Est. 1841 | YORK ST JOHN UNIVERSITY

Francis, Leslie J. and Village, Andrew (2024) Psychological Type and Temperament Profile of Anglican Clergy Serving in the Episcopal Church (USA). Journal of Anglican Studies, 23 (2). pp. 355-368.

Downloaded from: https://ray.yorksj.ac.uk/id/eprint/11107/

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/10.1017/S1740355324000469

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@yorksj.ac.uk

Journal of Anglican Studies (2024), page 1 of 14
doi:10.1017/S1740355324000469

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Psychological Type and Temperament Profile of Anglican Clergy Serving in the Episcopal Church (USA)

Leslie J. Francis[1,2] and Andrew Village[3]

[1]Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research (CEDAR), University of Warwick, Coventry, UK, [2]World Religions and Education Research Unit, Bishop Grosseteste University, Lincoln, UK and [3]School of Humanities, York St John University, York, UK
Corresponding author: Leslie J. Francis; Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

(Received 6 June 2024; accepted 9 September 2024)

Abstract
The present study drew on data provided by 179 clergymen and 226 clergywomen to discuss the psychological type and temperaments profile of stipendiary parochial clergy serving in The Episcopal Church (USA) and to set this profile alongside 591 clergymen and 486 clergywomen serving in the Church of England. The data indicated a similar profile for Anglican clergy on both sides of the Atlantic, with preferences for introversion, intuition, feeling and judging. In terms of temperament, in the USA 41% of clergymen were SJ, 38% NF, 17% NT and 4% SP; 43% of clergywomen were NF, 41% SJ, 13% NT and 2% SP.

Keywords: Anglican Church; clergy studies; empirical theology; psychological type; USA

Introduction

The relevance of psychological type theory and temperament theory for appreciating individual differences among clergy and religious leaders has been introduced at a conceptual level by several studies, including the following three books: *Personality type and religious leadership* by Oswald and Kroeger (1988), *Be a better leader: Personality type and differences in ministry* by Osborne (2016), and *Personality, religion and leadership: The spiritual dimensions of psychological type theory* by Ross and Francis (2020). Within the science of clergy studies, empirical research exploring and testing the application of psychological type theory among various groups of religious leaders emerged during the late 1960s with studies reporting on the profiles of 319 Jewish rabbis (Greenfield, 1969), 150 professed Roman Catholic sisters (Cabral, 1984), 60 Luteran seminarians (Harbaugh, 1984), 146 Catholic seminarians (Holsworth, 1984), two samples of 47 and 641 Roman Catholic sisters (Bigelow et al., 1988),

© The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Journal of Anglican Studies Trust. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is unaltered and is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press must be obtained for commercial re-use or in order to create a derivative work.

Check for updates

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

310 Lutheran pastors (Nauss, 1989) and 147 Presbyterian ministers from Scotland (Irvine, 1989).

A key development in this field was made by Macdaid, McCaulley and Kainz (1986) in their publication of an *Atlas of type tables*. This atlas drew together the available research at that time regarding the psychological type profile of different occupational groups classified within the following categories: art and communication; business and management; counselling and mental health; education; engineering; science and technology; government, justice and ministry; health; industry, service and trade; religion; and students. In the section on religion, the authors assembled 15 type tables, among which the two most significant provided profiles of 1,554 Protestant ministers and 1,298 Catholic priests. Comparison of these two type tables generated insights into what these two groups shared in common and into ways in which they differed. The other 13 type tables profiled: 114 brothers in Roman Catholic religious orders; 1,205 candidates for theology education; 534 clergy defined as 'all denominations except priests'; 50 directors of religious education; 1,147 nuns and other religious workers; 102 ordained Roman Catholic deacons; 219 priests and monks; 633 Protestant seminarians; 85 Protestants in specialised ministries; 319 rabbis; 79 religious educators across all denominations; 51 Roman Catholic seminarians; and 2,002 sisters in Roman Catholic religious orders.

The introduction of psychological type theory and temperament theory to the science of clergy studies is not without its critics, rooted both within psychological and theological traditions. The conceptual challenges confronting psychological type theory have been well summarised and addressed in a series of papers by Lloyd (2007, 2008, 2012, 2015, 2022, 2024). The empirical contribution of psychological type theory to the psychology of religion and empirical theology has been well illustrated in a series of edited collections by Village (2011a) and by Lewis (2012, 2015, 2021a, 2021b, 2022).

Introducing Psychological Type Theory

Psychological type theory, rooted in the work of Jung (1971), has been operationalised and developed by a series of psychometric instruments, including the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), the Myers–Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005; Francis, Laycock, & Brewster, 2017). At its core, psychological type theory distinguishes between four bipolar constructs: 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). According to this model, the two orientations (extraversion and introversion) and the two attitudes (judging and perceiving) define the context within which the individual human psyche functions. The two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) and the two judging functions (thinking and feeling) define the mental processes involved in observing and interpreting the world.

First, the two orientations are concerned with where psychological energy is sourced and focused. On the one hand, extraverts (E) are orientated toward the outer world, where they are energised by the people and events around them. They

enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and energising environments. They focus their attention on what is happening outside themselves. On the other hand, introverts (I) are orientated toward their inner world, where they are energised by their inner concepts and ideas. They enjoy solitude, silence and contemplation. They focus their attention on what is happening in their inner life.

Second, the two perceiving functions are concerned with the way in which people receive information. On the one hand, sensing types (S) prefer to focus on specific details, rather than the overall picture. They are concerned with what they can perceive through their senses. The tend to be practical, down to earth and matter of fact. On the other hand, intuitive types (N) prefer to focus on the possibilities suggested by a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. They focus on the overall picture, rather than on specific facts and data.

Third, the two judging functions are concerned with the criteria which people employ to make their decisions. On the one hand, thinking types (T) make their decisions based on objective, impersonal logic. They value integrity and justice. They consider conforming to principles to be more important than cultivating harmony. On the other hand, feeling types (F) make their decisions based on subjective, personal values. They value compassion and mercy. They are more concerned to cultivate harmony, than to confirm to abstract principles.

Fourth, the two attitudes toward the outer world identify which of the two sets of functions (that is the perceiving functions, or the judging functions) is preferred in dealings with the outer world. On the one hand, judging types (J) seek to order and to structure their outer world, as they actively evaluate external stimuli. They enjoy routine and established patterns. On the other hand, perceiving types (P) do not seek to order and to structure their outer world, but are more reflective, perceptive and open, as they passively perceive external stimuli. They have a flexible, spontaneous and open-ended approach to life.

According to psychological type theory, each individual needs access to all four functions (sensing, intuition, thinking and feeling) for normal and healthy living. The two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) are needed to gather information. These are the irrational functions concerned with collecting information, with seeing reality and possibility. The two judging functions (thinking and feeling) are needed to organise and evaluate information. These are the rational functions concerned with making decisions. Although each individual needs to be able to access all four functions, psychological type theory suggests that the relative strengths of these four functions vary from one individual to another. Empirical evidence suggests that individuals will develop preference for one of the perceiving functions (sensing or intuition) and tend to neglect the other, and that they will develop preference for one of the judging functions (thinking or feeling) and tend to neglect the other. Moreover, according to psychological type theory, for each individual either the preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) or the preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) takes preference over the other, leading to the emergence of one dominant function which shapes the individual's dominant approach to life. Dominant sensing shapes the practical person; dominant intuition shapes the imaginative person; dominant feeling shapes the humane person; and dominant thinking shapes the analytic person.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Introducing Temperament Theory

Temperament theory, rooted in the work of Keirsey and Bates (1978), employs some of the building blocks from psychological type theory to propose four basic temperament styles: Epimethean (SJ), Dionysian (SP), Promethean (NT) and Apollonian (NF). Subsequently Oswald and Kroeger (1988) built on Keirsey and Bates' characterisation of the four temperaments to create profiles of how these temperaments shape four very different styles of religious leadership.

The Epimethean Temperament (SJ) is styled 'the conserving, serving pastor'. SJ clergy tend to be the most traditional of all clergy temperaments, bringing stability and continuity in whatever situation they are called to serve. They tend to protect and conserve the traditions inherited from the past. They tend to be good at building community, fostering a sense of loyalty and belonging. They bring order and stability to their congregations, creating plans, developing procedures and formulating policies; and they are keen that these procedures should be followed. They are realists who offer practical and down-to-earth solutions to pastoral problems.

The Dionysian Temperament (SP) is styled 'the action-oriented pastor'. SP clergy tend to be fun loving and engaged in activity. They have little interest in the abstract, the theoretical and the non-practical aspects of theology and church life. They are flexible and spontaneous people who welcome the unplanned and unpredictable aspects of church life. They seem able to grasp the moment. At heart they work well as entertainers and performers.

The Promethean Temperament (NT) is styled 'the intellectual, competence-seeking pastor'. NT clergy tend to be academically and intellectually engaged. They are motivated by the search for meaning, for truth and for possibilities. They tend to make good teachers, preachers and advocates for social justice. They look for underlying principles rather than basic applications from their study of scripture. They see the value of opposing views and strive to allow alternative visions to be heard.

The Apollonian Temperament (NF) is styled 'the authenticity-seeking, relationship-oriented pastor'. NF clergy are attracted to helping roles that deal with human suffering. They want to meet the needs of others and to find personal affirmation in so doing. They can be articulate and inspiring communicators, committed to influencing others by touching their hearts. They have good empathic capacity, interpersonal skills and pastoral counselling techniques. They are able to draw the best out of people and work well as the catalyst or facilitator in the congregation.

Building a New Type Atlas

Building on the initiative established by Macdaid, McCaulley and Kainz (1986), a connected series of studies has started to develop an atlas of type tables for churches operating in Great Britain and Ireland, including: Apostolic network leaders, with 164 male participants (Kay, Francis, & Robbins, 2011); Baptist ministers, with 232 male and 51 female participants (Garland & Village, 2022); Church in Wales clergy, with 427 clergymen (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001); with 213 clergymen (Francis, Littler, & Robbins, 2010); and with 268 clergymen (Payne & Lewis, 2015); Church of England clergy, with 626 clergymen and 237 clergywomen (Francis, Craig, et al., 2007) with 622 clergymen (Francis, Robbins, et al., 2010) with 83 clergywomen (Francis, Robbins, & Whinney, 2011), with 97 training incumbents and 98 curates

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Tilley et al., 2011), with 529 clergymen and 518 clergywomen (Village, 2011b), with 90 curates under the age of forty (Francis & Smith, 2018), with 1,164 clergymen and 307 clergywomen (Francis, Village, & Voas, 2021) and with 77 stipendiary and 53 non-stipendiary clergy (Rutledge, 2021); Church of England Local Ordained Ministers, with 39 participants (Francis & Holmes, 2011), with 144 clergywomen (Francis, Robbins, & Jones, 2012), and with 56 clergymen and 79 clergywomen (Francis & Village, 2012); Church of England full-time hospital chaplains, with 101 participants (Francis, Hancocks, et al., 2009); Church of England bishops, with 168 bishops, serving or retired (Francis, Whinney, & Robbins, 2013); Church of England archdeacons, with 186 archdeacons serving or retired (Francis & Whinney, 2019); Church of England readers, with 108 male and 128 female participants (Francis, Jones, & Robbins, 2014), and with 59 male and 96 female participants (Francis, Jones, & Village, 2021); Free Church Ministers, with 148 male and 41 female participants (Francis, Whinney, et al., 2011); Methodist ministers, with 693 male and 311 female participants (Burton et al., 2010) and with 619 male and 312 female participants (Francis, Haley, & McKenna, 2023); Methodist local preachers, with 80 male and 62 female participants (Francis & Stevenson, 2018); Newfrontiers network of churches, with 134 lead elders (Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009) and 154 leaders (Francis, Robbins, & Ryland, 2012); Roman Catholic priests, with 79 participants (Craig et al., 2006) and with 190 participants (Francis & Village, 2022); Salvation Army Officers, with 165 male and 269 female participants (ap Siôn & Francis, 2022); and United Reformed Church ministers with 55 male ministers and 38 female ministers (Lewis et al., 2022).

Research Question

The most recent profile of stipendiary parochial clergy serving in the Church of England was published by Francis and Village (under review), drawing on data provided by 591 clergymen and 486 clergywomen who participated in the online survey promoted by the *Church Times* concerning the pandemic. Among clergymen these data demonstrated clear preferences for judging (76%) over perceiving (24%) and for introversion (61%) over extraversion (39%) and slight preference for intuition (53%) over sensing (48%) and for thinking (53%) over feeling (47%). In terms of temperaments, 42% reported Epimethean (SJ), 28% Apollonian (NF), 24% Promethean (NT) and 6% Dionysian (SP). Among clergywomen these data demonstrated clear preferences for judging (77%) over perceiving (25%), for feeling (66%) over thinking (34%) and for introversion (58%) over extraversion (42%) and slight preference for intuition (54%) over sensing (46%). In terms of temperament, 42% reported Epimethean (SJ), 37% Apollonian (NF), 16% Promethean (NT) and 5% Dionysian (SP).

Since the same survey was conducted within The Episcopal Church (USA), the aim of the present study is to report on the psychological type and temperament profile of a comparable sample of Anglican stipendiary parochial clergy serving there, in order to explore differences and similarities among two groups of Anglican clergy serving on different continents.

Method

Procedure

The *Covid-19 & Church-21* survey was originally designed in association with the *Church Times* to explore the impact of the pandemic on Anglican clergy and laity in England. It was opened on the Qualtrics XM platform on 22 January and closed on 23 July 2021. This survey was slightly shortened and adapted to suit the USA context of the Episcopal Church. There it was publicised and distributed through Virginia Theological Seminary, was live from 1 June to 23 August 2021 and attracted over 5,000 responses from across the USA. An overview of the responses from laity and clergy from The Episcopal Church were published by Village and Francis (2021).

Measures

Psychological type was assessed using the revised version of the Francis Psychological Type and Emotional Temperament Scales, FPTETS-R (Village & Francis, 2022, 2023a, 2023b). This 50-item instrument comprises four sets of 10 forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling) and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving) and 10 items related to emotional temperament (calm or volatile). Alpha reliabilities in this sample ranged from .77 to .87.

Participants

In terms of age, 1% of the clergymen were in their twenties, 11% in their thirties, 17% in their forties, 25% in their fifties, 34% in their sixties and 12% were aged seventy and over; 91% reported as ethnically white; 46% served in suburban or exurban areas, 27% in towns, 13% in inner city and 13% in rural ministry. In terms of age, 5% of the clergywomen were in their thirties, 14% in their forties, 29% in their fifties, 38% in their sixties and 14% were aged seventy or over; 92% reported as ethnically white; 45% served in suburban or exurban areas, 33% in towns, 10% in inner city and 12% in rural ministry.

Analysis

The scientific literature concerned with psychological type has developed a distinctive way of presenting type-related data. The conventional format of 'type tables' has been used in the present paper to allow the findings from this study to be compared with other relevant studies in the literature. In these tables the psychological type profiles of clergymen and clergywomen serving in stipendiary parochial ministry in The Episcopal Church (USA) are compared with the psychological type profiles of Church of England clergymen and clergywomen as reported by Francis and Village (under review). The statistical significance of differences between the present sample and the data published by Francis and Village (under review) are tested by means of the Selection Ratio Index (*I*), an extension of the classic chi-square test (McCaulley, 1985).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Results

Table 1 presents the type distribution for the 179 stipendiary parochial clergymen serving in The Episcopal Church (USA) who participated in the 2021 survey. The data indicate that these clergymen prefer introversion (68%) over extraversion (32%), intuition (55%) over sensing (45%), feeling (59%) over thinking (41%) and judging (81%) over perceiving (19%). In terms of the dominant functions, 35% were dominant intuitive types, 31% dominant sensing types, 21% dominant feeling types and 13% dominant thinking types. In terms of the 16 complete types, the two most frequently occurring types were ISTJ (18%) and INFJ (17%). In terms of temperament, 41% were Epimethean (SJ), 38% Apollonian (NF), 17% Promethean (NT) and 4% Dionysian (SP).

Table 1 also presents the statistical significance tests comparing the group of clergymen serving in The Episcopal Church with the 591 stipendiary parochial clergymen serving in the Church of England reported by Francis and Village (under review). The main difference between these two groups of clergymen comprised the higher proportion of feeling types among those serving in The Episcopal Church (59% compared with 47% in England). This difference was also reflected by the higher proportion of INFJs serving in The Episcopal Church (17% compared with 9%). There were two significant differences in the distribution among the four temperaments, with 38% reporting NF in the USA, compared with 28% in England and 17% reporting NT in the USA compared with 24% in England. Similar proportions reported SJ in the USA (41%) and in England (42%). Similar proportions reported SP in the USA (4%) and in England (6%).

Table 2 presents the type distribution for the 226 stipendiary parochial clergywomen serving in The Episcopal Church (USA) who participated in the 2021 survey. The data indicate that these clergywomen prefer introversion (62%) over extraversion (38%), intuition (57%) over sensing (43%), feeling (68%) over thinking (32%) and judging (75%) over perceiving (25%). In terms of the dominant functions, 31% were dominant feeling types, 29% dominant sensing types, 28% dominant intuitive types and 12% dominant thinking types. In terms of the 16 complete types, the four most frequently occurring types were ISFJ (16%), ISTJ (13%), INFJ (12%) and INFP (12%). In terms of temperament, 43% were Apollonian (NF), 41% Epimethean (SJ), 13% Promethean (NT) and 2% Dionysian (SP).

Table 2 also presents the statistical significance tests comparing the group of clergywomen serving in The Episcopal Church (USA) with the 486 stipendiary parochial clergywomen serving in the Church of England reported by Francis and Village (under review). There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups.

Discussion and Conclusion

Building on the developing atlas of type tables of clergy serving in Britain and Ireland, the present study was designed to present the psychological type and temperament profile of clergymen and clergywomen serving in stipendiary parochial ministry within The Episcopal Church (USA) and to set this profile along the psychological type and temperament profile of clergymen and clergywomen serving in stipendiary parochial ministry within the Church of England. A strength of this comparison is that both sets of data (in the USA and in England) were established by the same method at roughly

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1 Type distribution for The Episcopal Church (USA) stipendiary clergymen compared with Church of England stipendiary clergymen

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ	E	*n* = 58	(32.4%)	*I* = 0.84
n = 32	*n* = 22	*n* = 31	*n* = 17	I	*n* = 121	(67.6%)	*I* = 1.10
(17.9%)	(12.3%)	(17.3%)	(9.5%)				
I = 0.87	*I* = 1.27	*I* = 2.01***	*I* = 0.80	S	*n* = 81	(45.3%)	*I* = 0.95
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	N	*n* = 98	(54.7%)	*I* = 1.04
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++				
+++++	++	+++++		T	*n* = 74	(41.3%)	*I* = 0.79**
+++		++		F	*n* = 105	(58.7%)	*I* = 1.24**
				J	*n* = 145	(81.0%)	*I* = 1.06
				P	*n* = 34	(19.0%)	*I* = 0.80
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP				
n = 3	*n* = 3	*n* = 10	*n* = 3	**Pairs and Temperaments**			
(1.7%)	(1.7%)	(5.6%)	(1.7%)	IJ	*n* = 102	(57.0%)	*I* = 1.13
I = 2.48	*I* = 0.76	*I* = 1.10	*I* = 0.62	IP	*n* = 19	(10.6%)	*I* = 1.00
++	++	+++++	++	EP	*n* = 15	(8.4%)	*I* = 0.64
		+		EJ	*n* = 43	(24.0%)	*I* = 0.93
				ST	*n* = 44	(24.6%)	*I* = 0.86
				SF	*n* = 37	(20.7%)	*I* = 1.09
				NF	*n* = 68	(38.0%)	*I* = 1.34*
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP	NT	*n* = 30	(16.8%)	*I* = 0.70*
n = 0	*n* = 1	*n* = 13	*n* = 1				
(0.0%)	(0.6%)	(7.3%)	(0.6%)	SJ	*n* = 74	(41.3%)	*I* = 0.99
I = 0.00	*I* = 0.33	*I* = 0.95	*I* = 0.22	SP	*n* = 7	(3.9%)	*I* = 0.68
	+	+++++	+	NP	*n* = 27	(15.1%)	*I* = 0.84
		++		NJ	*n* = 71	(39.7%)	*I* = 1.15
				TJ	*n* = 67	(37.4%)	*I* = 0.82
				TP	*n* = 7	(3.9%)	*I* = 0.55
				FP	*n* = 27	(15.1%)	*I* = 0.91
				FJ	*n* = 78	(43.6%)	*I* = 1.42**
ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ				
n = 9	*n* = 11	*n* = 14	*n* = 9	IN	*n* = 61	(34.1%)	*I* = 1.21
(5.0%)	(6.1%)	(7.8%)	(5.0%)	EN	*n* = 37	(20.7%)	*I* = 0.85
I = 0.80	*I* = 1.13	*I* = 1.10	*I* = 0.72	IS	*n* = 60	(33.5%)	*I* = 1.02
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	ES	*n* = 21	(11.7%)	*I* = 0.81
	+	+++					
				ET	*n* = 19	(10.6%)	*I* = 0.63*
				EF	*n* = 39	(21.8%)	*I* = 1.00
				IF	*n* = 66	(36.9%)	*I* = 1.44**
				IT	*n* = 55	(30.7%)	*I* = 0.86

Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types			
	n	%	*Index*		*n*	%	*Index*		*n*	%	*Index*
E-TJ	18	10.1	0.76	I-TP	6	3.4	0.99	Dt.T	24	13.4	0.81
E-FJ	25	14.0	1.12	I-FP	13	7.3	1.00	Dt.F	38	21.2	1.07
ES-P	1	0.6	0.19	IS-J	54	30.2	1.00	Dt.S	55	30.7	0.93
EN-P	14	7.8	0.77	IN-J	48	25.8	1.31	Dt.N	62	34.6	1.13

Note: $N = 179$ (NB: + = 1% of *N*).
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 2 Type distribution for The Episcopal Church (USA) stipendiary clergywomen compared with Church of England stipendiary clergywomen

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ	E	*n* = 86	(38.1%)	*I* = 0.92
n = 29	*n* = 35	*n* = 28	*n* = 14	I	*n* = 140	(61.9%)	*I* = 1.06
(12.8%)	(15.5%)	(12.4%)	(6.2%)				
I = 0.96	*I* = 3.92	*I* = 1.16	*I* = 0.94	S	*n* = 98	(43.4%)	*I* = 0.94
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	N	*n* = 128	(56.6%)	*I* = 1.05
+++++	+++++	+++++	+				
+++	+++++	++		T	*n* = 72	(31.9%)	*I* = 0.93
	+			F	*n* = 154	(68.1%)	*I* = 1.04
				J	*n* = 170	(75.2%)	*I* = 0.97
				P	*n* = 56	(24.8%)	*I* = 1.09
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP				
n = 1	*n* = 3	*n* = 27	*n* = 3		**Pairs and Temperaments**		
(0.4%)	(1.3%)	(11.9%)	(1.3%)	IJ	*n* = 106	(46.9%)	*I* = 0.99
I = 0.72	*I* = 0.81	*I* = 1.53	*I* = 1.61	IP	*n* = 34	(15.0%)	*I* = 1.38
	+	+++++	+	EP	*n* = 22	(9.7%)	*I* = 0.83
		+++++		EJ	*n* = 64	(28.3%)	*I* = 0.95
		++					
				ST	*n* = 42	(18.6%)	*I* = 1.03
				SF	*n* = 56	(24.8%)	*I* = 0.88
				NF	*n* = 98	(43.4%)	*I* = 1.16
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP	NT	*n* = 30	(13.3%)	*I* = 0.82
n = 0	*n* = 1	*n* = 19	*n* = 2				
(0.0%)	(0.4%)	(8.4%)	(0.9%)	SJ	*n* = 93	(41.2%)	*I* = 0.99
I = 0.00	*I* = 0.24	*I* = 1.20	*I* = 0.36	SP	*n* = 5	(2.2%)	*I* = 0.49
		+++++	+	NP	*n* = 51	(22.6%)	*I* = 1.25
		+++		NJ	*n* = 77	(34.1%)	*I* = 0.96
				TJ	*n* = 66	(29.2%)	*I* = 0.97
				TP	*n* = 6	(2.7%)	*I* = 0.61
				FP	*n* = 50	(22.1%)	*I* = 1.21
				FJ	*n* = 104	(46.0%)	*I* = 0.97
ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ				
n = 12	*n* = 17	*n* = 24	*n* = 11	IN	*n* = 72	(31.9%)	*I* = 1.23
(5.3%)	(7.5%)	(10.6%)	(4.9%)	EN	*n* = 56	(24.8%)	*I* = 0.89
I = 1.43	*I* = 0.96	*I* = 0.89	*I* = 0.76	IS	*n* = 68	(30.1%)	*I* = 0.93
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	ES	*n* = 30	(13.3%)	*I* = 0.96
	+++	+++++					
		+		ET	*n* = 25	(11.1%)	*I* = 0.85
				EF	*n* = 61	(27.0%)	*I* = 0.94
				IF	*n* = 93	(41.2%)	*I* = 1.11
				IT	*n* = 47	(20.8%)	*I* = 0.97

Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types			
	n	%	*Index*		*n*	%	*Index*		*n*	%	*Index*
E-TJ	23	10.2	1.01	I-TP	4	1.8	1.23	Dt.T	27	11.9	1.04
E-FJ	41	18.1	0.92	I-FP	30	13.3	1.40	Dt.F	71	31.4	1.08
ES-P	1	0.4	0.20	IS-J	64	28.3	0.94	Dt.S	65	28.8	0.88
EN-P	21	9.3	0.93	IN-J	42	18.6	1.08	Dt.N	63	27.9	1.04

Note: $N = 226$ (NB: + = 1% of *N*).
$^{*}p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{***}p < .001$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the same time. The data point to many similarities among the two groups of clergy. It is on these similarities that this discussion and conclusion will concentrate.

In terms of orientation, Anglican clergy from both sides of the Atlantic preferred introversion: in the USA 68% clergymen and 62% of clergywomen and in England 61% of clergymen and 58% of clergywomen. In both contexts the Anglican Church is likely to build and to nurture an introverted culture, with an emphasis on an inner spirituality. A consequence is that extraverts may feel less at home in the Anglican Church and seek spiritual sustenance elsewhere.

In terms of attitudes, Anglican clergy from both sides of the Atlantic preferred judging: in the USA 81% of clergymen and 75% clergywomen and in England 76% of clergymen and 77% of clergywomen. In both contexts the Anglican Church is likely to build and to nurture a culture that prioritises the application of a judging function (thinking or feeling) in the external world, with an emphasis on order, structure and predictability. A consequence is that perceiving types, who prize flexibility and spontaneity in the external world, may feel less at home in the Anglican Church and seek spiritual sustenance elsewhere.

In terms of the perceiving process, Anglican clergy from both sides of the Atlantic preferred intuition: in the USA 55% of clergymen and 57% of clergywomen, and in England 53% of clergymen and 54% of clergywomen. This preference for intuition among Anglican clergy is of interest for three reasons. First, the growing atlas of clergy type tables from Britain and Ireland showed Anglican clergy to be outliers in terms of preferring intuition. The preference for sensing was higher in other denominations. Second, congregation studies in England found Anglican congregations to be weighted heavily in favour of sensing types (78% of men and 81% of women: see Francis, Robins, & Craig, 2011). Third, the psychological type norms for the UK population (Kendall, 1998) also reported a strong preference for sensing (73% of men and 79% of women). Leaders preferring intuition may expect predictable areas of disagreement working with members who prefer sensing. Sensing types prefer what they have experienced before and resist change. Intuitive types easily tire of the familiar and pursue innovation.

In terms of the judging process, Anglican clergy from both sides of the Atlantic tended to prefer feeling: in the UA, 59% of clergymen and 68% of clergywomen and in England 47% of clergymen and 66% of clergywomen. This preference for feeling among Anglican clergy is of practical importance for the following reason. The judging process (thinking and feeling) is the one component of psychological type theory that is reflected in strong sex differences. According to the population norms for the UK 70% of women prefer feeling, compared with 35% of men (Kendall, 1998). It is this comparison that explains why 47% of clergymen in England preferring feeling seems high. With a growing number of female clergy and with male clergy being more likely than men in general to prefer feeling, the Anglican Church is likely to build and to nurture a feeling culture, with the decision-making emphasis seeking harmony rather than striving for justice. A consequence is that those who prefer thinking may feel less at home in the Anglican Church and seek spiritual sustenance elsewhere. This phenomenon may help to explain the disproportionate weighting of Anglican congregations toward women, as evidenced for example by a recent study of the Diocese of Southwark, where overall men accounted for 34% of churchgoers (Francis & Lankshear, 2021). Moreover, the main significant difference between the two groups of

clergy is that there is a significantly higher proportion of feeling types among clergymen serving in The Episcopal Church (USA).

In terms of the dominant type profile, the least represented dominant type among Anglican clergy on both sides of the Atlantic was dominant thinking type that accounted for 17% of the clergymen and 12% of the clergywomen in England and for 13% of clergymen and 12% of clergywomen in the USA. Overall, therefore, the deficit in clerical leadership skills is likely to reside in the area of strategic management and rigorous theological analysis.

In terms of temperament theory, two-fifths of Anglican clergy both sides of the Atlantic (41% of clergymen and 41% of clergywomen in the USA and 42% of clergyman and 42% of clergywomen in England) reported the Epimethean (SJ) temperament. On the analysis offered by Oswald and Kroeger (1988), SJ clergy are styled 'the conserving, serving pastor'. Here are the trusted guardians of the traditions inherited from the past, a safe pair of hands to ensure that policies and procedures are in place and fully implemented. They are sensitive and practical leaders. In the USA another two-fifths of Anglican clergy (38% of clergymen and 43% of clergywomen) reported Apollonian (NF) temperament. On the analysis offered by Oswald and Kroeger (1988), NF clergy are styled 'the authenticity-seeking, relationship-oriented pastor'. Here are pastors with an eye on future possibilities and with the capacity to inspire others to catch that vision. Less in evidence both sides of the Atlantic are Anglican clergy who reported Promethean (NT) temperament or Dionysian (SP) temperament. On the analysis offered by Oswald and Kroeger (1988) NT clergy are styled 'the intellectual, competence-seeking pastor' and SP clergy are styled 'the action-oriented pastor'. With these two temperaments in short supply, The Episcopal Church (USA) may be under resourced in these areas of ministry and mission.

The limitation with the present study concerns the reliance on data generated through an online survey primarily concerned with exploring the impact of the pandemic on Anglican clergy and laity in England and the USA. This limitation can be addressed by future studies employing more rigorous sampling strategies among clergy serving in The Episcopal Church (USA). For example, if seminaries were to include regular psychological type and temperament profiling over a period of time, accumulated data could build up a comprehensive profile of ministry candidates, employ these data to inform theological education and formation and document the influence of type on ministry trajectories.

Acknowledgements. We thank Jennifer McKenzie and the Virginia Theological Seminary for promoting the survey among the Episcopal Church.

Competing interests. No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

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: HRP-RS-AV-0240-01). All participants had to affirm they were 18 or over and given their informed consent by ticking a box that gave access to the rest of the survey.

References

ap Siôn, T. G., & Francis, L. J. (2022). The Psychological Type Profile of Salvation Army Officers Working Within the United Kingdom: Diversity, Strengths, and Weaknesses in Ministry. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **25**(9), 842–859. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2021.1884211

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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.

Burton, L., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological Type Profile of Methodist Circuit Ministers in Britain: Similarities With and Differences From Anglican Clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, **23**(1), 64–81. doi: 10.1163/157092510X503020

Cabral, G. (1984). Psychological Types in a Catholic Convent: Applications to Community Living and Congregational Data. *Journal of Psychological Type*, **8**, 16–22.

Craig, C. L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L. J. (2006). Psychological Type Preferences of Roman Catholic Priests in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, **27**(2), 157–164. doi: 10.1080/13617670600849812

Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and Psychology: Personality, Religion and the Individual*. Darton, Longman and Todd.

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. doi: 10.1515/IJPT.2007.17

Francis, L. J., Gubb, S., & Robbins, M. (2009). Psychological Type Profile of Lead Elders Within the Newfrontiers Network of Churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Belief and Values*, **30**(1), 61–69. doi: 10.1080/13617670902784568

Francis, L. J., Haley, J. M., & McKenna, U. (2023). Psychological Type Profile of Methodist Ministers in Britain: Contributing to the Atlas of Clergy Type Tables. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, **33**, 102–125. doi: 10.1163/9789004544574_007

Francis, L. J., Hancocks, G., Swift, C., & Robbins, M. (2009). Distinctive Call, Distinctive Profile: The Psychological Type Profile of Church of England Full-Time Hospital Chaplains. *Practical Theology* **2**(2), 269–284. doi: 10.1558/prth.v2i2.269

Francis, L. J., & Holmes, P. (2011). Ordained Local Ministers: The Same Anglican Orders, But of Different Psychological Temperaments? *Rural Theology*, **9**(2), 151–160. doi: 10.1558/ruth.v9i2.151

Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & Robbins, M. (2014). The Psychological Type Profile of Readers in the Church of England: Clones of the Clergy or Distinctive Voices? *Journal of Anglican Studies*, **12**(2), 165–184. doi: 10.1017/S1740355313000077

Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & Village, A. (2021). Psychological Type and Psychological Temperament Among Readers Within the Church of England: A Complementary Ministry? *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, **24**(4), 389–403. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2020.1764517

Francis, L. J., & Lankshear, D. W. (2021). Profiling Adult Churchgoers Within the Diocese of Southwark: An Overview. In L. J. Francis & D. W. Lankshear (Eds.), *The Science of Congregation Studies: Searching for Signs of Growth* (pp. 19–41). Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-76107-3_2

Francis, L. J., Laycock, P., & Brewster, C. (2017). Exploring the Factor Structure of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS) Among a Sample of Anglican Clergy in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **20**(9), 930–941. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2017.1375469

Francis, L. J., Littler, K., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological Type and Offa's Dyke: Exploring Differences in the Psychological Type Profile of Anglican Clergy Serving in England and Wales. *Contemporary Wales*, **23**, 240–251.

Francis, L. J., Payne, V. J., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological Types of Male Anglican Clergy in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type*, **56**, 19–23.

Francis, L. J., 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**(2), 243–259. doi: 10.1515/IJPT.2011.036

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Duncan, B., & Whinney, M. (2010). Confirming the Psychological Type Profile of Anglican Clergymen in England: A Ministry for Intuitives. In B. Ruelas and V. Briseno (Eds.), *Psychology of intuition* (pp. 211–219). Nova Science Publishers.

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 and Culture*, **15**(9), 919–932. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2012.698449

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Ryland, A. (2012). Called for Leadership: Psychological Type Profile of Leaders Within the Newfrontiers Network of Churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, **40**(3), 220–228. doi: 10.1177/009164711204000305

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Whinney, M. (2011). Women Priests in the Church of England: Psychological Type Profile. *Religions*, **2,** 389–397. doi: 10.3390/rel2030389

Francis, L. J., & Smith, G. (2018). Changing Patterns in Recruitment to Stipendiary Ministry: A Study in Psychological Profiling. *Theology*, **121**(4), 268–277. doi: 10.1177/0040571X18765426

Francis, L. J., & Stevenson, A. (2018). Profiling Methodist Leadership. *Holiness*, **4**(1), 7–26. doi: 10.2478/holiness-2018-0001

Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (under review). Is the Psychological Type Profile of Stipendiary Parochial Clergy in the Church of England Changing? Exploring data from 2020–21.

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. doi: 10.1163/157092512X635743

Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2022). Psychological Type Profile and Temperament of Catholic Priests Serving in England, Wales, and Ireland. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **25**(9), 884–896. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2021.2017420

Francis, L. J., Village, A., & Voas, D. (2021). Psychological Type Theory, Femininity and the Appeal of Anglo-Catholicism: A Study Among Anglican Clergymen in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, **24**(4), 352–365. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2020.1767557

Francis, L. J., & Whinney, M. (2019). The Psychological Profile of Church of England Male Archdeacons at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century: Drawing on Psychological Type and Temperament Theory. *Journal of Anglican Studies*, **17**(1), 74–92. doi: 10.1017/S1740355318000256

Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., Burton, L., & Robbins, M. (2011). Psychological Type Preferences of Male and Female Free Church Ministers in England. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, **22,** 251–263. doi: 10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.55

Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., & Robbins, M. (2013). Who is Called to Be a Bishop? A Study in Psychological Type Profiling of Bishops in the Church of England. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, **34**(2), 135–151. doi: 10.1080/13617672.2013.801647

Garland, G., & Village, A. (2022). Psychological Type Profiles and Temperaments of Ministers in the Baptist Union of Great Britain (BUGB). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **25**(9), 860–874. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2021.1908974

Greenfield, M. (1969). Typologies of Persisting and Non-Persisting Jewish Clergymen. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, **16**(4), 368–372. doi: 10.1037/h0027708

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.

Irvine, A. R. (1989). Isolation and the Parish Ministry. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of St Andrews.

Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological Types: The Collected Works, (volume 6)*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kay W. K., Francis, L. J., & Robbins M. (2011). A Distinctive Leadership for a Distinctive Network of Churches? Psychological Type Theory and the Apostolic Networks. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, **20**(2), 306–322. doi: 10.1163/174552511X597170

Keirsey, 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, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Lewis, C. A. (2012). Psychological Type, Religion, and Culture: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **15**(9), 817–821. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2012.721534

Lewis, C. A. (2015). Psychological Type, Religion, and Culture: Further Empirical Perspectives. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **18**(7), 531–534. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2015.1103520

Lewis, C. A. (2021a). Psychological Type, Religion, and Culture: Further Empirical Perspectives (Part III). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **24**(4), 227–230. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2021.1929892

Lewis, C. A. (2021b). Psychological Type, Religion, and Culture: Further Empirical Perspectives (Part IV). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **24**(6), 533–534. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2021.1943650

Lewis, C. A. (2022). Psychological Type, Religion, and Culture: Further Empirical Perspectives (Part V). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **25**(10), 953–955. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2023.2215092

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lewis, C. A., Burgess, J. H., & Francis, L. J. (2022). Psychological Profile of Ministers of Word and Sacrament Within the United Reformed Church (URC). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **25**(9), 921–930. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2022.2037536

Lloyd, J. B. (2007). Opposition From Christians to Myers-Briggs Personality Typing. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, **28**(2), 111–123. doi: 10.1080/13617670701485672

Lloyd, J. B. (2008). Myers-Briggs Theory: How True, How Necessary. *Journal of Psychological Type*, **68**, 43–50.

Lloyd, J. B. (2012). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Mainstream Psychology: Analysis and Evaluation of an Unresolved Hostility. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, **33**(1), 23–34. doi: 10.1080/13617672.2012.650028

Lloyd, J. B. (2015). Unsubstantiated Beliefs and Values Flaw the Five-Factor Model of Personality. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, **36**(2), 156–164. doi: 10.1080/13617672.2015.1033209

Lloyd, J. B. (2022). Seeking Truth in Personality Science: Reconciling Trait Theory and Psychological Type. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **25**(9), 817–828. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2022.2158794

Lloyd, J. B. (2024). Psychological Type and the Life of Faith. *Theology*, **17**(2), 119–125.

Macdaid, G. P., McCaulley, M. H., & Kainz, R.I. (1986). *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Atlas of Type Tables*. Centre for Application of Psychological Type Inc.

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*. Consulting Psychologists Press.

Nauss, A. H. (1989), Leadership Styles of Effective Ministry, *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, **17**(1), 59–67. doi: 10.1177/009164718901700109

Osborne, G. (2016). *To Be a Better Leader: Personality Type and Difference in Ministry*. SPCK.

Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality Type and Religious Leadership*. The Alban Institute.

Payne, V. J., & Lewis, C. A. (2015). Confirming the Psychological Type Profile of Anglican Clergymen in Wales: A Ministry for Sensing Types. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **18**(7), 535–543. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2014.963999

Ross, C. F. J., & Francis, L. J. (2020). *Personality, Religion, and Leadership: The Spiritual Dimensions of Psychological Type Theory*. Lexington Books.

Rutledge, C. J. (2021). Psychological Type and Psychological Temperament of Non-Stipendiary Anglican Clergy: Appropriate to Meet the Needs of the Twenty-First Century? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **24**(4), 366–376. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2020.1758647

Tilley, D., Francis, L. J., Robbins M., & Jones, S. H. (2011). Apprentice Clergy? The Relationship Between Expectations in Ministry and the Psychological Type Profile of Training Incumbents and Curates in the Church of England. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, **22,** 286–305. doi: 10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.65

Village, A. (2011a). Introduction to Special Section: Psychological Type and Christian Ministry. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, **22,** 157–164. doi: 10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.28

Village, A., (2011b). Gifts Differing? Psychological Type Among Stipendiary and Non-Stipendiary Clergy. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, **22**, 230–250. doi: 10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.49

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2021). *TEC Survey: Initial Analyses of the Data*. York St John University.

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2022). Factorial Structure and Validity of the Francis Psychological Type and Emotional Temperament Scales (FPTETS). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, **25**(9), 897–909. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2022.2026311

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2023a). Introducing the Francis Psychological Type and Emotional Temperament Scales (FPTETS): A Study Among Church Leaders and Church Members. *Religion, Brain & Behavior*, **13**(4), 399–419. doi: 10.1080/2153599X.2022.2160800

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2023b). Revising the Francis Psychological Type and Emotional Temperament Scales (FPTETS). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture.* doi: 10.1080/13674676.2023.2232330

Cite this article: Francis, L.J. and Village, A. (2024). Psychological Type and Temperament Profile of Anglican Clergy Serving in the Episcopal Church (USA). *Journal of Anglican Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740355324000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press