

**Original citation:**

Francis, Leslie J., Robbins, Mandy and Jones, Susan H.. (2012) The psychological-type profile of clergywomen in ordained local ministry in the Church of England : pioneers or custodians? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, Vol.15 (No.9). pp. 919-932.

Permanent WRAP url:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/52209>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes the work of 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.

Publisher's statement:

"This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of an article Francis, Leslie J., Robbins, Mandy and Jones, Susan H. (2012) The psychological-type profile of clergywomen in ordained local ministry in the Church of England : pioneers or custodians? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, Vol.15 (No.9). pp. 919-932 published in *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* (2012), © Taylor & Francis, available online at:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13674676.2012.698449>

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

The logo for Warwick Publications Wrap. It features the text "warwickpublicationswrap" in a white, lowercase, sans-serif font. Below this text is a stylized yellow graphic consisting of two horizontal lines connected by a curved line, resembling an open book or a bridge. Underneath the graphic is the text "highlight your research" in a smaller, white, lowercase, sans-serif font. The entire logo is set against a dark grey rectangular background.

warwickpublicationswrap
highlight your research

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/lib-publications>

The psychological type profile of clergywomen in ordained local ministry in the Church of
England: pioneers or custodians?

Leslie J Francis *

University of Warwick, UK

Mandy Robbins

Glyndŵr University, UK

Susan H Jones

Glyndŵr University, UK

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

Abstract

This study employs psychological type theory to compare the psychological profile of 144 clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry in the Church of England alongside the established profile of 237 professional mobile clergywomen serving in the Church of England published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley and Slater (2007). The data found no significant differences between these two groups of clergywomen in terms of orientations (introversion and extraversion) or in terms of the judging process (thinking and feeling). In terms of the perceiving process, there was a significantly higher proportion of sensing types among those serving in ordained local ministry (70% compared with 35%). In terms of the attitudes, there was a significantly higher proportion of judging types among those serving in ordained local ministry (83% compared with 65%). The combined sensing judging (SJ) temperament accounted for 65% of the clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry, compared with 29% of the clergywomen serving in professional mobile ministry in the earlier study. It is argued that the SJ temperament characterises a custodian style of ministry.

Keywords: Psychology, religion, clergy, psychological type, ordained local ministry

Introduction

During the second half of the twentieth century, the Church of England began seriously to re-examine the long-established separation between Holy Orders and secular work and to develop new forms of ordained ministry that involved the integration of ordination with secular employment. In so doing the ground was prepared for auxiliary pastoral ministries (APM), non-stipendiary ministry (NSM), self-supporting ministry (SSM), ministry in secular employment (MSE), and ordained local ministry (OLM). The most controversial of these developments has been and remains the notion of ordained local ministry. Reviewing the development of ordained local ministry between 1991 and 2003, Jones, Village, and Francis (2011) reported that by 2001, 20 dioceses had at least one licensed ordained local minister and 23 had resisted the development. Since 2001 the situation has continued to fluctuate, with, for example, the Diocese of Southwark discontinuing the programme in local ordained ministry that it had earlier initiated.

The roots of local ordained ministry in the Church of England are traced to the Bethnal Green initiative under the direction of Ted Roberts (1972). The scheme developed by Roberts had six essential characteristics. First, local ordained ministry was to be a team enterprise. Second, the call to local priesthood would come initially from the local church. Third, the ministry would be in one place rather than itinerant. Fourth, training would be different from that currently offered to those training for full-time ministry; it would be local and practical. Fifth, supplementary ministry was to be for a specific term of service. Finally, establishing the principle of unpaid volunteer service was to break the division of the church into givers and receivers, professional ministers and lay receivers of ministry.

Eight years after the first candidates for ordained local ministry were ordained deacon in the Church of England in 1972 under the Bethel Green and Bermondsey experiments, in 1980, the Diocese of Southwark began what has become known as the Brandon Experiment.

Other dioceses followed and during the late 1980s and early 1990s four new training schemes were established in the Church of England, in the Dioceses of Lincoln (1984), Manchester (1989), Southwark (1991) and Truro (1992). By 2003 there were nineteen OLM schemes authorised by the House of Bishops and 217 candidates in training (Hind, 2003).

While the impetus for ordained local ministry clearly emerged from the local or diocesan level, the Church of England as a whole was keen to watch, monitor and regulate these local initiatives. Accordingly the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry (1987) published the first *Regulations for Non-stipendiary Ministry* as approved by the House of Bishops in February 1987. Almost immediately after this initial publication a working party was established to review these regulations. The recommendations and regulations proposed by this working party were agreed by the House of Bishops, subject to some amendments, in January 1991 and published by the Advisory Board of Ministry (1991) as *Local NSM*. Core to the recommendations was the following statement.

Local Non-Stipendiary Ministry is part of the ministry of Christ which he shares with all baptised members of the church. Those called to this ministry by their local church need to have made the calling their own. For its effective operation, LNSM requires the local church's commitment to shared ministry, including the collaboration of local church leaders, ordained and lay. It is a development in ministry open to parishes and candidates of all social backgrounds.

The following year in 1992, the Advisory Board of Ministry (1992) published a policy paper reviewing the diverse models of ministry and training proposed by dioceses for ordained local ministry. Six years later, a major report on ordained local ministry, *Strangers in the Wings*, was published by the Advisory Board of Ministry (1998). Then in 2006 the Bishop of Norwich, as Chair of the Ministry Division of the Church of England, wrote to the diocesan bishops in the Church of England to ascertain their views on ordained local ministry

(OLM). From the pool of 43 dioceses he received 35 substantive responses. These responses were summarised in a Ministry Division paper given the working title, *OLM: a ministry in flux*. Twelve responses were broadly in favour of OLMs; six responses indicated a review of OLM was taking place, four responses indicated that dioceses were looking into the possibility of OLM, a further two responses were either reconsidering OLM or raising serious questions about it. Fourteen responses indicated that the diocese did not have an OLM scheme and was not likely to have one. Three responses gave no strong views.

In spite of the controversial nature of ordained local ministry, little empirical research has been undertaken to assess this crucial experiment within the life of the Church of England. The present study draws on psychological type theory to test the extent to which women serving in ordained local ministry differ in their psychological profile from women serving in professional mobile ministry. The focus on clergywomen provides a particularly interesting test case in light of the fact that women have only been ordained to the priesthood in the Church of England since 1997 and consequently women have been recruited into these two forms of ministry (ordained local ministry and professional mobile ministry) during the same recent period.

Psychological type theory

Psychological type theory has its roots in the pioneering work of Carl Jung (1971) and has been developed and extended through the range of scientific research and practical application stimulated largely by the Myer-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), by the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), and by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). This theoretical framework, rooted in psychology, has made a significant impact on the broad fields of pastoral theology and practical theology with commentators focusing on themes like biblical hermeneutics and preaching (Francis & Atkins, 2000, 2001, 2002; Francis & Village, 2008), communicating

the gospel (Butler, 1999), congregational dynamics (Edwards, 1998; Baab, 1998), diversity in the Christian life (Osborn & Osborn, 1991), preferred ways of praying (Michael & Norrissey, 1984; Duncan, 1993; Fowke, 1997; Martinez, 2001), religious leadership (Oswald & Kroeger, 1988), shaping spirituality (Grant, Thompson, & Clarke, 1983; Goldsmith, 1994; McGuinness, 2009), and understanding the person of Christ (Sanford, 1987; Malone, 2000).

A key empirical research tradition within the psychology of religion, practical theology, and empirical theology has employed measurement of psychological type to illuminate preferences and differences within religious professionals (for full review see Francis, 2009). This research tradition has explored themes concerning the differences between the psychological type profiles of clergy and the general population, concerning the differences between the psychological type profiles of clergy associated with different denominations, and concerning the differences between the psychological type profiles of clergymen and clergywomen. The key conclusion to be drawn from these studies is that there are both some consistent psychological type patterns among clergy making them significantly different from the general population and also some significant differences between clergy representing different denominations (say, Assemblies of God or Presbyterian), different theological traditions (say, liberal or conservative) and different church orientations (say, evangelical or catholic).

A key contribution to mapping and to understanding the psychological type profile of clergywomen serving in the Church of England was made by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) who analysed data provided by a sample of 237 clergywomen. The findings from this study can be summarised as follows, discussing each of the four constructs proposed by psychological type theory in turn and drawing on the psychological type table reproduced from that study (see table 1). Psychological type theory distinguishes between

- insert table 1 about here -

four bipolar perspectives: two orientations (introversion and extraversion), two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving). According to this model, the two orientations (introversion and extraversion) and the two attitudes (judging and perceiving) define the kind of context within which the individual human psyche functions. The two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) and the two judging functions (thinking and feeling) define the mental processes involved in interpreting and making sense of the world.

First, the two orientations are concerned with where energy is drawn from and focused. On the one hand, extraverts (E) 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 upon 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 (I) 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. Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) demonstrate that clergywomen as a group showed a slight preference for introversion (54%) over extraversion (46%). This made the profile of clergywomen significantly different from the profile of women in the general UK population as reported by Kendall (1998) who found 57% of women preferred extraversion, compared with 43% who preferred introversion.

Second, the two perceiving functions are concerned with the way in which people receive information. On the one hand, sensing types (S) focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They tend to focus on specific details, rather than 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 (N) 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 as indirect associations and concepts impact on their perception. They focus on the overall picture, rather than on specific facts and data. Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) demonstrated that clergywomen as a group showed a clear preference for intuition (65%) over sensing (35%). This again made the profile of clergywomen significantly different from the profile of women in the general UK population as reported by Kendall (1998), who found that 79% of women preferred sensing, compared with 21% who preferred intuition.

Third, the two judging functions are concerned with the criteria which people employ to make decisions and judgements. On the one hand, thinking types (T) make decisions and 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 (F) make decisions and 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. Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) demonstrated that clergywomen as a group showed a clear preference for feeling (74%) over thinking (26%). This meant that the profile of clergywomen was not significantly different from the profile of the general UK population as reported by Kendall (1998) who found that 70% of women preferred feeling compared with 30% who preferred thinking.

Fourth, the two attitudes toward the outer world are determined by which of the two sets of functions (that is, perceiving S/N, or judging T/F) is preferred in dealings with the outer world. On the one hand, judging types (J) 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 an established goal 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 (P) do not seek to impose order on the outer world, but are more reflective, perceptive, and open, as they passively 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. Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) demonstrated that clergywomen as a group showed a clear preference for judging (65%) over perceiving (35%). This again meant that the profile of clergywomen was not significantly different from the profile of women in the general UK population as reported by Kendall (1998) who found that 62% of women preferred judging, compared with 38% who preferred perceiving.

According to Jungian theory, each individual needs access to all four functions (sensing, intuition, thinking and feeling) for normal and healthy living. The two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) are needed to gather information about the inner and outer worlds inhabited by the individual. These are the irrational functions concerned with collecting information, with seeing reality and possibility. The two judging functions (thinking and feeling) are needed to organise and evaluate information. These are the rational functions concerned with making decisions and determining courses of action. Although each individual needs access to all four functions, Jungian theory posits the view that the relative strengths of these four functions vary from one individual to another. The analogy is drawn with handedness. Although equipped with two hands, the majority of individuals prefer one and tend to develop skills with that hand to the neglect of the other hand. Similarly, empirical evidence suggests that individuals will develop preference for one of the perceiving functions

(sensing or intuition) and neglect the other, and that they will develop preference for one of the judging functions (thinking or feeling) and neglect the other.

Moreover, according to Jungian theory, for each individual either the preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) or the preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) 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; and dominant thinking shapes the analytic person. Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) demonstrated the following hierarchy of dominant type preferences among clergywomen: dominant feeling (39%), dominant intuition (31%), dominant sensing (19%), and dominant thinking (11%).

Keirsey and Bates (1978) also draw on psychological type theory to distinguish between different pairs, focusing particularly on the combinations of sensing and judging (SJ) and sensing and perceiving (SP) and on the combinations of intuition and feeling (NF) and intuition and thinking (NT). In terms of their preferences, Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) demonstrated that 29% of clergywomen displayed SJ preferences and 50% displayed NF preferences, compared with 6% who displayed SP preferences and 15% who displayed NT preferences.

Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) argued that an understanding of type theory can help to highlight areas of potential strength and weakness among clergy in terms of the four indices of psychological type. First, female clergy prefer introversion over extraversion. On the one hand, introverted clergy may be energised by many aspects of ministry such as private study and preparation, one-to-one encounters in counselling and in spiritual direction, silent prayer and reflection, and focusing deeply on interior spiritual issues. On the other hand, introverted clergy may be drained by many other aspects of

ministry, such as attending social events, speaking in public (especially without preparation), talking with strangers as part of evangelism or parish visiting, and assuming a high profile within the parish.

Second, female clergy prefer intuition over sensing. On the one hand, intuitive clergy may be energised by many aspects of ministry, such as the opportunity to speculate about meanings and possibilities in scripture, drawing inspiration from the symbols and teachings of the church, welcoming change and experimentation in liturgy, and developing a vision for the future of their church. On the other hand, intuitive clergy may be drained by other aspects of ministry, such as the value placed on tradition, encountering resistance to change, the need to focus on practical realities, and the importance of detail and accuracy in church administration.

Third, female clergy prefer feeling over thinking. On the one hand, feeling clergy may be energised by many aspects of ministry, such as spending time caring for others through visiting, counselling or pastoral care, needing to support and empathise with those in need, and the importance of interpersonal values in Christian teaching, such as love, harmony, peace, and compassion. On the other hand, feeling clergy may be drained by other aspects of ministry, such as having to look at problems objectively and logically, the need to make tough decisions which affect other people's lives, the need to be critical when necessary, and parish management.

Fourth, female clergy prefer judging over perceiving. On the one hand, judging clergy may be energised by many aspects of ministry, such as the need for organisation both in their own lives and in the life of their parishes, arranging services and events well in advance, keeping on top of administration and managing local affairs. On the other hand, judging types may be drained by other aspects of ministry, such as the need to think on their feet, responding effectively to crises, and adapting to changing situations.

In order to test how stable the profile of clergywomen provided by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) would be among other samples, Francis, Robbins, and Whinney (2011) reported on a sample of 83 clergywomen serving in the Church of England. They concluded that the two studies provided reasonably similar findings and supported the value of treating the profile provided by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) as an authoritative view of the psychological type preferences of clergywomen in general.

Research question

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to examine the extent to which clergywomen recruited and selected to serve within ordained local ministry replicate the psychological type profile of clergywomen serving within the Church of England in traditionally accepted forms of ministry. The study is exploratory in nature, in the absence of clear expectations and hypotheses grounded in existing research and theory on the nature of the women attracted to ordained local ministry.

Method

Procedure

A 24-page questionnaire was posted to all clergywomen in the Church of England under the age of 71 in the summer of 2007. A total of 3,392 questionnaires were mailed and 2,055 were returned completed, generating a response rate of 61%.

Instrument

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). This 40-item instrument comprises four sets of ten 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). Recent studies have demonstrated this instrument to function well in church-related contexts. For example,

Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported alpha coefficients of .83 and for EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale.

Sample

The present analysis is based on the 144 clergywomen serving in the Church of England in ordained local ministry who provided full data on the Francis Psychological Type Scales. In terms of age, 10 of these clergywomen were in their forties, 50 were in their fifties, 74 were in their sixties, and 10 failed to divulge their year of birth. In terms of years in orders, 5 had been ordained before 1995, 28 had been ordained between 1995 and 1999, 19 were ordained in 2000, 15 in 2001, 5 in 2002, 24 in 2003, 27 in 2004, and 19 in 2005; and two failed to divulge their year of ordination. These clergywomen had been ordained in 19 dioceses: Blackburn (6), Canterbury (7), Coventry (1), Durham (1), Gloucester (4), Guildford (9), Hereford (2), Lichfield (13), Lincoln (6), Liverpool (3), Manchester (11), Newcastle (3), Norwich (7), Oxford (14), St Edmundsbury and Ipswich (20), Salisbury (13), Southwark (14), Truro (1), and Wakefield (8); and one failed to divulge her diocese of ordination. In terms of marital status, 18 were single, 100 were married, 14 were widowed, 8 were divorced, and 3 were divorced and remarried; and one failed to divulge her marital status. In terms of location, 22 ministered in scattered rural parishes, 60 in villages, 9 in market towns, 23 in small towns, 19 in large towns, 24 in suburbs, and 12 in inner city parishes; and two failed to divulge the location of their ministry.

Data analysis

The scientific literature concerned with psychological type has developed a distinctive way of presenting type-related data. The conventional format of ‘type tables’ has been used in the present paper to allow the findings from this study to be compared with other relevant studies in the literature. In these tables the psychological type profiles of clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry are compared with the psychological type profiles of

Church of England clergywomen as reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). The statistical significance of differences between the present sample and the population norms and the clergywomen are tested by means of the Selection Ratio Index (*I*), an extension of the classic chi-square test (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

Results

All eight scales proposed by the FPTS generated good levels of internal consistency reliability, with the following alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951): extraversion and introversion = .86; sensing and intuition = .81; thinking and feeling = .60; judging and perceiving = .81. Table 2 presents the psychological type profile of the 144 clergywomen

- insert table 2 about here -

serving in ordained local ministry and compares them with the psychological type profile of clergywomen provided by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). This data will be discussed in two steps.

The first step discusses the psychological type profile of the clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, they display clear preferences for introversion (59%) over extraversion (41%), for sensing (70%) over intuition (30%), for feeling (79%) over thinking (21%), and for judging (83%) over perceiving (17%). In terms of dominant type preferences, they display the following hierarchy: dominant sensing (44%), dominant feeling (32%), dominant intuition (17%), and dominant thinking (7%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, the most frequent occurring types are ISFJ (31%) and ESFJ (19%) which together account for one in every two (50%) women serving in ordained local ministry. In terms of temperament pairs, two thirds of these clergywomen prefer SJ (65%) and one quarter prefer NF (24%), compared with 6% who prefer NT and 5% who prefer SP.

The second step compares the psychological type profiles of the two groups of clergywomen. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, there were no significant differences between the two groups on the orientations or on the judging process: 59% of OLMs preferred introversion, and so did 54% of the other group; 79% of the OLMs preferred feeling, and so did 74% of the other group. There were, however, significant differences between the two groups on the perceiving process and on the attitudes toward the outer world: while 70% of the OLMs preferred sensing, the proportion fell to 35% among the other group, with the opposite trend in intuition (30% and 65% respectively); while 83% of the OLMs preferred judging, the proportion fell to 65% among the other group.

In terms of dominant type preferences, there were similar proportions in the two groups of dominant feeling types (32% among the OLMs and 39% among the others) and of dominant thinking types (7% among the OLMs and 11% among the others). There were, however, significant differences between the two groups in the proportions of dominant sensing types (44% among the OLMs and 19% among the others) and of dominant intuitive types (17% among the OLMs and 31% among the others).

In terms of the sixteen complete types, among the clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry there are significantly higher proportions of three types: ISFJ (31% compared with 12%), ESFJ (19% compared with 7%), and ISTJ (10% compared with 5%). Among the clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry there are significantly lower proportions of three types: ENFJ (6% compared with 15%), INFP (5% compared with 14%), and ENTP (0% compared with 3%).

In terms of temperament pairs, the SJ temperament is significantly higher among the clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry (65% compared with 29%) and the NF temperament is significantly lower (24% compared with 50%). The other two temperament pairs account for comparatively few clergywomen within both categories. The NT

temperament is significantly lower among clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry (6% compared with 15%). The SP temperament is not significantly different between clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry (5%) and professional mobile clergywomen (6%).

Discussion and conclusion

This study set out to examine the psychological type profile of clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry alongside the psychological type profile of professional mobile clergywomen serving in the Church of England established by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). The statistically significant differences detected between the two groups are able to illuminate the distinctive strengths of women recruited to ordained local ministry in the Church of England, and also highlight ways in which they are able to complement the strengths of professional mobile clergywomen. Overall the data demonstrate that ordained local ministry is drawing on a distinctive pool of women (in terms of psychological type theory). This distinctiveness is highlighted by consideration of four levels at which psychological type data can be interrogated and applied.

The first level concerns the dichotomous type preferences. The major difference at this level concerns preferences on the perceiving process. While the majority of clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry prefer sensing (70%), the majority of professional mobile clergywomen prefer intuition (65%). Three main implications emerge from this difference. The first implication concerns the working relationship between incumbent and ordained local minister. The style of leadership offered by intuitive types and by sensing types is quite distinctive. Intuitive types value innovation, development and change. Sensing types are cautious about innovation, development and change. Co-leadership of congregations between intuitive types and sensing types may be complementary, or at times conflictual. While the majority of professional mobile clergywomen prefer judging (65%), the proportion rises

further to 83% among those serving in ordained local ministry. The style of leadership offered by judging types relies on structure, organisation and (often detailed) preparation. Given the different ratios between judging types and perceiving types among the two groups of clergy, it is more likely that a judging type ordained local minister will find herself working alongside a perceiving type incumbent than *vice versa*. In this particular working partnership the ordained local minister who prefers judging may become irritated by the flexibility of the incumbent who prefers perceiving and find herself unable to cope with demands for last minute changes and developments to plans and to settled routines. At the same time, the incumbent who prefers perceiving may become irritated with the less flexible and (perhaps) more rigid style of the ordained local minister who prefers judging.

The second implication concerns the relationship between the style of leadership and the local church congregation. A series of recent studies on Anglican congregations, reported by Craig, Francis, Bailey, and Robbins (2003), Francis, Duncan, Craig, and Luffman (2004), Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007), and Francis, Robbins and Craig (2011), have all demonstrated the high proportion of sensing types among churchgoers (often around 80%). The psychological type profile of ordained local ministers, therefore, is more likely than the psychological type profile of the incumbent to be consistent with the sensing preference of the congregation. It seems to be the case that when vocation is identified by the congregation, those called out by the congregation are more likely to reflect the psychological type preference of the congregation. While intuitive-preferring incumbents may wish to lead the congregation on to new visions, sensing-preferring ordained local ministers may be much more conscious of the anxieties and resistances that new visions may stir in the hearts and minds of the congregation.

The third implication concerns the connection between clergy and the wider population. According to Kendall (1998), in the wider population 73% of men and 79% of

women prefer sensing. This contrasts strongly with the way in which among professional mobile clergywomen 65% prefer intuition. A sensing-preferring population may be perplexed by an intuition-preferring clergy. There is a danger that such clergy may seem to the wider population to be day-dreamers with their heads in the air rather than their feet on the ground. They may view clergy as having little to say to the 'real world' or as people who are 'too heavenly-minded to be any earthly good.' By way of contrast, ordained local ministers may seem to be much 'more of the people' and to share much more in common with 'the people on the street'.

The second level concerns the dominant type preferences. Among ordained local ministers, dominant sensing types are particularly prevalent, accounting for 44%, compared with 19% of professional mobile clergywomen. Dominant sensing types are the practical people. In leadership, dominant sensing types will be aware of and care for present realities that shape and constrain the institution. Among professional mobile clergywomen, dominant intuitive types are much more prevalent, accounting for 31%, compared with 17% among ordained local ministers. Dominant intuitive types are the visionary people. In leadership, dominant sensing types will be aware of and care about future possibilities that could transform the institution. Dominant sensing types and dominant intuitive types may wish to lead very different types of churches.

The third level concerns the distinctive dynamics of the sixteen complete types. Among professional mobile clergywomen, the most frequently occurring types are ENFJ (15%), INFP (14%), and INFJ (11%). By way of contrast, the clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry, the two most frequently occurring types, accounting for half of clergywomen, are ISFJ (31%) and ESFJ (19%). In her booklet, *Introduction to Type*, Myers (1998, p.7) provides insightful profiles of the two SFJ types. The ISFJ profile is as follows:

Quiet, friendly, responsible and conscientious. Work devotedly to meet their

obligations. Lend stability to any project or group. Thorough, painstaking, accurate.

Their interests are usually not technical. Can be patient with necessary details. Loyal considerate, perceptive, concerned with how other people feel.

The ESFJ profile is as follows:

Warm-hearted, talkative, popular, conscientious, born co-operators, active committee members. Need harmony and may be good at creating it. Always doing something nice for someone. Work best with encouragement and praise. Main interest is in things that directly and visibly affect people's lives.

The fourth level concerns the temperament pairs as clarified by Keirsey and Bates (1978). In this regard, the major distinctiveness of the clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry concerns the higher level of SJ temperament and the lower level of NF temperament. In their analysis of the implications of the temperaments for styles of religious leadership, Oswald and Kroeger (1988) style the SJ parish leader as 'the conserving, serving pastor' who prizes 'being the guardian of the creative genius of the past' (p.79). They write as follows:

SJ pastors will focus on the rich heritage of the denomination, building on the best that comes from the past. S/he will emphasise the fundamentals of religion, attempting to impart to people a simple faith with practical, down-to-earth roles for living the Christian life. SJ clergy tend to be the most traditional of all clergy temperaments, bringing stability and continuity in whatever situation they are called to serve ... Ultimately, the SJ pastor desires to be a servant of the church and loyal to church authorities. (Oswald & Kroeger, 1988, p.75-76)

According to Oswald and Kroeger (1988) SJ leadership carries the following strengths: congregations managed by SJ leaders will not go through unnecessary change, and when changes are initiated they will be implemented by evolution not by revolution. SJ clergy will work hard to foster a sense of loyalty and belonging in their congregation. They

will prioritise a sense of social, moral and spiritual obligation throughout the congregation. They will work hard to develop sound plans, clear procedures and precise policies, and encourage others to adhere to them. SJ clergy bring superior skills to administrative functions, but they find dealing with people more difficult. SJ clergy will excel in pastoral ministry, taking especial care of the needs of the young and of the elderly. They are realists who like a common-sense approach to pastoral counselling and to problem solving. For SJ clergy, worship will be formal, dignified, and predictable.

Oswald and Kroeger (1988) also discuss some of the potential difficulties found by SJ pastors, including the drawbacks of literalism and pessimism. For them, scripture needs to be interpreted with respect for the literal text. For them, others' enthusiasms need to be subjected to stringent risk-assessments. They may become particularly vulnerable to burnout as a consequence of their commitment to rules, procedures and obligations. They may weary some members of their congregation by an apparent obsession with structure, order and discipline. They may find individuals who reject conventional church teaching hard to accept. They may be irritated by church members who fail to appreciate the importance of structure, deadlines and procedure. Overall it is this analysis of the leadership profile of SJs that underscores the image of ordained local ministers as custodians rather than pioneers.

This study set out to explore whether psychological type theory could illuminate the distinctive contribution being made to the Church of England by those serving in ordained local ministry. This exploration focused specifically on clergywomen and drew attention to a range of significant psychological differences between clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry and clergywomen serving in professional mobile ministry. These observed differences carry important practical implications for the ways in which ministry is conceived and executed. This work properly deserves replication among clergymen.

References

- Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry. (1987). *Regulations for Non-stipendiary Ministry*. London: ACCM.
- Advisory Board of Ministry. (1991). *Local NSM: the report of a Church of England working party concerned with local non-stipendiary ministry*. London: Central Board of Finance.
- Advisory Board of Ministry. (1992). *Development of Models of Ministry and Training in Recent Diocesan Proposals for LNSM*. London: Church House Publishing.
- Advisory Board of Ministry. (1998). *Stranger in the Wings*. London: Church House Publishing.
- Baab, L. M. (1998). *Personality type in congregations: How to work with others more effectively*. Washington, DC: Alban Institute.
- Butler, A. (1999). *Personality and communicating the Gospel*. Cambridge: Grove Books.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- Duncan, B. (1993). *Pray your way: Your personality and God*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Edwards, L. (1998). *Howe we belong, fight, and pray: The MBTI as key to congregational dynamics*. Washington DC: Alban Institute.
- Fowke, R. (1997). *Personality and prayer: Finding and extending the prayer style that suits your personality*. Guildford: Eagle.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2009). Psychological type theory and religious and spiritual experience. In M. De Souza, L. J. Francis, J. O'Higgins-Norman, & D. G. Scott (Eds.), *International*

Handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing (pp 125-146). Dordrecht: Springer.

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., Craig, C. L., & Hall, G. (2008). Psychological type and attitude toward Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 23, 181-191.

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., Robbins, M., & Whinney, M. (2011). Women priests in the Church of England: Psychological type profile. *Religions*.

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

Goldsmith, M. (1994). *Knowing me knowing God*. London: SPCK.

Grant, W. H., Thompson, M., & Clarke, T. E. (1983). *From image to likeness: A Jungian path in the gospel journey*. New York: Paulist Press.

Hind, J. (2003). *Formation for Ministry within a Learning Church*. London: Church House Publishing.

- Jones, S. H., Village, A., Francis, L J. (2011). Assessing the impact of Ordained Local Ministry on the performance of Church of England Dioceses 1991-2003. *Practical Theology*, 4, 231-236.
- 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, California: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- McGuinness, J. (2009). *Growing spiritually with the Myers-Briggs model*. London: SPCK.
- Malone, P. (2000). *The same as Christ Jesus: Gospel and type*. London: St Paul.
- Martinez, P. (2001). *Prayer life: How your personality affects the way you pray*. Carlisle: Paternoster.
- Michael, C. P., & Norris, M. C. (1984). *Prayer and temperament: Different prayer forms for different personality types*. Charlottesville, Virginia: The Open Door.
- Myers, I. B. (1998). *Introduction to type: A guide to understanding your results on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (fifth edition, European English version). Oxford: Oxford 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.
- Osborn, L., & Osborn, D. (1991). *God's diverse people*. London: Daybreak.
- Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality type and religious leadership*. Washington, DC: The Alban Institute.
- Roberts, T. (1972). *Partners and Ministers*. London: Falcon Books.

Sanford, J. M. (1987). *The kingdom within: The inner meaning of Jesus' sayings*. San Francisco, California: Harper

Table 1

Type distribution for Clergywomen serving in the Church of England

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | |
|--|---|---|--|---------------------------------|--|
| ISTJ <i>n</i> = 11 (4.6%) +++++ | ISFJ <i>n</i> = 29 (12.2%) +++++ | INFJ <i>n</i> = 25 (10.5%) +++++ | INTJ <i>n</i> = 16 (6.8%) +++++ | E <i>n</i> = 109 (46.0%) | |
| | +++++ | +++++ | +++++ | I <i>n</i> = 128 (54.0%) | |
| | +++++ | +++++ | ++ | S <i>n</i> = 84 (35.4%) | |
| | ++ | + | | N <i>n</i> = 153 (64.6%) | |
| | | | | T <i>n</i> = 62 (26.2%) | |
| | | | | F <i>n</i> = 175 (73.8%) | |
| | | | | J <i>n</i> = 153 (64.6%) | |
| | | | | P <i>n</i> = 84 (35.4%) | |
| | | | | Pairs and Temperaments | |
| ISTP <i>n</i> = 2 (0.8%) + | ISFP <i>n</i> = 8 (3.4%) +++ | INFP <i>n</i> = 33 (13.9%) +++++ | INTP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.7%) ++ | IJ <i>n</i> = 81 (34.2%) | |
| | | +++++ | | IP <i>n</i> = 47 (19.8%) | |
| | | +++++ | | EP <i>n</i> = 37 (15.6%) | |
| | | ++++ | | EJ <i>n</i> = 72 (30.4%) | |
| | | | | ST <i>n</i> = 27 (11.4%) | |
| | | | | SF <i>n</i> = 57 (24.1%) | |
| | | | | NF <i>n</i> = 118 (49.8%) | |
| | | | | NT <i>n</i> = 35 (14.8%) | |
| ESTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.4%) | ESFP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.7%) ++ | ENFP <i>n</i> = 25 (10.5%) +++++ | ENTP <i>n</i> = 7 (3.0%) +++ | SJ <i>n</i> = 69 (29.1%) | |
| | | +++++ | | SP <i>n</i> = 15 (6.3%) | |
| | | + | | NP <i>n</i> = 69 (29.1%) | |
| | | | | NJ <i>n</i> = 84 (35.4%) | |
| ESTJ <i>n</i> = 13 (5.5%) +++++ | ESFJ <i>n</i> = 16 (6.8%) +++++ | ENFJ <i>n</i> = 35 (14.8%) +++++ | ENTJ <i>n</i> = 8 (3.4%) +++ | TJ <i>n</i> = 48 (20.3%) | |
| | +++++ | +++++ | | TP <i>n</i> = 14 (5.9%) | |
| | ++ | +++++ | | FP <i>n</i> = 70 (29.5%) | |
| | | +++++ | | FJ <i>n</i> = 105 (44.3%) | |
| | | +++++ | | IN <i>n</i> = 78 (32.9%) | |
| | | | | EN <i>n</i> = 75 (31.6%) | |
| | | | | IS <i>n</i> = 50 (21.1%) | |
| | | | | ES <i>n</i> = 34 (14.3%) | |
| | | | | ET <i>n</i> = 29 (12.2%) | |
| | | | | EF <i>n</i> = 80 (33.8%) | |
| | | | | IF <i>n</i> = 95 (40.1%) | |
| | | | | IT <i>n</i> = 33 (13.9%) | |

| Jungian Types (E) | | | Jungian Types (I) | | | Dominant Types | | | Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater |
|-------------------|----------|------|-------------------|----------|------|----------------|----------|------|--|
| | <i>n</i> | % | | <i>n</i> | % | | <i>n</i> | % | |
| E-TJ | 21 | 8.9 | I-TP | 6 | 2.5 | Dt.T | 27 | 11.4 | Psychological types of female Anglican clergy |
| E-FJ | 51 | 21.5 | I-FP | 41 | 17.3 | Dt.F | 92 | 38.8 | |
| ES-P | 5 | 2.1 | IS-J | 40 | 16.9 | Dt.S | 45 | 19.0 | |
| EN-P | 32 | 13.5 | IN-J | 41 | 17.3 | Dt.N | 73 | 30.8 | |

Note: N = 237 + = 1% of N

These data are taken from 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.

Table 2

Type distribution for clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry compared with clergywomen serving in other ministries in the Church of England

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|----------|------|--------------------|----------------|----------|------|--------------|
| ISTJ <i>n</i> = 15 (10.4%) <i>I</i> = 2.24* +++++ +++++ | ISFJ <i>n</i> = 45 (31.3%) <i>I</i> = 2.55*** +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ + | INFJ <i>n</i> = 9 (6.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.59 +++++ + | INTJ <i>n</i> = 5 (3.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.51 ++++ | E <i>n</i> = 59 (41.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.89 I <i>n</i> = 85 (59.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.09 S <i>n</i> = 101 (70.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.98*** N <i>n</i> = 43 (29.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.46*** T <i>n</i> = 30 (20.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.80 F <i>n</i> = 114 (79.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.07 J <i>n</i> = 119 (82.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.28*** P <i>n</i> = 25 (17.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.49*** | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Pairs and Temperaments | | | | | | | |
| ISTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.82 + | ISFP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.41 + | INFP <i>n</i> = 7 (4.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.35** +++++ | INTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.41 + | IJ <i>n</i> = 74 (51.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.50*** | | | <i>I</i> = 1.50*** | | | | |
| | | | | IP <i>n</i> = 11 (7.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.39*** | | | <i>I</i> = 0.39*** | | | | |
| | | | | EP <i>n</i> = 14 (9.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.62 | | | <i>I</i> = 0.62 | | | | |
| | | | | EJ <i>n</i> = 45 (31.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.03 | | | <i>I</i> = 1.03 | | | | |
| ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.0 | ESFP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.65 +++ | ENFP <i>n</i> = 10 (6.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.66 +++++ ++ | ENTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00* | ST <i>n</i> = 22 (15.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.34 | | | <i>I</i> = 1.34 | | | | |
| | | | | SF <i>n</i> = 79 (54.9%) <i>I</i> = 2.28*** | | | <i>I</i> = 2.28*** | | | | |
| | | | | NF <i>n</i> = 35 (24.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.49*** | | | <i>I</i> = 0.49*** | | | | |
| | | | | NT <i>n</i> = 8 (5.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.38** | | | <i>I</i> = 0.38** | | | | |
| ESTJ <i>n</i> = 6 (4.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.76 ++++ | ESFJ <i>n</i> = 28 (19.4%) <i>I</i> = 2.88*** +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ | ENFJ <i>n</i> = 9 (6.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.42** +++++ + | ENTJ <i>n</i> = 2 (1.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.41 + | SJ <i>n</i> = 94 (65.3%) <i>I</i> = 2.24*** | | | <i>I</i> = 2.24*** | | | | |
| | | | | SP <i>n</i> = 7 (4.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.77 | | | <i>I</i> = 0.77 | | | | |
| | | | | NP <i>n</i> = 18 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.43*** | | | <i>I</i> = 0.43*** | | | | |
| | | | | NJ <i>n</i> = 25 (17.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.49*** | | | <i>I</i> = 0.49*** | | | | |
| | | | | TJ <i>n</i> = 28 (19.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.96 | | | <i>I</i> = 0.96 | | | | |
| | | | | TP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.24* | | | <i>I</i> = 0.24* | | | | |
| | | | | FP <i>n</i> = 23 (16.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.54** | | | <i>I</i> = 0.54** | | | | |
| | | | | FJ <i>n</i> = 91 (63.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.43*** | | | <i>I</i> = 1.43*** | | | | |
| | | | | IN <i>n</i> = 22 (15.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.46*** | | | <i>I</i> = 0.46*** | | | | |
| | | | | EN <i>n</i> = 21 (14.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.46*** | | | <i>I</i> = 0.46*** | | | | |
| | | | | IS <i>n</i> = 63 (43.8%) <i>I</i> = 2.07*** | | | <i>I</i> = 2.07*** | | | | |
| | | | | ES <i>n</i> = 38 (26.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.84*** | | | <i>I</i> = 1.84*** | | | | |
| | | | | ET <i>n</i> = 8 (5.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.45* | | | <i>I</i> = 0.45* | | | | |
| | | | | EF <i>n</i> = 51 (35.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.05 | | | <i>I</i> = 1.05 | | | | |
| | | | | IF <i>n</i> = 63 (43.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.09 | | | <i>I</i> = 1.09 | | | | |
| | | | | IT <i>n</i> = 22 (15.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.10 | | | <i>I</i> = 1.10 | | | | |
| Jungian Types (E) | | | | Jungian Types (I) | | | | Dominant Types | | | |
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> |
| E-TJ | 8 | 5.6 | 0.63 | I-TP | 2 | 1.4 | 0.55 | Dt.T | 10 | 6.9 | 0.61 |
| E-FJ | 37 | 25.7 | 1.19 | I-FP | 9 | 6.3 | 0.36** | Dt.F | 46 | 31.9 | 0.82 |
| ES-P | 4 | 2.8 | 1.32 | IS-J | 60 | 41.7 | 2.47*** | Dt.S | 64 | 44.4 | 2.34*** |
| EN-P | 10 | 6.9 | 0.51* | IN-J | 14 | 9.7 | 0.56* | Dt.N | 24 | 16.7 | 0.54** |

Note: N = 144

+ = 1% of N

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$