

Journal Article

Temperament theory and congregation studies: different types for different services?

Francis, Leslie J., Wright, Howard and Robbins, M

This article is published by [Taylor & Francis](#). The definitive version of this article is available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1756073X.2016.1149679>

Recommended citation:

Francis, Leslie J., Wright, Howard and Robbins, M (2016), 'Temperament theory and congregation studies: different types for different services?' *Practical Theology*, 9 (1). pp. 29-45. doi:10.1080/1756073X.2016.1149679

Temperament theory and congregation studies: Different types for different services?

Leslie J Francis*

University of Warwick, England, UK

Howard Wright

St Mary's Centre, Wales, UK

Mandy Robbins

Glyndŵr University, Wales, UK

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Centre for Education Studies

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

Temperament theory and psychological type theory provide a tool for assessing and interpreting the profile of church congregations. In this study the profiles of the three congregations (Ns = 43, 110, 43) at one Anglican church (Holy Trinity Church) are situated against the normative profile generated by the congregations at 140 Anglican churches (N = 3,302). The data demonstrate that normative profile attracts a high proportion of the Epimethean Temperament (SJ) at 72%. The two morning services at Holy Trinity Church replicated the profile at 65% and 74%. The evening service, however, attracted a significantly lower proportion of the Epimethean Temperament (47%) with a corresponding significantly higher proportion of the Apollonian Temperament. These findings support the view that individual churches are able to offer diverse provisions that generate congregations with distinctively different psychological profiles.

Keywords: congregation studies, psychological type, Fresh Expressions, churchgoers

Introduction

From the early 1980s a small, but growing, number of studies has introduced psychological type theory to the field of congregation studies. In some early studies from North America, Gerhardt (1983) reported on 83 adult Unitarian Universalists, Delis-Bulhoes (1990) on 48 Catholics and 154 Protestants, Ross (1993, 1995) on 116 Anglicans and 175 Catholics, Rehak (1998) on 76 Evangelical Lutherans, and Bramer and Ross (2012) on 177 evangelical Protestants. Although the samples were small, the data suggested that there may be ways in which different psychological types are attracted to or retained by different denominations or different styles of services.

More recent studies in England and Wales have reported on 101 Anglicans (Craig, Francis, Bailey, & Robbins, 2003), 372 Anglicans (Francis, Duncan, Craig, & Luffman, 2004), 158 Anglicans (Francis, Butler, Jones, & Craig, 2007), 185 Anglicans (Francis, Robbins, Williams, & Williams, 2007), 290 Anglicans (Village, Francis, & Craig, 2009), 3,304 Anglicans (Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011), 1,156 churchgoers from a range of denominations (Village, Baker, & Howart, 2012), 105 Greek Orthodox Christians (Lewis, Varvatsoulis, & Williams, 2012), 403 attenders at a cathedral carol service (Walker, 2012), 76 Anglicans (Francis, 2013), and 281 attenders at a cathedral Sunday service (Lankshear & Francis, 2015). In Australia studies have been reported on 1,527 churchgoers across 18 denominations (Robbins & Francis, 2011) and 1,476 Roman Catholics (Robbins & Francis, 2012).

The aim of the present study is to define and discuss psychological type theory and to assess what can be said specifically about the psychological type profile of Anglican congregations in England on the basis of psychological type theory. Then an extension of psychological type theory, known as temperament theory, will be introduced in order to

explore whether the perspective of temperament theory adds additional insight into the character of Anglican congregations.

Psychological type theory

Psychological type theory has its origins in the insights of Jung (1971) and has been further developed in conversation with a series of instruments designed to assess type characteristics, including the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). The basic building blocks of psychological type theory distinguish between two orientations (extraversion and introversion), two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving).

The two orientations are concerned with where energy is drawn from; energy can be gathered either from the outside world or from the inner world. Extraverts (E) are orientated toward the outside world; they are energised by the events and people around them. They enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and exciting environments. They prefer to act in a situation rather than to reflect on it. They may vocalise a problem or an idea, rather than thinking it through privately. They may be bored and frustrated by silence and solitude. They tend to focus their attention upon what is happening outside themselves and may be influenced by the opinions of other people. They are usually open individuals, easy to get to know, and enjoy having many friends. In contrast, introverts (I) are orientated toward their inner world; they are energised by their inner ideas and concepts. They may feel drained by events and people around them. They prefer to reflect on a situation rather than to act in 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 perceiving functions are concerned with the way in which people receive and process information; this can be done through use of the senses or through use of intuition. Sensing types (S) focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They tend to focus on specific details, rather than the overall picture. They are concerned with the actual, the real, and the practical and tend to be down-to-earth and matter-of-fact. They may feel that particular details are more significant than general patterns. 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 (N) focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. They may feel that perception by the senses is not as valuable as information gained 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. They can appear to be up in the air and may be seen as idealistic dreamers. They often aspire to bring innovative change to established conventions.

The judging functions are concerned with the way in which people make decisions and judgements; this can be done through use of objective impersonal logic or subjective interpersonal values. Thinking types (T) make judgements based on objective, impersonal logic. They value integrity and justice. They are known for their truthfulness and for their desire for fairness. They consider conforming to principles to be of more importance than cultivating harmony. They are often good at making difficult decisions as they are able to analyse problems in order to reach an unbiased and reasonable solution. They are frequently referred to as 'tough-minded'. They may consider it to be more important to be honest and correct than to be tactful, when working with others. In contrast, feeling types (F) make judgements based on subjective, personal values. They value compassion and mercy. They

are known for their tactfulness and for their desire for peace. They are more concerned to promote harmony, than to adhere to abstract principles. 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 are often thought of as ‘warm-hearted’. They may find it difficult to criticise others, even when it is necessary. They find it easy to empathise with other people and tend to be trusting and encouraging of others.

The attitudes towards the outside world are concerned with the way in which people respond to the world around them, either by imposing structure and order on that world or by remaining open and adaptable to the world around them. Judging types (J) have a planned, orderly approach to life. They enjoy routine and established patterns. They prefer to follow schedules in order to reach an established goal and may make use of lists, timetables, or diaries. They tend to be punctual, organised, and tidy. They 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 (P) have a flexible, open-ended approach to life. They enjoy change and spontaneity. They prefer to leave projects open in order to adapt and improve them. 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. Indeed, they may welcome change and variety as routine bores them. Their behaviour may often seem impulsive and unplanned.

Psychological type data can be reported and interpreted in a number of different ways, drawing on the four dichotomous type preferences (the two orientations, the two perceiving functions, the two judging functions, and the two attitudes), on the 16 complete types (like

ISTJ or ENFP), on the four dominant types (dominant sensing, dominant intuition, dominant feeling, or dominant thinking) or on the eight dominant and auxiliary pairs (like dominant thinking with auxiliary intuition, or dominant intuition with auxiliary thinking).

The largest and most authoritative study of the psychological type profile of Anglican congregations in England was provided by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011), on data provided by 3,304 participants attending 140 congregations. This study reported on the type profiles of male and female churchgoers separately and compared these profiles with the population norms provided by Kendall (1998). Such comparisons made it clear just how much Anglican church congregations in England appeal to some types more than to other types. This is seen clearly from the preference endorsed on the four comparisons between extraversion and introversion, between sensing and intuition, between thinking and feeling, and between judging and perceiving. Women churchgoers are more introverted than women in the general population (49% compared with 43%), and more inclined to prefer judging (85% compared with 62%). On the other hand, there are no significant differences in preferences for sensing by women churchgoers (81%) and women in the general population (79%), or in preferences for feeling by women churchgoers (70%) and women in the general population (70%). Men churchgoers are more introverted than men in the general population (62% compared with 53%), more inclined to prefer sensing (78% compared with 73%), more inclined to prefer feeling (42% compared with 35%), and more inclined to prefer judging (86% compared with 55%).

Psychological temperament theory

Drawing on psychological type theory, Keirsey and Bates (1978) proposed an interpretive framework distinguishing between four temperaments characterised as SJ, SP, NT and NF. In the language shaped by Keirsey and Bates (1978) the Epimethean Temperament characterises the SJ profile, people who long to be dutiful and exist primarily

to be useful to the social units to which they belong. The Dionysian Temperament characterises the SP profile, people who want to be engaged, involved, and doing something new. The Promethean Temperament characterises the NT profile, people who want to understand, explain, shape and predict realities, and who prize their personal competence. The Apollonian Temperament characterises the NF profile, people who quest for authenticity and for self-actualisation, who are idealistic and who have great capacity for empathic listening. Oswald and Kroeger (1988) built on Keirsey and Bates' (1978) characterisation of the four temperaments to create profiles of how these four temperaments shape four very different styles of religious leadership. As yet similar attempts have not been made to interpret congregational style in the light of temperament theory.

Following Oswald and Kroeger's (1988) lead, the Epimethean Temperament (SJ) would tend to shape the most traditional of all churchgoers, the people who long for stability and continuity in the life of their church. They are attracted by a simple and straight forward faith, and they are committed to down-to-earth rules for the Christian life. They want to protect and conserve the traditions that they have inherited from a previous generation. For them, change emerges slowly over time and new things are seriously tested before they are adopted. They prize order and stability and are willing to serve a stable community with loyalty. Procedures and policies are important to them and they are keen that procedures and policies should be followed by others. They can be trusted for their reliability, punctuality and efficiency. They tend to be realistic and practical people who may distrust innovation and experimentation. A congregation structured by and for the Epimethean Temperament would have a reliable and traditional feel about it.

The Dionysian Temperament (SP) would tend to shape the most action-oriented and fun loving of all churchgoers, the people who long for the church to engage them in activities. They have little interest in the abstract, theoretical and non-practical aspects of theology and

church life. They are flexible and spontaneous people who welcome unplanned and unpredictable aspects of church life. They may be particularly attracted to charismatic worship, responding to the leading of the Holy Spirit, welcoming a fresh flowing form that allows for impromptu testimonials, speaking in tongues, and spontaneous singing. They can bring their local church to life when they are allowed to take initiatives, although they are better at starting new things than at seeing them through. A congregation structured by and for the Dionysian Temperament would have a spontaneous and innovative feel about it.

The Promethean Temperament (NT) would tend to shape the most academically curious and intellectually grounded of all churchgoers, people who are motivated by their search for truth and for possibilities opened up by their faith. They tend to be visionaries who expect their local church to look for new ways of doing things and to apply rigorous testing of strategies and teaching. They enjoy the academic study and analysis of the faith. They may have an appetite for theological study and high expectations of their clergy to take a lead in such matters. They tend to be advocates for social justice and expect their churches to be places of integrity, truth and forgiveness, rather than centres for harmony and compromise. They may look for underlying principles rather than practical application from their study of scripture. They appreciate the value of debate and the opportunity for opposing views to be presented and heard.

The Apollonian Temperament (NF) would tend to shape the most idealistic of all churchgoers, people concerned with making life better for others. They want to meet the needs of others and to find personal affirmation in the process. They can be articulate people, with good empathetic capacity and interpersonal skills. As members of the congregation they want to be engaged in a visionary and pastorally effective community, and may take on an unobtrusive pastoral role in that community. Here are the people who may see the potential

for ministries with young people, among the elderly, among the homeless and among the hungry, although they may need SJ colleagues to help them implement their vision.

Reviewing the data presented on Anglican congregations in England by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011) through the lens of temperament theory draws stark attention to these congregations as communities shaped by the Epimethean Temperament (SJ). Among men 71% reported preference for the Epimethean Temperament, compared with 44% of men in the general population. Among women 73% reported preference for the Epimethean Temperament, compared with 54% of women in the general population. The inevitable consequence is that the other three temperaments account for relatively small proportions of Anglican congregations in England. The Apollonian Temperament (NF) accounts for 13% of women and 10% of men in Anglican congregations. The Promethean Temperament (NT) accounts for 6% of women and 13% of men in Anglican congregations. The Dionysian Temperament (SP) accounts for 9% of the women and 7% of the men in Anglican congregations.

Congregations shaped by and for the Epimethean Temperament (SJ) may provide the ideal environment within which this temperament can thrive and flourish. At the same time, it may appear a less attractive environment for the other three temperaments. Some support for this view is offered by Francis and Robbins (2012) in a study exploring the connection between psychological type and congregational satisfaction. While the most prevalent type in their sample of churchgoers was ISFJ, the type recording the lowest scores on the index of congregational satisfaction was ENTP, the type that presents the mirror image of ISTJ. Unfortunately the analyses presented by Francis and Robbins (2012) do not include comparison of congregational satisfaction according to temperament theory.

Another recent study, however, does draw on temperament theory to examine the proportion of the Epimethean Temperament (SJs) present in less conventional church

congregations. In this study Francis, Clymo, and Robbins (2014) explored whether ‘Fresh Expressions’ of church may be reaching psychological types that conventional forms of church find it hard to reach. Their data produced interesting results. While 73% of women in conventional church reported Epimethean Temperament (SJ), the proportion fell to 62% among women in Fresh Expressions. While 71% of men in conventional church reported Epimethean Temperament (SJ), the proportion fell to 33% among men in Fresh Expressions. The inevitable consequence is that the other three temperaments were more in evidence within Fresh Expressions of church. The Apollonian Temperament (NF) accounts for 23% of women and 25% of men. The Promethean Temperament (NT) accounted for 12% of women and 41% of men. The Dionysian Temperament (SP) accounted for 3% of women and 2% of men. These data clearly suggest that different types of church (or congregations) may appeal to different psychological temperaments.

Research question

Studies like Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011) and Francis, Clymo, and Robbins (2014) have followed the same research model of aggregating data from individual congregations (drawn respectively from conventional church and from Fresh Expressions of church) and have examined the profiles of male and female churchgoers separately. A strength in this approach is that it facilitates direct comparisons with the profiles published for males and females by Kendall (1998) that provide a form of population norms. Psychological type theory and psychological temperament theory can, however, be used in another way within congregational studies in order to profile individual congregations and to draw attention to the specific characteristics of those congregations, as illustrated by Francis (2013). In this case, the research model focuses on the psychological profile of the *whole* congregation and is unconcerned about sex differences within the congregation.

By way of a case study, the present paper focuses on one Anglican church (known in this study by the pseudonym of Holy Trinity Church) that offers three distinctive services on a Sunday that seem to attract different congregations. The two services held at 8.00am and at 10.00am both follow a fairly conventional Anglican format. The service held at 7.00pm is a smaller informal congregation, meeting around tables with encouraged interaction with each other and with those leading the service.

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to explore the psychological type profile and temperament profile of these three different congregations at Holy Trinity Church. The first hypothesis is that the congregations at the two morning services are unlikely to depart significantly from the profile of the congregations reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011). The second hypothesis is that the congregation at the evening service is, in comparison with the profile of the congregations reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011), likely to contain a significantly lower proportion of the Epimethean Temperament (SJ), with a consequent significantly higher proportion of the other three temperaments.

Method

Procedure

All individuals attending the three services at 8.00am, 10.00am and 7.00pm were invited to complete a questionnaire containing a measure of psychological type and core demographic questions, including sex and age. Participation in the project was voluntary, and responses to the questionnaire were confidential and anonymous. Data was provided by 196 individuals, 43 attending the 8.00am service, 110 attending the 10.00am service, and 43 attending the 7.00pm service. This compares with a normal combined Sunday attendance of 178 individuals, indicating that the Sunday on which the project was conducted drew on above-average attendance.

Instruments

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'.

Sample

The 43 participants at the 8.00am service comprised 22 men and 21 women; 3 were under the age of forty, 14 were in their forties or fifties, and 26 were aged sixty or over. The 110 participants at the 10.00am service comprised 44 men and 66 women; 16 were under the age of forty, 45 were in their forties or fifties, and 48 were aged sixty or over. The 43 participants at the 7.00pm service comprised 15 men and 28 women; 13 were under the age of forty, 24 were in their forties or fifties; and 6 were aged sixty or over.

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 these tables will, however, be restricted to those aspects of the data strictly relevant to the research question. In the context of type tables, the statistical significance of the difference between two groups is established by means of the selection ratio index (*I*), an extension of chi-square (McCaulley, 1985).

Results

The aim of this study was to compare the psychological type and temperament profiles of three individual congregations with the normative profiles for Anglican congregations that could be retrieved from the participants in the study reported by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011). The first step was to compute the normative profile from that study by aggregating the responses of men and women. Table 1, therefore presents the aggregated type distribution for 3,302 individuals (2,133 women and 1,169 men) drawn from 140 Church of England congregations. These data confirm preferences for introversion (54%) over extraversion (46%), for sensing (80%) over intuition (20%), for feeling (60%) over thinking (40%), and for judging (86%) over perceiving (14%). Within this group of 3,302 Anglican churchgoers the most frequently occurring of the sixteen complete types were ISFJ (22%), ESFJ (20%), ISTJ (18%), and ESTJ (12%). The Epimethean Temperament (SJ) thus accounted for 72% of Anglican churchgoers, leaving 12% for the Apollonian Temperament (NF), 8% for the Promethean Temperament (NT), and 8% for the Dionysian Temperament (SP).

- insert table 1 about here -

Table 2 presents the psychological type and temperament profile for the 43 individuals who attended the 8.00am service at Holy Trinity Church. This congregation showed no significant differences from the normative data in terms of the dichotomous preferences, the sixteen complete types or the temperaments. In this congregation there were preferences for introversion (58%) over extraversion (42%), for sensing (74%) over intuition (26%), for feeling (51%) over thinking (49%), and for judging (84%) over perceiving (16%). Within the group of 43 Anglican churchgoers the most frequently occurring of the sixteen complete types were ISTJ (28%), ISFJ (16%), and ESTJ (14%). The Epimethean Temperament (SJ) accounted for 65% of this congregation, leaving 19% for the Apollonian Temperament (NF), 7% for the Promethean Temperament (NT), and 9% for the Dionysian Temperament (SP).

- insert table 2 about here -

Table 3 presents the psychological type and temperament profiles for the 110 individuals who attended the 10.00am service at Holy Trinity Church. This congregation showed no significant difference from the normative data in terms of the dichotomous preferences or the temperaments. In this congregation there were preferences for introversion (63%) over extraversion (37%), for sensing (79%) over intuition (21%), for feeling (61%) over thinking (39%), and for judging (88%) over perceiving (12%). Within this group of 110 Anglican churchgoers the most frequently occurring of the sixteen complete types were ISFJ (34%), ISTJ (17%), and ESFJ (14%). This represents a significantly higher proportion of ISFJs than in the normative congregations (34% compared with 22%). The Epimethean Temperament (SJ) accounted for 74% of this congregation, leaving 10% for the Apollonian Temperament (NF), 11% for the Promethean Temperament (NT), and 6% for the Dionysian Temperament (SP).

- insert table 3 about here -

Table 4 presents the psychological type and temperament profiles for the 43 individuals who attended the 7.00pm service at Holy Trinity Church. In terms of the dichotomous preferences the congregation differs significantly from the normative congregation in terms of the perceiving process. While 80% of the normative congregations preferred sensing, the proportion dropped to 58% in this congregation, with the consequent increase in the proportion of intuitive types from 20% to 42%. Although not reaching statistical significance this congregation contained more extraverts than the normative congregation (56% compared with 46%), with a consequent lower proportion of introverts (44% compared with 54%). In this congregation there were preferences for feeling (58%) over thinking (42%) and for judging (79%) over perceiving (21%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, there were three groups over represented in this congregation compared with the normative data: ENFJ (12% compared with 4%), ENTJ (12% compared with 3%), and ESTP (5% compared with 1%). The type significantly underrepresented was ISFJ (9% compared with 22%). In terms of temperaments, in this congregation there were significantly fewer Epimethean Temperament (SJ) at 47% compared with 72%; and there were significantly more Apollonian Temperament (NF) at 28% compared with 12%. The Promethean Temperament (NT) accounted for 14% of this congregation, and the Dionysian Temperament (SP) for 12%.

- insert table 4 about here -

Conclusion

This study set out to create a psychological type and temperament profile of typical Anglican congregations in England, reworking the data published by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011) and to situate alongside these normative data the profiles of the three congregations meeting in the same Anglican church at 8.00am, 10.00am, and 7.00pm, in order to test the idea that profiles of this nature could illuminate the distinctive characteristics

and strengths of diverse service provision in terms of the individuals drawn in by such provision. On the basis of information about the provision offered at the three Sunday services held at Holy Trinity Church two specific hypotheses were advanced. The first hypothesis was that the congregations at the two morning services at Holy Trinity Church were unlikely to depart significantly from the normative congregational profile derived from Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011). The second hypothesis was that the congregation at the evening service at Holy Trinity Church was likely to contain a significantly lower proportion of the Epimethean Temperament (SJ), in comparison with the normative congregational profile derived from Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011), with a consequent significantly higher proportion of the other three temperaments. Both of these hypotheses were supported by the data.

The first main conclusion to follow from these data is that temperament theory is able to offer an illuminating account of the characteristic strength (and by implications also the weakness) of the predominant service provision offered by Anglican churches in England. The profile derived from Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011) from data collected from 140 congregations shows a church largely shaped by and for the Epimethean Temperament (SJ). The Epimethean Temperament accounted for 72% of the individuals in these 140 congregations. By way of comparison Kendall (1998) shows that this temperament accounts for 54% of women and 44% of men in the population as a whole. Both of the Sunday morning services at Holy Trinity Church replicated this general pattern, with the Epimethean Temperament accounting for 65% of the individuals at the 8.00am service and 74% of the individuals at the 10.00am service.

These findings suggest that the two morning services at Holy Trinity Church are firmly rooted in the mainline Anglican heritage. Here are people who are sustained by stability and continuity; people who are attracted by a simple and straight forward faith;

people who want to conserve tradition with which they have grown familiar and which they wish to pass on to future generations. Procedures, policies, and predictability are important to such people. The problem is that such a strong dominance by the Epimethean Temperament may make such congregations less attractive to and less accessible to the other three temperaments.

The second main conclusion to follow from these data is that individual Anglican churches, like Holy Trinity Church in this case study, are able to augment their staple service provision with something of a different nature that may be accessible to a wider range of temperaments. The 7.00pm service at Holy Trinity Church is an example of such augmented provision that complements the two morning services in order to generate a wider range of participation. At this evening service the proportion of Epimethean Temperament (SJ) reduced to 47%. The real strength of this service is that it attracted a significantly higher proportion of the Apollonian Temperament (NF), at 28% compared with 19% at the 8.00am service, 10% at the 10.00am service, and 12% at the 140 services offering the normative profile. The Apollonian Temperament (NF) would shape a congregation with an eye on the future rather than on the past, and with a desire to glimpse new possibilities rather than to safeguard the inheritance. Here are people who are keen to meet the needs of others, and to find personal affirmation in the process. Here are people who want to be engaged in a visionary and pastorally effective community. Interestingly, it was the Apollonian Temperament (NF) that became so much more visible among the participants of Fresh Expressions reported by Francis, Clymo, and Robbins (2014).

In their analysis and responses to the needs and aspirations of church-leavers, Francis and Richter (2007) introduced the notion of *multiplex church* as the vision of church that permits and facilitates a variety of expressions but within an overarching umbrella that unites

the component parts. Holy Trinity Church seems to have implemented that kind of vision by offering the distinctive opportunity of the 7.00pm service.

Alongside these two main conclusions derived from temperament theory the present data allow further insight into the distinctive characteristics of the 7.00pm service at Holy Trinity by drawing on the component parts of psychological type theory. The dichotomous preferences confirm the greater accessibility of the 7.00pm service to intuitive types. While according to the normative data, 20% of Anglican churchgoers preferred intuition, the proportion rose to 42% at the 7.00pm service. Here is a congregation with above average potential for intuition that may long for a somewhat different approach to teaching and preaching from that welcomed by sensing types. Among intuitive types there may be a somewhat greater interest in the big themes and the cross-cutting ideas. Among intuitive types there may be a somewhat greater openness to questioning faith and to embracing religious uncertainty. While according to the normative data, 46% of churchgoers preferred extraversion, the proportion rose (although not significantly) to 56% at the 7.00pm service. Here is a congregation with above average potential for social engagement and for active learning strategies. Among extraverts there may be somewhat less interest in the quiet, meditative and reflective approach of much mainline Anglican worship.

On the other hand, the psychological type profile of the 7.00pm congregation did not differ greatly from the normative profile in terms of the judging process or in terms of the attitude toward the outside world. The preference for thinking stood at 40% in the normative profile, and at 42% in the 7.00pm services. In other words the 7.00pm service had not been successful at drawing in a higher proportion of thinking types in the same way as it had been successful in drawing in a higher proportion of intuitive types. Recognising that the thinking preference is endorsed by 65% of men and 30% of women in the population (Kendall, 1998), a truly multiplex church may need to explore and to experiment further to speak more

strongly to the thinking preference. The preference for judging stood at 86% in the normative profile and at 79% in 7.00pm service. Recognising that the perceiving preference is endorsed by 45% of men and 38% of women in the population (Kendall, 1998), a truly multiplex church may need to explore and to experiment further to speak more strongly to the perceiving preference.

These conclusions have demonstrated how psychological type and temperament theory may be employed to illuminate and to evaluate the diversity of service provision within one Anglican church in England (known in this study by the pseudonym of Holy Trinity Church). There is now value in other case studies building on this model in order to extend the range of data on which this approach can be employed, tested and critiqued.

References

- Bramer, P. D. G., & Ross, C. F. J. (2012). Type patterns among evangelical Protestants in Ontario. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 997-1007.
- 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.
- 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. (2013). The psychological type profile of a church: A case study. *Comprehensive Psychology, 2*, 6.
- Francis, L. J., Butler, A., Jones, S. H., & Craig, C. L. (2007). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church: a perspective from England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 10*, 435-443.
- 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., Clymo, J., & Robbins, M. (2014). Fresh Expressions: Reaching those psychological types conventional forms of church find it hard to reach? *Practical Theology, 7*, 252-267.
- 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. & Richter, P. (2007). *Gone for good? Church-leaving and returning in the twenty-first century*. Peterborough: Epworth.

- Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (2012). Not fitting in and getting out. Psychological type and congregational satisfaction among Anglican churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 1023-1035
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Craig, C. L. (2011). The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: Compatible or incompatible with their clergy? *International Journal of Practical Theology, 15*, 243-259.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., 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.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works*, (volume 6). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Lankshear, D. W., & Francis, L. J. (2015). Inside Southwark Cathedral: A study in psychological type profiling. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture* xxxx.
- Lewis, C. A., Varvatsoulas, G., & Williams, E. (2012). Psychological type profile of practising Greek Orthodox churchgoers in London. *Mental, Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 979-986.
- McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The Selection Ratio Type Table: A research strategy for comparing type distributions. *Journal of Psychological Type, 10*, 46-56.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

- Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality Type and Religious Leadership*. Washington, DC: The Alban Institute.
- Rehak, M. C. (1998). Identifying the congregation's corporate personality. *Journal of Psychological Type, 44*, 39-44.
- 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*, 213-229.
- Robbins, M., & Francis, L. J. (2012). The psychological type profile of Australian Catholic congregations: Psychological theory and congregational studies. In A. W. Ata (Ed.), *Catholics and Catholicism in contemporary Australia: Challenges and achievements* (pp. 262-281). Melbourne, Victoria: David Lovell Publishing.
- 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.
- Village, A., Baker, S., & Howat, S. (2012). Psychological type profiles of churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 969-978.
- Village, A., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2009). Church tradition and psychological type preferences among Anglicans in England. *Journal of Anglican Studies, 7*, 93-109.
- Walker, D. S. (2012). O Come all ye thinking types: The wider appeal of the cathedral carol service. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 987-995.

Table 2

Type distribution for 8.00am congregation compared with Francis, Robbins, and Craig

(2011)

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 12 (27.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.54 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 7 (16.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.74 +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 2 (4.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.42 +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 1 (2.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.60 ++	E <i>n</i> = 18 (41.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.91	I <i>n</i> = 25 (58.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.08	S <i>n</i> = 32 (74.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.93	N <i>n</i> = 11 (25.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.28
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ISFP <i>n</i> = 1 (2.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.87 ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 2 (4.7%) <i>I</i> = 2.52 +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	Pairs and Temperaments			
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ESFP <i>n</i> = 3 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.99 +++++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 1 (2.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.86 ++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	IJ <i>n</i> = 22 (51.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.08	IP <i>n</i> = 3 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.09	EP <i>n</i> = 4 (9.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.18	EJ <i>n</i> = 14 (32.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.85
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 6 (14.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.18 +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 3 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.35 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 3 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.77 +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 2 (4.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.81 +++++	ST <i>n</i> = 18 (41.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.32	SF <i>n</i> = 14 (32.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.67*	NF <i>n</i> = 8 (18.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.58	NT <i>n</i> = 3 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.84
EN-P <i>n</i> = 1 2.3 0.63			IN-J <i>n</i> = 3 7.0 0.98	SJ <i>n</i> = 28 (65.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	SP <i>n</i> = 4 (9.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.17	NP <i>n</i> = 3 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.10	NJ <i>n</i> = 8 (18.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.36
				TJ <i>n</i> = 21 (48.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.34	TP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	FP <i>n</i> = 7 (16.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.52	FJ <i>n</i> = 15 (34.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.71
				IN <i>n</i> = 5 (11.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.19	EN <i>n</i> = 6 (14.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.37	IS <i>n</i> = 20 (46.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.06	ES <i>n</i> = 12 (27.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.77
				ET <i>n</i> = 8 (18.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.16	EF <i>n</i> = 10 (23.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.77	IF <i>n</i> = 12 (27.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.93	IT <i>n</i> = 13 (30.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.27

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types					
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	8	18.6	1.29	I-TP	0	0.0	0.00	Dt.T	8	18.6	1.14
E-FJ	6	14.0	0.58	I-FP	3	7.0	1.55	Dt.F	9	20.9	0.73
ES-P	3	7.0	1.67	IS-J	19	44.2	1.10	Dt.S	22	51.2	1.15
EN-P	1	2.3	0.63	IN-J	3	7.0	0.98	Dt.N	4	9.3	0.86

Note: *N* = 43 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001

Table 3

Type distribution for 10.00am congregation, compared with Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011)

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 19 (17.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.95 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 37 (33.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.52** +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 4 (3.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.11 ++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 4 (3.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.94 ++++	E <i>n</i> = 41 (37.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.81	I <i>n</i> = 69 (62.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.17	S <i>n</i> = 87 (79.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.99	N <i>n</i> = 23 (20.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.04
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ISFP <i>n</i> = 3 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.02 ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	INTP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 2.22 ++	J <i>n</i> = 97 (88.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	P <i>n</i> = 13 (11.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.83	Pairs and Temperaments	
ESTP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 2.73 ++	ESFP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.26 +	ENFP <i>n</i> = 3 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.01 +++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.82 ++	IJ <i>n</i> = 64 (58.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.23*	IP <i>n</i> = 5 (4.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.71	EP <i>n</i> = 8 (7.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	EJ <i>n</i> = 33 (30.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.78
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 10 (9.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.77 +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 15 (13.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.68 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 4 (3.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.92 ++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 4 (3.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.41 ++++	ST <i>n</i> = 31 (28.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.89	SF <i>n</i> = 56 (50.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.05	NF <i>n</i> = 11 (10.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.85	NT <i>n</i> = 12 (10.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.32
				SJ <i>n</i> = 81 (73.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.02	SP <i>n</i> = 6 (5.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.69	NP <i>n</i> = 7 (6.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.00	NJ <i>n</i> = 16 (14.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.06
				TJ <i>n</i> = 37 (33.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	TP <i>n</i> = 6 (5.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.53	FP <i>n</i> = 7 (6.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.59	FJ <i>n</i> = 60 (54.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.11
				IN <i>n</i> = 10 (9.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.93	EN <i>n</i> = 13 (11.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.16	IS <i>n</i> = 59 (53.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.22*	ES <i>n</i> = 28 (25.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.71*
				ET <i>n</i> = 18 (16.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.02	EF <i>n</i> = 23 (20.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.69*	IF <i>n</i> = 44 (40.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.34*	IT <i>n</i> = 25 (22.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.95

	Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types				
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		
E-TJ	14	12.7	0.88	I-TP	2	1.8	0.95	Dt.T	16	14.5	0.89
E-FJ	19	17.3	0.72	I-FP	3	2.7	0.60	Dt.F	22	20.0	0.70*
ES-P	3	2.7	0.65	IS-J	56	50.9	1.27	Dt.S	59	53.6	1.21
EN-P	5	4.5	1.23	IN-J	8	7.3	1.02	Dt.N	13	11.8	1.09

Note: *N* = 110 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001

Table 4

Type distribution for 7.00pm congregation compared with Francis, Robbins, and Craig

(2011)

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 8 (18.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.03 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 4 (9.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.42*	INFJ <i>n</i> = 3 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 2.13 +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 1 (2.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.60 ++	E <i>n</i> = 24 (55.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.21	I <i>n</i> = 19 (44.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.82	S <i>n</i> = 25 (58.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.73***	N <i>n</i> = 18 (41.9%) <i>I</i> = 2.09***
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ISFP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	INFP <i>n</i> = 3 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 3.78*	INTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	T <i>n</i> = 18 (41.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.05	F <i>n</i> = 25 (58.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.97	J <i>n</i> = 34 (79.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.92	P <i>n</i> = 9 (20.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.46
ESTP <i>n</i> = 2 (4.7%) <i>I</i> = 6.98**	ESFP <i>n</i> = 3 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.99	ENFP <i>n</i> = 1 (2.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.86 ++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	Pairs and Temperaments			
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 2 (4.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.39 +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 6 (14.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.70 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 5 (11.6%) <i>I</i> = 2.95** +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 5 (11.6%) <i>I</i> = 4.52** +++++	IJ <i>n</i> = 16 (37.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.79	IP <i>n</i> = 3 (7.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.09	EP <i>n</i> = 6 (14.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.77	EJ <i>n</i> = 18 (41.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.09
EN-P <i>n</i> = 1 (2.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.63	IN-J <i>n</i> = 4 (9.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.30	IS-J <i>n</i> = 12 (27.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.69	IT <i>n</i> = 9 (20.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.88	ST <i>n</i> = 12 (27.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.88	SF <i>n</i> = 13 (30.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.63*	NF <i>n</i> = 12 (27.9%) <i>I</i> = 2.37***	NT <i>n</i> = 6 (14.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.69
				SJ <i>n</i> = 20 (46.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.65***	SP <i>n</i> = 5 (11.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.47	NP <i>n</i> = 4 (9.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.46	NJ <i>n</i> = 14 (32.6%) <i>I</i> = 2.38***
				TJ <i>n</i> = 16 (37.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.02	TP <i>n</i> = 2 (4.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.30	FP <i>n</i> = 7 (16.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.52	FJ <i>n</i> = 18 (41.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.85
				IN <i>n</i> = 7 (16.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.66	EN <i>n</i> = 11 (25.6%) <i>I</i> = 2.51***	IS <i>n</i> = 12 (27.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.64*	ES <i>n</i> = 13 (30.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.84
				ET <i>n</i> = 9 (20.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.30	EF <i>n</i> = 15 (34.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.16	IF <i>n</i> = 10 (23.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.78	IT <i>n</i> = 9 (20.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.88

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types					
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	7	16.3	1.13	I-TP	0	0.0	0.00	Dt.T	7	16.3	1.00
E-FJ	11	25.6	1.07	I-FP	3	7.0	1.55	Dt.F	14	32.6	1.14
ES-P	5	11.6	2.78*	IS-J	12	27.9	0.69	Dt.S	17	39.5	0.89
EN-P	1	2.3	0.63	IN-J	4	9.3	1.30	Dt.N	5	11.6	1.07

Note: *N* = 43 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001