



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): Bruce G. Fawcett, Leslie J. Francis, and Mandy Robbins

Article Title: Psychological Type Profile Of Religiously Committed Male And Female Canadian Baptist Youth: A Study Among Participants At Tidal Impact

Year of publication: 2009

Link to published version:

<http://www.aymeducators.org/?form=JYMAbstracts&issue=Fall%202009>

Publisher statement: None



PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE PROFILE OF RELIGIOUSLY COMMITTED MALE AND FEMALE CANADIAN BAPTIST YOUTH: A STUDY AMONG PARTICIPANTS AT TIDAL IMPACT

*Bruce G. Fawcett, Leslie J. Francis, and Mandy Robbins**

Introduction

A rapidly growing body of international research has been applying Jungian psychological type theory to profile the distinctive psychological characteristics of those drawn to ordained Christian ministry within a variety of church traditions and denominational strands. Within the broader context of practical theology and ministry studies there are two main benefits from this field of empirical research. On the one hand, the research data help to illuminate the psychological appeal of ordained ministry. On the other hand, the data help to define the psychological gap that may exist between those who respond to the call to ministry and the broader population from which they are drawn.

Psychological type theory has its roots in the observations of Carl Jung as documented in his classic volume *Psychological Types* (1971). The theory has also been developed and extended by a series of self-completion psychological tests, 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).

The core of Jung's theory resides in the identification of two key psychological processes, generally defined as the perceiving process and as the judging process. The perceiving process is concerned with the gathering of information. Jung terms this the irrational process, since it is not concerned with evaluating or applying the information. The judging process is concerned with the evaluation and application of information. Jung terms this the rational process. The genius of Jung's theory resides in the insight that each of these processes can be reflected in two opposing functions. Jung's own creativity was inspired by the interplay of opposing forces and opposing perspectives, and many of his contemporary

*Bruce G. Fawcett, PhD, serves as Associate Professor of Leadership at Acadia Divinity College, Acadia University in Wolfville, Nova Scotia. Leslie J. Francis, PhD, serves as Professor of Religions and Education and Mandy Robbins, PhD, serves as Senior Research Fellow at the University of Warwick in Coventry, England.

disciples anchor this notion of polarity within the common human experience of handedness. Although equipped with two hands, the majority of people tend naturally to prefer one over the other; they tend to develop the skills of one hand and neglect comparatively the development of the other hand. Jung's basic theory suggests that a similar tendency pertains to psychological functions.

The two functions of the perceiving process are defined as sensing and as intuition. People who prefer and develop sensing gather information by focusing on the facts of a situation, relying on and trusting their five senses. Sensing types tend to focus on the facts of a situation. They begin with the specific details rather than with the overall picture. They are concerned with the actual, the real, and the practical. They tend to be down to earth and matter of fact. They may feel that particular details are more significant than general patterns, and they prefer to stay with the traditional and with the conventional. They tend to be reluctant to trust their hunches, to resist following inspiration, and to stay with the known rather than the unknown. They tend to live for today rather than for tomorrow. In contrast, people who prefer and develop intuition gather information by focusing on wider meanings and relationships, using their imagination and their ability to draw disparate insights together. Intuitive types tend to focus on the overall picture rather than on specific facts or details. They follow their inspirations with enthusiasm, if not always with realism, and they tend to be attracted to ideals, to possibilities, and to long-term goals. They often aspire to bring about innovative change and to challenge established conventions. They tend to live for tomorrow rather than for today.

Aspects of the Christian tradition and aspects of ordained clerical leadership may appeal to sensers (say, the clear connection with tradition and unchangeable eternal truths), and to intuitives (say, the promise of a dawning kingdom and the ideals of God's reign). According to Kendall (1998), in the UK population as a whole, 73% of men and 79% of women prefer sensing, leaving just 23% of men and 21% of women who prefer intuition. In their study of 626 Anglican clergymen and 237 Anglican clergywomen, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater (2007) found a very different profile with 62% of the clergymen and 65% of the clergywomen preferring intuition. Such data suggest that the call to ordained ministry (at least in the Church of England) is recognized much more frequently by intuitive types rather than by sensing types.

Although levels of preference for intuition vary from one study to another, the majority of studies clearly demonstrate a higher proportion of intuitive types among clergymen than among men in general. Compared with 27% of men in the UK population, preferences for intuition were displayed, for example, by: 43% of

Anglican clergymen in Wales (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001); 47% of male evangelical church leaders in England (Francis & Robbins, 2002); 49% of Roman Catholic priests in the UK (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006); and 51% of male youth ministers in the UK (Francis, Nash, Nash, & Craig, 2007).

The two functions of the judging process are defined as thinking and feeling. People who prefer and develop thinking make decisions by using objective, analytical logic. Thinking types value integrity and justice, and they are often recognized for their truthfulness and for their desire for fairness. They consider standing by principles to be of more importance than cultivating harmony. They are often good at making difficult decisions since they are able to analyze problems to reach an unbiased and reasoned solution. When working with others, they may consider it to be more important to be honest and correct than to be tactful. They strive for truth rather than for peace. In contrast, people who prefer and develop feeling make decisions by using subjective personal values and taking interpersonal relationships into account. Feeling types value compassion and mercy, and they are often recognized for their tactfulness and for their desire for peace. They are more concerned to promote harmony, than to adhere to abstract principles. They may be thought of as "people persons" since they are able to take into account other people's feelings and values in decision-making and in problem-solving, trying to reach a solution that satisfies everyone. They may find it difficult to criticize others, even when it is necessary to do so. They find it easy to empathize with other people, and they tend to be trusting and encouraging of others.

Aspects of the Christian tradition and aspects of ordained clerical leadership may appeal to thinkers (say, the theology of a God of justice), or to feelers (say, the theology of a God of mercy). According to Kendall (1998), in the UK population as a whole, preferences for thinking and for feeling are strongly related to sex difference. In the UK population as a whole, thinking is preferred by 65% of men and by 30% of women; feeling is preferred by 35% of men and by 70% of women. In their study of 626 Anglican clergymen and 237 Anglican clergywomen, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater (2007) found that clergywomen reflected the preference of women in the UK population: 74% of clergywomen preferred feeling and 26% preferred thinking. The situation among clergymen was, however, quite different from the population norms: 54% of clergymen preferred feeling and 47% preferred thinking. Such data suggest that the call to ordained ministry (at least in the Church of England) is recognized more frequently by feeling types than by thinking types, and may be associated with a feminine rather than with a masculine personality profile in terms of the judging process.

Although levels of preference for feeling vary from one study to another, the majority of studies clearly demonstrate a higher proportion of feeling types among clergymen than among men in general. Compared with 35% of men in the UK population, preferences for feeling were displayed, for example, by: 69% of Anglican clergymen in Wales (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001); 56% of male evangelical church leaders in England (Francis & Robbins, 2002); 79% of Roman Catholic priests in the UK (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006); and 55% of male youth ministers in the UK (Francis, Nash, & Craig, 2007).

Alongside the two key psychological processes of perceiving (sensing and intuition) and judging (thinking and feeling) psychological type theory also distinguishes between two orientations and two attitudes toward the outer world. The orientations are concerned with the source and focus of psychological energy. The attitudes toward the outer world are concerned with identifying the preferred spheres in which the preferred perceiving process (either sensing or intuition) and the preferred judging process (either thinking or feeling) are exercised.

The two orientations are defined as extraversion and introversion. Extraverts focus their energy on, and gain their energy from, the outside world of people and things. They enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and exciting environments. They prefer to act in a situation rather than to reflect on it and tend to vocalize a problem or an idea rather than think it through privately. They may be bored and frustrated by silence and solitude. They tend to focus their attention on what is happening outside themselves. They are usually open people, and easy to get to know. They enjoy having many friends. In contrast, introverts focus their energy on and gain energy from their inner world of ideas and reflections. They may feel drained by events and people around them, and they prefer to reflect on a situation for some considerable time before acting on it. They enjoy solitude, silence, and contemplation, and they tend to focus their attention on what is happening in their inner life. They may appear reserved, detached, and difficult to get to know. They may prefer to have a small circle of intimate friends, rather than many acquaintances.

Aspects of the Christian tradition and aspects of ordained clerical leadership may appeal to extraverts (say, the sense of Christian fellowship), and to introverts (say, the inward spiritual life). According to Kendall (1998), in the UK population as a whole, women are more likely to prefer extraversion (57% compared with 47% of men), while men are more likely to prefer introversion (53% compared with 43% of women). In their study of 626 Anglican clergymen and 237 Anglican clergywomen, Francis, Craig, Whinney,

Tilley, & Slater (2007) found that clergymen followed the population norms with 57% preferring introversion and 43% preferring extraversion. Clergywomen, on the other hand, were closer to the male than to the female population norms with 54% preferring introversion and 46% preferring extraversion.

The two attitudes toward the outer world are defined as judging and perceiving. Judging types use their preferred judging function (either thinking or feeling) in the outer world. They present a systematic, ordered approach to life. They prefer to follow schedules in order to reach an established goal and they tend to make good use of lists, timetables, and calendars. They tend to be punctual, organized, and tidy, and they may find it difficult to deal with unexpected disruptions of their plans. They prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once formulated. In contrast, perceiving types present a spontaneous explorative attitude toward the outer world. They enjoy change and spontaneity and they prefer to leave projects open in order to adjust and improve them. They may find plans and schedules restrictive and they tend to be easy going about matters like punctuality, deadlines, and tidiness. They may consider last minute pressure to be a necessary motivation in order to complete projects and to bring things to fruition. They are often good at dealing with the unexpected, although their behaviour may at times appear to be impulsive and unplanned.

Aspects of the Christian tradition and aspects of ordained clerical leadership may appeal to judging types (say, the discipline of regular patterns of prayer, worship, and study), and to perceiving types (say, being open to the unpredictable leading of the Holy Spirit). According to Kendall (1998), in the UK population as a whole, 55% of men and 62% of women prefer judging. In their study of 626 Anglican clergymen and 237 Anglican clergywomen, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater (2007) found higher levels of preference for judging among clergy than among the general population, with judging being preferred by 68% of clergymen and 65% of clergywomen.

What is not known from previous research, however, is the extent to which the personality characteristics displayed by seminarians and those actively engaged in Christian ministry are reflected among the younger people who explore Christian ministry. The intention of the present study is to address this issue by an investigation of the young people who attend Tidal Impact, a week-long youth mission and service event sponsored by the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches, Eastern Canada's largest Protestant denomination. Research conducted comparing the spiritual practices of those who attended Tidal Impact with those who attended Springforth, one of Canada's largest Christian youth conferences,

that was held in the same year in the same city and sponsored by the same denomination, demonstrated significantly higher levels of commitment among the Tidal Impact participants. For instance, those who attended Tidal Impact (Fawcett, MacDonald, & Nylén, 2005) as compared to those who attend Springforth (Fawcett & Linkletter, 2003) were more likely to report that they “prayed nearly every day” (66% vs. 59%), “attended worship nearly every week” (89% vs. 81%), read the Bible “at least once a week” (50% vs. 49%) and were baptised (82% vs. 75%). In light of this research, it seems reasonable to conceive of Tidal Impact as a recruitment area for future ministers.

Methodology

Procedure

All the young people attending Tidal Impact 2002 held in New Brunswick, Canada, were invited to complete a detailed questionnaire as part of their participation at one of six afternoon Concerts of Prayer held during the week-long program. 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 755 surveys were completed by adolescents over the age of 11 years. A further 190 surveys completed by leaders and participants over the age of 18 were excluded from the following analysis.

Measures

Psychological type was assessed by the Adolescent Form of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Fawcett, Francis, & Robbins, In Press). 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 (In Press) 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 755 participants, 479 were female, 274 were male, and two failed to disclose their sex; 275 were between the ages of 12 and 14, 251 were between the ages of 15 and 17, 228 were over the age of 17, and two failed to disclose their age. In terms of frequency of church attendance, the majority (91%) attended weekly, and in terms of personal prayer, the majority (71%) prayed daily, with a further 18% praying weekly.

Data Analysis

The research literature concerned with the empirical investigation of psychological type has developed a highly distinctive method for analyzing, handling, and displaying statistical data in the form of "type tables." This convention has been adopted in the 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. Comparisons between type tables (in this case between males and females) is effected by the Selection Ratio Index (an extension of Chi-square).

Results

Table 1 presents the type distribution for religiously committed male Canadian Baptist youth (N=274). In terms of the two key processes, these data are broadly in line with the findings from previous research among clergymen. The male youth display clear preferences for intuition (75%) over sensing (26%), and for feeling (86%) over thinking (14%). In terms of the orientations, there is a balance between extraversion (51%) and introversion (49%). In terms of the attitudes toward the outer world, the Tidal Impact males differ from previous research among clergymen in that there is a clear preference for perceiving (61%) over judging (39%). In terms of the 16 discrete psychological types, the three most frequently reported types are ENFP (22%), ENFJ (11%), and INFJ (9%). In terms of dominant type preferences, the following hierarchy emerged: feeling (45%), intuition (37%), sensing (11%), and thinking (8%).

Table 2 presents the type distribution for religiously committed female Canadian Baptist youth (N=479). Again, in terms of the two key processes, these data are broadly in line with the findings from previous research among clergywomen. The female youth display clear preferences for intuition (66%) over sensing (34%), and for feeling (92%) over thinking (8%). In terms of the orientations, there is a balance between extraversion (52%) and introversion (48%). In terms of the attitudes toward the outer world, there is a clear preference for judging (61%) over perceiving (39%). In terms of the 16 discrete psychological types, the three most frequently reported types are ENFP (20%), ENFJ (18%), and ISFJ

Table 1. Type Distribution for religiously committed male Canadian Baptist youth.
N =274 + = 1% of *N*

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ <i>n</i> =1 (0.4%)	ISFJ <i>n</i> =17 (6.2%)	INFJ <i>n</i> = 25 (9.1%)	INTJ <i>n</i> = 8 (2.9%)	E	<i>n</i> =135	(49.3 %)
	+++++	+++++	+++	I	<i>n</i> =139	(50.7 %)
	+	++++		S	<i>n</i> =70	(25.5 %)
				N	<i>n</i> =204	(74.5 %)
				T	<i>n</i> =38	(13.9 %)
				F	<i>n</i> =236	(86.1 %)
				J	<i>n</i> =106	(38.7 %)
				P	<i>n</i> =168	(61.3 %)
				Pairs and Temperaments		
ISTP <i>n</i> = 6 (2.2%)	ISFP <i>n</i> =11 (4.0%)	INFP <i>n</i> =60 (21.9%)	INTP <i>n</i> =11 (4.0%)	IJ	<i>n</i> =51	(18.6 %)
++	++++	+++++	++++	IP	<i>n</i> =88	(32.1 %)
		+++++		EP	<i>n</i> =80	(29.2 %)
		+++++		EJ	<i>n</i> =55	(20.1 %)
		+++++		ST	<i>n</i> =8	(2.9 %)
		++++		SF	<i>n</i> =62	(22.6 %)
		++		NF	<i>n</i> =174	(63.5 %)
				NT	<i>n</i> =30	(10.9 %)
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)	ESFP <i>n</i> =13 (4.7%)	ENFP <i>n</i> =59 (21.5%)	ENTP <i>n</i> =8 (2.9%)	SJ	<i>n</i> =40	(14.6 %)
	+++++	+++++	+++	SP	<i>n</i> =30	(10.9 %)
		+++++		NP	<i>n</i> =138	(50.4 %)
		+++++		NJ	<i>n</i> =66	(24.1 %)
		+++++		TJ	<i>n</i> =13	(4.7 %)
		++		TP	<i>n</i> =25	(9.1 %)
				FP	<i>n</i> =143	(52.2 %)
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 1 (0.4%)	ESFJ <i>n</i> =21 (7.7%)	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 30 (10.9%)	ENTJ <i>n</i> =3 (1.1%)	FJ	<i>n</i> =93	(33.9 %)
	+++++	+++++	+	IN	<i>n</i> =104	(38.0%)
	+++	+++++		EN	<i>n</i> =100	(36.5%)
		+		IS	<i>n</i> =35	(12.8 %)
				ES	<i>n</i> =35	(12.8 %)
				ET	<i>n</i> =12	(4.4 %)
				EF	<i>n</i> =123	(44.9 %)
				IF	<i>n</i> =113	(41.2 %)
				IT	<i>n</i> = 26	(9.5 %)

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
E-TJ	4	1.5	I-TP	17	6.2	Dt. T	21	7.7
E-FJ	51	18.6	I-FP	71	25.9	Dt. F	122	44.5
M. ES-P	13	4.7	IS-J	18	6.6	Dt. S	31	11.3
EN-P	67	24.5	IN-J	33	12.0	Dt. N	100	36.5

B. Fawcett, L.J. Francis and M. Robbins Psychological types of religiously committed male Canadian Baptist youth.

Table 2. Type Distribution for religiously committed female Canadian Baptist youth compared with the males.

N = 479 + = 1% of *N* *I* = Selection Ratio Index *<.05 ***p*<.01 ****p*<.001

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 4 (0.8%) <i>I</i> = 2.29 +	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 83 (17.3%) <i>I</i> = 2.79*** +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 63 (13.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.44 +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 8 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.57 ++	E	247 (51.6%)	<i>I</i> = 1.05
				I	232 (48.4%)	<i>I</i> = 0.95
				S	164 (34.2%)	* <i>I</i> = 1.34
				N	315 (68.5%)	* <i>I</i> = 0.88
				T	37 (7.7%)	** <i>I</i> = 0.56
				F	442 (92.3%)	** <i>I</i> = 1.07
				J	292 (61.0%)	*** <i>I</i> = 1.58
				P	187 (39.0%)	*** <i>I</i> = 0.6
ISTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.19*	ISFP <i>n</i> = 12 (2.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.62 +++	INFP <i>n</i> = 45 (9.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.43*** +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 15 (3.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.78 +++	Pairs and Temperaments		
				IJ	158 (33.0%)	*** <i>I</i> = 1.77
				IP	74 (15.4%)	*** <i>I</i> = 0.48
				EP	113 (23.6%)	<i>I</i> = 0.81
				EJ	134 (28.0%)	* <i>I</i> = 1.39
				ST	8 (1.7%)	<i>I</i> = 0.57
				SF	156 (32.6%)	** <i>I</i> = 1.44
				NF	286 (59.7%)	<i>I</i> = 0.94
				NT	29 (6.1%)	* <i>I</i> = 0.55
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.0 +++	ESFP <i>n</i> = 13 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.57	ENFP <i>n</i> = 94 (19.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.91 +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 6 (1.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.43 +	SJ	137 (28.6%)	*** <i>I</i> = 1.96
				SP	27 (5.6%)	** <i>I</i> = 0.51
				NP	160 (33.4%)	*** <i>I</i> = 0.66
				NJ	155 (32.4%)	* <i>I</i> = 1.34
				TJ	14 (2.9%)	<i>I</i> = 0.62
				TP	23 (4.8%)	* <i>I</i> = 0.53
				FP	164 (34.2%)	*** <i>I</i> = 0.66
				FJ	278 (58.0%)	*** <i>I</i> = 1.71
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 2 (0.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 48 (10.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.31 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 84 (17.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.60* +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.0*	IN	131 (27.3%)	** <i>I</i> = 0.72
				EN	184 (38.4%)	<i>I</i> = 1.05
				IS	101 (21.1%)	** <i>I</i> = 1.65
				ES	63 (13.2%)	<i>I</i> = 1.03
				ET	8 (1.7%)	* <i>I</i> = 0.38
				EF	239 (49.9%)	<i>I</i> = 1.11
				IF	203 (42.4%)	<i>I</i> = 1.03
				IT	29 (6.1%)	<i>I</i> = 0.64

Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%	<i>I</i>
E-TJ	2	0.4	0.29	I-TP	17	3.5	Dt. T	19	4.0	0.52*
E-FJ	132	27.6	1.48**	I-FP	57	11.9	Dt. F	189	39.5	0.89
ES-P	13	2.7	0.57	IS-J	87	18.2	Dt. S	100	20.9	1.85***
EN-P	100	20.9	0.85	IN-J	71	14.8	Dt. N	171	35.7	0.98

B. Fawcett, L.J. Francis and M. Robbins Psychological types of religiously committed male Canadian Baptist youth.

(17%). In terms of dominant type preferences the following hierarchy emerged: feeling (40%), intuition (36%), sensing (21%), and thinking (4%).

Table 2 also provides data on the statistical significance of differences between the psychological type profiles of the female and male youth. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, these data demonstrate that there are significant differences between the sexes on the perceiving process, the judging process, and the attitudes toward the outer world, but not on the orientations. Compared with the females, the males are significantly more likely to prefer intuition, thinking, and perceiving.

Discussion and Conclusions

Seven main conclusions emerge from these data. The first aim of the study was to test whether the psychological type profile of religiously committed youth (who were sufficiently motivated to engage in a week-long mission and service event) reflected the general trend within the psychological type profile of ordained Christian leaders, as exemplified, for example, by the study of Anglican clergymen and clergywomen reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater (2007). The data indicate not only that the psychological type profile of these people reflect the trends among ordained Christian leaders, but in some sense reflects a caricature of their leaders. While ordained Christian leaders tend to contain a much higher proportion of intuitives than the population as a whole, these religiously committed youth tend to contain an even higher proportion of intuitives than most groups of clergy (66% of the females and 75% of the males). While ordained Christian leaders tend to contain a much higher proportion of feelers than the population as a whole (especially the male population), these religiously committed youth tend to contain an even higher proportion of feelers than most groups of clergy (92% of the females and 86% of the males). If this group of religiously committed youth were to be a fertile field for recruitment into ordained ministry, it is likely that the psychological gulf between clergy and the population as a whole would widen even further.

Second, the high proportion of intuitives among these religiously committed youth has implications for those aspects of youth ministry to which they may tend to respond well and for those aspects of youth ministry to which they may tend to respond less well. A group of young people led and inspired by youth leaders and pastors with a preference for intuition will catch a vision for building a better future, for espousing the great causes of the kingdom, for seeking change, and for investing energy in transformation. Such young people are less concerned with detail, with practicalities, and

with grounding their vision and zeal in realism. It may be a hard job for their leaders to rein in their enthusiasm and to ensure that the group has given enough attention to practicalities and to detail. Young people who chase after a vision may exhaust themselves in the chase and be disillusioned by the concerns of the adult church to maintain structures and enforce constraints.

Third, the high proportion of feelers among the religiously committed youth also has implications for those aspects of youth ministry to which they may tend to respond well and for those aspects of youth ministry to which they may respond less well. A group of young people led and motivated by youth leaders and pastors with a preference for feeling will invest heavily in interpersonal relationships, will build deep interpersonal commitments, and will look for a church that is committed to maintaining peace and harmony, that is committed to proclaiming forgiveness in the name of the God of mercy. Such young people are less concerned with objective standards and the routine application of church teaching. It may be a hard job for their leaders to impress upon them the need for inflexible rules and boundaries that inevitably cause pain and conflict for some of their number. Young people who invest too heavily in those aspects of service and mission that embrace the ideals of selfless giving may be caught too deeply in the pain and confusion of others and become worn down by their desire to be of service to others.

Fourth, there is a second implication for youth ministry that follows from the high proportion of feeling types among religiously committed youth and this relates to the gender-related profiling of feeling. In the UK population as a whole, just 35% of men prefer feeling, compared with 70% of women (Kendall, 1998). In this group of religiously committed youth it is obviously clear that females (N=479) outnumber males (N=274) in the ratio of 64% to 34%. According to the psychological type data the majority of males in this group (86%) prefer the more psychologically feminine response of feeling. This finding is consistent with the feminization of the mainline Christian denominations (as suggested, for example, by Brown, 2001) and the difficulties that these denominations experience in attracting men. Youth ministry may need to recognize that service and mission events like Tidal Impact fail to reach young men and those of a more psychologically masculine predisposition.

Fifth, the largest difference in the psychological type profiles of the adolescent males and adolescent females participating in Tidal Impact concerned their attitude toward the outer world. While 61% of the females prefer judging, the proportion fell to 39% among the males; conversely 61% of the males prefer perceiving compared with 39% of the females. This difference is likely to be highly visible to those trying to organize the logistics of a major youth event involving

well over a thousand young people. In this context, as a group the females are likely to appear to be so much better organized, so much more responsible, and so much more reliable. As a consequence the leaders may delegate more responsibility to the young females and marginalize the young males even further.

Sixth, consideration of the dominant type preference of these religiously committed young people draws attention to the very low numbers of dominant thinkers (4% among the females and 8% among the males). Within any organization dominant thinkers play an important role in management, in strategy, and in implementing decisions. A church devoid of sufficient dominant thinkers may be heading for future crises in leadership, where tough decisions, strong management, and strategic direction may be required to maintain focus and to secure long-term sustainability.

Seventh, the data draw attention to the extraordinarily high proportion of ENFPs within the sample (22% of the males and 20% of the females). In her *Introduction to Type*, Myers (1998, p. 15) describes ENFPs at their best in the following way:

For people with ENFP preferences life is a creative adventure full of exciting possibilities. They are keenly perceptive of people and the world around them and insightful about the present and future. ENFPs experience a wide range of feelings and intense emotions. They need appreciative support from others and readily give it in return.

Myers (1998) proceeds to identify the problems experienced by ENFPs and argues that if they fail to find appreciation for their gifts and contributions they can easily become frustrated, lose direction, become rebellious, and ignore procedures. These are dangers worth keeping in mind when working with young and enthusiastic ENFPs.

These conclusions have been drawn on the basis of one study conducted among a group of religiously committed Baptist youth in Eastern Canada using the Adolescent Form of the Francis Psychological Type Scales. For the findings to be more widely generalized, replication studies are needed among other denominational groups and in other geographical contexts. It also needs to be recognized that the assessment of psychological type is much less well developed and less well established among adolescents than among adults and that general population baselines for Canadian adolescents do not exist nor do baselines for large groups of Canadian clergy. In addition, future studies comparing the type preferences of youth engaged in short-term mission with those of their mission experience leaders may prove fruitful. This would allow

researchers to test the question of whether the attraction of youth to short-term mission experiences is based on type affinity with the leader in addition to one's own personal spiritual commitment. Further work is still needed in testing the Adolescent Form of the Francis Psychological Type Scales. Further research into the type preference of Canadian Baptist clergy would allow a comparison of Canadian Baptist youth with their own ministers.

Meanwhile, however, the findings from the present study offer a reasonable challenge within the context of practical theology and ministry studies to those concerned with the future development of youth ministry and with the formation of young people preparing themselves to respond to the vocation of ordained ministry. From this data, three main applications emerge for those who would seek to challenge young people to hear God's call to vocational ministry.

First, the fact that the young people involved in Tidal Impact largely reflected the psychological type profile of current clergy may illustrate the commonly observed social scientific principle that "like attracts like." If those administering programs and initiatives designed to challenge young people to consider a call to vocational ministry wish to broaden the pool of potential clergy to include those from all type preferences, they would do well to consider including among their staff and volunteers those who do not match the common profile of clergy.

Second, those who administer and design programs designed to challenge young people to hear God's call to vocational ministry may wish to consider the way they promote such programs. If there is a desire to challenge thinking males, for example, to clerical roles then careful consideration should be given to the recruitment messages sent through text, images, music, and other media.

Third, those who are in positions to speak into the life of those wrestling with a call to ministry should be careful to examine their own hidden biases toward what kind of personality one must possess in order to be called to ministry. It could be that the type profile of some young people wrestling with a call does not match that of their pastor or other pastors but might be very helpful to churches and other ministries.

References

- Brown, C.G. (2001). *The death of Christian Britain*. London: Routledge.
- Craig, C.L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L.J. (2006). Psychological type preferences of Roman Catholic priests in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 27, 157-164.

- Fawcett, B.G., Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (in press). *The scale properties of the Adolescent Form of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTSA) among Canadian Baptist youth.*
- Fawcett, B.G. & Linkletter, J. (2003). Baptist youth in Atlantic Canada – How committed are they? In Fawcett, B.G. & R. Nylén (eds.) *Effective youth ministry*. Saint John, New Brunswick: Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches, 61-67.
- Fawcett, B.G., McDonald, M., & Nylén, R. (2005). *Mission tour: Successfully leading youth on a short-term mission experience*. Saint John, New Brunswick: Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches.
- Francis, L.J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- 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., Nash, P., Nash, S., & Craig, C.L. (2007). Psychology and youth ministry: Psychological type preferences of Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Youth Ministry*, 5(2), 73-90.
- Francis, L.J., Payne, V.J., & Jones, S.H. (2001). Psychological types of male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 56, 19-23.
- Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (2002). Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 23(2), 217-220.
- Jung, C.G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, Volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Keirse, D. & Bates, M., (1978). *Please understand me: Character types and temperament*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis Books.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I.B. (1998). *Introduction to type*. 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, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

