

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Francis, Leslie J. ORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2946-9980>, Village, Andrew ORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2174-8822> and Voas, David (2020)
Psychological type theory, femininity and the appeal of Anglo-
Catholicism: A study among Anglican clergymen in England. *Mental
Health, Religion & Culture*.

Downloaded from: <http://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/4698/>

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://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13674676.2020.1767557>

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 Repository Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at ray@yorks.ac.uk

Psychological type theory, femininity and the appeal of Anglo-Catholicism:
A study among Anglican clergymen in England

Leslie J Francis*

University of Warwick, UK

Andrew Village

York St John University, UK

David Voas

University College London, UK

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Centre for Education Studies

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

This study draws on psychological type theory as operationalised by the Francis Psychological Type Scales to test the hypothesis that, among Anglican clergymen, the appeal of the Anglo-Catholic tradition is connected with higher levels of psychological femininity. In this context preference for feeling in contrast with thinking is taken as an indication of psychological femininity. Drawing on data from 1,107 clergymen who participated in the Church Growth Research Project, comparison is made between 405 who identified as Evangelical Anglicans, 328 who identified as Anglo-Catholics, and 374 who identified as Broad Church Anglicans. While 47% of the Evangelicals identified as feeling types, the proportion rose to 60% among Anglo-Catholics. These data support the underlying thesis. However, the proportion rose even higher to 69% among Broad Church Anglicans. These data qualify the underlying thesis, and suggest that it is the Evangelical Anglican clergy who stand apart from a more pervasive appeal of Anglicanism connected with higher levels of psychological femininity.

Keywords: psychological type, religion, clergy, Church of England

Introduction

The psychological science of personality and individual differences affirms the same basic structure of personality among both men and women, and yet at the same time recognises that men and women differ from each other in terms of their location on these basic aspects of personality. For example, the Eysenckian three dimensional model of personality finds the same three higher order factors (extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism) among both men and women (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975, 1991). They also report that women routinely report higher neuroticism scores in comparison with men (for review see Francis, 1993), while men routinely report higher psychoticism scores in comparison with women (see Eysenck & Eysenck, 1976). By extension it is reasonable to describe men who record higher neuroticism scores as displaying aspects of psychological femininity, and to describe women who record higher psychoticism scores as displaying aspects of psychological masculinity.

The model of personality known as psychological type theory has its roots in the work of Jung (1971) and was further developed by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). This model of personality finds the same basic typology among men and women, distinguishing between the two orientations (extraversion and introversion), the two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), the two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and the two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving). The psychological type literature also reports that women are more likely than men to prefer feeling, while men are more likely than women to prefer thinking. For example, in reporting psychological type norms for the UK population, Kendall (1998) found that feeling was preferred by 70% of women, compared with 35% of men, while thinking was preferred by 30% of women, compared with 65% of men. By extension, it is reasonable to describe men who prefer feeling as displaying aspects of psychological femininity, and to describe women who prefer thinking as displaying aspects of psychological masculinity.

The notions of psychological masculinity and psychological femininity are rooted in gender orientation theory as developed by Sandra Bem and as assessed by the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1981). According to Bem's conceptualisation, psychological masculinity and psychological femininity are not opposite ends of a single continuum, but independent constructs. In this sense both men and women can occupy various positions on these two scales (masculinity and femininity), recording high scores on both at the same time, recording lower scores on both at the same time, or recording a high score on one and a low score on the other. The point, however, is that women routinely record higher scores than men on the scale of femininity, while men routinely record higher scores than women on the scale of masculinity.

Gender orientation theory came into prominence within the social scientific study of religion with the work of Thompson (1991). Thompson challenged the dominance of sociological theories that tried to explain the generally observed phenomena that women are more religious than men by means of structural location theories. Thompson's thesis was that the variation in levels of religiosity between men and women could be explained more economically by gender orientation theory. According to this application of gender orientation theory, individual differences in levels of religiosity within both men and women (considered separately) could be accounted for by differences in levels of psychological femininity and psychological masculinity. The argument continued by maintaining that individual differences in religiosity among men and women considered together should be accounted for entirely by these two psychological variables (femininity and masculinity). Thompson (1991) tested this thesis by conducting regression models on five measures of religiosity, entering the Bem measures of masculinity and femininity before entering sex into the model. Data provided by 358 undergraduate students in the USA confirmed Thompson's thesis: no additional variance on any of the five dependent measures of religion was

explained by entering sex into the equation after taking account of masculinity and femininity scores.

Building on Thompson's original work, a series of studies have employed the Bem (1981) Sex Role Inventory alongside the Francis Scale of Attitude toward Christianity (Francis, Lewis, Philipchalk, Brown, & Lester, 1995), a measure of the affective dimension of religion, to test Thompson's hypotheses. The findings from these studies reported by Francis and Wilcox (1996, 1998) and by Francis (2005a) have demonstrated that femininity scores predict gender differences in religiosity. Most important, however, is the finding that when these studies employed multiple-regression to control for the impact of gender-orientation on religiosity, sex had no additional impact on individual differences in religiosity. This demonstrates, in agreement with Thompson's hypotheses, that higher levels of religiosity may be interpreted as a function of gender-orientation rather than as a function of being female. Other empirical studies utilising alternative measures of religiosity alongside the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1981) support the conclusion that higher femininity scores are associated with higher levels of religiosity within the context of the Christian faith (Smith, 1990; Mercer & Durham, 1999) and within the context of the Islamic faith (Abu-Ali & Reisen, 1999), although these studies do not proceed to explore whether or not biological sex accounts for further variance in religiosity scores after controlling for femininity scores.

Linking Thompson's thesis grounded in gender orientation theory with the observed sex differences in personality theories, Penny, Francis, and Robbins (2015) employed the same analytic model as proposed by Thompson (1991), but replacing the two scales (psychological masculinity and psychological femininity) proposed by Bem (1981), with the three personality scales (neuroticism, psychoticism, and extraversion) proposed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975, 1991). Data provided by 1,682 undergraduate students in Wales confirmed that no additional variances on the dependent measure of religion was explained

by entering sex into the equation after taking account of the three personality measure. This finding lends further weight to the view that it is reasonable to interpret high neuroticism scores and low psychoticism scores as displaying psychological femininity, while at the same time interpreting low neuroticism scores and high psychoticism scores as displaying psychological masculinity.

Anglican orientations and personality

Personality theories have been employed not only to explore and to explain different levels or degrees of religiosity within men and within women or between men and women, but also to explore and to explain preferences for different styles or expressions of religiosity. One specific context in which the connection between personality and different styles or expressions of religiosity has been explored arises within the diversity of the Anglican Church.

From its distinctive inception within the English Reformation the Church of England (and hence the international Anglican Church) claims the distinction of being both Reformed and Catholic. During the nineteenth century both the Reformed roots and the Catholic roots of the Church of England were, as it were, rediscovered and re-emphasised through the emergence of the Tractarian or Anglo-Catholic Movement (Penhale, 1986; Hylson-Smith, 1993) and through the emergence of the Evangelical Movement, reflecting the Reformed tradition (Saward, 1987, Hylson-Smith, 1988). Both movements tried to capture the soul of the Church of England by investing in seminaries in order to train clergy in their distinctive traditions and by collecting advowsons in order to influence the appointment of clergy to parishes through the patronage system. Between these two wings of the Anglican Church there has stood (and continues to stand) a broad middle territory which has been variously described, as Broad Church and Middle-Way. Less scholarly attention has been given to this middle category, compared with the attention given to the Anglo-Catholic wing and to the

Evangelical wing, with the notable exception of Walker (1988) who focused on the ‘middle way’.

The ethos of the Anglo-Catholic movement included such features as a high doctrine of the ministry and of the sacraments, ornate vestments, pageantry, atmospheric music, incense, confession, obedience, fasting, beauty, submission and subtle imagery. The ethos of the Evangelical movement included such features as emphasis on biblical theology, biblical inspiration, biblical authority, personal conversion, justification by grace through faith, centrality of a preaching ministry, absence of ritual and imagery, simplicity in church architecture, and simplicity in clerical dress with cassock, surplice, preaching scarf and hood.

Randall’s (2005) monumental study on the continuing significance of ‘churchmanship’, the distinction between the different traditions visible within Anglicanism, makes it clear that there are measurable psychological as well as theological differences between clergy attracted to the Evangelical wing of the Anglican Church and clergy attracted to the Catholic wing. One psychological construct that may help to account for the different appeal of the Anglo-Catholic orientation and the Evangelical orientation is precisely that of psychological masculinity and psychological femininity as captured by the Bem Sex Life Inventory (Bem, 1981) or by established models of personality as proposed by the Eysenckian three dimensional model (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975, 1991) or by psychological type theory (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

It is not difficult to speculate that the very different emphases of the Evangelical movement and the Anglo-Catholic movement may appeal more to priests whose personality profile display higher levels of masculinity or higher levels of femininity. There is something much more feminine about the appeal of the Anglo-Catholic orientation and something much more masculine about the appeal of the Evangelical orientation. Indeed the nineteenth century observers themselves were not slow to note the feminisation of the Anglo-Catholic

clergy, whom some critics of the movement described as essentially un-English and unmanly (Best, 1967). For example, Punch (1865) characterised Anglo-Catholic clergy as ‘parsons in petticoats’ who ‘are very fond of dressing like ladies. They are much addicted to wearing vestments... variously trimmed and embroidered.’ Kingsley (1881) wrote of ‘an element of foppery even in dress and manner; a fastidious, maundering, die-away effeminacy’. Rigg (1895) in a classic study of the leaders of the Anglo-Catholic movement made much of the ‘characteristically feminine’ mind and temperament of Newman and the lack of virility of most of his disciples. According to Chadwick (1954), even the founder of the Anglo-Catholic theological college at Cuddesdon, Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, agreed that the religious formation provided by his college lacked vigour and ‘virility.’ If the same descriptors were offered in the late-twentieth century they might well not carry the same level of implied criticism. These observations may lead to the direct hypothesis that priests who espouse an Anglo-Catholic orientation may also display higher levels of psychological femininity.

In a first attempt to examine an association between Anglo-Catholic orientation and psychological femininity, Francis and Thomas (1996) administered the short-form Eysenck Personality questionnaire Revised (Eysenck, Eysenck, & Barrett, 1985) together with their nine-item index of Anglo-Catholic practices to a sample of 222 clergymen serving in the Church in Wales. Their data found no significant correlation between Anglo-Catholic orientation and either neuroticism scores or psychoticism scores. In a second study, Randall (2005) administered the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975) together with his semantic differential grid index of churchmanship to a sample of 262 Anglican clergy ordained in England and Wales in 1994 (202 males and 60 females). These data demonstrated significantly higher mean scores on the neuroticism scale among Anglo-Catholic clergy compared with Evangelical clergy, but no significant mean differences between the two groups on the psychoticism scales. In a third study, Francis and Littler

(2012) administered the short-form Eysenckian Personality Questionnaire Revised (Eysenck, Eysenck, & Barrett, 1985) together with the 21-item Francis-Littler Anglo-Catholic Orientation Scale to a sample of 232 clergymen serving in the Church in Wales. These data also demonstrated significantly higher mean scores on the neuroticism scale among Anglo-Catholic clergy compared with Evangelical clergy, but no significant differences between the two groups on the psychoticism scale.

Drawing on a different model of personality, two studies have explored the connection between Anglican orientation and psychological type, one among lay churchgoers, the other among clergy. In the first of these two studies, Village, Francis, and Craig (2009) reported on a sample of 290 churchgoers attending Evangelical Anglican churches and Anglo-Catholic churches in central England who completed the Keirseley Temperament Sorter (Keirseley, 1998). According to this study the significant difference between Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics was found in the perceiving process: while 17% of Evangelicals preferred intuition, the proportion rose to 31% among Anglo-Catholics. There were, however, no significant differences between the two groups in terms of the orientations (introversion and extraversion), the judging process (thinking and feeling) or the attitudes (judging and perceiving).

In the second of these two studies, Village (2013) reported on a sample of 1,047 clergy recently ordained in the Church of England who completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2009). According to this study the significant difference between Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic clergy was found in the perceiving process for both men and women: while 40% of Evangelical clergymen preferred intuition, the proportion rose to 60% among Anglo-Catholic clergymen; while 42% of Evangelical clergymen preferred intuition, the proportion rose to 56% among Anglo-Catholic clergymen. Among clergymen there was also a significant difference in terms of orientation: while 52% of

Evangelical clergywomen preferred introversion, the proportion rose to 67% among Anglo-Catholic clergywomen. Among clergymen there was also a significant difference in terms of the judging process: while 47% of Evangelical clergymen preferred feeling, the proportion rose to 53% among Anglo-Catholic clergymen.

Research question

A consensus is beginning to emerge from the five studies reported above linking psychological femininity and the appeal of Anglo-Catholicism among clergymen. Using the Eysenckian dimensional model of personality this view was supported by Randall (2005) and by Francis and Littler (2012) in terms of higher neuroticism scores, although not by Francis and Thomas (1996). Using the model of psychological type theory this view was supported by Village (2013) among clergymen, although that same finding did not hold true among clergywomen (Village, 2013) or among lay churchgoers undifferentiated by sex (Village, Francis, & Craig, 2009). Against this background, the present study proposed to build on the foundations laid by Village (2013) and to examine in a new large database of Anglican clergymen the hypothesis that there is a significantly higher proportion of feeling types among clergymen attracted to the Anglo-Catholic wing of the Anglican Church than is the case among clergymen attracted to the Evangelical wing. This study, however, enables a more sophisticated model to be constructed by bringing into consideration (for the first time in this research tradition) the middle category, the Broad Church and the Middle-Way clergymen.

Method

Procedure

The data used in this study came from a large online survey administered between April and July 2013 as part of the Church of England's Church Growth Research Programme. Invitations to participate in the survey were sent by email to clergy (mostly with incumbent

status) within a large sample of parishes. More detail regarding the sample and overall study can be found in Voas and Watt (2014).

Participants

The present analysis is based on the 1,107 clergymen who provided full data on the measure of psychological type, who completed the measure of church orientation, who were engaged in stipendiary ministry, and who were not over the age of seventy.

Measures

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005b). This is a 40-item instrument comprising four sets of 10 forced-choice items relating to each of the four components of psychological type: the two orientations (extraversion and introversion), the two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), the two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and the two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving). Participants were asked for each pair of characteristics to check 'the box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if you feel both characteristics apply to you. Tick the characteristic that reflects the real you, even if other people see you differently'.

Church orientation was assessed by a seven-point semantic differential grid anchored by the poles: Catholic and Evangelical. Following earlier practice (Village & Francis, 2009) those scoring 1-2 were classed as Anglo-Catholic; 3-4 as Broad Church, and 5-7 as Evangelical.

Data analysis

According to the classification system noted above in respect of the semantic differential grid, 328 of the participating clergymen were classified as Anglo-Catholics, 405 of the participating clergymen were classified as Evangelical, and 374 of the participating clergymen were classified as Broad Church. Separate type tables were calculated for Anglo-

Catholic clergymen, for Evangelical clergymen, and for Broad Church clergymen. Within the scientific literature concerned with analysing and presenting psychological type data, the distinctive type tables provide information about the 16 complete types, about the four dichotomous preferences, about the six sets of pairs and temperaments, about the dominant types, and about the introverted and extraverted Jungian types. Commentary on this table will, however, be restricted to those aspects of the data strictly relevant to the research question. In the context of type tables the statistical significance of the difference between two groups is established by means of the selection ratio index (I), an extension of chi-square (McCaulley, 1985).

Results

- insert table 1 about here -

Table 1 presents the psychological type distribution for the 405 clergymen identified as Evangelical. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, there is an equal balance between extraverts (49%) and introverts (51%), a slight preference for intuition (55%) over sensing (45%), a slight preference for thinking (53%) over feeling (47%), and a strong preference for judging (76%) over perceiving (24%). In terms of dominant type preferences, 32% were dominant intuitive types, 25% dominant sensing types, 23% dominant feeling types, and 21% dominant thinking types. In terms of the sixteen complete types, the two most frequently occurring types were ISTJ (13%) and INTJ (12%).

- insert table 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the psychological type distribution for the 328 clergymen identified as Anglo-Catholic. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, there is a preference for introversion (57%) over extraversion (43%), a balance between sensing (49%) and intuition (51%), a strong preference for feeling (60%) over thinking (40%), and a strong preference for judging (81%) over perceiving (19%). In terms of dominant type preferences, 32% were

dominant intuitive types, 28% dominant sensing types, 24% dominant feeling types, and 16% dominant thinking types. In terms of the sixteen complete types, the three most frequently occurring types were ISFJ (14%), INFJ (14%), and ISTJ (12%).

Table 2 also examines the statistically significant differences between the two profiles reported among Evangelical clergymen and Anglo-Catholic clergymen. In terms of the four dichotomous preferences, the only statistically significant difference occurred on the judging process. While 47% of the Evangelical clergymen preferred feeling, the proportion rose to 60% among the Anglo-Catholic clergymen. No significant differences emerged in terms of dominant type preferences. In terms of the sixteen complete types, two types were more highly represented among Anglo-Catholic clergy than among Evangelical clergymen. While 9% of Evangelical clergymen were ISFJ, the proportion rose to 14% among Anglo-Catholic clergymen. While 7% of Evangelical clergymen were INFJ, the proportion rose to 14% among Anglo-Catholic clergymen.

- insert table 3 about here -

Table 3 presents the psychological type distribution of the 374 clergymen identified as Broad Church. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, there is a preference for introversion (58%) over extraversion (42%), a preference for intuition (59%) over sensing (41%), a strong preference for feeling (69%) over thinking (31%), and a strong preference for judging (70%) over perceiving (30%). In terms of dominant type preferences, 35% were dominant intuitive types, 28% were dominant feeling types, 25% were dominant sensing types, and 12% were dominant thinking types. In terms of the sixteen complete types, the most frequently occurring types were ISFJ (15%) and INFJ (13%).

Table 3 also examines the statistically significant differences between the two profiles reported among Evangelical clergymen and Broad Church clergymen. In terms of the four dichotomous preferences, two statistically significant differences emerged on the orientations

and on the judging process. While 51% of the Evangelical clergymen preferred introversion, the proportion rose to 58% among the Broad Church clergymen. While 47% of the Evangelical clergymen preferred feeling, the proportion rose to 69% among the Broad Church clergymen. In terms of dominant type preferences, there were significantly fewer dominant thinking types among Broad Church clergymen than among Evangelical clergymen (12% compared with 20%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, there were significantly fewer ISTJs (7% compared with 13%) and significantly fewer ESTJs (4% compared with 8%); there were significantly more ISFJs (15% compared with 9%) and significantly more INFJs (13% compared with 7%).

Conclusion

This study has been located within a psychologically-informed framework that conceptualised established measures of personality, operationalised by the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975) or the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005b), as capturing measures of psychological masculinity and psychological femininity in ways that serve a similar function to the indices of masculinity and femininity operationalised by the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1981). Within this conceptual framework, this study has built on three earlier studies reported by Francis and Thomas (1996), Randall (2005), and Francis and Littler (2012) that set out to test the thesis that there is a significant connection between the personality characteristics of Anglican clergymen and their identification with either the Evangelical wing or the Anglo-Catholic wing of the Church. Specifically the hypothesis proposed a connection between psychological femininity and the appeal of the Anglo-Catholic tradition.

The three previous studies by Francis and Thomas (1996), Randall (2005), and Francis and Littler (2012) had all employed the Eysenckian three dimensional model of personality in which high neuroticism scores and low psychoticism scores could be

interpreted as indicators of psychological femininity. The thesis was only partly supported by these three studies. Two of these studies found that Anglican clergy attracted to the Anglo-Catholic tradition recorded significantly higher neuroticism scores compared with Anglican clergy attracted to the Evangelical tradition, but that there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of scores recorded on the psychoticism scale. A more recent study by Village (2013) had tested the same thesis drawing on psychological type theory. Village found a significantly higher proportion of feeling types among Anglo-Catholic clergymen compared with Evangelical clergymen.

The present study built on Village's (2013) pioneering study by testing the hypothesis that a higher proportion of feeling types would be found among Anglican clergymen who identified with the Anglo-Catholic wing of the Church compared with Anglican clergymen who identified with the Evangelical wing of the Church. While Village's study was based entirely on newly ordained clergy, this study made an original contribution to knowledge by examining a cross-section of clergymen engaged in stipendiary ministry within the Church of England. The finding from the present paper is both clear and quite stark. While 47% of Anglican clergymen who were attracted to the Evangelical tradition preferred feeling, the proportion rose to 60% of Anglican clergymen who were attracted to the Anglo-Catholic tradition. This finding, however, needs to be set alongside three other considerations.

The first consideration draws on the additional information made available by the present study giving visibility to the third stream within the Anglican Church, known as Broad Church or Middle-Way. In terms of displaying preference for feeling, these new data show that the Broad Church clergymen have more in common with the Anglo-Catholic clergymen than with the Evangelical clergymen. While 47% of Anglican clergymen who were attracted to the Evangelical tradition preferred feeling and the proportion rose to 60% of Anglican clergymen who were attracted to the Anglo-Catholic tradition, the proportion was

even higher among Anglican clergymen attracted to the Broad Church tradition (69%). This finding may change the research question posed by future research. In place of testing the hypothesis that, among Anglican clergymen, the appeal of the Anglo-Catholic tradition is connected with higher levels of psychological femininity, future research may wish to test the hypothesis that the appeal of the Evangelical tradition is connected with lower levels of psychological femininity. This revised hypothesis needs to be tested by setting Evangelical clergymen alongside both Anglo-Catholic clergymen and Broad Church clergymen.

The second consideration connects the findings from the present study with the broader body of research that compares the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in the Church of England (undifferentiated by church tradition) with the male population norms as published by Kendall (1998), including the studies by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) and Francis, Robbins, Duncan, and Whinney (2010). These studies draw attention to the significant over representation of feeling types among Anglican clergymen (undifferentiated by church tradition) compared with men in the general population. Thus, in the present study the proportion of feeling types falls from 60% among Anglo-Catholic clergy to 47% among Evangelical clergymen; but the proportion falls much further to 35% among men in the general population. Consequently, while the present study suggests that psychological femininity may be particularly strong among Anglo-Catholic clergymen, these data do not suggest that psychological femininity is low among Evangelical clergymen.

The third consideration warns against building strong conclusions on the basis of just two cross-sectional studies. The present study represents the first replication of Village's study and has explored the psychological type difference between Anglican clergymen attracted to the Anglo-Catholic tradition, Anglican clergymen attracted to the Evangelical tradition, and Anglican clergymen attracted to the Broad Church tradition. The study draws

on a solid database assembled within the disciplined context of the Church of England's Church Growth Research Project. The findings need both to be taken seriously and to be checked by sound replication studies.

References

- Abu-Ali, A., & Reisen, C. A. (1999). Gender role identity among adolescent Muslim girls living in the US. *Current Psychology: A journal for diverse perspectives on diverse psychological issues*, 18, 185-192. doi.org/10.1007/s12144-999-1027-x
- Bem, S. L. (1981). *Bem Sex Role Inventory: Professional manual*. Palo Alto, CA, Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Best, G. (1967), Popular Protestantism in Victorian Britain. In R. Robson (Ed.) *Ideas and institutions of Victorian Britain: Essays in honour of George Kitson Clark* (pp. 115-142). London: G. Bell.
- Chadwick, O. (1954). *The founding of Cuddesdon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (adult and junior)*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1976). *Psychoticism as a dimension of personality*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1991). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scales*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Eysenck, S. B. G., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 21-29. doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(85)90026-1
- Francis, L. J. (1993). The dual nature of the Eysenckian neuroticism scales: A question of sex differences? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 15, 43-59. doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(93)90040-A
- Francis, L. J. (2005a). Gender role orientation and attitude toward Christianity: A study among older men and women in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 33, 179-186.

Francis, L. J. (2005b). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*.

London: Darton, Longman and Todd.

Francis, L. J. (2009). Psychological type theory and religious and spiritual experiences. In M.

De Souza, L. J. Francis, J. O'Higgins-Norman, & D. G. Scott (Eds.), *International Handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing* (pp. 125-146). Dordrecht: Springer. doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9018-9_8

Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology, 11*, 266-284. doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2007.17

Francis, L. J., Lewis, J. M., Philipchalk, R., Brown, L. B., & Lester, D. (1995). The internal consistency reliability and construct validity of the Francis Scale of Attitude toward Christianity (adult) among undergraduate students in the UK, USA, Australia and Canada. *Personality and Individual Differences, 19*, 949-953. doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(95)00131-X

Francis, L. J., & Littler, K. (2012). Churchmanship and personality among clergymen in the Church in Wales: Are Anglo-Catholic priests more feminine? *Journal of Empirical Theology, 25*, 236-245. doi.org/10.1163/15709256-12341248

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). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Francis, L. J., & Thomas, T. H. (1996). Are Anglo Catholic priests more feminine? A study among male Anglican clergy, *Pastoral Sciences, 15*, 15-22.

Francis, L. J., & Wilcox, C. (1996). Religion and gender orientation. *Personality and*

- Individual Differences*, 20, 119-121. doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(95)00135-S
- Francis, L. J., & Wilcox, C. (1998). Religiosity and femininity: Do women really hold a more positive attitude toward Christianity? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37, 462-469. doi.org/10.2307/1388053
- Hylson-Smith, K. (1988). *Evangelicals in the Church of England 1734-1984*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark.
- Hylson-Smith, K. (1993). *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the sixteenth century to the late twentieth century*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works* (volume 6). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Keirse, D. (1998). *Please understand me: 2*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Kingsley, F. (Ed.) (1881). *Charles Kingsley: His letters and memories of his life*. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co.
- McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The Selection Ratio Type Table: A research strategy for comparing type distributions. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 10, 46-56.
- Mercer, C., & Durham, T. W. (1999). Religious mysticism and gender orientation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 38, 175-182. doi.org/10.2307/1387592
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Penhale, F. (1986). *Catholics in crisis*. London: Mowbray.
- Penny, G., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2015). Why are women more religious than men? Testing the explanatory power of personality theory among undergraduate students in

Wales. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 18, 492-502.

doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2015.1079603

Punch (1865). Parsons in petticoats. *Punch*, 48, 239.

Randall, K. (2005). *Evangelicals etcetera: Conflict and conviction in the Church of England's parties*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Rigg, J. H. (1895). *Oxford High Anglicanism and its chief leaders*. London: Charles H. Kelly.

Saward, M. (1987). *Evangelicals on the move*. London: Mowbray.

Smith, R. D. (1990). Religious orientation, sex-role traditionalism, and gender identity:

Contrasting male and female responses to socializing forces. *Sociological Analysis*,

51, 377-385. doi.org/10.2307/3711078

Thompson, E. H. (1991). Beneath the status characteristics: Gender variations in religiousness. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30, 381-394.

doi.org/10.2307/1387275

Village, A. (2013). Traditions within the Church of England and psychological type: A study among the clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 26, 22-44.

doi.org/10.1163/15709256-12341252

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2009). *The mind of the Anglican clergy: Assessing attitudes and beliefs in the Church of England*. Lampeter: Mellen.

Village, A., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2009). Church tradition and psychological type preferences among Anglicans in England. *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 7, 93-109.

doi.org/10.1017/S1740355309000187

Voas, D., & Watt, L. (2014). *Numerical change in church attendance: National, local and individual factors*. Report commissioned by the Church of England. Retrieved from

http://www.churchgrowthresearch.org/uk/progress_findings_reports

Walker, P. (1988). *Rediscovering the middle way*. Oxford: Mowbray

Table 1

Type distribution for Evangelical clergymen

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences				
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 53 (13.1%) +++++ +++++ +++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 37 (9.1%) +++++ ++++ ++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 28 (6.9%) +++++ ++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 50 (12.3%) +++++ +++++ ++	E <i>n</i> = 200 (49.4%)	I <i>n</i> = 205 (50.6%)			
ISTP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.0%) +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 7 (1.7%) ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 14 (3.5%) ++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 12 (3.0%) +++	S <i>n</i> = 184 (45.4%)	N <i>n</i> = 221 (54.6%)			
ESTP <i>n</i> = 7 (1.7%) ++	ESFP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.0%) +	ENFP <i>n</i> = 30 (7.4%) +++++ ++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 21 (5.2%) +++++	T <i>n</i> = 214 (52.8%)	F <i>n</i> = 191 (47.2%)			
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 34 (8.4%) +++++ +++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 38 (9.4%) +++++ ++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 33 (8.1%) +++++ +++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 33 (8.1%) +++++ +++	J <i>n</i> = 306 (75.6%)	P <i>n</i> = 99 (24.4%)			
				Pairs and Temperaments				
				IJ <i>n</i> = 168 (41.5%)	IP <i>n</i> = 37 (9.1%)			
				EP <i>n</i> = 62 (15.3%)	EJ <i>n</i> = 138 (34.1%)			
				ST <i>n</i> = 98 (24.2%)	SF <i>n</i> = 86 (21.2%)			
				NF <i>n</i> = 105 (25.9%)	NT <i>n</i> = 116 (28.6%)			
				SJ <i>n</i> = 162 (40.0%)	SP <i>n</i> = 22 (5.4%)			
				NP <i>n</i> = 77 (19.0%)	NJ <i>n</i> = 144 (35.6%)			
				TJ <i>n</i> = 170 (42.0%)	TP <i>n</i> = 44 (10.9%)			
				FP <i>n</i> = 55 (13.6%)	FJ <i>n</i> = 136 (33.6%)			
				IN <i>n</i> = 104 (25.7%)	EN <i>n</i> = 117 (28.9%)			
				IS <i>n</i> = 101 (24.9%)	ES <i>n</i> = 83 (20.5%)			
				ET <i>n</i> = 95 (23.5%)	EF <i>n</i> = 105 (25.9%)			
				IF <i>n</i> = 86 (21.2%)	IT <i>n</i> = 119 (29.4%)			
Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
E-TJ	67	16.5	I-TP	16	4.0	Dt.T	83	20.5
E-FJ	71	17.5	I-FP	21	5.2	Dt.F	92	22.7
ES-P	11	2.7	IS-J	90	22.2	Dt.S	101	24.9
EN-P	51	12.6	IN-J	78	19.3	Dt.N	129	31.9

Note: *N* = 405 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

Table 2

Type distribution for Catholic clergymen compared with Evangelical clergymen

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 39 (11.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.91 +++++ +++++ ++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 45 (13.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.50* +++++ +++++ ++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 45 (13.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.98** +++++ +++++ ++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 31 (9.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.77 +++++ +++++	E <i>n</i> = 141 (43.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.87	I <i>n</i> = 187 (57.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.13	S <i>n</i> = 160 (48.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.07	N <i>n</i> = 168 (51.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.94
ISTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.31	ISFP <i>n</i> = 9 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.59 +++	INFP <i>n</i> = 10 (3.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.88 +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 7 (2.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.72 ++	J <i>n</i> = 265 (80.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.07	P <i>n</i> = 63 (19.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.79	Pairs and Temperaments	
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00*	ESFP <i>n</i> = 7 (2.1%) <i>I</i> = 2.16 ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 21 (6.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.86 +++++ +	ENTP <i>n</i> = 8 (2.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.47 ++	IJ <i>n</i> = 160 (48.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.18*	IP <i>n</i> = 27 (8.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	EP <i>n</i> = 36 (11.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.72	EJ <i>n</i> = 105 (32.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.94
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 26 (7.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.94 +++++ +++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 33 (10.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.07 +++++ +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 27 (8.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.01 +++++ +++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 19 (5.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.71 +++++ +	ST <i>n</i> = 66 (20.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.83	SF <i>n</i> = 94 (28.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.35*	NF <i>n</i> = 103 (31.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.21	NT <i>n</i> = 65 (19.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.69**
				SJ <i>n</i> = 143 (43.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.09	SP <i>n</i> = 17 (5.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.95	NP <i>n</i> = 46 (14.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.74	NJ <i>n</i> = 122 (37.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.05
				TJ <i>n</i> = 115 (35.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.84	TP <i>n</i> = 16 (4.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.45**	FP <i>n</i> = 47 (14.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.06	FJ <i>n</i> = 150 (45.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.36***
				IN <i>n</i> = 93 (28.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.10	EN <i>n</i> = 75 (22.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.79	IS <i>n</i> = 94 (28.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.15	ES <i>n</i> = 66 (20.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.98
				ET <i>n</i> = 53 (16.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.69*	EF <i>n</i> = 88 (26.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.03	IF <i>n</i> = 109 (33.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.56***	IT <i>n</i> = 78 (23.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.81

	Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>			<i>n</i>	%
E-TJ	45	13.7	0.83	I-TP	8	2.4	0.62	Dt.T	53	16.2	0.79
E-FJ	60	18.3	1.04	I-FP	19	5.8	1.12	Dt.F	79	24.1	1.06
ES-P	7	2.1	0.79	IS-J	84	25.6	1.15	Dt.S	91	27.7	1.11
EN-P	29	8.8	0.70	IN-J	76	23.2	1.20	Dt.N	105	32.0	1.01

Note: *N* = 328 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

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

Table 3

Type distribution for Broad Church clergymen compared with Evangelical clergymen

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 25 (6.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.51** +++++ ++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 56 (15.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.64* +++++ +++++ +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 48 (12.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.86** +++++ +++++ +++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 36 (9.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.78 +++++	E <i>n</i> = 156 (41.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.84	I <i>n</i> = 218 (58.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.15	
				S <i>n</i> = 153 (40.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	N <i>n</i> = 221 (59.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.08	
				T <i>n</i> = 116 (31.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.59***	F <i>n</i> = 258 (69.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.46***	
				J <i>n</i> = 262 (70.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.93	P <i>n</i> = 112 (29.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.23	
				Pairs and Temperaments		
ISTP <i>n</i> = 3 (0.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.81 +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 15 (4.0%) <i>I</i> = 2.32 ++++	INFP <i>n</i> = 28 (7.5%) <i>I</i> = 2.17* +++++ +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 7 (1.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.63 ++	IJ <i>n</i> = 165 (44.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.06	IP <i>n</i> = 53 (14.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.55*	EP <i>n</i> = 59 (15.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.03
				EJ <i>n</i> = 97 (25.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.76*		
				ST <i>n</i> = 45 (12.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.50***	SF <i>n</i> = 108 (28.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.36*	NF <i>n</i> = 150 (40.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.55***
				NT <i>n</i> = 71 (19.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.66**		
ESTP <i>n</i> = 3 (0.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.46 +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 10 (2.7%) <i>I</i> = 2.71 +++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 38 (10.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.37 +++++ +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 8 (2.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.41* ++	SJ <i>n</i> = 122 (32.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.82*	SP <i>n</i> = 31 (8.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.53	NP <i>n</i> = 81 (21.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.14
				NJ <i>n</i> = 140 (37.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.05		
				TJ <i>n</i> = 95 (25.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.61***	TP <i>n</i> = 21 (5.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.52**	FP <i>n</i> = 91 (24.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.79***
				FJ <i>n</i> = 167 (44.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.33**		
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 14 (3.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.45** ++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 27 (7.02%) <i>I</i> = 0.77 +++++ ++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 36 (9.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.18 +++++ +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 20 (5.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.66 +++++	IN <i>n</i> = 119 (31.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.24	EN <i>n</i> = 102 (27.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.94	IS <i>n</i> = 99 (26.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.06
				ES <i>n</i> = 54 (14.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.70*		
				ET <i>n</i> = 45 (12.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.51***	EF <i>n</i> = 111 (29.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.14	IF <i>n</i> = 147 (39.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.85***
				IT <i>n</i> = 71 (19.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.65***		

	Jungian Types (E)			I-TP	Jungian Types (I)			Dt.T	Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	34	9.1	0.55**		10	2.7	0.68		44	11.8	0.57***
E-FJ	63	16.8	0.96	I-FP	43	11.5	2.22**	Dt.F	106	28.3	1.25
ES-P	13	3.5	1.28	IS-J	81	21.7	0.97	Dt.S	94	25.1	1.01
EN-P	46	12.3	0.98	IN-J	84	22.5	1.17	Dt.N	130	34.8	1.09

Note: *N* = 374 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

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