

Est.  
1841

YORK  
ST JOHN  
UNIVERSITY

Garland, Gareth and Village, Andrew (2021) Psychological type profiles and temperaments of ministers in the Baptist Union of Great Britain (BUGB). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 25 (9). pp. 860-874.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/5043/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2021.1908974>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repositories Policy Statement](#)

# RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at  
[ray@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:ray@yorks.ac.uk)

Psychological type profiles and temperaments of ministers in the Baptist Union of  
Great Britain (BUGB)

Gareth Garland\*

York St John University, UK

Andrew Village

York St John University, UK

\*Corresponding author:

Gareth Garland

School of Humanities, York St John University, Lord Mayor's Walk

YORK YO31 7EX

UK

Email: [gareth.garland@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:gareth.garland@yorks.ac.uk)

### **Ethical Approval**

Ethical approval was granted by the Research Ethics Committee for the School of Humanities, Religion and Philosophy at York St John University (approval code: REChrp00002)

### **Abstract**

Psychological type profiles and temperaments were assessed among 232 male and 51 female ministers linked to the Baptist Union of Great Britain (BUGB) and compared with previously published samples from the general UK population and the Church of England. Compared with the general population, Baptist ministers showed greater propensity for introversion, intuition, and judging. Male ministers showed greater propensity for feeling than the general population, but there was no difference among the women. Compared with Anglican clergy, Baptist ministers showed similar preferences for orientation and judging, but greater propensity towards sensing over intuition and judging over perceiving. The most frequent temperament was Epimethean (SJ), followed by Apollinarian (NF) among women and Promethean (NT) among men. The most frequent psychological types were ISTJ, ISFJ, and INFP. The implications for the type of leadership and pastoral care offered by these ministers are discussed.

**Keywords:** Anglican clergy, Baptist ministers, personality, psychological type, temperament

## Introduction

Psychological type theory offers insight into individual differences and can be a useful tool in understanding preferences for different forms of religious expression (Butler, 1999). Application of type theory can enable clergy and others to gain better self-understanding of their strengths and weaknesses in relation to the tasks and expectations of ministering in churches (Francis, Craig, et al., 2007). Type theory, as suggested by Carl Jung (1971) and later developed by Katherine Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers (Myers & Myers, 1980), assumes personality is the product of binary preferences related to orientation (introversion or extraversion), perceiving (sensing or intuition), judging (thinking or feeling), and attitude (judging or perceiving) (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). In this model, preferences in each component combine to produce 16 possible psychological types, which are associated with particular personality characteristics. Temperament theory uses the same four components, but combines them differently to produce four temperaments which have been named the Apollonian, Promethean, Dionysian, and Epimethean (Keirse & Bates, 1978; Oswald & Kroeger, 1988). Temperament theory also suggests different personality characteristics are associated particular temperaments and offers a parallel means to the 16 types to explore the characteristics of religious ministers (Francis & Holmes, 2011; Francis et al., 2016; Francis & Village, 2012). This paper builds on a long-standing research tradition that has explored the personality of religious ministers by examining type preferences among a sample of Baptist ministers in the UK.

### **Describing personality: trait versus type models**

The personality models of Hans Eysenck (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991), Costa and McCrae (1985), and Carl Jung (1971) represent some of the key current approaches to the subject of personality and social psychology. Eysenck's interest stemmed from studying psychopathology, and his three-dimensional model of personality, operationalised by the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Revised), is based on the three continua of extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism. Extreme high scores on these dimensions, particularly the latter two, are associated with pathological personality disorders, which makes the scales more difficult to interpret in terms of 'normal' personalities. Of the many other approaches to trait-based models of personality developed over the last half century, the Big Five Factor model of

personality is probably the most widely used in research (Costa & McCrae, 1985; De Raad, 2000; Digman, 1990; Saroglou, 2002). In contrast, Jung's model of psychological type was based on two core processes (perceiving and judging) and an orientation to the outer world. Jung believed individuals tended to display binary preferences, rather than falling somewhere along a continuum. Jung's model was expanded into four dimensions by Katherine Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers and has been operationalized through a range of instruments such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, MBTI<sup>®</sup>, (Myers et al., 1998), the Keirsey Temperament Sorter, KTS, (Keirsey, 1998; Keirsey & Bates, 1978), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales FPTS, (Francis, 2005). Although the notion of types has been criticised, there is good evidence for links with trait-based models, (Crump et al., 2003; Furnham, 1996; McCrae & Costa, 1989; Tobacyk et al., 2008) and much of the criticism of type models may be unjustified (Lloyd, 2007, 2012).

### **The psychological type model**

The four components of the psychological type model relate to different aspects of psychological function, and how they operate in relation to the external or internal psychological worlds.

Orientation (introversion or extraversion) describes where people prefer to function psychologically. Extraverts (E) tend to be oriented in the outside world and are therefore energised by external activity. In contrast, introverts (I) tend to be oriented in their inner world and are therefore energised by internal reflections and ideas. Whereas extraverts enjoy stimulating and exciting settings with opportunities to communicate, in contrast introverts may feel drained of energy by events and interactions. Whereas extraverts may prefer to act in a situation, introverts may prefer to reflect on the situation before taking any action. Whereas extraverts may vocalise their thoughts, introverts may value contemplation. Whereas extraverts may feel drained by silence and solitude, introverts may feel energised by it. Whereas extraverts may focus their attention on external events, introverts may focus their attention on what is happening internally. Whereas an extravert may enjoy a wide circle of friends and be easy to get to know, an introvert may have fewer friends pursuing intimate relationships rather than casual acquaintances, thus appearing reserved and even detached.

The perceiving process operates through two functions, sensing and intuition, which refer to the way in which information is received and processed. Those who

perceive by sensing (S) tend to focus on specific details rather than the big picture or wider patterns of interconnections. In contrast, those who perceive by intuition (N) focus on possibilities of a situation rather than concerning themselves with the minutiae of detail. Whereas sensing types are concerned by practicalities and reality, intuitive types are concerned by meaning and inter-relationships. Whereas sensing types are attached to the conventional or the traditional, intuitive types are attracted to concepts and indirect associations. Whereas sensing types might be described as being conservative, matter-of-fact or down-to-earth, intuitive types might be described as being innovative, creative or imaginative.

The judging process operates through two functions, thinking and feeling, which refer to the ways in which decisions are made. Those who judge by thinking (T) ground decision-making logically using impersonal objectivity. In contrast, those who judge by feeling (F) ground their decision making subjectively, attaching personal values to the situation. Whereas thinking types look to integrity and justice, feeling types look to compassion and mercy. Whereas thinking types tend to strive for truthfulness and fairness, feeling types tend to strive for tactfulness and peace. Whereas thinking types prioritise conforming to principles above promoting harmony, feeling types prioritise a sense of harmony above adherence to principles. Whereas thinking types are equipped to make difficult or objective decisions, feeling types are focused on ensuring that solutions satisfy all involved. Whereas the hallmark of thinking types may be their honesty and objectivity, the hallmark of feeling types may be their warmth and empathy. Whereas thinking types are readily able to offer correct assessments of people and situations, feeling types may find it difficult to criticise others, wanting to empathise and encourage instead.

Attitude towards the outside world (judging and perceiving) concerns the way a subject responds to the world around them. In the Myers-Briggs conceptualisation, it refers to which of the two core processes (perceiving or judging) tends to be used in the outer world. Those whose response to the outside world is to judge (J) impose structure and prefer order. In contrast, those whose response to the outside world is to perceive (P) are adaptable and open. Whereas judging types tend to plan, perceiving types tend to favour spontaneity. Whereas judging types find routine and schedules to be beneficial, perceiving types are comfortable with adapting and leaving things open-ended. Whereas schedules may be seen as an aid to completing projects by judging types, perceiving types may see schedules as restrictive and as a hindrance to

improving projects. Whereas judging types value the benefits of list making, drawing up timetables and keeping diaries, perceiving types are more likely to favour a form of adaptable spontaneity. Whereas judging types tend to be tidy and punctual, perceiving types tend to be more relaxed about tidiness, deadlines, and punctuality. Whereas judging types are less ready to deal with unexpected disruptions and changes to plans, perceiving types are more ready to adapt to the unexpected and changes to plans. Whereas the behaviour of judging types may be viewed as decisive and rooted, perceiving types may be viewed as flexible and imaginative.

Type theory argues that individuals tend to display preferences independently in each of the four dimensions, leading to 16 possible combinations, or types (INTJ, INTP, ENTJ, ENTP etc.). The dynamics of the preferences means that each of the sixteen types tends to display a particular set of personality characteristics. The fact these are based on preferences, rather than absolute difference, means most individuals can operate in different ways at different times, which helps to explain the complexity of personalities observed in everyday life.

### **Temperament theory**

Temperament theory uses the four components of the psychological type model, but combines them into four categories rather than sixteen (Keirsey & Bates, 1978). It focuses on two expressions of sensing types (those that prefer perceiving in the outer world and those that prefer judging in the outer world), and on two expressions of intuitive types (those that prefer feeling and those that prefer thinking). These different combinations of preferences help to explain the characteristics of the four temperaments.

The Apollonian Temperament (NF) is styled as those who are authenticity-seeking and relationship-oriented. These types tend to be romantics and idealists, with a desire to be in service to others by helping those who suffer. They are often empathetic and may touch the hearts of those who listen to them. Apollonians tend to be inspirational more than they are practical, although they are good at facilitating and putting to use the gifts of others. They thrive in projects that are people related and are more comfortable within unstructured frameworks of ministry. NFs find personal affirmation in meeting the needs of others.

The Promethean Temperament (NT) is styled as those who are competence-seeking intellectuals. These types tend to be the most academic and intellectual,

seeking meaningful truth and investigating possibilities. They preach and teach well, seeking underlying principles rather than basic application, and they may be strong advocates for social justice. They value the voicing of opposing views, desiring truth above harmony. NTs are visionaries with a desire to succeed.

The Dionysian Temperament (SP) is styled as those who are action oriented. These types tend to be the most energetic and activity based, and as a result are less likely to spend time in the abstract or theoretical dimensions of life, favouring instead the practical outworking of ideas. They may be described as being fun, spontaneous, and flexible, and flourish in unplanned and unpredictable scenarios. They cope well in the midst of crisis and are strong at resolving conflict. They may be better at starting initiatives than seeing them through. SPs may work well with people of different ages.

The Epimethean Temperament (SJ) is styled as those who are conserving servers of others. These types bring stability and continuity, protecting and conserving traditions. They ground a community in received truths, offering loyalty and a place to belong. They bring order and planning for the future, implementing policies to enable gradual change to emerge. Epimetheans are efficient, punctual, reliable, and realistic. SJs are sensitive in dealing pastorally with others.

### **Psychological type studies of clergy**

Two main strands of research have examined psychological type among Christian ministers. The first has examined the correlations between religious dimensions and psychological type, with the aim of determining whether psychological type preferences are associated with particular expressions of faith or church life. These have shown that the preferences of clergy and other ministers are related to many aspects of Christianity including charismatic experience (Francis & Jones, 1997), Christian conservatism (Village, 2016, 2019), tolerance for religious uncertainty (Francis & Jones, 1999), and different modes of faith expression (Francis, Craig, et al., 2008; Francis & Loudon, 2000; Village, 2013).

The second strand has involved profiling the psychological type of ministers or congregations in different denominations. The underlying assumption here is that the characteristics of different denominations derive from different emphases of faith expression, which may be related to psychological type preferences in predictable ways. Ministers in a particular denomination may reflect the same patterns as their congregations or may display slightly different preferences due to self-selection of

those going forward for ordination or the process by which denominations select their ministers.

There have been numerous studies profiling the psychological type of various religious orders or clergy. North American studies include profiles from Catholic convents and seminaries (Bigelow et al., 1988; Cabral, 1984; Harbaugh, 1984; Holsworth, 1984), Catholic clergy (Burns et al., 2013), and clergy in the Presbyterian Church (Francis, Robbins, & Wulff, 2011). Studies in the UK include profiles of various groups from the Church of England such as clergymen and women (Francis, Craig, et al., 2007), ordained local ministers (Francis & Holmes, 2011; Village, 2011), women priests (Francis, Robbins, & Whinney, 2011), women in local ministry (Francis et al., 2012), bishops (Francis, Whinney, & Robbins, 2013), male archdeacons (Francis & Whinney, 2019), and hospital chaplains (Francis et al., 2009a). Profiles of other clergy or lay ministers in the UK include clergy in Wales (Francis et al., 2010; Francis et al., 2013), Readers (Francis, Jones, & Village, 2020), male evangelical church leaders (Francis & Robbins, 2002), Methodist circuit ministers (Burton et al., 2010), and Methodist lay leaders (Francis & Stevenson, 2018). These studies have shown that profiles of ministers can vary from those in the general population, can vary between clergy and congregations, and can vary between clergy in different denominations.

Some of the key findings from profile studies have arisen from comparing Church of England clergy to the general population and to Church of England congregations. Compared to the general UK population, a sample of 626 Anglican clergymen showed greater tendency towards intuition rather than sensing, feeling rather than thinking, and judging rather than perceiving, but were similar in showing a slight preference for introversion rather than extraversion. In the same study, 237 clergywomen showed greater preference for introversion and greater preference for intuition, but were otherwise similar to the general population (Francis, Craig, et al., 2007). When these profiles were compared to Church of England congregations, the two main differences were the greater proportion of intuitive types among clergy compared to congregations, and the greater proportion of thinking types among congregations compared to clergy, especially among men (Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011).

Relevant to this study of Baptist ministers are profile comparisons between Anglican clergy and those in evangelical or non-conformist churches. For example, a

study of 57 male leaders in the evangelical tradition found 28% displayed a preference for sensing, feeling, and judging (ESFJ or ISFJ), which is comparable with what has been found among clergy within the Anglican tradition (Francis & Robbins, 2002). However, when comparing the profiles of Anglican clergy to Methodist circuit ministers (Burton et al., 2010), the data demonstrated that Methodist circuit ministers were less inclined to prefer intuition, and more inclined to prefer sensing, than clergy in the Anglican tradition. Among the clergymen, Methodists showed a stronger preference for feeling over thinking than did their Anglican counterparts. Additional differences can be seen when examining data from a study of 134 lead elders in the Newfrontier churches, who showed slight preferences for extraversion over introversion, for sensing over intuition, and for thinking over feeling, and a strong preference for judging over perceiving, which contrasts with male Anglican clergy who prefer introversion over extraversion, intuition over sensing, and feeling over thinking, and have a less pronounced preference for judging over perceiving (Francis et al., 2009b).

Profiling of clergy has also employed temperament theory. Examples of such research include studies of Ordained Local Ministers in the Anglican tradition that reveal an emphasis on the Epimethean (SJ) temperament (Bowden et al., 2012; Francis & Holmes, 2011; Francis et al., 2012; Francis & Village, 2012) . This contrasts to Anglican clergy in more traditional roles, who have a tendency towards an NF rather than SJ , especially among women (Francis & Village, 2012). A further study of Anglican Readers has shown some distinction between occupants of this office compared with the Anglican clergy (Francis, Jones, et al., 2020). A higher proportion of Readers were SJ than among Anglican clergy (15% more among men and 10% more among women), while the NF temperament was less frequent among Readers than among clergy (13% fewer among men and 18% fewer among women).

This paper explores the psychological type and temperament profiles of accredited ministers in the Baptist Union of Great Britain (BUGB). The aim is to compare these with previously published data used to identify the profiles of the general population, and with a sample of Anglican clergy from the Church of England. The results are then interpreted to identify possible strengths and weaknesses for ministry among the Baptist ministers.

## Method

### Procedure

Data were collected as part of the *Accredited Ministry and You* survey in 2019. The survey was made available to clergy online, advertised through the *Baptist Times* and social media forums, and a paper copy was mailed to each church using addresses in the Baptist Union of Great Britain (BUGB) directory. A total of 1,377 ministers were invited to complete the survey of which a total of 295 subjects participated, representing approximately 21% of active accredited ministers across the BUGB in 2019. Of the 295 replies received, 283 people completed sufficient responses to allow their psychological type to be determined. Of these, 82% were male and 18% female; 31% were less than 50 years old, 34% in their 50s, 29% in their 60s, and 7% in their 70s; 63% were ordained and 65% were accredited to BUGB.

### Instrument

Psychological type preferences were assessed using the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS). This is a 40-item instrument comprising four sets of ten forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving) (Francis, 2005). Previous studies have demonstrated that this instrument functions well in a range of church-related contexts (for example, see Francis, Butler, et al., 2007; Francis, Edwards, et al., 2020; Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011; Village, 2016). In this sample the alpha reliabilities were .83 for the EI scale, .72 for the SN scale, .70 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale.

### Analysis

Data from male and female ministers were treated separately throughout, with type preferences and temperaments reported first, followed by frequencies of the 16 types. The sample distributions were compared with previously published data on UK norms for men and women (Kendall, 1998) and with a previously published sample of Anglican clergymen and clergywomen (Francis, Craig, et al., 2007). Comparisons were made in each case using 2 x 2 contingency tables with 1 *df*.

## Results

### Type preferences

The type preferences of male and female ministers were similar in each component, apart from the judging process, where 35% of women preferred thinking over feeling, compared with 52% of men (Tables 1 & 2). This is in line with a widely reported trend for most women to prefer feeling over thinking and most men to prefer thinking over feeling (Kendall, 1998; Myers et al., 1998). For orientation, there was a preference for introversion over extraversion (63% in men and 57% in women), for the perceiving process there was a slight preference for sensing over intuition (51% for men and 53% for women), and for attitude to the outer world there was a strong preference for judging over perceiving (79% for men and 76% for women).

Compared with the UK population generally, both sexes showed a stronger tendency towards introversion over extraversion (63% Baptists versus 53% UK population for men, and 57% versus 43% for women), towards intuition over sensing (49% Baptists versus 27% UK population for men, and 47% versus 21% for women), and towards judging over perceiving (79% Baptists versus 55% UK population for men, and 77% versus 62% for women). In the judging process, male Baptist ministers showed a stronger tendency towards feeling than the UK male population generally (48% Baptists versus 35% UK population), but there was no statistically significant difference among women ministers (65% versus 70%).

These preferences aligned with Anglican clergy in some instances but not others (Tables 1 & 2). In terms of orientation, Baptist ministers were similar to Anglican clergy in showing a greater tendency towards introversion than the general population. In the perceiving process, Baptists ministers fell between the high preference for intuition over sensing among Anglican clergy and the low such preference in the general population. In the judging process, Baptist ministers of both sexes showed similar preferences to their Anglican counterparts. Among men there was a greater tendency towards feeling over thinking compared to the general population, but women of both denominations demonstrated a similarly high preference for feeling over thinking that was similar to that in the population generally. In attitude to the outer world, Baptist male ministers showed an even stronger trend towards judging than did Anglican clergymen, and the same was true for women, though the trend was not statistically significant.

### **Temperaments**

These type preferences were reflected in the distribution of the four temperaments among the Baptist ministers (Tables 1 & 2). In both sexes, the Epimethean (SJ) temperament was at a similar frequency to the general population (46% Baptists versus 44% UK population for men, and 51% versus 54% for women), the Dionysian (SP) temperament was less frequent (6% Baptists versus 29% UK population for men, and 2% versus 25% for women), the Apollonian (NF) temperament was more frequent (24% Baptists versus 12% UK population for men, and 31% versus 15% for women), and the Promethean (NT) temperament was also more frequent (25% Baptists versus 15% UK population for men, and 16% versus 5% for women). Compared with Anglican clergy, Baptist ministers of both sexes showed a higher proportion of SJs and a lower proportion of NFs, but the proportions of SPs and NTs were similar.

### **Psychological types**

The type preferences were also reflected in the distribution of the 16 types among the Baptist ministers. For men (Table 3), the most frequent types were ISTJ (17%), ISFJ (16%), INTJ (11%), and INFJ (9%). For women (Table 4) the most frequent types were ISFJ (20%), ISTJ (15%), ENFP (12%) and ESFJ (12%). The distribution showed some difference from the UK population in general. Male Baptist ministers show significantly higher proportions of ISFJ, INFJ, INTJ, and ENFJ, and lower proportions of ISTP, ESTP, and ESFP. There were similar trends for female ministers, but the low sample size made statistical testing less certain. Compared to Anglican clergymen, the male Baptist ministers showed higher frequencies of ISTJ, ISFJ, and lower frequencies of INFP, but other distributions were similar. For women, the only statistically significant difference was the higher proportion of ISTJ among the Baptists than among the Anglicans.

### **Discussion and Conclusions**

This study of the psychological type preferences of 283 Baptist ministers has demonstrated that their preferences and personalities show both similarities and differences from the UK population at large and Anglican clergy. These differences help to highlight the distinctiveness of the kind of leadership and pastoral care that these Baptist ministers may be best suited to offer.

First, the tendency towards introversion over extraversion is greater than in the general population, but similar to that among Anglican clergy. A large part of ministry involves engaging with people, be that in worship, in fellowship groups, or the one-to-one meetings that are the core of pastoral work. Extraverts are likely to be energised by this activity and will enjoy meeting many different people in the course of a day. Introverts are likely to be drained by this activity as they prefer a few deep friendships and are energised by solitude. Studies of clergy in other denominations have pointed out the possibilities that introverts might find some aspects of ministry draining and this might foster lower wellbeing if they cannot also find time to be energised in more solitary activity (Francis, Robbins, et al., 2008). This study suggests this danger may also apply to a significant proportion of Baptist ministers.

Second, in the perceiving process, Baptist ministers showed a slight preference for sensing over intuition, but sensing and intuitive types were much more evenly balanced than in the UK population, where three quarters preferred sensing rather than intuition. The difference from the UK norms was not as great as for Anglican clergy, but nonetheless points to the likelihood for some disparity between the preferences in congregations (that tend to be nearer the general population) and the preferences among ministers. This disparity may need to be noted when, for example, intuitive clergy are preaching to sensing congregations (Francis & Village, 2008), but it may also be an important strength for those in senior ordained roles. Intuitive types tend to see the big picture, and are comfortable imagining change and future possibilities, qualities that are often useful in leading churches, especially in times of flux. This study suggests a significant proportion of Baptist ministers may be suited to a role of overall leadership and innovation.

Third, the tendency for male Baptist ministers to show a greater propensity towards feeling compared with men in the general population reflects a similar trend in Anglican clergymen (Francis, Craig, et al., 2007). Village (2013) found similar proportions of feeling types among a sample of 529 newly-ordained Church of England clergymen, with proportions of preferred feeling types being higher among those from Anglo-Catholic (53%) or Broad church (59%) traditions than among those from the Evangelical tradition (47%). The proportion of feeling types among the male ministers here (48%) was similar to that of the Anglican Evangelicals, suggesting that Evangelicalism generally may be associated with a slightly stronger preference for thinking compared with some other traditions. Women generally tend to prefer feeling

over thinking, and both women Baptist ministers and Anglican clergywomen seem to follow the general population trend. Overall, most Baptist ministers are likely to show the sort of empathy, tendermindedness, and values-orientated decision making that is associated with feeling types. This may make them good at judging the mood of their congregations, or working pastorally, but can leave them vulnerable when tough-minded decisions have to be made that risk upsetting people.

Fourth, the strong preference for judging, rather than perceiving, in dealings with the outer world places these Baptist ministers at odds with the UK population and Anglican clergy. The latter still tend to prefer judging over perceiving, and more so their congregations (Francis, Butler, et al., 2007), but the trend here was stronger. Judging types tend to want to order their external world, and this may be a helpful preference for those who run churches that have regular tasks that need to be completed on time. Judging types are prevalent in organisations, including churches, and this might point to Baptist ministers being similar to their congregations in the ways they handle their outer worlds.

The most frequent temperament among the Baptist ministers was Epimethean (SJ), described by Keirse (2021) as ‘guardians’. This temperament describes those who revere the past and who are committed to tradition, order, and structure. The Apollonian (NF) temperament was more frequent among Baptist ministers than in the general population, but less frequent than among Anglican clergy, where it was the most frequent temperament. Apollonians are described as ‘idealists’, insofar as they tend to be imaginative, romantic, and prize authenticity. They are also kind-hearted, empathetic and diplomatic. The temperament that was most underrepresented among male and female ministers was the Dionysian (SP) or ‘artisan’, described as daring, impulsive, playful, and adaptable. The fourth temperament, the Promethean (NT) was more frequent than in the general population, and about the same frequency as in Anglican clergy. Prometheans are described as ‘rational’ and tend to be visionary innovators who might look for pragmatic and strategic change and subject such change to rigorous scrutiny. It is not difficult to imagine how these different temperaments could contribute to Baptist church life in different ways. The data here suggest that on the whole Baptist ministers may tend to put a brake on change and innovation, especially if it involves untried or risky innovations. The presence of a good proportion of Apollonians means that some will seek to lead by consensus.

The distribution of the 16 psychological types showed some differences from the Anglican clergy sample, but this could only be tested thoroughly among the men because of the small sample of women Baptist ministers. Baptists showed higher proportions of ISTJ and ISFJ, and a lower proportion of INFP, than Anglican clergymen. According to the Myers & Briggs Foundation (2021), the ISTJ type is characterised by:

Quiet, serious, earn success by thoroughness and dependability. Practical, matter-of-fact, realistic, and responsible. Decide logically what should be done and work toward it steadily, regardless of distractions. Take pleasure in making everything orderly and organized - their work, their home, their life. Value traditions and loyalty.

While the ISFJ type is characterised by:

Quiet, friendly, responsible, and conscientious. Committed and steady in meeting their obligations. Thorough, painstaking, and accurate. Loyal, considerate, notice and remember specifics about people who are important to them, concerned with how others feel. Strive to create an orderly and harmonious environment at work and at home.

These two descriptions point to ministers who may be adept at the sort of leadership and pastoral care that is needed within the context of mainstream Baptist churches in the UK. INFP tended to be more frequent among Anglican clergy than Baptist ministers. It is described as:

Idealistic, loyal to their values and to people who are important to them. Want an external life that is congruent with their values. Curious, quick to see possibilities, can be catalysts for implementing ideas. Seek to understand people and to help them fulfill their potential. Adaptable, flexible, and accepting unless a value is threatened.

This paints a picture of clergy who may be more open to change, but who would not easily change their core values. This sort of leadership may be scarcer in Baptist than Anglican churches.

As with Anglicans, the types that are underrepresented tended to ESTP and ESFP. These tend to be active, spontaneous people who learn by doing and engaging rather than by imagining or thinking. Such people might find the rather inward and contemplative style of most church leaders at odds with the way they would want to run a church.

Overall, this study has indicated that Baptist ministers show some distinct differences in psychological type and temperament from the general population, and

some affinities and differences from Anglican clergy. The samples are relatively small, and it would be good to repeat this study with a larger sample of ministers (especially women) from both BUGB and non-BUGB Baptist churches. In addition, it would be useful to study Baptist congregations to see if they are more like their ministers than the general UK population.

## References

- Bigelow, E. D., Fitzgerald, R., Busk, P., Girault, E., & Avis, J. (1988). Psychological characteristics of Catholic sisters: Relationships between the MBTI and other measures. *Journal of Psychological Type, 14*, 32-36.
- Bowden, A., Francis, L. J., Jordan, E., & Simon, O. (2012). *Ordained local ministry in the Church of England*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Burns, J., Francis, L. J., Village, A., & Robbins, M. (2013). Psychological type profile of Roman Catholic priests: An empirical enquiry in the United States. *Pastoral Psychology, 62*, 239-246. <https://doi.org/0.1007/s11089-012-0483-7>
- Burton, L., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type profile of Methodist circuit ministers in Britain: Similarities to and differences from Anglican clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology, 23*(1), 64-81. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/157092510X503020>
- Butler, A. (1999). *Personality and communicating the gospel*. Grove.
- Cabral, G. (1984). Psychological types in a Catholic convent: Applications to community living and congregational data. *Journal of Psychological Type, 8*, 16-22.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*. Psychological Assessment Resources. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/t07564-000>
- Crump, J., Furnham, A., & Moutafi, J. (2003). The relationship between the revised NEO-Personality Inventory and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Social Behavior and Personality, 31*(6), 577-584. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2003.31.6.577>
- De Raad, B. (2000). *The Big Five personality factors: The psycholexical approach to personality*. Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the Five-Factor Model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41*(1), 417-440. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.41.020190.002221>
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1991). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scales (EPS adult)*. Hodder and Stoughton.
- Francis, L. J., Hancocks, G., Swift, C., & Robbins, M. (2009a). Distinctive call, distinctive profile: The psychological type profile of Church of England full-

time hospital chaplains. *Practical Theology*, 2(2), 269-284.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1558/prth.v2i2.269>

Francis, L. J., & Holmes, P. (2011). Ordained Local Ministers: The same Anglican orders, but different psychological temperaments? *Rural Theology*, 9(2), 151-160. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1558/ruth.v9i2.151>

Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. Darton, Longman & Todd.

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 & Culture*, 10(5), 435-443.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13694670600668382>

Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., & Hall, G. (2008). Psychological type and attitude towards Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 23(2), 181 - 191.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13537900802024543>

Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological typology of Anglican clergy in England: Diversity, strengths, and weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 11(2), 266-284. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2007.17>

Francis, L. J., Edwards, O., & ap Sion, T. (2020). Applying psychological type and psychological temperament theory to the congregations at cathedral carol services. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 1-13.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1764516>

Francis, L. J., Gubb, S., & Robbins, M. (2009b). Psychological type profile of Lead Elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 30(1), 61-69.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/13617670902784568>

Francis, L. J., & Jones, S. H. (1997). Personality and charismatic experience among adult Christians. *Pastoral Psychology*, 45(6), 421-428.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310642>

Francis, L. J., & Jones, S. H. (1999). Psychological type and tolerance for religious uncertainty. *Pastoral Psychology*, 47(4), 253-259.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021395211229>

Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & Village, A. (2020). Psychological type and psychological temperament among Readers within the Church of England: a complementary ministry? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 1-15.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1764517>

- Francis, L. J., Littler, K., & Robbins, M. (2010). 13. Psychological type and Offa's Dyke: Exploring differences in the psychological type profile of anglican clergy serving in England and Wales. *Contemporary Wales*, 23(1), 240-251.
- Francis, L. J., & Loudon, S. H. (2000). Mystical orientation and psychological type: A study among student and adult churchgoers. *Transpersonal Psychology Review*, 4(1), 36-42.
- Francis, L. J., Payne, V. J., & Robbins, M. (2013). Psychological type and susceptibility to burnout: A study among Anglican clergymen in Wales. *Psychology of burnout: New research*, 179-192.
- Francis, L. J., Powell, R., & Village, A. (2016). Psychological temperament and religious orientation: An empirical enquiry among Australian church leadership. In P. Hughes (Ed.), *Charting the Faith of Australians* (pp. 111-165). Christian Research Association.
- Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2002). Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 23(2), 217-220.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1361767022000010860>
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Craig, C. (2011). The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: Compatible or incompatible with their clergy? *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 15(2), 243-259.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2011.036>
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Jones, S. H. (2012). The psychological-type profile of clergywomen in ordained local ministry in the Church of England: pioneers or custodians? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15(9), 919-932.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.698449>
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Whinney, M. (2011). Women priests in the Church of England: Psychological type profile. *Religions*, 2(3), 389-397.  
<https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/2/3/389>
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Wulff, K. (2011). Psychological type profile of clergywomen and clergymen serving in the Presbyterian Church (USA): Implications for strengths and weaknesses in ministry. In R. L. Piedmont & A. Village (Eds.), *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* (Vol. 22, pp. 192-211). Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.38>
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Wulff, K. M. (2008). The relationship between work-related psychological health and psychological type among clergy serving in the Presbyterian Church (USA). *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 21(2), 166-182. <https://doi.org/10.1163/157092508X349854>

- Francis, L. J., & Stevenson, A. J. (2018). Profiling Methodist leadership. *HOLINESS The Journal of Wesley House Cambridge*, 4(1), 7-26.  
<https://doi.org/10.2478/holiness-2018-0001>
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2008). *Preaching with all our souls*. Continuum.
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2012). The psychological temperament of Anglican clergy in Ordained Local Ministry (OLM): The conserving, serving pastor? *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 25(1), 57-76.  
<https://doi.org/10.1163/157092512X635743>
- Furnham, A. (1996). The big five versus the big four: The relationship between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and NEO-PI five factor model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 21(2), 303-307.  
[https://doi.org/Doi: 10.1016/0191-8869\(96\)00033-5](https://doi.org/Doi:10.1016/0191-8869(96)00033-5)
- Harbaugh, G. L. (1984). The person in ministry: Psychological type and the seminary. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 23-32.
- Holsworth, T. E. (1984). Type preferences among Roman Catholic seminarians. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 33-35.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works* (Vol. 6). Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Keirsey, D. (1998). *Please understand me II: Temperament, character and intelligence*. Prometheus Nemesis.
- Keirsey, D. (2021). *The four temperaments*. Retrieved 26 January from <https://www.keirsey.com/>
- Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me* (3rd ed.). Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Lloyd, J. B. (2007). Opposition from Christians to Myers-Briggs personality typing: An analysis and evaluation. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 28(2), 111-123.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13617670701485672>
- Lloyd, J. B. (2012). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® and mainstream psychology: Analysis and evaluation of an unresolved hostility. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 33(1), 23-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2012.650028>

- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1989). Reinterpreting the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator from the perspective of the Five-Factor Model of personality. *Journal of Personality*, 57(1), 17-40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1989.tb00759.x>
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (3rd ed.). Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I. B., & Myers, P. B. (1980). *Gifts differing*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality type and religious leadership*. Alban Institute.
- Saroglou, V. (2002). Religion and the five factors of personality: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32(1), 15-25. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(00\)00233-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00233-6)
- The Myers & Briggs Foundation. (2021). *The 16 MBTI® Types*. Retrieved 26 January from <https://www.myersbriggs.org/my-mbti-personality-type/mbti-basics/the-16-mbti-types.htm>
- Tobacyk, J. J., Livingston, M. M., & Robbins, J. E. (2008). Relationships between Myers-Briggs Type Indicator measure of psychological type and NEO measure of Big Five personality factors in Polish university students: A preliminary cross-cultural comparison. *Psychological Reports*, 103(2), 588-590. <https://doi.org/10.2466/PRO.103.6.588-590>
- Village, A. (2011). Gifts Differing? Psychological Type Among Stipendiary And Non-Stipendiary Anglican Clergy. In *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion. Vol.22* (pp. 230-250). Brill. <http://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/774/>
- Village, A. (2013). Traditions within the Church of England and psychological type: A study among the clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 26(1), 22-44. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15709256-12341252>
- Village, A. (2016). Biblical conservatism and psychological type. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 29(2), 137-159. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15709256-12341340>
- Village, A. (2019). Liberalism and conservatism in relation to psychological type among Church of England clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 32(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15709256-12341384>

Table 1 Preferences and temperaments of male Baptist ministers compared to UK norms and Anglican clergymen

|              | BUGB           |      | UK norms       |      |              | Anglican clergy |      |              |
|--------------|----------------|------|----------------|------|--------------|-----------------|------|--------------|
|              | <i>N</i> = 232 |      | <i>N</i> = 748 |      |              | <i>N</i> = 626  |      |              |
| Preferences  |                |      |                |      |              |                 |      |              |
|              | <i>N</i>       | %    | <i>N</i>       | %    | <sup>a</sup> | <i>N</i>        | %    | <sup>b</sup> |
| E            | 87             | 37.5 | 351            | 46.9 | *            | 270             | 43.1 | NS           |
| I            | 145            | 62.5 | 397            | 53.1 |              | 356             | 56.9 |              |
| S            | 119            | 51.3 | 547            | 73.1 | ***          | 240             | 38.3 | ***          |
| N            | 113            | 48.7 | 201            | 26.9 |              | 386             | 61.7 |              |
| T            | 121            | 52.2 | 485            | 64.8 | ***          | 291             | 46.5 | NS           |
| F            | 111            | 47.8 | 263            | 35.2 |              | 335             | 53.5 |              |
| J            | 184            | 79.3 | 409            | 54.7 | ***          | 427             | 68.2 | ***          |
| P            | 48             | 20.7 | 339            | 45.3 |              | 199             | 31.8 |              |
| Temperaments |                |      |                |      |              |                 |      |              |
|              | <i>N</i>       | %    | <i>N</i>       | %    | <sup>a</sup> | <i>N</i>        | %    | <sup>b</sup> |
| SJ           | 106            | 45.7 | 331            | 44.3 | NS           | 195             | 31.2 | ***          |
| SP           | 13             | 5.6  | 216            | 28.9 | ***          | 45              | 7.2  | NS           |
| NF           | 55             | 23.7 | 92             | 12.3 | ***          | 219             | 35.0 | **           |
| NT           | 58             | 25.0 | 109            | 14.6 | ***          | 167             | 26.7 | NS           |

Note. Distributions for Baptist ministers (BUGB) are compared with <sup>a</sup> UK Norms (Kendall, 1998) and <sup>b</sup> Anglican clergy (Francis, Craig, et al., 2007) using chi-squared tests on frequencies with 1 *df* for Preferences and Temperaments (each Temperament tested against the sum of the other three in a 2 x 2 contingency table). NS = Not significant; \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .001$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

Table 2 Preferences and temperaments for female Baptist ministers compared to UK norms and Anglican clergywomen

|                     | BUGB          |      | UK norms       |      |              | Anglican clergy |      |              |
|---------------------|---------------|------|----------------|------|--------------|-----------------|------|--------------|
|                     | <i>N</i> = 51 |      | <i>N</i> = 865 |      |              | <i>N</i> = 237  |      |              |
| <b>Preferences</b>  |               |      |                |      |              |                 |      |              |
|                     | <i>N</i>      | %    | <i>N</i>       | %    | <sup>a</sup> | <i>N</i>        | %    | <sup>b</sup> |
| E                   | 22            | 43.1 | 496            | 57.3 | *            | 109             | 46.0 | NS           |
| I                   | 29            | 56.9 | 369            | 42.7 |              | 128             | 54.0 |              |
| S                   | 27            | 52.9 | 686            | 79.3 | ***          | 84              | 35.4 | *            |
| N                   | 24            | 47.1 | 179            | 20.7 |              | 153             | 64.6 |              |
| T                   | 18            | 35.3 | 256            | 29.6 | NS           | 62              | 26.2 | NS           |
| F                   | 33            | 64.7 | 609            | 70.4 |              | 175             | 73.8 |              |
| J                   | 39            | 76.5 | 532            | 61.5 | *            | 153             | 64.6 | NS           |
| P                   | 12            | 23.5 | 333            | 38.5 |              | 84              | 35.4 |              |
| <b>Temperaments</b> |               |      |                |      |              |                 |      |              |
|                     | <i>N</i>      | %    | <i>N</i>       | %    | <sup>a</sup> | <i>N</i>        | %    | <sup>b</sup> |
| SJ                  | 26            | 51.0 | 469            | 54.2 | NS           | 69              | 29.1 | **           |
| SP                  | 1             | 2.0  | 217            | 25.1 | ***          | 15              | 6.3  |              |
| NF                  | 16            | 31.4 | 133            | 15.4 | **           | 118             | 49.8 | *            |
| NT                  | 8             | 15.7 | 46             | 5.3  | **           | 35              | 14.8 | NS           |

Note. For explanation, see Table 1.

Table 3 Psychological types of male Baptist ministers compared to UK norms and Anglican clergymen

|      | BUGB           |      | UK norms       |      |              | Anglican clergy |      |              |
|------|----------------|------|----------------|------|--------------|-----------------|------|--------------|
|      | <i>N</i> = 232 |      | <i>N</i> = 748 |      |              | <i>N</i> = 626  |      |              |
|      | <i>N</i>       | %    | <i>N</i>       | %    | <sup>a</sup> | <i>N</i>        | %    | <sup>b</sup> |
| ISTJ | 40             | 17.2 | 147            | 19.7 | NS           | 62              | 9.9  | **           |
| ISFJ | 36             | 15.5 | 52             | 7.0  | ***          | 49              | 7.8  | ***          |
| INFJ | 20             | 8.6  | 12             | 1.6  | ***          | 57              | 9.1  | NS           |
| INTJ | 25             | 10.8 | 19             | 2.5  | ***          | 69              | 11.0 | NS           |
| ISTP | 4              | 1.7  | 81             | 10.8 | ***          | 14              | 2.2  | NS           |
| ISFP | 2              | 0.9  | 28             | 3.7  | NS           | 9               | 1.4  | NS           |
| INFP | 10             | 4.3  | 27             | 3.6  | NS           | 63              | 10.1 | ***          |
| INTP | 8              | 3.4  | 31             | 4.1  | NS           | 33              | 5.3  | NS           |
| ESTP | 2              | 0.9  | 61             | 8.2  | ***          | 7               | 1.1  | NS           |
| ESFP | 5              | 2.2  | 46             | 6.1  | *            | 15              | 2.4  | NS           |
| ENFP | 8              | 3.4  | 38             | 5.1  | NS           | 42              | 6.7  | NS           |
| ENTP | 9              | 3.9  | 27             | 3.6  | NS           | 16              | 2.6  | NS           |
| ESTJ | 17             | 7.3  | 87             | 11.6 | NS           | 41              | 6.5  | NS           |
| ESFJ | 13             | 5.6  | 45             | 6.0  | NS           | 43              | 6.9  | NS           |
| ENFJ | 17             | 7.3  | 15             | 2.0  | ***          | 57              | 9.1  | NS           |
| ENTJ | 16             | 6.9  | 32             | 4.3  | NS           | 49              | 7.8  | NS           |

Note. Distributions for Baptist ministers (BUGB) are compared with <sup>a</sup>UK Norms (Kendall, 1998) and <sup>b</sup>Anglican clergy (Francis, Craig, et al., 2007) using chi-squared tests on frequencies with 1 *df* in a 2 x 2 contingency table (each type tested against the sum of the other 15). NS = Not significant; \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .001$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

Table 4 Psychological types of female Baptist ministers compared to UK norms and Anglican clergywomen

|      | BUGB          |      | UK norms       |      |              | Anglican clergy |      |              |
|------|---------------|------|----------------|------|--------------|-----------------|------|--------------|
|      | <i>N</i> = 51 |      | <i>N</i> = 865 |      |              | <i>N</i> = 237  |      |              |
|      | <i>N</i>      | %    | <i>N</i>       | %    | <sup>a</sup> | <i>N</i>        | %    | <sup>b</sup> |
| ISTJ | 8             | 15.7 | 74             | 8.6  | NS           | 11              | 4.6  | **           |
| ISFJ | 10            | 19.6 | 153            | 17.7 | NS           | 29              | 12.2 | NS           |
| INFJ | 3             | 5.9  | 15             | 1.7  | *            | 25              | 10.5 | NS           |
| INTJ | 2             | 3.9  | 4              | 0.5  | **           | 16              | 6.8  | NS           |
| ISTP | 0             | 0.0  | 22             | 2.5  | NS           | 2               | 0.8  | NS           |
| ISFP | 1             | 2.0  | 68             | 7.9  | NS           | 8               | 3.4  | NS           |
| INFP | 3             | 5.9  | 24             | 2.8  | NS           | 33              | 13.9 | NS           |
| INTP | 2             | 3.9  | 9              | 1.0  | NS           | 4               | 1.7  | NS           |
| ESTP | 0             | 0.0  | 32             | 3.7  | NS           | 1               | 0.4  | NS           |
| ESFP | 0             | 0.0  | 95             | 11.0 | *            | 4               | 1.7  | NS           |
| ENFP | 6             | 11.8 | 65             | 7.5  | NS           | 25              | 10.5 | NS           |
| ENTP | 0             | 0.0  | 18             | 2.1  | NS           | 7               | 3.0  | NS           |
| ESTJ | 2             | 3.9  | 82             | 9.5  | NS           | 13              | 5.5  | NS           |
| ESFJ | 6             | 11.8 | 160            | 18.5 | NS           | 16              | 6.8  | NS           |
| ENFJ | 4             | 7.8  | 29             | 3.4  | NS           | 35              | 14.8 | NS           |
| ENTJ | 4             | 7.8  | 15             | 1.7  | **           | 8               | 3.4  | NS           |

Note. For explanation, see Table 3.