIFT method is to address the sensing perspective. It is the sensing perspective which gets to grip with the text itself and which gives proper attention to the details of the passage and may wish to draw on insights of historic methods of biblical scholarship in order to draw in 'facts' from other parts of the Bible. The first set of questions asks, 'How does this passage speak to the sensing function? What are the facts and details? What is there to see, to hear, to touch, to smell, and to taste?'

The second step in the SIFT method is to address the intuitive perspective. It is the intuitive perspective which relates the biblical text to wider issues and concerns. The second set of questions asks, 'How does this passage speak to the intuitive function? What is there to speak to the imagination, to forge links with current situations, to illuminate issues in our lives?'

The third step in the SIFT method is to address the feeling perspective. It is the

feeling perspective which examines the human interest in the biblical text and learns the lessons of God for harmonious and compassionate living. The third set of questions asks, 'How does this passage speak to the feeling function? What is there to speak about fundamental human values, about the relationships between people, and about what it is to be truly human?'

The fourth step in the SIFT method is to address the thinking perspective. It is the thinking perspective which examines the theological interest in the biblical text and which reflects rationally and critically on issues of principle. The fourth set of questions asks, 'How does this passage speak to the thinking function? What is there to speak to the mind, to challenge us on issues of truth and justice, and to provoke profound theological thinking?'

Although the research method leading to the development of the SIFT method of biblical hermeneutics and liturgical preaching has been largely theoretically driven, there are four empirical studies that have examined this theoretical development. In the first study, Bassett, Mathewson, and Gailitis (1993) examined the link between preferred interpretations of scripture and psychological preferences established partly by psychological type theory and partly by a measure of problem solving styles. Participants were asked to read four passages from New Testament epistles and then offered a choice of interpretations that were intended to express preferences for 'thinking' or for 'feeling' (as defined by psychological type theory) and preferences for 'collaborative', for 'deferring', or for 'independent' (as defined by this problem solving typology). Although mixing two personality models makes the results difficult to interpret, the data provided some support for a link between psychological type preference and choice of interpretations. Most obviously those classed as feeling types showed a preference for feeling-type interpretations.

In the second study, Village and Francis (2005) invited a sample of 404 lay adult Anglicans from 11 different churches to read a healing story from Mark's Gospel and then to



choose between parts of interpretative statements designed to distinguish between the perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) or between the judging functions (thinking and feeling). The participants also completed the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978) as a measure of psychological type. The data demonstrated that, when forced to choose between contrasting options, participants preferred interpretations that matched their psychological type preferences in both the perceiving process and the judging process.

In the third study, Francis, Robbins, and Village (2009) invited a sample of 389 experienced preachers to read Mark 1:29-39 and to record their evaluations of the four reflections on this passage proposed originally by Francis (1997) and which were derived from the SIFT method of biblical hermeneutics and liturgical preaching. The participants also completed the 126-item Form G (Anglicised) of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) as a measure of psychological type. The data demonstrated that preachers were four times more likely to prefer a sensing interpretation of the text rather than a thinking interpretation, emphasising the richness of the narrative rather than facing the theological questions posed by it. Moreover, there was little evidence to suggest that preachers were less likely to appreciate interpretations consonant with their less preferred function than those consonant with their most preferred or dominant function. In this sense, the SIFT method should be accessible to preachers of all psychological types.

In the fourth study, Village (in press) invited a sample of 718 recently ordained Anglican clergy serving in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales to read the healing story from Mark 9:14-29 and to select between interpretative statements designed to appeal to particular psychological type preferences. The participants also completed the Francis Psychological Type Scale (Francis, 2005) as a measure of psychological type. The data demonstrated that, after controlling for differences in biblical conservatism, preferences for interpretation were significantly correlated with psychological type function preferences in

both the perceiving process and the judging process. These findings confirmed and expanded the findings from the earlier study among Anglican lay people reported by Village and Francis (2005).

This small body of empirical research exploring issues relevant to the SIFT method of biblical hermeneutics and liturgical preaching has been shaped by the quantitative tradition within empirical theology and now needs complementing by the qualitative tradition (Francis, Robbins, & Astley, 2009).

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to test the extent to which preachers naturally draw on their dominant type preference when they are constructing sermons. In the previous study reported by Francis, Robbins and Village (2009) the aim was to examine how preachers respond to the sermons prepared by others. In the present study the aim is to examine what preachers prepare for themselves. The context in which such research can be conducted is provided by the preaching workshops operated by the author. In the context of these workshops assessment is made of psychological type, and participants are given the opportunity to work in a range of type-alike groups, including groups based on the four dominant types of sensing, intuition, feeling and thinking. This paper reports findings from two such preaching workshops: one arranged for Anglican preachers in England, and one arranged for Anglican preachers in Northern Ireland.

## **Method**

### **Procedure**

Participants were invited by their diocesan trainers to attend a day session between 10.30 and 15.30 led by the author on the theme of introducing the SIFT method of biblical hermeneutics and liturgical preaching. The morning session introduced the ideas underpinning the theology and psychology of individual differences and workshop opportunities were provided to explore type theory. At 13.00 participants were invited to

complete the type sorter and then to break for lunch. The findings of the type sorter were used to allocate the participants to dominant type groups. Between 14.00 and 14.45 the four dominant type groups were asked to prepare a presentation on their approach to Mark 6:34-44 (see appendix). It is these presentations that provide the source materials for the following analyses.

Psychological type was assessed by the 1995 edition of the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey, 1998). This instrument proposes 10 items to discriminate between introversion and extraversion and three sets of 20 items to distinguish between sensing and intuition, between thinking and feeling, and between judging and perceiving. Following the advice of Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2007), tied scores on the Keirsey Temperament Sorter were assigned to introversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving.

## **Results**

### **Study one**

Study one was conducted among 24 Anglican readers serving in the Church of England (9 men and 15 women). The type profile presented in table 1 demonstrates a balance between introversion (13) extraversion (11), and between sensing (12) and intuition (12), but preferences for feeling (17) over thinking (7), and for judging (19) over perceiving (5). In terms of dominant types, there were 10 dominant feelers, 6 dominant sensors, 6 dominant intuitives, and 2 dominant thinkers.

The *sensing* group generated an organised and numbered list of points. Point one emphasised the need to start with the information given in the passage itself and to start with the experience of the disciples. Here were a group of men in need of rest, quiet and refreshment. That is why Jesus led them across the water. But their needs were frustrated. Their needs were overtaken by the needs of the crowd. Their need for spiritual refreshment was displaced by the crowd's need for physical refreshment. The disciples felt frustrated not

being able to meet the needs of the crowd, until Jesus pointed out to them that they had all the resources that they required. The disciples assumed that everyone would need to find their own food, until Jesus asked them to see what they had to hand. For this group the narrative raised questions about discipleship in contemporary life, and about the needs of today for spiritual feeding. As disciples we need feeding and we need to feed others. The physical resources that we have are of importance and adequate for the task.

The *intuitive* group generated a highly coloured mind map displaying graphically a range of unconnected ideas. They were fascinated by the use of numbers: 5000 people, 5 loaves, 12 baskets, and groups of 100 and of 50 people. They contrasted the themes of scarcity and abundance, linked with grace and with eucharist, and linked with order emerging from chaos. They identified themes of confusion, compassion, teaching, and feeding. They drew attention to Jesus' assessment of the crowd as being like sheep without a shepherd. They went beyond the Markan text to reflect on the boy who in another gospel was responsible for bringing the loaves, and this led naturally into a discussion of children and communion that then quickly became their main point of interest,

The *feeling* group focused immediately on the range of human needs displayed and recognised in the narrative: Jesus, the disciples, and the crowd all had different and competing needs. According to this group, the miracle of the loaves and fishes proclaimed how the Lord will provide and meet the range of human needs. According to this group the passage also displayed how apparently limited resources can be used wisely to the benefit of others. We are called to use our resources and our skills to the benefit of others.

The *thinking* group provided a crisp analysis of the major themes in the passage, contrasting the approaches of Jesus and of the disciples. The disciples ran to Jesus in panic; Jesus remained calm. The disciples saw the negative side of the situation and saw no solution; Jesus saw the positive side of the situation and saw a way forward. The disciples identified

the problem but not the solution; Jesus sent the disciples off to do further research. According to this group, Jesus offers a solution to human hunger by breaking bread that points to his suffering and crucifixion. As disciples we are offered that model to follow.

### **Study two**

Study two was conducted among 22 Anglican clergy serving in the Church of Ireland (17 men and 5 women). The type profile presented in table 2 demonstrates preferences for extraversion (13) over introversion (9), for sensing (18) over intuition (4), for feeling (16) over thinking (6), and for judging (21) over perceiving (1). In terms of dominant types, there were 9 dominant feelers, 8 dominant sensors, 3 dominant thinkers, and 2 dominant intuitives.

The *sensing* group began by seeing the disciples as showing their own pre-disposition for sensing. The disciples have conducted a very thorough analysis of the situation and they see clearly the practical problem with which they are confronted. They recognise that they are in a remote place, that it is getting late, and that there is no ready supply of food. The disciples are practical people and recognise that it would take the people some time to find the food they need. They recognise that it would cost them eight months wages to purchase enough food themselves. The disciples were able to delineate the problem, but needed Jesus to provide the vision of a way forward. The sensing group were fascinated by the details of the narrative. They counted the five loaves and the two fishes, but most of all they counted the 12 baskets. The 12 baskets were a clear statement of plenty and a clear indication of the resource that God provides for the people. This group captured the overall message and theme of the passage as indicative of the practical concern of Jesus for the needs of the people.

The *intuitive* group (of just two people) identified the Lord's Prayer as the lens through which to view the passage. The Lords Prayer prays, 'Give us this day our daily bread.' Here is a petition that means so much for a crowd that is hungry and that is without

resources. But the hunger that matters is so much more than physical hunger. The passage shows God's amazing provision to offer the food that really matters. The passage also shows that God needs our collaboration in feeding the deep hunger of the people. In faith we need to take what is available, and within the Kingdom of God (for which we also pray in the Lord's Prayer) what is available by God's grace meets the needs and satisfies the hunger of all the people. Seeing this passage through the lens of the Lord's Prayer also calls to mind the way in which John's Gospel uses this passage as a spring-board for teaching about Jesus as the Bread of Life. The Lord's Prayer is a live example of how God's will is done, bringing the Bread of Life to all.

The *feeling* group focused on the theme of compassion, introduced at the beginning of the passage when Jesus saw the crowd and had compassion on them. Jesus showed great powers of empathy in putting himself in the shoes of the crowd, in experiencing how things felt for them, and in sensing their quest for leadership and for teaching. As a shepherd, Jesus felt for the people as his sheep. As a shepherd, Jesus wanted to take them into his care. As a shepherd, Jesus wanted to feed them. As a shepherd, Jesus had concern for them. It was with compassion that Jesus took the five loaves. It was with compassion that Jesus' action of sharing the bread demonstrated the love of God in action. It was with compassion that Jesus got the crowd seated in orderly groups on the green grass to prevent chaos from breaking out and to pre-empt any unruly scramble for the food. This group also tried to see things through the eyes of the disciples. The disciples must have felt helpless at being unable to respond to Jesus' command to feed the crowd. They must have felt frustrated at being challenged to do the impossible. Indeed, Jesus' treatment of the disciples seems insensitive and even unkind.

The *thinking* group identified four main themes of theological interest in the passage. The first theme concerned the location of the passage within the structure of Mark's Gospel. At this point of the Gospel, the Messianic Secret was still paramount. The disciples did not

know who Jesus really is. In this passage Jesus is still teaching the disciples and preparing them for the insight proclaimed by Peter at Caesarea Philippi. The second theme concerned the connection between this feeding of the five thousand and the eucharist. Particular attention was drawn to the four-fold eucharistic actions when Jesus took the five loaves, when Jesus gave thanks, when Jesus broke the loaves, and when Jesus gave the fragments to the disciples to distribute to the people. The third theme concerned the sexism inherent in Mark's worldview. The passage explicitly refers to the number of men who had eaten, and it remains for another of the Gospels to add a gloss regarding the women and children. The fourth theme concerned the gospel imperative against waste and the care taken by the disciples to pick up all that remained of the broken pieces of bread and fish.

### Conclusion

Building on quantitative studies reported by Bassett, Matthewson, and Galitis (1993); Village and Francis (2005); Francis, Village, and Robbins (2009); and Village (in press) the present study employed a qualitative methodology to test the extent to which preachers (left to their own devices) preach in the voice shaped by their dominant psychological type. Data were provided by two groups of preachers who were participating in continuing professional education workshops (24 licensed readers and 22 licensed clergy). These data demonstrated that, when working in type-alike groups, preachers generated preaching material consistent with the emphases of their dominant psychological type. *Sensors* gave close attention to the details of the text and focused on practical outcomes. *Intuitives* allowed the text to spark their imagination and sometimes ended up with themes far removed from the starting point of the passage itself. *Feelers* saw the passage through the lens of compassionate concern and from the perspective of the people within the narrative. *Thinkers* saw the passage from the perspective of the ongoing theological issues raised.

Overall these data suggest that if preachers are to access and proclaim the four

distinctive voices of the hermeneutical process advocated by the SIFT method (sensing, intuition, feeling, and thinking), it is important for preachers to be trained to approach scripture through their less preferred psychological type functions as well as through their dominant function. Experience-based workshops like those employed in the present study provide one efficient and effective method for implementing this kind of practical training.

The two main limitations with the present study are these: only one passage of scripture was employed; and only two groups of preachers were involved in the research. These two limitations need to be addressed by further replication studies capable of extending the range of scripture employed and capable of working with other groups of preachers. The present study suggests that further research of this nature is likely to illustrate more fully the link between psychological type preferences and hermeneutical approaches.



### References

- Bassett, R. L., Mathewson, K. & Gailitis, A. (1993). Recognising the person in biblical interpretation: an empirical study. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 12, 38-46.
- Francis, L. J. (1997). *Personality Type and Scripture: Exploring Marks' gospel*, London: Mowbray.
- Francis, L.J. (2003). Psychological type and biblical hermeneutics: the SIFT method of preaching. *Rural Theology*, 1, 13-23.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2006a). Mark and Psychological type. In J. Vincent (Ed.). *Mark Gospel of Action: Personal and community responses* (pp. 98-108). London: SPCK.
- Francis, L. J. (2006b). Psychological type and liturgical preaching: The SIFT method, *Liturgy*, 21 (3), 11-20, 2006.
- Francis, L. J. (2007). Psychological types. In F. Watts (Ed.). *Jesus and psychology* (pp. 137-154). London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. & Atkins, P. (2000). *Exploring Luke's Gospel: A guide to the gospel readings in the Revised Common Lectionary*. London: Mowbray.
- Francis, L. J. & Atkins, P. (2001). *Exploring Matthew's Gospel: A guide to the gospel readings in the Revised Common Lectionary*. London: Mowbray.
- Francis, L. J. & Atkins, P. (2002). *Exploring Mark's Gospel: An aid for readers and preachers using year B of the Revised Common Lectionary*. London: Continuum.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M. & Astley, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Empirical Theology in Texts and Tables: Qualitative, quantitative and comparative perspectives*. Leiden: Brill.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M. & Craig, C. L. (2007). Two different operationalisations of psychological type: Comparing the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Keirsey

Temperament Sorter. In R. A. Degregovia (Ed.), *New Developments in Psychological Testing* (pp 119-138). New York: Nova Science Publishers Inc.

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Village, A. (2009). Psychological type and the pulpit: An empirical enquiry concerning preachers and the sift method of biblical hermeneutics. *HTS Theological Studies*, 65(1), article 161, 1-7.

Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2008). *Preaching with all our soul*. London: Continuum.

Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Keirse, D. (1998). *Please Understand Me: 2*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis.

Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis.

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Village, A. (in press). Psychological type and biblical interpretation among Anglican clergy in the UK. *Journal of Empirical Theology*.

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2005). The relationship of psychological type preferences to biblical interpretation. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 18(1), 74-89.

**Appendix: Mark 6:34-44 (New International Version)**

<sup>34</sup>When Jesus landed and saw a large crowd, he had compassion on them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd. So he began teaching them many things.

<sup>35</sup>By this time it was late in the day, so his disciples came to him. "This is a remote place," they said, "and it's already very late". <sup>36</sup>Send the people away so they can go to the surrounding countryside and villages and buy themselves something to eat."

<sup>37</sup>But he answered, "You give them something to eat."

They said to him, "That would take eight months of a man's wages! Are we to go and spend that much on bread and give it to them to eat?"

<sup>38</sup>"How many loaves do you have?" he asked. "Go and see."

When they found out, they said, "Five—and two fish."

<sup>39</sup>Then Jesus directed them to have all the people sit down in groups on the green grass. <sup>40</sup>So they sat down in groups of hundreds and fifties. <sup>41</sup>Taking the five loaves and the two fish and looking up to heaven, he gave thanks and broke the loaves. Then he gave them to his disciples to set before the people. He also divided the two fish among them all. <sup>42</sup>They all ate and were satisfied, <sup>43</sup>and the disciples picked up twelve basketfuls of broken pieces of bread and fish. <sup>44</sup>The number of the men who had eaten was five thousand.

Table 1

Study one: Anglican readers

N = 24 += 1% of N

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
<b>ISTJ</b> n = 2 (8.3%) +++++ +++	<b>ISFJ</b> n = 3 (12.5%) +++++ +++++ +++	<b>INFJ</b> n = 3 (12.5%) +++++ +++++ +++	<b>INTJ</b> n = 2 (8.3%) +++++ +++	E	11 (45.8%)
				I	13 (54.2%)
				S	12 (50.0%)
				N	12 (50.0%)
				T	7 (29.2%)
				F	17 (70.8%)
				J	19 (79.2%)
				P	5 (20.8%)
The Sixteen Complete Types				Pairs and Temperaments	
<b>ISTP</b> n = 0 (0.0%)	<b>ISFP</b> n = 0 (0.0%)	<b>INFP</b> n = 3 (12.5%) +++++ +++++ +++	<b>INTP</b> n = 0 (0.0%)	IJ	10 (41.7%)
				IP	3 (12.5%)
				EP	2 (8.3%)
				EJ	9 (37.5%)
				ST	4 (16.7%)
				SF	8 (33.3%)
				NF	9 (37.5%)
				NT	3 (12.5%)
<b>ESTP</b> n = 0 (0.0%)	<b>ESFP</b> n = 1 (4.2%) ++++	<b>ENFP</b> n = 0 (0.0%)	<b>ENTP</b> n = 1 (4.2%) ++++	SJ	11 (45.8%)
				SP	1 (4.2%)
				NP	4 (16.7%)
				NJ	8 (33.3%)
				TJ	6 (25.0%)
				TP	1 (4.2%)
				FP	4 (16.7%)
				FJ	13 (54.2%)
<b>ESTJ</b> n = 2 (8.3%) +++++ +++	<b>ESFJ</b> n = 4 (16.7%) +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	<b>ENFJ</b> n = 3 (12.5%) +++++ +++++ ++	<b>ENTJ</b> n = 0 (0.0%)	IN	8 (33.3%)
				EN	4 (16.7%)
				IS	5 (20.8%)
				ES	7 (29.2%)
				ET	3 (12.5%)
				EF	8 (33.3%)
				IF	9 (37.5%)
				IT	4 (16.7%)

---

Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)		Dominant Types		<i>L J Francis</i> <i>Psychological types of</i> <i>Anglican readers</i>
	n %		n %		n %	
E-TJ	2 8.3	I-TP	0 0.0	Dt. T	2 8.3	
E-FJ	7 29.2	I-FP	3 12.5	Dt. F	10 41.7	
ES-P	1 4.2	IS-J	5 20.8	Dt. S	6 25.0	
EN-P	1 4.2	IN-J	5 20.8	Dt. N	6 25.0	

---

Table 2

*Study 2 Anglican Clergy*

*N* = 22 += 1% of *N*

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
<b>ISTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (13.6%) +++++	<b>ISFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 5 (22.7%) +++++	<b>INFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 1 (4.5%) +++++	<b>INTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) ++++	E	13 (59.1%)
				I	9 (40.9%)
				S	18 (81.8%)
				N	4 (18.2%)
				T	6 (27.3%)
				F	16 (72.7%)
				J	21 (95.5%)
				P	1 ( 4.5%)
<b>ISTP</b> <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	<b>ISFP</b> <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	<b>INFP</b> <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	<b>INTP</b> <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	Pairs and Temperaments	
				IJ	9 (40.9%)
				IP	0 ( 0.0%)
				EP	1 ( 4.5%)
				EJ	12 (54.5%)
				ST	6 (27.3%)
				SF	12 (54.5%)
				NF	4 (18.2%)
				NT	0 ( 0.0%)
<b>ESTP</b> <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	<b>ESFP</b> <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	<b>ENFP</b> <i>n</i> = 1 (4.5%) +++++	<b>ENTP</b> <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	SJ	18 (81.8%)
				SP	0 ( 0.0%)
				NP	1 ( 4.5%)
				NJ	3 (13.6%)
				TJ	6 (27.3%)
				TP	0 ( 0.0%)
				FP	1 ( 4.5%)
				FJ	15 (68.2%)
<b>ESTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 3 (13.6%) +++++	<b>ESFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 7 (31.8%) +++++	<b>ENFJ</b> <i>n</i> = 2 (9.1%) +++++	<b>ENTJ</b> <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) ++	IN	1 ( 4.5%)
				EN	3 (13.6%)
				IS	8 (36.4%)
				ES	10 (45.5%)
				ET	3 (13.6%)
				EF	10 (45.5%)
				IF	6 (27.3%)
				IT	3 (13.6%)

Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)		Dominant Types		<i>L J Francis.</i> <i>Psychological types of</i> <i>Anglican clergy</i>
<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
E-TJ	3 13.6	I-TP	0 0.0	Dt. T	3 13.6	
E-FJ	9 40.9	I-FP	0 0.0	Dt. F	9 40.9	
ES-P	0 0.0	IS-J	8 36.4	Dt. S	8 36.4	
EN-P	1 4.5	IN-J	1 4.5	Dt. N	2 9.1	