

Original citation:

Francis, Leslie J. and Smith, Greg (Researcher in education). (2015) Exploring organized and visionary approaches to designing an Advent Fun Day in an educational setting. *International Journal of Christianity & Education*, 19 (1). pp. 57-72.

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/81697>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP URL' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

Exploring organised and visionary approaches to designing an Advent Fun Day in an educational setting: An empirical enquiry drawing on psychological type theory

Leslie J Francis*

University of Warwick, UK

Greg Smith

University of Warwick, UK

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

This study draws on one of the four components of psychological type theory (the distinction between judging and perceiving attitudes toward the outside world) to examine the implications of these two contrasting psychological perspectives for shaping approaches to Christian ministry within an educational setting. Qualitative data were generated by two samples of clergy (comprising training incumbents and curates) serving in one diocese of the Church of England, and who completed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (N = 15, 22). On each occasion three education groups were structured, distinguishing between high scoring perceiving types, high scoring judging types, and low scoring perceiving and low scoring judging types working together. The three groups were all asked to address the same task: to imagine, design and plan an Advent Fun Day for the parish and benefice. The data illustrated the distinction between the organised approach to designing a Christian event modelled by the judging types and the visionary approach to designing a Christian event modelled by the perceiving types. The implications of these findings are discussed for designing educational programmes to help clergy appreciate the connection between psychological type preferences and ministry styles.

Keywords: Psychological type, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, clergy, religion, practical theology

Introduction

Psychological type theory distinguishes between two fundamental psychological processes (Jung, 1971). One psychological process concerns the ways in which we gather information. This is the *perceiving* process or the process concerned with perception. Jung describes this as the irrational process since it is not making decisions or judgements about things. The other psychological process concerns the ways in which we make decisions. This is the *judging* process or the process concerned with evaluation. Jung describes this as the rational process. Jung's theory of individual differences is that each of these two processes may be expressed in two distinctive and contrasting ways. In terms of the perceiving process, some people prefer *sensing* (S), while others prefer *intuition* (N). According to the theory these two types of people look at the world in very different ways. In terms of the judging process, some people prefer *thinking* (T), while others prefer *feeling* (F). According to the theory these two types of people come to decisions about the world in very different ways.

A great deal of the theoretical interest in and practical application from psychological type theory for Christian living and for Christian ministry is grounded in the four psychological functions: the two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) and the two judging functions (thinking and feeling). For example, it is the distinctive characteristics of these four functions that form the theoretical foundations for the SIFT approach to biblical hermeneutics and liturgical preaching (Francis & Village, 2008). The theory of type dynamics, however, takes the account of individual differences one step beyond the consideration of the four functions to take into account the orientation in which these functions are employed.

Psychological type theory distinguishes between the two orientations of introversion and extraversion. Introversion is concerned with the inner world and the life of the individual in the inner world, while extraversion is concerned with the outer world and the life of the

individual in the outer world. According to the theory, individuals employ either their preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) or their preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) in the outer world. Then as a consequence their other preferred function is employed in the inner world. For extraverts their strongest, or dominant function is employed in the outer world, leaving their second or auxiliary function to serve in the inner world. For introverts their strongest or dominant function is employed in the inner world, leaving their second or auxiliary function to serve in the outer world. What is key in shaping type dynamics is not whether the function employed in the outer world is the dominant or the auxiliary function, but whether it is a perceiving function or a judging function. Those who employ a judging function (thinking or feeling) in the outer world are characterised as judging types (J). Those who employ a perceiving function (sensing or intuition) in the outer world are characterised as perceiving types (P). This distinction between judging types and perceiving types provide descriptions of some very clear differences in approaches to life that may have clear implications for approaches to Christian ministry and practical theology.

According to psychological type theory, individuals who prefer to relate to the outer world with a judging function present a planned and orderly approach to life. Judging types schedule projects so that each step gets done on time. They like to get things finished and settled, and to know that the finished product is in place. They work best when they can plan their work in advance and follow that plan. Judging types use lists and agendas to structure their day and to plan their actions. They may dislike interruption from the plans they have made and are reluctant to leave the task in hand even when something more urgent arises. Judging types tend to be satisfied once they reach a judgement or have made a decision, both about people and things. They dislike having to revise their decision and taking fresh information into account. They like to get on with a task as soon as possible once the

essential things are at hand. As a consequence, judging types may decide to act too quickly. They want to move toward closure, even when the data are incomplete.

According to psychological type theory, individuals who prefer to relate to the outer world with a perceiving function present a flexible and spontaneous approach to life. Perceiving types adapt well to changing situations. They make allowances for new information and for changes in the situation in which they are living or acting. They may have trouble making decisions, feeling that they have never quite got enough information on which to base their decision. Perceiving types may start too many projects and consequently have difficulty in finishing them. They may tend to postpone unpleasant tasks and to give their attention to more pleasant options. Perceiving types want to know all about a new task before they begin it, and may prefer to postpone something while they continue to explore the options. When perceiving types use lists they do so not as a way of organizing the details of their day, but as a way of seeing the possibilities in front of them. They may choose never to act on these possibilities. Perceiving types do not mind leaving things open for last minute changes. They work best under pressure and get a lot accomplished at the last minute under the constraints of a deadline. They adopt an open-minded attitude toward life and resist closure to obtain more data.

Psychological type and scientific enquiry

While psychological type theory has its roots in Jung's theoretical extrapolation from clinical observation, it has been anchored more recently within the empirical field of the individual differences approach to psychology. This development has rested on the construction of a series of psychometric instruments designed to operationalise the core theoretical constructs of psychological type theory. The three measures of psychological type best known and best established within the broader field of the individual differences approach to the psychology of religion are the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers &

McCaulley, 1985), the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978) and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). The developing science of psychological type rests on empirical data designed to explore three major issues.

The first issue concerns reliability. All psychological tests need to demonstrate that the measurements they record can be trusted. The three tests employed to establish reliability are test-retest reliability, split half reliability, and internal consistency reliability. Data exists for the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator on all three types of reliability (see Carskadon, 1977; Bents and Wierschke, 1996; Harvey, 1996; Francis & Jones, 1999). The data conclude that the continuous scale scores generated by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator achieve a high level of internal consistency reliability. The test-retest reliability from the sixteen complete types is less satisfactory. In other words type indicators may be more effective at grading individuals on the underlying continua than assigning individuals to discrete type categories.

The second issue concerns validity. All psychological tests need to demonstrate that they actually measure what they purport to measure. A reliable measuring instrument is of little use if there remains uncertainty about the validity of its measurements. The three forms of validity testing generally recognised are reference validity, concurrent validity and construct validity. Data on all three forms of validity are available for the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Reference validity has been established by the correlation between scale scores and self-designation (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). Concurrent validity has been established by the correlation between scores recorded on different instruments purporting to assess the same constructs, say the concurrent validity between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2007), or the concurrent validity between the Myers Biggs Type Indicator and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, both of which contain measures of extraversion (Francis & Jones, 2000; Francis, Craig, & Robbins, 2007). Construct validity has been established by testing the predicted association between

psychological type and other outcomes. For example, Ross and Francis (2015) confirmed the predicted association between psychological type and mystical orientation. Walker (2015) confirmed the predicted association between psychological type and religious orientation.

The third issue concerns the scientific utility of psychological type theory in illuminating matters of psychological interest within applied fields. Specifically within the context of Christian ministry, studies have begun to explore the implications of psychological type preferences for professional clergy (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007; Francis, Robbins, Duncan, & Whinney, 2010; Francis, Robbins, & Whinney, 2011), for ordained local ministry (Francis, Robbins, & Jones, 2012; Francis & Village, 2012), for bishops (Francis, Whinney, & Robbins, 2013), and for congregations (Francis, Robbins, Williams, & Williams, 2007; Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011). The present study builds on that tradition.

Psychological type and theological enquiry

While psychological type theory is rooted in psychological science and the psychology of individual differences, it has been adapted more recently within a Christian anthropology in the context of the notion of a theology of individual difference. The theology of individual difference is rooted by Francis and Village (2008) within the framework of systematic theology that distinguishes between those aspects of individual differences that can be legitimately located within the doctrine of creation (reflecting the divine image of the creator) and those aspects of individual differences that can be legitimately located within the doctrine of the fall (and consequently are subject to the saving grace of Christ). Drawing on Genesis 1: 27 they locate psychological type differences, alongside sex differences and ethnic differences, as properly reflecting the diversity within the divine image. In this sense both introverts and extraverts, both sensing types and intuitive types, both feeling types and thinking types, and both judging types and perceiving types, like both men and women,

reflect what God intends them to be. On this account introverts should not be expected to repent and become extraverts any more than women should be expected to repent and become men. While the saving grace of Christ may transform pride into humility, similar transformation may not be expected from introversion into extraversion. Recasting psychological type theory within the context of the theology of individual differences places a theological emphasis on tracing the connection between psychological type preferences and, say, the exercise of Christian ministry. It may be a mistake for the church to privilege, say, an introverted approach to ministry over an extraverted approach to ministry, or *vice versa*, a sensing approach to ministry over an intuitive approach to ministry or *vice versa*, a feeling approach to ministry over a thinking approach to ministry, or *vice versa*, a judging approach to ministry over a perceiving approach to ministry or *vice versa*. The present paper develops this issue specifically in respect of differences between judging and perceiving approaches to ministry.

Perceiving and judging types in Christian ministry

Although both judging types and perceiving types have a clear place in Christian ministry, current empirical data, at least within the United Kingdom, suggest that judging types are over-represented among clergy and religious leaders, in the sense that there are higher proportions of judging types in ministry roles than in the UK population as a whole. According to Kendal (1998), within the UK population as a whole 55% of men prefer judging. The proportions look somewhat different among those engaged in Christian ministry. For example, among Church of England clergymen, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) and Francis, Robbins, Duncan, and Whinney (2010) found 68% and 73% preferred judging respectively.

In a quantitative study, Francis and Payne (2002) tested the hypothesis that judging types and perceiving types may conceptualise ministry in quite distinctive ways. Within the

context of the development of the Payne Index of Ministry Styles (PIMS), Francis and Payne characterised judging types as expressing their preferred approach to ministry through the following items:

- In my parish work I like to plan things down to the last detail.
- Any changes in the parish should be carefully planned.
- I like services to be well thought out in advance.
- I prefer to run my parish according to a strict schedule.
- I think things should be kept in order in church.
- Good leadership involves good planning in church.
- I usually list things that need to be done each day in the parish.

In contrast with the judging preference, in the development of the Payne Index of Ministry Styles (PIMS), Francis and Payne characterised perceiving types as expressing their preferred approach to ministry through the following items:

- I like to be flexible in worship not tied always to time and order.
- I enjoy having variety and unplanned stimulation in ministry.
- I enjoy new and unexpected experiences in my ministry.
- I enjoy being spontaneous in services.
- In my ministry I enjoy having my routine disturbed.
- Freedom is an important aspect of ministry for me.
- I like the unpredictability of pastoral ministry.

Drawing on data provided by 191 clergymen serving in the Church in Wales, Francis and Payne (2002) found that these two distinctive sets of items cohered to produce two homogenous scales. The scale of judging ministry style produced an alpha coefficient of .79, and the scale of perceiving ministry style produced an alpha coefficient of .79. Moreover, there was a correlation of .60 between the scale of judging ministry style and judging scores

recorded on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI: Myers & McCaulley, 1985), and there was a correlation of .57 between the scale of perceiving ministry style and perceiving scores recorded on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. These statistics support the hypothesis that judging types and perceiving types express and experience ministry in different and distinctive ways.

Research question

The aim of the present study is to complement the quantitative research design implemented by Francis and Payne (2002) by means of a qualitative study among clergy. The research model for the present study has been provided by a series of recent qualitative studies that have explored preferences for sensing or intuition and preferences for thinking or feeling within the context of biblical hermeneutics and preaching styles. These studies have employed type-alike groups to draw out type preferences in these areas (see Francis, 2010, 2012a, 2012b, 2013; Francis & Jones, 2011, 2014; Francis & Smith, 2012, 2013). The contexts for these studies have often been workshops within residential training events or seminars for serving clergy.

Against this background, the present study has designed a workshop activity capable of highlighting the distinctive approaches within a specific aspect of Christian ministry preferred by judging types and perceiving types through offering opportunities for both structure and flexibility, and for both organisation and vision.

Method

Procedure

In the context of two residential programmes designed for training incumbents and their curates (the first conducted during November 2012 and the second conducted during November 2013), the participants were invited to complete a recognised measure of psychological type and to experience working in groups structured on the basis of

psychological type theory. The activity related to the groups structured on the basis of preferences for judging and perceiving was as follows: Imagine, design and plan an Advent Fun Day for the parish and benefice. They were advised that they should make the exercise as real world as possible, producing a blueprint that could actually be used in their home parish context.

Measure

Psychological type was assessed by the 126-item Form G (Anglicised) of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). This instrument uses a force-choice questionnaire format to indicate preferences between the two orientations (extraversion or introversion), the two perceiving functions (sensing or intuition), the two judging functions (feeling or thinking), and the two attitudes (judging or perceiving). The preference between introversion and extraversion is assessed by questions like: When you are with a group of people, would you rather: a) join in the talk of the group (extraversion), or b) talk with one person at a time (introversion)? The preference between sensing and intuition is assessed by questions like: Would you rather have as a friend: a) someone who is always coming up with new ideas (intuition), or b) someone who has both feet on the ground (sensing)? The preference between feeling and thinking is assessed by questions like: Do you more often let: a) your heart rule your head (feeling), or b) your head rule your heart (thinking)? The preference between judging and perceiving is assessed by questions like: When you go somewhere for the day, would you rather: a) plan what you will do and when (judging), or b) just go (perceiving)? Broad support for the reliability and validity of the instrument is provided in the international literature as summarised by Francis and Jones (1999) who additionally demonstrated the stability of the scale properties of the instrument among a sample of 429 adult churchgoers. In another study among 863 Anglican clergy, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) reported the following alpha coefficients:

extraversion, .80; introversion, .79; sensing, .87; intuition, .82; thinking, .79; feeling, .72; judging, .85; perceiving, .86.

Analysis

The workshops were observed by the course leaders. The participants were asked to make careful notes of their discussion and to feedback to the plenary session. It is these observations, written texts and spoken presentations (carefully noted by the course leaders) that provide the data for analysis. The results section of the article present a summary of the written and spoken presentations in order to allow the different perspectives emphasised by the groups to become clearly visible.

Study one

Participants

The programme was attended by six sets of training incumbents and their curates, together with three curates unaccompanied by their training incumbent. The group of 15 participants comprised 8 women and 7 men. Profiles provided by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator identified dichotomous preference in a group characterised by preference for extraversion (8) over introversion (7), preference for intuition (10) over sensing (5), preference for feeling (10) over thinking (5), and preference for judging (8) over perceiving (7). The 16 complete types show that the most frequently represented type was ENFP (3). The complete data on the psychological type profile of this group of 15 clergy is presented in table 1

- insert table 1 about here -

For this activity the participants were divided into three groups: the first group consisted of six high scoring judging types (53, 47, 41, 39, 35, 35); the second group consisted of four high scoring perceiving types (51, 29, 11, 11); and the third group consisted of two lower scoring judging types (13, 9) and three lower scoring perceiving types (7, 3, 1).

Results

The group of *high scoring perceiving types* were immediately at the seaside on the beach. They acknowledged the need to prepare for all eventualities and to accommodate all ages. Recognising a theme of journeying, they wanted each participant to have a different experience on the journey, prompting reflection on the advent theme of unexpected events. One individual wanted to take people away from the Christmas shopping, but there was much emphasis on the need for a variety of options. Eventually, the beach was deemed to be unrealistic, and the group began to imagine a day spent at the cathedral, with an ice skating option at the nearby rink for children and shopping for adults. The cathedral, they supposed, might be set up for advent; and there could be opportunity for a craft activity making lanterns, a visit to the refectory or a visit to the chapel for worship and prayer, possibly in darkness. One member then worried that the local cathedral might be over familiar to participants and other cathedrals slightly further afield were all considered as possible alternatives. At this point, one member said that he found the whole exercise uncomfortable, professing himself highly frustrated that a plan had been arrived at so quickly. In response, the group turned over their piece of flip chart paper and began again; on this occasion devising a day around a posada (a Christian festival originating in Latin America) using real people. They considered the exercise to be broad brush stroke and great fun.

The group of *high scoring judging types* methodically composed a timetable for their fun day. The group were clear about the date and venue for the day. The group considered details such as the length of the lunch interval, but such debates were resolved in a matter of a very few seconds. They went on to identify which songs would be sung, which resources would be used for storytelling, which craft activities would be offered and what food would be available. Significantly, as the group began to plan the afternoon, there was a recognition that the morning's activities had been aimed exclusively at children, with whom it appeared

they associated 'fun'; and one member declared how much she would personally hate the whole thing. Thereafter, the group began to plan a quiet afternoon, with plenty of detail inserted, including the provision of iPods and headphones and a precise timetable to govern the afternoon. The group wrote down titles 'imagine' and 'design', although the word 'fun' was deleted from the tile to be replaced by 'preparation'.

The third group, which consisted of a mix of perceiving types and judging types oscillated between planning and imagining. At the instigation of one of the judging persons, they moved quite quickly to decide on a single event; but some of the perceiving members of the group were not daunted and much later introduced completely new ideas, including the possibility of inviting the *Military Wives Choir*. The response of the judging types was to plan the publicity and to negotiate who would e-mail Gareth Malone. The group, which is more likely to be typical of a church planning group or indeed any planning group, by virtue of its mix of perceiving types and judging types, designed a treasure hunt, with clues in local shop windows. A date was set, a publicity strategy outlined, suitable refreshments identified, a venue determined and the opportunity to publicise Christmas services noted. Although there was a degree of conflict in the group, they appeared to thrive on working together and were closest to producing an Advent day that was both fun and deliverable.

Study two

Participants

The programme was attended by nine sets of training incumbents and their curates, together with three curates unaccompanied by their training incumbent and one incumbent unaccompanied by his curate. The group of 22 participants comprised 5 women and 17 men. Profiles provided by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator identified dichotomous preferences in a group characterised by preference for introversion (15) over extraversion (7), preference for intuition (13) over sensing (9), preference for feeling (12) over thinking (10), and for judging

(13) over perceiving (9). The 16 complete types show that the most frequently represented types were ISTJ (4), INFJ (3), INFP (3), and ENFP (3). The complete data on the psychological type profile of this group of 22 clergy is presented in table 2

- insert table 2 about here -

For this activity the participants were divided into three groups: the first group consisted of seven high scoring judging types (51, 47, 41, 39, 39, 31, 25); the second group consisted of seven high scoring perceiving types (61, 51, 43, 39, 25, 19, 11); and the third group consisted of six lower scoring judging types (23, 13, 9, 9, 5, 5) and two lower scoring perceiving types (9, 5).

Results

The group of *high scoring perceiving types* spent the first ten minutes of the exercise reflecting on how annoying they find the need to have to plan things too far in advance. One voice said that it was far too early to plan an Advent event since Advent did not begin until the following Sunday. Another voice said that she works hard against her type preferences to plan things in advance, but that this is exhausting for her. Once this preliminary issue had been fully aired, ideas began to flow and to flow quickly. Two big ideas caught hold of the imagination: the first idea was light and dark, and the second idea was waiting. These were the main themes of advent.

The idea of light and dark sparked the suggestion of making lanterns and arranging a lantern parade. There could be lanterns, candles and a huge bonfire. It could all take place outside, with a barbeque or a hog roast, and with a meal around the bonfire. The lantern parade could be supported by the community choir, by a school choir, and by a band; although the parade might be more effective in silence. The Women's Institute and the Scouts could be involved. The idea of light and dark could be enriched by Advent wreaths, by gathering greenery and making wreaths, by making candles to place in the wreaths.

The idea of waiting really caught the imagination. All sorts of activities could be arranged for which participants had to learn to wait. One voice could negotiate a good deal on a bouncy castle, and keep people waiting before getting access to it. Another voice proposed preparing a slow meal, waiting for the hog roast, with everyone engaged in the preparation, and growing hungrier by the minute.

There was considerable uncertainty regarding when the event should be held, but this uncertainty never deterred enthusiasm. There was also considerable uncertainty about the detailed management of the event, but this could be left in the capable hands of the parish administrator who was currently employed four hours each week to manage this kind of thing. The lantern procession could be left in the hands of the Scouts, the music could be left in the hands of the music department of the school, and the catering could be left in the hands of the Women's Institute.

Overall the idea of an Advent Fun Day appealed to the group of high scoring perceiving types.

The group of *high scoring judging types* spent the first ten minutes of the exercise criticising the very notion of an Advent Fun Day. Advent is traditionally a season of waiting, of penitence and of preparation, in which there is no room for a Fun Day. This stumbling block was only removed by agreeing to change the name of the proposed event to Advent Activity Day. Eventually, after a rather slow start, one individual frustrated by the lack of progress strode to the flip chart and summarily devised an agenda for the discussion. The group continued to protest that planning should have begun at least two if not three months earlier, but eventually turned their attention to the proposed agenda. This done, decisions were quickly made with relatively little debate. The audience for the day would be Messy Church; the date would be as close to Advent Sunday as possible (noting that things have a 'proper place'); the location would be the Parish Hall (as opposed to the church) and

activities would include: Christingle, Advent calendars, Godly play story, a chill out tent with luminous stars on its roof, and candle making. Advent food would be supplied e.g. mince pies with the tops missing to highlight incompleteness without Jesus return. The group, having had the slowest of starts, finished the activity with ten minutes to spare. Once feedback had been given to the whole group, one member of high judging group took the flip chart summary away to use in the parish.

Conclusion

This study was designed to test the thesis that judging types and perceiving types bring different gifts and different skills to an aspect of Christian ministry, at least as explored in an educational setting. The thesis was tested by designing a workshop activity capable of highlighting the distinctive approaches of judging types and perceiving types posited by psychological type theory. The workshop was intended to offer opportunities for both structure and flexibility, and for both organisation and vision. In this workshop activity participants were invited to work in type-alike groups: one group of high scoring judging types, one group of high scoring perceiving types, and one group drawing together lower scoring judging types and lower scoring perceiving types. Within this context the participants were tasked as follows: Imagine, design and plan an Advent Fun Day for the parish and benefice. They were advised that they should make the exercises as real world as possible, producing a blueprint that could be used in their home parish context. Three main conclusions emerge from the data generated from this workshop activity.

The first and main conclusion is that the different groups behaved true to type. The perceiving types working together enjoyed the exercise and would no doubt have carried on for much longer and potentially imagined brand new schemes. The very act of calling time closed down possibilities. By the time feedback was required, only an outline idea had been identified. In contrast, the judging types working together were evidently mindful of the

deadline to which they were working and worked methodically to ensure that the planning was complete by the time of feedback. While their plan was ostensibly effective, there was little energy or enthusiasm for its implementation. Finally, the third group of mixed perceiving types and judging types, struck a creative balance. The judging types kept the group to task, while the perceiving types were unafraid to introduce new ideas even as the deadline approached. It is conceivable that the artificial nature of the exercise enabled the judging types to be more tolerant of these last minute additions.

The second conclusion is that the voice of psychological type may be heard most clearly in this kind of educational context when real world consequences emerge from the exercise. In the context of a training programme, it is difficult to allow sufficient time to create an exercise that is entirely authentic. It may be possible to develop the exercise by forewarning participants in the weeks before the course in order to investigate the extent to which judging types will pre-plan and whether perceiving types will delay serious thinking until their arrival. Moreover, placing more emphasis on the feedback presentation, with the opportunity to prepare a fuller multi-media presentation that is subject to peer assessment might introduce further real world pressure to the exercise. It is nonetheless significant that such visible type differences emerged in spite of the artificial nature of the context.

The third conclusion is that perceiving types and judging types need each other for the effective design and planning of significant events within the context of an educational exercise of this nature. Judging types bring method and a sense of planning to the process, while perceiving types refuse to rule out fresh inspiration just because a plan has been set. Judging types respond to the urgency of the event much further in advance to ensure those factors that need advance preparation are adequately attended to, while perceiving types are not panicked by the approach of the deadline.

If the insights generated within this educational setting can be translated into the real context of church ministry, church planning groups are commended consciously to ensure both types are available to their planning committees. At the same time, however, planning groups that bring judging types and perceiving types together really do need to allow opportunity for discussing and for respecting the differences brought to process by these two distinctive perspectives. Drawing together organised and visionary approaches to Christian ministry may, in an uninformed environment, generate as much conflict as creativity.

References

- Bents, R., & Wierschke, A. (1996). Test-retest reliability of the Myers-Briggs Typenindikator. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 36, 42-46.
- Carskadon, T.G. (1977). Test-retest reliabilities of continuous scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicato. *Psychological Reports*, 41, 1011-1012.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2010). Five loaves and two fishes: An empirical study in psychological type and biblical hermeneutics among Anglican preachers. *HTS Theological Studies*.66(1) art. #811, 1-5.
- Francis, L. J. (2012a). What happened to the fig tree? An empirical study in psychological type and biblical hermeneutics, *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 873-891.
- Francis, L. J. (2012b). Interpreting and responding to the Johannine feeding narrative: An empirical study in the SIFT hermeneutical method among Anglican ministry training candidates, *HTS Theological Studies*, 68(1) art. #1205, 1-9.
- Francis, L. J. (2013). Ordinary readers and reader perspective on sacred texts: Drawing on empirical theology and Jungian psychology. In J. Astley and L. J. Francis (Eds.), *Exploring ordinary theology: Dimensions of everyday Christian existence and the life of the Church* (pp. 87-96). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Francis, L. J., Craig C. L., & Robbins, M. (2007). The relationship between psychological type and three major dimensions of personality. *Current Psychology*, 25, 257-271.
- 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., & Jones, S. H. (1999). The scale properties of the MBTI Form G (Anglicised) among adult churchgoers. *Pastoral Sciences, 18*, 107-126.
- Francis, L. J., & Jones, S. H. (2000). The relationship between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire among adult churchgoers. *Pastoral Psychology, 48*, 377-386.
- Francis, L. J., & Jones, S. H. (2011). Reading and proclaiming the resurrection: an empirical study in psychological type theory among trainee and experienced preachers employing Mark 16 and Matthew 28. *Journal of Empirical Theology, 24*, 1-18.
- Francis, L. J. & Jones, S. H. (2014). Life in the eucharistic community: An empirical study in psychological type theory and biblical hermeneutics reading John 6: 5-15. *Pastoral Psychology, 63*, 281-290.
- Francis, L. J. & Payne, V. J. (2002). The Payne Index of Ministry Styles (PIMS): Ministry styles and psychological type among male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 13*, 125-141.
- 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. Degregorio (Ed.), *New Developments in Psychological Testing* (pp 119-138). New York: Nova Science Publishers Inc.
- 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., Duncan, B., & Whinney, M. (2010). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in England: A ministry for intuitives. In B. Ruelas and V. Briseno (Eds.), *Psychology of intuition* (pp. 211-219). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Jones, S. H. (2012). The psychological type profile of clergywomen in ordained local ministry in the Church of England: Pioneers or custodians? *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 945-953.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Whinney, M. (2011). Women priests in the Church of England: Psychological type profile. *Religions*, 2, 389-397.
- 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., & Smith, G. (2012). Separating sheep from goats: Using psychological type theory in a preaching workshop on Matthew 25: 31-46. *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, 9, 175-191.
- Francis, L. J., & Smith, G. (2013). Reading and proclaiming the Birth Narratives from Luke and Matthew: A study in empirical theology among curates and their training incumbents employing the SIFT method. *HTS Theological Studies*, 69(1), article 2001, 1-13.
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2008). *Preaching with all our souls*. London: Continuum.
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2012). The psychological temperament of Anglican clergy in ordained local ministry (OLM): The conserving, serving pastor? *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 25, 57-76.
- Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., & Robbins, M. Who is called to be a bishop? (2013). A study in psychological type profiling of bishops in the Church of England. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 34, 135-151.
- Harvey, R. J. (1996). Reliability and validity. In A. L. Hammer (Ed.), *MBTI Applications: A decade of research on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (pp 5-29). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

- 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.
- 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.
- Ross, C., & Francis, L. J. The perceiving process and mystical orientation: A study in psychological type theory among 16- to 18-year-old students. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*.
- Walker, D. S. (2014). Unsettling the guardian: Quest religiosity and psychological type among Anglican churchgoers. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture* (pages not yet available).

Table 1

Type distribution of clergy for study one

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 1 (6.7%) +++++ ++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 1 (6.7%) +++++ ++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 1 (6.7%) +++++ ++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 1 (6.7%) +++++ ++	E <i>n</i> = 8 (53.3%)	I <i>n</i> = 7 (46.7%)	
				S <i>n</i> = 5 (33.3%)	N <i>n</i> = 10 (66.7%)	
				T <i>n</i> = 5 (33.3%)	F <i>n</i> = 10 (66.7%)	
				J <i>n</i> = 8 (53.3%)	P <i>n</i> = 7 (46.7%)	
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	ISFP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	INFP <i>n</i> = 2 (13.3%) +++++ +++++ +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 1 (6.7%) +++++ ++	Pairs and Temperaments		
				IJ <i>n</i> = 4 (26.7%)	IP <i>n</i> = 3 (20.0%)	EP <i>n</i> = 4 (26.7%)
				EJ <i>n</i> = 4 (26.7%)		
				ST <i>n</i> = 2 (13.3%)	SF <i>n</i> = 3 (20.0%)	NF <i>n</i> = 7 (46.7%)
				NT <i>n</i> = 3 (20.0%)		
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	ESFP <i>n</i> = 1 (6.7%) +++++ ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 3 (20.0%) +++++ +++++ +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	SJ <i>n</i> = 4 (26.7%)	SP <i>n</i> = 1 (6.7%)	NP <i>n</i> = 6 (40.0%)
				NJ <i>n</i> = 4 (26.7%)		
				TJ <i>n</i> = 4 (26.7%)	TP <i>n</i> = 1 (6.7%)	FP <i>n</i> = 6 (40.0%)
				FJ <i>n</i> = 4 (26.7%)		
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 1 (6.7%) +++++ ++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 1 (6.7%) +++++ ++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 1 (6.7%) +++++ ++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = (6.7%) +++++ ++	IN <i>n</i> = 5 (33.3%)	EN <i>n</i> = 5 (33.3%)	IS <i>n</i> = 2 (13.3%)
				ES <i>n</i> = 3 (20.0%)		
				ET <i>n</i> = 2 (13.3%)	EF <i>n</i> = 6 (40.0%)	IF <i>n</i> = 4 (26.7%)
				IT <i>n</i> = 3 (20.0%)		

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%
E-TJ	2	13.3	I-TP	1	6.7	Dt.T	3	20.0
E-FJ	2	13.3	I-FP	2	13.3	Dt.F	4	26.7
ES-P	1	6.7	IS-J	2	13.3	Dt.S	3	20.0
EN-P	3	20.0	IN-J	2	13.3	Dt.N	5	33.3

Note: N = 15 (NB: + = 1% of N)

Table 2

Type distribution of clergy for study two

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

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%
E-TJ	2	9.1	I-TP	2	9.1	Dt.T	4	18.2
E-FJ	1	4.5	I-FP	3	13.6	Dt.F	4	18.2
ES-P	0	0.0	IS-J	6	27.3	Dt.S	6	27.3
EN-P	4	18.2	IN-J	4	18.2	Dt.N	8	36.4

Note: N = 22 (NB: + = 1% of N)