

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

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

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

Author(s): Burton, Lewis, Francis, Leslie J and Robbins, Mandy
Article Title: Psychological Type Profile of Methodist Circuit Ministers in Britain: Similarities to and Differences from Anglican Clergy
Year of publication: 2010
Link to published article:
[http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1163/157092510X503020](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/157092510X503020)
Publisher statement: None

Psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers in Britain: Similarities with and differences from Anglican clergy.

Lewis Burton

St Mary's Centre at St Deiniol's Library

Leslie J Francis*

University of Warwick, UK

Mandy Robbins

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

Psychological type theory is employed to profile similarities and differences in Methodist ministers in Britain and the Church of England clergy profiled in an earlier study by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). New data were provided by 693 male Methodist ministers and 311 female Methodist ministers who completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales. The data demonstrated that both male and female Methodist ministers were less likely to prefer intuition and more likely to prefer sensing in comparison with their Anglican colleagues. Also male Methodist ministers were more likely to prefer feeling and less likely to prefer thinking in comparison with their Anglican colleagues. In other respects the Methodist ministers and the Anglican clergy recorded similar profiles. These findings are interpreted to illuminate characteristics of strength and weakness in Methodist and Anglican ministry in England and to highlight potential challenges in effecting cooperation between the two denominations.

Keywords: Psychological type, clergy, Anglican, Methodist, Britain

Introduction

Methodism and Anglicanism

The Methodist Church and the Anglican Church in England share a common history and a common heritage. John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, was a child of the vicarage and was ordained as a priest in the Church of England. After ordination he sought to develop his faith in a serious way, but was conscious of his own shortcomings. A spiritual experience in 1738 led him into a life where his evangelical zeal was so successful in finding converts that he was led to establish an organization to sustain those who were brought to faith. Wesley always insisted that his followers remained in the Church of England, and he conceived that the movement which took the name of Methodism should be a ginger group within that Church, but tensions, both within the church and in society after his death in 1791, created a situation where Methodism separated from the Church of England and gradually became a Church in its own right (Waller, 2003).

The Anglican Church in England retains the privileged status of being the Established Church and maintains a parochial structure that offers and provides ministry to every community in the land (at least in theory). Through the circuit structure the Methodist Church maintains a similar attempt to provide a full coverage of the land (although somewhat more hard pressed to implement such coverage in some areas). It is the commonality of respective commitments to parish and to circuit structure that distinguish Anglicanism and Methodism from those denominations that have centred ministry in more eclectic ways, say focusing on particular areas of strength. Methodism has in the past been described as a Free Church and as Nonconformist, but to a large extent neither description fits. The first does not do justice to its organization, for like the Church of England, it is a national Church and where authority through the whole Church resides in the national Conference which meets annually, and is therefore not like other Churches which are have

their own authority vested in the congregation (Shier-Jones, 2004). It is Nonconformist in that it is a Church in its own right and not part of the national Established Church, the Church of England. It does have, however, many links with the Church of England and most of its liturgy, together with other factors, are derived from the Church of England, from which it takes its origin (Maizel-Long, 2004).

During the past five decades several attempts have been made to draw the Methodist Church and the Church of England closer together, beginning with the Conversations between the two Churches in the late 1960s which proposed a scheme for union which, though passed by the Methodist Conference, failed to carry the necessary majority in the Convocations of the Church of England (Turner, 1985: 194-214). Various schemes have been tested since then with the purpose of bringing a number of Churches in England into closer relationships, only to lead to further failure (Turner, 1985: 215-225). At the turn of the century, however, talks were taking place to establish a Covenant for closer relationships between the Church of England and Methodism. This was agreed and signed on All Saints Day, 2003. This Covenant obliges the two Churches to a process of creating a united Church in the future. The agreement does not yet agree to the integration of its ministries, but sees it as a goal yet to be achieved: "In particular, we look forward to the time when the fuller visible unity of our Churches makes possible a united, interchangeable ministry" (Covenant 2001:61; Covenant, 2008). If this is so, then in an empirical way it is necessary to see what differences there are between the two ministries if their coming together is to be achieved successfully.

Although the Church of England and the Methodist Church may share much in common, there are clearly forces that also seem to be working to keep them apart. For example, recent studies have drawn attention to differences in theology or differences in pastoral practice. A study of the response of Anglican parish clergy and Methodist circuit

ministers to the situation created by the Foot and Mouth Disease epidemic of 2001 indicated that, although both sets of ministers responded well in supporting those affected by the disease, they tended to approach pastoral need in different ways. It was apparent that this was created by their different understanding of ministry, their different training and the constraints and opportunities placed on them by the organizational patterns of their Church (Burton, 2003). Differences between the two ministries were also confirmed in an empirical study of the clergy in the Diocese of York and the ministers in the Circuits of the York and Hull Methodist District (Burton, 2005).

Psychological type theory

Within the broad fields of empirical theology and empirical psychology of religion there has been a long tradition of linking psychological theory and ministry studies, in order to illuminate the psychological characteristics of religious professionals and to examine the links between these psychological characteristics and different expressions and interpretations of ministry (Dittes, 1971). A particularly fruitful branch of psychology in respect of ministry studies has been provided by the personality and individual differences approach. For example, recent studies conducted among clergy have drawn fruitfully on: the Sixteen Personality Factor model developed by Cattell, Eber and Tatsuoka (1970) as evidenced by Musson (1998, 2001, 2002); the Big Five Factor model developed by Costa and McCrae (1985) as evidenced by Rodgeron and Piedmont (1998); the Major Three Dimensions model developed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1991) as evidenced by Francis and Rodger (1994a, 1994b); the Twenty-one Personality Traits model developed by Eysenck, Barrett, Wilson, and Jackson (1992) as evidenced by Francis, Jones, Jackson, and Robbins (2001); and the Sixteen Psychological Types model developed by Jung (1971) as evidenced by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley and Slater (2007). Within this context the most

productive advances in recent studies have been provided by psychological type theory (Francis, 2009)

Psychological type theory has its roots in conceptualizations advanced by Carl Jung (Jung, 1971) and in the development of a range of self-completion assessment devices, including the Keirsey Temperament sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). At its core, psychological type theory suggests that individuals differ in terms of four bi-polar preferences: extraversion (E) and introversion (I), sensing (S) and intuition (N), thinking (T) and feeling (F), and judging (J) and perceiving (P).

Extraversion and introversion are dichotomous *orientations*, that is, two different ways in which people focus their psychological energy. Extraverts focus their energy on and gain energy from the outside world of people and things. They enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and exciting environments. They prefer to act in a situation rather than to reflect on it and they may vocalise a problem or an idea rather than think it through privately. They may be bored and frustrated by silence and solitude. More often they focus their attention on what is happening outside them and may be influenced by others' opinions. They are usually open people, easy to get to know, and they enjoy having many friends. In contrast, introverts focus their energy on and gain energy from their inner world of ideas and reflections. They may feel drained by events and people around them and they prefer to reflect on a situation rather than to act on it. They enjoy solitude, silence, and contemplation, as they tend to focus their attention on what is happening in their inner life. They may appear reserved and detached as they are difficult to get to know, and they may prefer to have a small circle of intimate friends rather than many acquaintances. The two orientations of introversion and extraversion may be reflected in different emphases in ministry, with the extraverted minister placing more emphasis on the exterior and

community aspects of ministry and the introverted minister placing more emphasis on the interior and individual aspects of ministry.

Sensing and intuition are dichotomous *perceiving functions*, that is, two different ways in which people take in information. Sensing types gather information by focusing on the facts of a situation using the five 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. They may feel that particular details are more significant than general patterns and they are frequently fond of the traditional and conventional. They may be conservative and tend to prefer what is known and well-established. In contrast, intuitive types gather information by focusing on wider meanings and relationships using their imagination. They may feel that perception by the senses is not as valuable as information gained from the unconscious mind; indirect associations and concepts impact their perceptions. They focus on the overall picture, rather than specific facts and data. They follow their inspirations enthusiastically, but not always realistically and they may be seen as idealistic dreamers. They often aspire to bring innovative change to established conventions. The two perceiving functions of sensing and intuition may be reflected in different emphases in ministry, with the sensing minister placing more emphasis on maintaining and supporting the inherited tradition and the intuitive minister placing more emphasis on shaping and changing the future.

Thinking and feeling are dichotomous *judging functions*, that is, two different ways in which people make decisions and judgements. Thinking types make decisions by using objective, analytical logic. They value integrity and justice and are often known for their truthfulness and desire for fairness. They consider conforming to principles to be of more importance than cultivating harmony. They are often good at making difficult decisions as they are able to analyse problems to reach an unbiased and reasonable solution. When

working with others, they may consider it to be more important to be honest and correct than to be tactful. In contrast, feeling types make decisions by using subjective, personal values. They value compassion and mercy and are often known for their tactfulness and desire for peace. They are more concerned to promote harmony, than to adhere to abstract principles and they may be thought of as ‘people-persons’, as they are able to take into account other people’s feelings and values in decision-making and problem-solving, ensuring they reach a solution that satisfies everyone. They may find it difficult to criticise others, even when it is necessary. They find it easy to empathise with other people, and they tend to be trusting and encouraging of others. The two judging functions of thinking and feeling may be reflected in different emphases in ministry, with the thinking minister placing more emphasis on teaching the truths of the faith and the feeling minister placing more emphasis on displaying the reign of God through acts of pastoral care.

Judging and perceiving are dichotomous *attitudes toward the outside world*, that is, two different ways in which people approach the world around them. Judging types present a systematic, ordered attitude toward the outside world. 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 and they may find it difficult to deal with unexpected disruptions of their plans. Likewise, they are inclined to be resistant to changes to established methods. They prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once made. In contrast, perceiving types present a spontaneous, explorative attitude toward the outside world. They enjoy change and spontaneity and they prefer to leave projects open in order to adapt and improve them. They may find plans and schedules restrictive and tend to be easygoing about issues such as punctuality, deadlines, and tidiness. Indeed, they may consider last minute pressure to be a necessary motivation in order to complete projects. They are often good at dealing with the

unexpected and they may welcome change and variety as routine bores them. Their behaviour may often seem impulsive and unplanned. The two attitudes toward the outside world of judging and perceiving may be reflected in different emphases in ministry, with the judging minister placing more emphasis on structure and organisation and the perceiving minister placing more emphasis on creativity and flexibility.

During the past decade a series of interrelated studies has begun to create an empirically-derived source of information on the psychological type profile of individuals training for ministry or serving in ministry within a range of different denominations in the United Kingdom. These studies include, for example, Anglican Church in Wales clergymen (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001; Francis & Payne, 2002), male and female Bible college students (Francis, Penson, & Jones, 2001), evangelical church leaders (Francis & Robbins, 2002; Craig, Francis, & Robbins, 2004), male missionary personnel (Craig, Horsfall, & Francis, 2005), evangelical lay church leaders (Francis, Craig, Horsfall, & Ross, 2005), Roman Catholic priests (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006), youth ministers (Francis, Nash, Nash, & Craig, 2007), evangelical Anglican seminarians (Francis, Craig & Butler, 2007), Assemblies of God theological college students (Kay, Francis, & Craig, 2008; Kay & Francis, 2008), Newfrontiers lead elders (Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009), Newfrontiers leaders (Ryland, Francis, & Robbins, in press), and Anglican health-care chaplains (Francis, Hancocks, Swift, & Robbins, 2009).

Of central importance to the present enquiry is the authoritative study of 626 Anglican clergymen and 247 Anglican clergywomen in England reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). The data obtained by this study are reported in two ways. First, the psychological type characteristics of the clergy are discussed in their own right. Both male and female clergy revealed preferences for introversion over extraversion, for intuition over sensing, for feeling over thinking, and for judging over perceiving.

Second, the psychological type profile of the clergy was contrasted with the profile for the UK population as reported by Kendall (1998). A number of revealing differences were highlighted by the comparison, but two were of particular theoretical and practical importance. Both male and female Anglican clergy were much more likely to prefer intuition than is the case among people in general. Male Anglican clergy were much more likely to prefer feeling than is the case among men in general. Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) discussed the implications of these findings for the kind of leadership being modeled in the Church of England, for the strengths and weaknesses associated with that kind of leadership, and for the ways in which that kind of leadership might be perceived by the wider society.

Research question

Since as yet no comparable data have been published on the psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers in England, the aim of the present study is to undertake a full population survey of Methodist circuit ministers and to compare these new data with the profile of Anglican clergy previously published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). Since this is being established as an exploratory study, no specific hypotheses are being advanced regarding the similarities or differences between the two groups. Psychological type theory should, however, be able both to illustrate ways in which Anglican clergy and Methodist ministers share common psychological characteristics that may promote collaboration and a common vision of ministry and mission and to illustrate ways in which they may display somewhat different psychological preferences that may serve to generate different visions for and approaches to ministry.

Method

Procedure

A detailed questionnaire was distributed in the late spring of 2004 to all Methodist ministers, both presbyters and probationers, who were in active circuit work in England. A total of 1,728 questionnaires were dispatched and 1,026 responses were received, making a response rate of 59%. Of the 1,026 returned questionnaires, 1,004 included a full response to the section assessing psychological type.

Sample

The 1,004 circuit ministers among whom the analyses were conducted comprised 311 women and 693 men. Among the 693 male ministers, 41 were under the age of 36, 162 were aged between 36 and 45, 224 were aged between 46 and 55, 253 were aged between 56 and 65, 6 were over the age of 65, and 8 failed to disclose their age; 201 had served in ministry for under 11 years, 229 for between 11 and 20 years, 133 for between 21 and 30 years, 125 for more than 30 years, and 5 failed to disclose their length of time in ministry. Among the 311 female ministers, 24 were under the age of 36, 69 were aged between 36 and 45, 131 were aged between 46 and 55, 81 were aged between 56 and 65, 2 were over the age of 65, and none failed to disclose their age; 225 had served in ministry for under 11 years, 68 for between 11 and 20 years, 15 for between 21 and 30 years, 2 for more than 30 years, and 1 failed to disclose her length of time in ministry.

Measures

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). This 40-item instrument comprises four sets of 10 forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). 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 for the EI scale, .76 for the

SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale.

Data analysis

The scientific literature concerned with psychological type has developed a highly distinctive way of presenting type-related data. The conventional format of 'type tables' has been employed in the present paper to allow the findings from this study to be located easily alongside other relevant studies in the literature. In these tables the psychological type profiles of male and female Methodist circuit ministers are compared with the profiles for Anglican clergymen and clergywomen based on a random sample of Anglican clergy published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). The statistical significance of differences between the present sample and the population norms are tested by means of the Selection Ratio Index (*I*), an extension of the classic chi square test. The Selection Ratio Index was developed specifically to take into account the multiple testing involved within the complexity of type tables (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

Results

The eight continuous scales proposed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales to underpin the assignment to discrete type categories all achieved alpha coefficients in excess of the threshold of .65 suggested by DeVellis (2003): introversion and extraversion, .80; sensing and intuition, .70; thinking and feeling, .67; judging and perceiving, .80.

Table 1 presents the type distribution for the 693 male Methodist ministers. These data demonstrate preferences for introversion (61%) over extraversion (40%), for sensing (54%) over intuition (46%), for feeling (64%) over thinking (36%), and for judging (70%) over perceiving (30%). The two predominant types are ISFJ (18%) and ISTJ (11%). Table 1 also contrasts the type distribution of these 693 male Methodist ministers with the type distribution of 626 Anglican clergymen published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). These data indicate that the male Methodist ministers are significantly less

likely to prefer thinking (36% compared with 47%) and significantly more likely to prefer feeling (64% compared with 54%). The Methodist ministers are also significantly more likely to prefer sensing (54% compared with 38%) and significantly less likely to prefer intuition (46% compared with 62%). However, there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of preferences for introversion (61% of Methodists and 57% of Anglicans), for extraversion (40% of Methodists and 43% of Anglicans), for judging (70% of Methodists and 68% of Anglicans), or for perceiving (30% of Methodists and 32% of Anglicans).

-Insert tables 1 and 2 about here-

Table 2 presents the type distribution for the 311 female Methodist ministers. These data demonstrate preferences for introversion (53%) over extraversion (47%), for sensing (52%) over intuition (48%), for feeling (77%) over thinking (23%), and for judging (70%) over perceiving (31%). The three predominant types are ISFJ (19%), ESFJ (15%) and ENFJ (10%). Table 2 also contrasts the type distribution of these 311 female Methodist ministers with the type distribution of 237 Anglican clergywomen published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). These data indicate that the female Methodist ministers are significantly more likely to prefer sensing (52% compared with 35%) and significantly less likely to prefer intuition (48% compared with 65%). However, there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of preferences for introversion (53% of Methodists and 54% of Anglicans), for extraversion (47% of Methodists and 46% of Anglicans), for thinking (23% of Methodists and 26% of Anglicans), for feeling (77% of Methodists and 74% of Anglicans), for judging (70% of Methodists and 65% of Anglicans), and for perceiving (31% of Methodists and 35% of Anglicans).

Discussion

These data have demonstrated some key similarities between aspects of the psychological type profile of Methodist ministers and the psychological type profile of Anglican clergy, and also some key (statistically significant) differences between the two groups. It is constructive to view the similarities first, in terms of the orientations and the attitudes toward the outer world. Then attention will be drawn to the statistically significant differences, in terms of the perceiving process and the judging process.

In terms of orientation, no statistically significant differences emerged between male Methodist ministers and Anglican clergymen or between female Methodist ministers and Anglican clergywomen. In all four groups there were higher proportions of introverts than extraverts, with the preference for introversion being more pronounced among men than among women. This finding suggests that in terms of overall balance, Methodist and Anglican leadership may agree in modeling expressions of church life that value a ministry style that reflects the preference for introversion. There are clearly many areas of strength associated with an introverted approach to ministry. Ministers who prefer introversion tend to be energized by those aspects of ministry associated with 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 or within the circuit. It is these aspects of ministry that may be undervalued or neglected by a Church shaped largely by an introverted preference.

In terms of attitudes toward the outer world, no significant differences emerged between male Methodist ministers and Anglican clergymen or between female Methodist ministers and Anglican clergywomen. In all four groups there were higher proportions of

judgers than perceivers. This finding suggests that in terms of overall balance, Methodist and Anglican leadership may agree on modeling expressions of church life that value a ministry style that reflects this preference for judging. There are clearly many areas of strength associated with a judging approach to ministry. Ministers who prefer judging tend to be energized by those aspects of ministry associated with well-planned and effective organisation both in their own lives and in the life of their parishes, arranging services and events well in advance, maintaining efficient administrative systems 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 unanticipated crises, and adapting to changing situations. It is these aspects of ministry that may be undervalued or neglected by a Church shaped largely by a judging preference.

In terms of the perceiving process, statistically significant differences emerged both between male Methodist ministers and Anglican clergymen and between female Methodist ministers and Anglican clergywomen. In the case of Anglicans, there was a very clear preference for intuition over sensing. In the case of Methodists, there was a slight preference for sensing over intuition. This finding suggests that Anglican clergy are more likely than Methodist ministers to build a Church shaped by the intuitive preference. 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 local 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. Methodist ministry, rooted more firmly in a sensing approach may find the Anglican intuitive style at points frustrating and at points incomprehensible.

Sensing Methodist ministers may feel that intuitive Anglican clerics have their heads in the clouds and their feet far from the ground. In this sense, theological differences may be less important and less disruptive to good working relations than psychological differences distinguishing between preferences for sensing and preferences for intuition.

In terms of the judging process, statistically significant differences emerged between male Methodist ministers and Anglican clergymen. While among both groups there were clear preferences for feeling over thinking, the preference was significantly more pronounced among Methodist ministers. This finding suggests that both Methodist ministers and Anglican clergymen are likely to build a Church shaped by the feeling preference. Ministers and clergy who have a preference for feeling 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.

The observed preference for feeling over thinking among both Anglican clergy and Methodist ministers deserves further commentary, drawing on the data from Anglican clergy reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) and the data for the UK population norms reported by Kendall (1998), as well as on the new data reported from Methodist ministers. Among women, preference for feeling was reported by 77% of Methodist ministers, 74% of Anglican clergy, and 70% of the population as a whole. Among men, preference for feeling was reported by 64% of Methodist ministers, 54% of Anglican clergy, and 35% of the population as a whole. These data suggest that leadership

in both the Anglican Church and the Methodist Church models the predominantly feminine characteristic of feeling rather than the predominantly masculine characteristic of thinking. This is consistent with the findings from a different stream of research that draws attention to the feminised culture of Methodist and Anglican churches and to the higher proportions of women in the congregations compared with men (Brierley, 1991; Gelder & Escott, 2001). Moreover, some studies, including Francis (1996), suggest that the proportion of women in Methodist congregations is even higher than in Anglican congregations. This observation would be consistent with the present data indicating that the preference for feeling is often stronger among Methodist ministers than among Anglican clergy.

The even more pronounced preference for feeling among Methodist ministers may indicate a second area of potential misunderstanding between the styles of leadership modeled within the two denominations. Although thinkers are in the minority among Anglican clergy, the higher proportion of thinkers among Anglicans than among Methodists may predispose the Anglican Church to project a more self-critical, somewhat tougher image in comparison with the Methodist Church. Working side-by-side, the Methodist Church may sometimes seem to possess the softer pastoral heart (say, baptizing all-comers and welcoming the remarriage of divorcees), while the Anglican Church may sometimes seem to possess the more critical theological head (say, concerning the episcopal ordination of women or concerning the debate over homosexuality).

Conclusion

The present study set out to test the power of psychological type theory to illuminate similarities and differences between the preferred approaches to ministry modeled by Anglican parochial clergy and Methodist circuit ministers in England. New data provided by 693 male Methodist ministers and 311 female Methodist ministers, compared with earlier data reported on 626 Anglican clergymen and 237 clergywomen by Francis, Craig,

Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007), drew attention to key similarities between the ministry profiles of the two denominations, as well as to key difference. Three main conclusions emerge from these data.

First, the main area of potential conflict, disagreement and misunderstanding between the two denominations is likely to occur in respect of the perceiving processes. This difference will be most visible in areas of worship and teaching. Anglican leaders are more likely to seek change and innovation, are more likely to promote novel and speculative teaching, and more likely to sit loosely to tradition and to convention. Methodist leaders are more likely to respect the conservative tendencies of church congregations, to work within the constraints of the *status quo* and to leave unchallenged the traditional beliefs of the people within their pastoral care.

Second, the secondary area of potential conflict, disagreement or misunderstanding between the two denominations is likely to occur in respect of the judging processes. This difference will be most visible in areas of pastoral care and church management. Although still in the minority in the Anglican Church there may be enough leaders with a preference for thinking (perhaps especially in management positions) to generate a tougher approach to organizational matters, with consequent threat to the authority of the local congregation and inevitable discomfort for some of the local people. This tougher approach to organizational matters may be reflected in unwelcome changes to ministry provision, to service times, to service content, and (especially in rural areas) enforced collaboration between congregations. By way of contrast the Methodist approach may go on offering (minimal) pastoral care to congregations that have long since lost viability, until such time as withdrawal of insurance cover forces closure of the building.

Third, in spite of these areas of difference, Anglican clergy and Methodist ministers share a great deal in common. What is shared in common becomes particularly visible when

contrasted with the broader profile of the UK population as a whole. What is shared in common may help Anglican clergy and Methodist ministers to build similar congregations, appealing to similar subsets of the UK population. While such shared psychological characteristics may help the two denominations to work together with relative comfort, it remains for other denominations to widen the psychological profile of their leaderships and then build churches capable of attracting a wider profile of membership. All four features of psychological type theory contribute to this understanding. Among the clergy and ministers there is a somewhat greater tendency to prefer introversion than among the population as a whole. A quieter, more reflective leadership may have difficulty in engaging a somewhat more extraverted population. Among the clergy and ministers there is a much greater tendency to prefer intuition than among the population as a whole. An intuitive leadership may have difficulty in engaging a predominantly sensing population. Among the clergy and ministers there is a much greater tendency to prefer feeling than among the population as a whole. A feeling leadership may have difficulty in engaging a predominantly thinking male population. Among the clergy and ministers there is a much greater tendency to prefer judging than among the population as a whole. A judging leadership may have difficulty in engaging the considerable number of perceivers within the population.

While the present study has provided an authoritative overview of the psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers, based on a good response to a population survey, the interpretation of these data remain speculative. Further research is needed among both Anglican clergy and Methodist ministers to build on this foundational study by exploring more fully the hypothesised links between personality preferences and preferred ministry styles, and by examining why it is that these two closely related Churches have recruited significantly different psychological type profiles among their ordained leadership.

References

- Brierley, P. (1991). *'Christian' England*. London: MARC Europe.
- Burton, L. (2003). Rural clergy response to Foot and Mouth Disease: The different worlds of Methodism and Anglicanism. *Contact*, 141, 24-35.
- Burton, L. (2005). The Anglican-Methodist Covenant: differences in the belief patterns of Anglican clergy and Methodist ministers. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 26, 273-288.
- Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W., & Tatsuoka, M. M. (1970). *Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF)*. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*. Odessa, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Covenant (2001). *An Anglican-Methodist Covenant*. Peterborough: Methodist Publishing House.
- Covenant (2008). *Living God's Covenant: The second interim report from the Joint Implementation Commission for an Anglican-Methodist Covenant*. Peterborough: Methodist Publishing House.
- Craig, C.L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L.J. (2006). Psychological type preferences of Roman Catholic priests in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 27, 157-164.
- Craig, C., Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (2004). Psychological type and sex differences among church leaders in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 25, 3-13.
- Craig, C. L. Horsfall, T., & Francis, L. J. (2005). Psychological types of male missionary personnel training in England: a role for thinking type men? *Pastoral Psychology*, 53, 475-482.

- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage.
- Dittes, J. E. (1971). Psychological characteristics of religious professionals. In M. Strommen (Ed.), *Research on Religious Development: a comprehensive handbook* (pp. 422-460). New York: Hawthorn Books Inc.
- Eysenck, H. J., Barrett, P., Wilson, G., & Jackson, C. (1992). Primary trait measurement of the 21 components of the PEN system. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 8, 109-117.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1991). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scales*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Francis, L. J. (1996). *Church Watch: Christianity in the countryside*. London: SPCK.
- 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., & Butler, A. (2007). Psychological types of male evangelical Anglican seminarians in England. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 67, 11-17, 2007.
- 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., Horsfall, T., & Ross, C. F. J. (2005). Psychological types of male and female evangelical lay church leaders in England, compared with United Kingdom population norms. *Fieldwork in Religion*, 1, 69-83.

- 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., Gubb, S., & Robbins, M. (2009). Psychological type profile of Lead Elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Belief and Values, 30*, 61-69.
- Francis, L. J., Hancocks, G., Swift, C., & Robbins, M. (2009). Distinctive call, distinctive profile: The psychological type profile of Church of England full-time hospital chaplains. *Practical Theology 2*, 269-284.
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., Jackson, C. J., & Robbins, M. (2001). The feminine personality profile of male Anglican clergy in Britain and Ireland: a study employing the Eysenck Personality Profiler. *Review of Religious Research, 43*, 14-23.
- Francis, L.J., Nash, P., Nash, S., & Craig, C.L. (2007). Psychology and youth ministry: Psychological type preferences of Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Youth Ministry, 5*(2), 73-90.
- Francis, L. J. & Payne, V. J. (2002). The Payne Index of Ministry Styles (PIMS): Ministry styles and psychological type among male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 13*, 125-141.
- Francis, L. J., Payne, V. J., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type, 56*, 19-23.
- Francis, L. J., Penson, A. W., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male and female Bible College students in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 4*, 23-32.
- Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2002). Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders. *Journal of Belief and Values, 23*, 217-220.

- Francis, L. J., & Rodger, R. (1994a). The influence of personality on clergy role prioritization, role influences, conflict and dissatisfaction with ministry. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 16, 947-957.
- Francis, L.J. & Rodger, R. (1994b) The personality profile of Anglican clergymen, *Contact*, 113, 27-32.
- Gelder, A., & Escott, P. (2001). *Faith in Life: A snapshot of church life in England at the beginning of the 21st century*. London: Churches Information for Mission.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kay, W. K., & Francis, L.J. (2008). Psychological type preferences of female Bible College students in England. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 29, 101-105.
- Kay, W. K., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2008). Psychological type preferences of male British Assemblies of God Bible College students: Tough minded or tender hearted? *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*, 28, 6-20.
- Kendall, E., (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Maizel-Long, J. (2004). Theology, sung and celebrated. In C. Marsh (Ed.) *Unmasking Methodist Theology* (pp. 48-58). London: Continuum.
- Musson, D. J. (1998). The personality profile of male Anglican clergy in England: the 16PF. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 689-698.
- Musson, D. J. (2001). Male and female Anglican clergy: gender reversal on the 16PF5? *Review of Religious Research*, 43, 175-183.

- Musson, D. J. (2002). Personality of male Anglican clergy in England: revisited using the 16PF5. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 5, 195-206.
- 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.
- Rodgers, T. E., & Piedmont, R. L. (1998). Assessing the incremental validity of the Religious Problem-Solving Scale in the prediction of clergy burnout. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37, 517-527.
- Ryland, A., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (in press). Called for leadership: Psychological type profile of leaders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom.
- Shier-Jones, A. (2004). Being Methodical: Theology with church structures. In C. Marsh (Ed.) *Unmasking Methodist Theology* (pp. 29-40). London: Continuum.
- Turner, J.M. (1985). *Conflict and reconciliation: Studies in Methodism and Ecumenism in England, 1740-1982*. London: Epworth Press.
- Waller, R. (2003). *John Wesley: A personal portrait*. London: SPCK.

Table 1

Type Distribution of male Methodist ministers in England compared with Church of England clergymen

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ n = 79 (11.4%) I=1.15 +++++ +++++ +	ISFJ n = 127 (18.3%) I=2.34*** +++++ +++++ +++++	INFJ n = 56 (8.1%) I=0.89 +++++ +++	INTJ n = 56 (8.1%) I=0.73 +++++ +++	E n = 274 (39.5%) I= 0.92	I n = 419 (60.5%) I= 1.06
ISTP n = 5 (0.7%) I=0.32* *	ISFP n = 22 (3.2%) I=2.21* +++	INFP n = 52 (7.5%) I=0.75 +++++ +++	INTP n = 22 (3.2%) I=0.62 +++	S n = 376 (54.3%) ***I= 1.42	N n = 317 (45.7%) ***I= 0.74
ESTP n = 7 (1.0%) I=0.90 +	ESFP n = 34 (4.9%) I=2.05* +++++	ENFP n = 50 (7.2%) I=1.08 +++++ ++	ENTP n = 16 (2.3%) I=0.90 ++	T n = 247 (35.6%) ***I= 0.77	F n = 446 (64.4%) ***I= 1.20
ESTJ n = 35 (5.1%) I=0.77 +++++ +++++	ESFJ n = 67 (9.7%) I=1.41 +++++ +++++	ENFJ n = 38 (5.5%) I=0.60** +++++ +	ENTJ n = 27 (3.9%) I=0.50** +++++	J n = 485 (70.0%) I= 1.03	P n = 208 (30.0%) I= 0.94

Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types						
n	%	I	n	%	I	n	%	I			
E-TJ	62	8.9	0.62**	I-TP	27	3.9	0.52**	Dt. T	89	12.8	0.59***
E-FJ	105	15.2	0.95	I-FP	74	10.7	0.93	Dt. F	179	25.8	0.94
ES-P	41	5.9	1.68*	IS-J	206	29.7	1.68***	Dt. S	247	35.6	1.68***
EN-P	66	9.5	1.03	IN-J	112	16.2	0.80	Dt. N	178	25.7	0.87

L Burton, LJ Francis and M Robbins, *Type distribution for male Methodist ministers in Britain, compared with Church of England clergymen.*

Note: N = 693; + = 1% of N; I = Selection Ratio Index; * = p <0.5; ** = p <.01; *** p <.001

Table 2

Type Distribution of female Methodist ministers in Britain compared with Church of England clergywomen.

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences									
ISTJ n = 15 (4.8 %) I=1.04 +++++	ISFJ n = 60 (19.3 %) I=1.58* +++++	INFJ n = 29 (9.3 %) I=0.88 +++++	INTJ n = 12 (3.9 %) I=0.57 +++	E n = 146 (46.9 %) I= 1.02	I n = 165 (53.1 %) I= 0.98	S n = 162 (52.1 %) ***I= 1.47	N n = 149 (47.9 %) ***I= 0.74						
				T n = 71 (22.8 %) I= 0.87	F n = 240 (77.2 %) I= 1.05								
				J n = 216 (69.5 %) I= 1.08	P n = 95 (30.5 %) I= 0.86								
ISTP n = 2 (0.6 %) I=0.76 +	ISFP n = 8 (2.6 %) I=0.76 +++	INFP n = 29 (9.3 %) I=0.67 +++++	INTP n = 10 (3.2 %) I=1.91 +++	Pairs and Temperaments									
				IJ n = 116 (37.3 %) I= 1.09	IP n = 49 (15.8 %) I= 0.79	EP n = 46 (14.8 %) I= 0.95	EJ n = 100 (32.2 %) I= 1.06						
				ST n = 35 (11.3 %) I= 0.99	SF n = 127 (40.8 %) ***I= 1.70	NF n = 113 (36.3 %) **I= 0.73	NT n = 36 (11.6 %) I= 0.78						
ESTP n = 3 (1.0 %) I=2.29 *	ESFP n = 14 (4.5 %) I=2.67 +++++	ENFP n = 23 (7.4 %) I=0.70 +++++	ENTP n = 6 (1.9 %) I=0.65 ++	SJ n = 135 (43.4 %) ***I= 1.49	SP n = 27 (8.7 %) I= 1.37	NP n = 68 (21.9 %) I= 0.75	NJ n = 36 (26.0 %) *I= 0.73						
				TJ n = 50 (16.1 %) I= 0.79	TP n = 21 (6.8 %) I= 1.14	FP n = 74 (23.8 %) I= 0.81	FJ n = 166 (53.4 %) *I= 1.20						
ESTJ n = 15 (4.8 %) I=0.88 +++++	ESFJ n = 45 (14.5%) I=2.14** +++++	ENFJ n = 32 (10.3 %) I=0.70 +++++	ENTJ n = 8 (2.6 %) I=0.76 +++	IN n = 80 (25.7 %) I= 0.78	EN n = 69 (22.2 %) *I= 0.70	IS n = 85 (27.3 %) I= 1.30	ES n = 77 (24.8 %) **I= 1.73						
				ET n = 32 (10.3 %) I= 0.84	EF n = 114 (36.7 %) I= 1.09	IF n = 126 (40.5 %) I= 1.01	IT n = 39 (12.5 %) I= 0.90						
Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types					
	n	%	I		n	%	I		n	%	I	L Burton, LJ Francis, and M Robbins, <i>Type distribution of female Methodist ministers in Britain compared with Church of England clergywomen.</i>	
E-TJ	23	7.4	0.83	I-TP	12	3.9	1.52	Dt. T	35	11.3	0.99		
E-FJ	77	24.8	1.15	I-FP	37	11.9	0.69	Dt. F	114	36.7	0.94		
ES-P	17	5.5	2.59	IS-J	75	24.1	1.43*	Dt. S	92	29.6	1.56**		
EN-P	29	9.3	0.69	IN-J	41	13.2	0.76	Dt. N	70	22.5	0.73*		

Note: N = 311; + = 1% of N; I = Selection Ratio Index; * = p < 0.5; ** = p < .01; *** p < .001