

# THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

**Original citation:**

Francis, Leslie J. and Robbins, Mandy. (2012) Not fitting in and getting out : psychological type and congregational satisfaction among Anglican churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, Vol.15 (No.10). pp. 1023-1035.

**Permanent WRAP url:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/52218>

**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. and Robbins, Mandy. (2012) Not fitting in and getting out : psychological type and congregational satisfaction among Anglican churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, Vol.15 (No.10). pp. 1023-1035, published in *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* (2012), © Taylor & Francis, available online at:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13674676.2012.676260>

**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](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk)



warwickpublicationswrap  
highlight your research

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

Not fitting in and getting out: Psychological type and congregational satisfaction among  
Anglican churchgoers in England

Leslie J. Francis\*

The University of Warwick, UK

Mandy Robbins

The University of Warwick, 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**

Listening to the motivations reported by individuals for ceasing church attendance and becoming church leavers, Francis and Richter (2007) identified high on the list the sense of 'not fitting in'. Drawing on psychological type theory, several recent studies have documented the way in which some psychological types are over-represented in church congregations and other psychological types are under-represented (Francis, 2005). Bringing these two observations together, the present study tested the hypothesis that church congregations have created type-alike communities within which individuals displaying the opposite type preferences are more likely to feel marginalised and to display lower levels of satisfaction with the congregations they attend. Data were provided by 1,867 churchgoers who completed a measure of psychological type, together with measures of frequency of attendance and congregational satisfaction. These data confirmed that congregations were weighted towards preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling and judging (ISFJ), and that individuals displaying the opposite preferences (especially intuition, thinking and perceiving) recorded lower levels of congregational satisfaction. The implications of these findings are discussed for promoting congregational retention by enhancing awareness of psychological type preferences among those who attend.

## Introduction

The decline in church attendance in England over the past decades has been well documented, although there is less agreement on the underlying causes for such decline (Gill, 1993, 2003). One research tradition that has employed empirical techniques to address this issue has done so by exploring the people who used to attend church and then disengaged from their previous practice of church attendance. Examples of this research tradition from the 19760s and 1980s conducted in the United States of America include studies reported by Hartman (1976), Savage (1976), Roozen, (1978, 1980), Hale (1980), Hoge, McGuire, and Stratman (1981), and Hadaway (1989). More recently in the United Kingdom the Church Leaving Applied Research Project employed both qualitative methods (interviewing church leavers) and quantitative methods (a detailed questionnaire survey among church leavers). The first book emerging from this project, *Gone but not forgotten*, by Richter and Francis (1998), identified from the responses to the interviews and to the questionnaires eight basic themes underpinning church leaving. The second book from this project, *Gone for good*, by Francis and Richter (2007) refined the analysis further to identify and to discuss fifteen discrete causes for church leaving. These fifteen causes were described as: matters of belief and unbelief; growing up and changing; life transitions and life changes; alternative lives and alternative meanings; incompatible lifestyles; not belonging and not fitting in; costs and benefits; disillusionment with the church; being let down by the church; problems with relevance; problems with change; problems with worship; problems with leadership; problems with conservatism; and problems with liberalism.

Each of these fifteen themes deserves further investigation and scrutiny. The intention of the present study is to concentrate on the theme of ‘not belonging and not fitting in’, and to examine the power of psychological type theory to identify the types of people who may be most susceptible to this experience. The statistics suggested that this theme was by no means

insignificant as a motivational factor among church leavers. As many as 45% of the respondents to the questionnaires said that they did not feel part of the church where they had attended. Moreover, those who had left with the view that they did not feel part of the church were more prominent among the permanent disaffiliates than among potential returners (56% compared with 33%).

While there may be many reasons for 'not belonging and not fitting in', one frequently cited reason was that of feeling somehow different from the majority of people there. One interviewee, a relatively young Roman Catholic, spoke of the impact of getting divorced and now feeling uncomfortable attending church where most other people were part of a couple. Another interviewee, a middle-aged man who left a New Church, felt uncomfortable surrounded by so many younger people. On the other hand, the problem for one homemaker in her thirties was that there had been an absence of younger people in her church. She said:

We were the youngest couple. The next married couple to us were in their forties, but they were old forties, do you know what I mean? I mean, they were only like ten years older than us, but it seemed like a big gap, so there wasn't anybody our own age.

(Francis & Richter, 2007, p. 174-175)

A range of other demographic factors may also come to the surface in contributing to a sense of isolation or exclusion. Men may feel somewhat out of place in congregations shaped largely by women. White faces may feel out of place in congregations shaped largely by people of colour. Graduates may feel out of place in congregations shaped largely by working-class culture.

Recent research that has introduced psychological type theory to the field of congregational studies suggests that churches may attract people of particular psychological type profiles and as a consequence (unintentionally) begin to marginalise others who do not

somehow fit the dominant type profile of the group (see Francis, 2005, 2009). Psychological type theory has its roots in the pioneering work of Carl Jung (1971) and has been developed and popularised through a series of type indicators, type sorters or type scales. The most frequently employed of these measures in church-related research and congregational studies are the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS: Keirsey & Bates, 1978), the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator (MBTI: Myers & McCaulley, 1985), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). At its core psychological type theory distinguishes between two orientations, two perceiving functions, two judging functions, and two attitudes toward the outer world. In each of these four areas, psychological type theory conceptualises difference in terms of two discrete categories (or types) rather than in terms of a continuum stretching between two poles.

In psychological type theory, the two orientations are concerned with contrasting energy sources and distinguish between introversion (I) and extraversion (E). Introverts are energised by the inner world. When tired they prefer to go inwards to regain energy. Extraverts are energised by the outer world. When tired they prefer to congregate with other people to regain energy. Introverts enjoy their own company and appreciate silence. Extraverts enjoy the company of others and prefer to engage in conversation. A congregation shaped by introverts may seem somewhat strange to extraverts, while a congregation shaped by extraverts may seem somewhat strange to introverts.

In psychological type theory, the two perceiving functions are concerned with contrasting ways of taking in information and distinguish between sensing (S) and intuition (N). Sensing types are concerned with the details of a situation as perceived by the five senses. Intuitive types are concerned with the meaning and significance of a situation. Sensing types feel comfortable with the familiar and with the conventional. They tend to dislike change. Intuitive types feel comfortable with innovation and with new ideas. They

tend to promote change. A congregation shaped by sensing types may seem somewhat strange to intuitive types, while a congregation shaped by intuitive types may seem somewhat strange to sensing types.

In psychological type theory, the two judging functions are concerned with contrasting ways of evaluating situations and distinguish between thinking (T) and feeling (F). Thinking types are concerned with the objective evaluation of a situation, and with identifying the underlying logic. Feeling types are concerned with the subjective evaluation of a situation, and with identifying the underlying values. Thinking types are more concerned with supporting effective systems. Feeling types are concerned with supporting interpersonal relationships. A congregation shaped by thinking types may seem somewhat strange to feeling types, while a congregation shaped by feeling types may seem somewhat strange to thinking types.

In psychological type theory, the two attitudes toward the outer world are concerned with which of the two psychological processes is employed in the outer world and distinguishes between judging (J) and perceiving (P). Judging types employ their preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) in the outer world. Perceiving types employ their preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) in the outer world. Judging types display a planned, orderly and organised profile to the outer world. Perceiving types display a flexible, spontaneous and unplanned profile to the outer world. A congregation shaped by judging types may seem somewhat strange to perceiving types, while a congregation shaped by perceiving types may seem somewhat strange to judging types.

As well as discussing the four contrasting pairs independently (introversion *or* extraversion, sensing *or* intuition, thinking *or* feeling, and judging *or* perceiving), psychological type theory draws these component parts together in a variety of ways, three of which are particularly important. First, the combination of the components allows each

individual's strongest, or *dominant* function to be identified: dominant sensing types are practical people; dominant intuitive types are imaginative people; dominant feeling types are humane people; and dominant thinking types are logical people. Second, alongside their dominant preference individuals are given clearer identity by their second strongest, or *auxiliary* function. The auxiliary is the preferred function for the opposite process complementing the dominant function, leading to eight dominant-auxiliary pairs: dominant sensing with thinking, dominant sensing with feeling, dominant intuition with thinking, dominant intuition with feeling, dominant feeling with sensing, dominant feeling with intuition, dominant thinking with sensing, and dominant thinking with intuition. Third, all four preferred components of psychological type theory cohere to generate 16 complete types, usually identified by their initial letter (for example INTJ or ESFP).

Psychological type theory was introduced into congregational studies in North America by Gerhardt (1983), Rehak (1998), Delis-Bulhoes (1990), and Ross (1993, 1995) and in the United Kingdom by Craig, Francis, Bailey, and Robbins (2003), and Francis, Duncan, Craig and Luffman (2004). Building on these foundational studies, Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007) analysed data from 185 churchgoers attending small congregations in rural Wales and compared the profile of male and female churchgoers with population norms for the United Kingdom published by Kendall (1998). The main finding from this comparison concerned the undue weighting toward sensing, feeling and judging in church congregations. Among women ISFJ accounts for 32% of churchgoers, compared with 18% of the general population, and ESFJ accounts for 28% of churchgoers, compared with 19% of the general population. Among men ISFJ accounts for 19% of churchgoers, compared with 7% of the general population, and ESFJ accounts for 27% of churchgoers, compared with 6% of the general population. The over-representation of ISFJ and ESFJ among churchgoers leads to under-representation of other types. Francis, Robbins, Williams and



Williams (2007) chose for their study the descriptive (but challenging) title, 'All types are called, but some are more likely to respond'.

The major shortcoming with the study reported by Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007) concerned the interpretative weight carried by a sample of only 185 churchgoers. A more recent study, reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (in press), addressed this shortcoming by assembling data from 2,135 women and 1,169 men surveyed in the context of Anglican church services in England and by (again) comparing the psychological type profile of these churchgoers with the population norms for the UK published by Kendall (1998). The findings from this larger study are remarkably similar to some of the findings from the smaller study (especially among the women). Among the female churchgoers there were strong preferences for sensing (81%), for feeling (70%) and for judging (85%), with a balance between introversion (49%) and extraversion (51%). In this study 25% of the women reported ISFJ and 25% reported ESFJ. Among the male churchgoers there were preferences for introversion (62%), for sensing (78%), for thinking (58%) and for judging (86%). In this study 17% of the men reported ISFJ and 11% reported ESFJ.

The major shortcoming with the two studies reported by Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007) and Francis, Robbins, and Craig (in press) is that both studies were restricted to Anglicans in England and Wales. Another study, reported by Robbins and Francis (2011) addressed this shortcoming by drawing on data collected by the Australian National Church Life Survey from 936 women and 591 men surveyed in the context of church services across 18 participating denominations and by comparing the psychological type profile of the churchgoers with the population norms for Australia published by Ball (2008). The findings from this Australian study are remarkably similar to the findings reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (in press). Among the female churchgoers, there

were strong preferences for sensing (81%), for feeling (62%), and for judging (87%), with a balance between introversion (52%) and extraversion (48%). In this study, 23% of the women reported ISFJ and 22% reported ESFJ. Among the male churchgoers, there were preferences for introversion (59%), and for sensing (78%), for thinking (60%) and for judging (88%). In this study, 13% of the men reported ISFJ and 14% reported ESFJ.

Overall, when the profiles of the men and women are added together for the three studies (giving a sample of 5,016), the ISFJ profile of churchgoers is confirmed with introversion (54%), sensing (80%), feeling (58%), and judging (86%). Given the predominance of the ISFJ profile within church congregations, the hypothesis being advanced by the present study proposes that extraverts, intuitive types, thinking types and perceiving types are more likely to be among church leavers who give as their reason for disengagement 'not belonging, not fitting in'.

### **Research question**

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to test the hypothesis that psychological type theory is able to predict individual differences in levels of congregational satisfaction among churchgoers. Given that congregations are weighted towards introverts, sensing types, feeling types, and judging types the four specific hypotheses are that

- congregational satisfaction will be higher among introverts than extraverts.
- congregational satisfaction will be higher among sensing types than intuitive types.
- congregational satisfaction will be higher among feeling types than thinking types.
- congregational satisfaction will be higher among judging types than perceiving types.

Such hypotheses are relevant to the issue of church-leaving on the assumption that low levels of congregational satisfaction prompt disengagement from the church.

## **Method**

### **Procedure**

Snowball sampling was employed to attract participation from a wide range of Church of England congregations, generally employing contacts established through the Network for Psychological Type and Christian Faith and through clergy continuing ministerial education programmes. Clergy or laity leading worship within these congregations were scripted to introduce the purpose of the project and to invite everyone present to complete the brief questionnaire at a given point in the service. Participation was voluntary, anonymous and confidential. A total of 72 Church of England congregations had participated in the project at the stage when the current analyses were undertaken, including a number of very small congregations from rural churches.

### **Instrument**

*Psychological type* was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). This is a 40-item instrument comprising 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). Recent studies have demonstrated that this instrument functions well in church-related contexts. For example, Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported alpha coefficients of .83 for the EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale. Participants were asked for each pair of characteristics to check the 'box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if you feel both characteristics apply to you. Tick the characteristics that reflect the real you, even if other people see you differently'.

*Congregational satisfaction* was assessed by the Francis Index of Congregational Satisfaction (FICS), an instrument developed and tested specifically for the present study. This instrument comprises a set of nine semantic differential grids (employing a seven-point scale) anchored by: welcome and unwelcome; comfortable and uncomfortable; content and

discontent; happy and unhappy; valued and not valued; at ease and uneasy; satisfied and dissatisfied; I fit in and I do not fit in; I belong and I do not belong. The semantic differential grids were prefaced by the statement 'In this congregation I feel ...' and participants were invited to 'indicate how strongly you feel about the statements by drawing a circle round one number on each line'.

### **Sample**

From the 72 congregations participating in the study, thoroughly completed questionnaires were returned by 1,867 individuals, of whom 3% were under the age of twenty, 7% in their twenties, 11% in their thirties, 17% in their forties, 21% in the fifties, 21% in their sixties, 17% in their seventies, and 4% were aged eighty or over.

### **Data analysis**

The research literature concerning 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 following presentation in order to integrate these new data within the established literature and to provide all the detail necessary for secondary analysis and further interpretation within the rich theoretical framework afforded by psychological type. Type tables have been designed to provide information about the sixteen discrete psychological 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 on this table will, however, be restricted to those aspects of the data strictly relevant to the research question.

### **Results**

The eight scales of the Francis Psychological Type Scales all achieved satisfactory internal consistency reliability in terms of the alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951):

extraversion and introversion,  $\alpha = .75$ ; sensing and intuition,  $\alpha = .79$ ; thinking and feeling,  $\alpha = .76$ ; judging and perceiving,  $\alpha = .77$ .

Table 1 presents the type distribution for the 1867 Anglican churchgoers in England.

- Insert table 1 -

These data demonstrate preferences for introversion (57%) over extraversion (43%), for sensing (78%) over intuition (22%), for feeling (59%) over thinking (41%), and for judging (85%) over perceiving (15%). In terms of dominant type preferences, 45% were dominant sensing, 27% dominant feeling, 15% dominant thinking, and 12% dominant intuition. In terms of the sixteen complete types the three most frequently occurring types were ISFJ (23%), ISTJ (19%), and ESFJ (18%). The combined SJ preference accounted for 71% of these Anglican churchgoers.

Table 2 presents the properties of the Francis Index of Congregational Satisfaction, in terms of the correlations between the individual items and the sum of the other items and in

- Insert Table 2 here -

terms of the alpha coefficient. These data demonstrate a high level of internal consistency reliability ( $\alpha = .90$ ).

Table 3 examines the mean scores recorded on the measure of congregational

- Insert Table 3 here -

satisfaction by the dichotomous type preferences. These data demonstrate that significantly higher levels of congregational satisfaction were recorded by extraverts than by introverts, by sensing types than by intuitive types, by feeling types than by thinking types, and by judging types than by perceiving types.

Table 4 examines the mean scores recorded on the measure of congregational

- Insert table 3 here -

satisfaction by dominant type preferences. These data demonstrate that dominant intuitive types displayed the lowest level of congregational satisfaction in comparison with the other three dominant types.

Table 5 takes the analysis one stage further by examining the mean scores recorded on

- Insert table 5 here -

the measure of congregational satisfaction by the combined dominant and auxiliary pairs.

These data demonstrate that the two types sharing the highest level of congregational satisfaction combine sensing and feeling preferences (dominant sensing with auxiliary feeling, and dominant feeling with auxiliary sensing) and that the two types sharing the lowest level of congregational satisfaction combine thinking and intuition preferences (dominant thinking with auxiliary intuition and dominant intuition with auxiliary thinking).

Table 6 completes the analysis by examining the mean scores recorded on the

- Insert table 6 here -

measure of congregational satisfaction by the sixteen complete types. Of particular interest from this table is the observation that the lowest mean score of congregational satisfaction is recorded by ENTPs who represent the mirror image of the predominant profile of Anglican churchgoers as ISFJ.

### **Discussion and conclusion**

This study set out to test the thesis that psychological type theory is capable of explaining the experience reported by some church leavers that their motivation for congregational disengagement was associated with the feeling of ‘not fitting in’ and consequently the response of ‘getting out’ (see Francis & Richter, 2007). Three main conclusions may be drawn from the data gathered and analysed by the present study and on the basis of which an answer can be offered to the central research question raised by this study.

The first conclusion concerns the development of the Francis Index of Congregational Satisfaction (FICS). This instrument provides a set of nine semantic differential grids that combine to generate a unidimensional measure with a very good level of internal consistency reliability ( $\alpha = .90$ ). According to this index, a high level of congregational satisfaction is reflected in the sense of feeling welcome, comfortable, content, happy, valued, at ease, and satisfied, and in the sense of fitting in and of belonging. According to this index, a low sense of congregational satisfaction is reflected in the sense of feeling unwelcome, uncomfortable, discontent, unhappy, not valued, uneasy and dissatisfied, and in the sense of not fitting in and of not belonging. On the basis of the good scaling properties, this instrument can be commended for further use and employed to examine the association between levels of congregational satisfaction and psychological type within the present study.

The second conclusion concerns the psychological type profile of churchgoers as generated by a new survey in which 1,867 individuals attending services in Anglican Churches in England completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS). According to these data, Anglican Churchgoers in England demonstrated preferences for introversion (57%), sensing (78%), feeling (59%), and judging (85%). The most frequently occurring types in this sample were ISFJ (23%), ISTJ (19%), and ESFJ (18%). These findings reflect quite closely the profile of 3,304 Anglican churchgoers in England reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (in press) who demonstrated preferences for introversion (54%), for sensing (80%), for feeling (60%), and for judging (86%). In that study frequently occurring types were ISFJ (22%), ESFJ (20%), and ISTJ (18%). They also reflect quite closely the profile of 1,527 churchgoers reported by Robbins and Francis (2011) within the context of the Australian National Church Life Survey from a range of different Christian denominations. These data demonstrated preferences for introversion (55%), for sensing (80%), for feeling (53%), and for judging (87%). In that study frequently occurring types

were ISTJ (21%), ISFJ (19%), and ESFJ (19%). All three of these main studies, therefore, concur that church congregations may be places shaped by and shaped for introverts, sensing types, feeling types and judging types.

Preference for introversion characterises a community in which participants are energised by their inner world rather than by their outer world. Introverts are people who will value the contemplative, quiet and solitary aspects of public worship more than the active, participatory and community aspects of church life. A community shaped by a preference for introversion may, however, feel somewhat alien to individuals who view the world through the lens of extraversion. For this reason extraverts may find it more difficult to access their local churches and, having done so, may sense that they are not really fitting in, and not properly belonging.

Preference for sensing characterises a community concerned with continuity, with traditions, with stability, and with a God grounded in divine changelessness. Here is a community concerned with guarding what has been handed down by previous generations, and with resisting change. Such a community may tend to espouse conservative social and moral values. A community shaped by a preference for sensing may, however, feel somewhat alien to individuals who view the world through the lens of intuition. For this reason intuitive types may find it more difficult to access their local churches and, having done so, may sense that they are not really fitting in, and not properly belonging.

Preference for feeling characterises a community concerned with human values, with interpersonal relationships, and with a loving and caring God. Here is a community concerned with peace and with harmony. Such a community may tend to project a feminine profile, given the significantly higher levels of preference for feeling reported among women than among men in many national population studies (see Kendall, 1998). A community shaped by a preference for feeling may, however, feel somewhat alien to individuals who



view the world through the lens of thinking. For this reason thinking types may find it more difficult to access their local churches and, having done so, may sense that they are not really fitting in, and not properly belonging.

Preference for judging characterises a community concerned with organisation, with discipline, with structure and with a God who welcomes a regular pattern of worship (whatever that pattern may be). Here is a community concerned with valuing regular commitment, advanced planning, and respect for guidelines (implicit as well as explicit). Such a community may tend to reject spontaneity and flexibility. A community shaped by a preference for judging may, however, feel somewhat alien to individuals who view the world through the lens of perceiving. For this reason perceiving types may find it more difficult to access their local churches and, having done so, may sense that they are not really fitting in, and not properly belonging.

The third conclusion concerns the significant association between psychological type and levels of congregational satisfaction. In terms of the binary distinctions, the forgoing discussion proposed that lower levels of congregational satisfaction would be recorded among extraverts compared with introverts, among intuitive types compared with sensing types, among thinking types compared with feeling types, and among perceiving types compared with judging types. The data confirmed three of these hypotheses, but not the fourth. Contrary to the hypothesis, extraverts recorded higher levels of congregational satisfaction and introverts recorded lower levels of congregational satisfaction, in spite of there being a higher proportion of introverts than extraverts in church congregations. This discrepancy is, nonetheless, consistent with a somewhat different well-established body of research. Overall, extraverts tend to record higher scores than introverts across a range of measures concerned with satisfaction and wellbeing in general, as illustrated in studies reported by Rahim (1981), by Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault, and Avis (1988), and by

Francis and Jones (2000). The basic thesis, however, is sustained: that congregations are shaped by sensing types and intuitive types experience lower levels of congregational satisfaction; that congregations are shaped by feeling types and thinking types experience lower levels of congregational satisfaction; and that congregations are shaped by judging types and perceiving types experience lower levels of satisfaction.

In terms of dominant types, it is dominant intuitives who comprise the smallest dominant type within church congregations (12%) and who also record the lowest scores of congregational satisfaction. In terms of the combined dominant and auxiliary pairs, the two types sharing the highest level of congregational satisfaction combine sensing and feeling preferences (dominant sensing with auxiliary feeling, and dominant feeling with auxiliary sensing), and these types accounted for 47% of all churchgoers. The two types sharing the lowest level of congregational satisfaction combine thinking and intuition preferences (dominant thinking with auxiliary intuition and dominant intuition with auxiliary thinking), and these types accounted for just 9% of all churchgoers. In terms of the sixteen complete types, the most interesting observation is that the lowest mean score of congregational satisfaction was recorded by ENTPs who represent the mirror image of the predominant profile of Anglican churchgoers as ISFJs.

Taken together these data support the overall conclusion that psychological type theory is capable of explaining (at least in part) the experience reported by some churchgoers that their motivation for congregational disengagement was associated with the feeling of 'not fitting in' and the consequent response of 'getting out'.

There are three limitations with the present study that need to be addressed by future research building on this study. The first limitation concerns reliance on one (new) measure of congregational satisfaction as an indicator of potential disengagement from church life. Future research could develop more highly nuanced indices of congregational satisfaction,

including more direct assessment of potential disengagement. The second limitation concerns reliance on one study surveying only one denominational group (Anglicans). Future research could replicate and extend the present study in other denominational and national contexts. The third limitation concerns the extrapolation of psychological type profiling established among churchgoers to church leavers. Future research concerned directly with contacting church leavers could include a measure of psychological type in order to check the conclusions based on the present study.

### References

- Ball, I. L. (2008). Australian data on the distribution of psychological types. *Bulletin of Psychological Type, 31*, 53-55.
- Bigelow, E. D., Fitzgerald, R., Busk, P., Girault, E., & Avis, J. (1988). Psychological characteristics of Catholic sisters: relationships between the MBTI and other measures. *Journal of Psychological Type, 14*, 32-36.
- Craig, C. L., Francis, L. J., Bailey, J., & Robbins, M. (2003). Psychological types in Church in Wales congregations. *The Psychologist in Wales, 15*, 18-21.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334.
- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990). Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members. *Journal of Psychological Type, 20*, 25-33.
- 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., 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., Duncan, B., Craig, C. L., & Luffman, G. (2004). Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England. *Journal of Adult Theological Education, 1*, 66-77.
- Francis L. J., & Jones, S. H. (2000). Psychological type and happiness: a study among adult churchgoers. *Journal of Psychological Type, 54*, 36-41.

- Francis, L. J. & Richter, P. (2007). *Gone for good? Church-leaving and returning in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Peterborough: Epworth.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Craig, C. L. (in press). The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: Compatible or incompatible with their clergy? *International Journal of Practical Theology*.
- 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.
- Gerhardt, R. (1983). Liberal religion and personality type. *Research in Psychological Type*, 6, 47-53.
- Gill, R. (1993). *The Myth of the Empty Church*. London: SPCK.
- Gill, R. (2003). *The 'Empty' Church Revisited*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hadaway, C. K. (1989). Identifying American apostates: A cluster analysis. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 201–15.
- Hale, J. R. (1980). *The Unchurched: Who they are and why they stay away*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Hartman, W. J. (1976). *Membership trends: A study of decline and growth in the United Methodist Church 1949–1975*. Nashville, Tennessee: Discipleship Resources.
- Hoge, D. R., McGuire, K. and Stratman, B. F. (1981). *Converts, dropouts, returnees: A study of religious change among Catholics*. New York: Pilgrim 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, California: 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, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Rahim, A. (1981). Job satisfaction as a function of personality-job congruence: A study with Jungian psychological types. *Psychological Reports*, 49, 496-498.
- Rehak, M.C. (1998). Identifying the congregation's corporate personality. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 44, 39-44.
- Richter, P., & Francis, L. J. (1998). *Gone but not forgotten: church leaving and returning*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Robbins, M., & Francis, L. J. (2011). All are called, but some psychological types are more likely to respond: profiling churchgoers in Australia. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 212-229.
- Roozen, D. A. (1978). *The Churched and the Unchurched in America: A comparative profile*. Washington, DC: Glenmary Research Center.
- Roozen, D. A. (1980). Church dropouts: Changing patterns of disengagement and re-entry. *Review of Religious Research*, 21(4), 427-50.
- Ross, C. F. J. (1993). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church: comparisons with Catholics, Evangelicals and clergy. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 26, 28-35.
- Ross, C. F. J. (1995). Type patterns among Catholics: four Anglophone congregations compared with Protestants, Francophone Catholics and priests. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 33, 33-41.
- Savage, J. S. (1976). *The apathetic and bored church member: Psychological and theological implications*. New York: LEAD Consultants.

Table 1

*Type distribution for Anglican churchgoers in England*

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ	E	I	S
<i>n</i> = 355 (19.0%)	<i>n</i> = 422 (22.6%)	<i>n</i> = 69 (3.7%)	<i>n</i> = 85 (4.6%)	<i>n</i> = 802 (43.0%)	<i>n</i> = 1065 (57.0%)	<i>n</i> = 1464 (78.4%)
+++++	+++++	++++	+++++	N		<i>n</i> = 403 (21.6%)
+++++	+++++			T		<i>n</i> = 758 (40.6%)
+++++	+++++			F		<i>n</i> = 1109 (59.4%)
++++	+++++			J		<i>n</i> = 1585 (84.9%)
	+++			P		<i>n</i> = 282 (15.1%)
The Sixteen Complete Types				Pairs and Temperaments		
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP	IJ	IP	EP
<i>n</i> = 18 (1.0%)	<i>n</i> = 52 (2.8%)	<i>n</i> = 46 (2.5%)	<i>n</i> = 18 (1.0%)	<i>n</i> = 931 (49.9%)	<i>n</i> = 134 (7.2%)	<i>n</i> = 148 (7.9%)
+	++	+++	+	EJ		<i>n</i> = 654 (35.0%)
				ST		<i>n</i> = 583 (31.2%)
				SF		<i>n</i> = 881 (47.2%)
				NF		<i>n</i> = 228 (12.2%)
				NT		<i>n</i> = 175 (9.4%)
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP	SJ	SP	NP
<i>n</i> = 8 (0.4%)	<i>n</i> = 63 (3.4%)	<i>n</i> = 52 (2.8%)	<i>n</i> = 25 (1.3%)	<i>n</i> = 1323 (70.9%)	<i>n</i> = 141 (7.6%)	<i>n</i> = 141 (7.6%)
	+++	+++	+	NJ		<i>n</i> = 262 (14.0%)
				TJ		<i>n</i> = 689 (36.9%)
				TP		<i>n</i> = 69 (3.7%)
				FP		<i>n</i> = 213 (11.4%)
				FJ		<i>n</i> = 896 (48.0%)
ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ	IN	EN	IS
<i>n</i> = 202 (10.8%)	<i>n</i> = 344 (18.4%)	<i>n</i> = 61 (3.3%)	<i>n</i> = 47 (2.5%)	<i>n</i> = 218 (11.7%)	<i>n</i> = 185 (9.9%)	<i>n</i> = 847 (45.4%)
+++++	+++++	+++	+++	ES		<i>n</i> = 617 (33.0%)
+++++	+++++			ET		<i>n</i> = 282 (15.1%)
+	+++++			EF		<i>n</i> = 520 (27.9%)
	+++			IF		<i>n</i> = 589 (31.5%)
				IT		<i>n</i> = 476 (25.5%)

  

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types			Anglican Churchgoers in England
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%	
E-TJ	249	13.3	I-TP	36	1.9	Dt.T	285	15.3	Leslie J Francis and Mandy Robbins
E-FJ	405	21.7	I-FP	98	5.2	Dt.F	503	26.9	
ES-P	71	3.8	IS-J	777	41.6	Dt.S	848	45.4	
EN-P	77	4.1	IN-J	154	8.2	Dt.N	231	12.4	

Note: N = 1867

+ = 1% of N

Table 2

*Francis Index of Congregational Satisfaction: correlation coefficient for each item with the sum of the other data*

positive pole	negative pole	r
welcome	unwelcome	.54
comfortable	uncomfortable	.65
content	discontent	.72
happy	unhappy	.69
valued	not valued	.68
at ease	uneasy	.71
satisfied	dissatisfied	.73
I fit in	I do not fit in	.66
I belong	I do not belong	.71
	alpha	.90



Table 3

*Congregational satisfaction scores by dichotomous type preferences*

comparisons	N	mean	SD	t	p <
extraversion	802	54.5	9.5		
introversion	1065	52.8	10.1	3.7	.001
sensing	1464	54.3	9.4		
intuition	403	50.8	10.8	6.0	.001
thinking	758	52.0	10.5		
feeling	1109	54.6	9.2	5.5	.001
judging	1585	53.8	9.6		
perceiving	282	51.7	10.9	3.3	.001

Table 4

*Congregational satisfaction scores by dominant type preferences*

dominant types	N	mean	SD	t	p <
dominant feeling	503	54.5	9.4		
dominant sensing	848	54.1	9.4		
dominant thinking	285	53.0	9.9		
dominant intuition	231	49.7	11.1	15.0	.001

Table 5

*Congregational satisfaction scores by dominant and auxiliary type preferences*

dominant and auxiliary types	N	mean	SD	t	p <
dominant sensing with feeling	485	55.3	8.8		
dominant feeling with sensing	396	54.9	9.3		
dominant thinking with sensing	220	53.7	9.6		
dominant feeling with intuition	107	53.1	9.7		
dominant sensing with thinking	363	52.5	10.0		
dominant intuition with feeling	121	51.8	9.4		
dominant thinking with intuition	65	50.6	10.6		
dominant intuition with thinking	110	47.4	12.4	11.9	.001

Table 6

*Congregational satisfaction scores by 16 complete types*

type	N	mean	SD	t	p <
ESFP	63	57.3	7.4		
ESFJ	344	55.5	9.0		
ENFJ	61	55.1	8.3		
ISFJ	422	55.1	9.0		
ESTJ	202	54.2	9.2		
ENFP	52	53.0	8.9		
ISTJ	355	52.6	10.0		
ENTJ	47	51.8	10.6		
ISFP	52	51.2	10.6		
INFJ	69	50.9	9.8		
INFP	46	50.5	10.9		
ESTP	8	49.6	10.7		
ISTP	18	48.4	12.5		
INTJ	85	48.3	11.4		
INTP	18	47.7	10.3		
ENTP	25	44.6	15.2	7.7	.001