

Bangor University

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the United Kingdom: an empirical study

Craig, Charlotte

Award date:
2004

Awarding institution:
University of Wales, Bangor

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE
PREFERENCES OF
CHURCHGOERS IN THE UNITED
KINGDOM:
AN EMPIRICAL STUDY**

**PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE
PREFERENCES OF CHURCHGOERS IN
THE UNITED KINGDOM:
AN EMPIRICAL STUDY**

by

CHARLOTTE LISA CRAIG

of

UNIVERSITY OF WALES, BANGOR
LLYFRGELL YN UNIG

TO BE CONSULTED IN THE
LIBRARY ONLY

A dissertation submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Wales

September 2004



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declarations	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Summary	vi
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 Psychological Type: Theory, Measurement, and Value	10
Chapter 2 Rationale for the Empirical Study	33
Chapter 3 Methodology: Designing the Empirical Study	50
Chapter 4 Psychological Type Preferences of Churchgoers in the UK	68
Chapter 5 Comparing Churchgoers with Other Groups	89
Chapter 6 Demographic Characteristics and Psychological Type	112
Chapter 7 Christian Practice and Psychological Type	141
Chapter 8 Congregational Profiling and Psychological Type	164
Chapter 9 Church Satisfaction and Psychological Type	183
Chapter 10 Denomination and Psychological Type	202
Chapter 11 Church Orientation and Psychological Type	225
Chapter 12 Faith Origins and Psychological Type	250
Chapter 13 Faith Styles and Psychological Type	278
Chapter 14 Conclusions	304
References	321
Appendix 1 'Finding Faith' Pilot Questionnaire	333
Appendix 2 'Finding Faith' Questionnaire	345
Appendix 3 'Finding Faith' Project Statement	357

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to the Revd Professor Leslie J. Francis for his expert supervision and for initiating the Finding Faith project. I would also like to thank the Revd Dr Susan H. Jones and the Revd Angela Butler for their involvement in initiating the project and Springboard for their financial contribution to the project.

I am grateful to the church leaders who facilitated their congregation's participation in the project and to all the churchgoers who took the time and effort to complete questionnaires.

I would like to thank my colleagues in the Welsh National Centre for Religious Education for their assistance and encouragement. In particular, I am grateful to Dr Mandy Robbins for her help with statistical analysis and to Dr Mike Fearn for his support and guidance, as well as for proof-reading the text.

I am also grateful for the continuing support of friends and family, in particular Lyn and Alex Craig. In addition, I would like to thank Jeff D. Kampfer for his boundless enthusiasm.

Charlotte Lisa Craig

University of Wales, Bangor

September 2004

SUMMARY

The current study reviews existing research concerned with psychological type theory and aspects of the Christian faith, and then proceeds to identify a series of key research questions in order to build on and develop this existing literature. These research questions are addressed by means of a questionnaire survey which explores the psychological type preferences of people attending 95 church congregations within the UK.

Having profiled the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK, the type preferences of this sample are then compared and contrasted with other groups such as the UK population norms, non-churchgoers, and clergy. The current study then goes on to assess the relationship between psychological type and demographic characteristics, aspects of Christian practice, congregational dynamics, church satisfaction, denominational affiliation, church orientation, faith origins, and faith styles.

The data reveal a clear tendency for churchgoers to prefer introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving, which reflects the findings of most previous studies among both lay people and clergy. This profile is significantly different both from the general UK population and from non-churchgoers. People who prefer intuition, thinking, and perceiving are underrepresented among churchgoers and also report less satisfaction with the church. The implications of the psychological type preferences of the current sample are discussed and conclusions concerning the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK are drawn.

INTRODUCTION

Christian tradition recognises that although men and women are created in the image of God (Genesis 1:20), they are also unique individuals who possess different characteristics, interests, strengths, and weaknesses (Romans 12:4-8). Psychological type theory aims to describe, define, and classify some of these strengths and weaknesses with a view to helping people understand both themselves and others better. The value of psychological type theory for the church is implied by the use of this biblical quotation in the preface to the important work on psychological type theory, *Gifts Differing* (Myers and Myers, 1995):

For as we have many members in one body,
and all members have not the same office:
So we, being many, are one body...
And every one members one of another.
Having then gifts differing... (Romans 12: 4-8).

Psychological type theory has become favoured within parts of the contemporary church in the UK (see, for example, Delmage, 1996; Francis, 2001) and significant claims have been made on its behalf. For example, Goldsmith (1994, p 65) suggests that ‘much contemporary debate and division in theology is, to my mind, not so much about theology as about personality’. However, there have been few empirical studies designed to support the claims or recommendations of many type theorists (Ross, Weis and Jackson, 1996). Given the increasing popularity of psychological type theory within the church, it is expedient to contribute to the knowledge base which can inform this debate with empirical research. This study aims, therefore, to build on and develop existing theoretical and empirical studies concerned with psychological type theory and Christianity, by identifying and addressing their limitations. This study also aims to identify important but previously unexplored aspects of the relationship between psychological type

theory and Christianity. On the basis of a thorough review of existing research, ten research questions will be formulated and addressed in the current study.

The first aspect of the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity that the current study will explore concerns the psychological type profile of churchgoers in the UK. The current study identifies the popularity of psychological type theory among churches in the UK. However, it is recognised that little research has been conducted among the laity in the UK and that research of this nature has tended to make use of small samples. It is suggested that a thorough understanding of the psychological type profile of churchgoers will help to identify areas of strength and weakness in the contemporary church and enable meaningful application of psychological type theory to ministry and mission. Therefore, the first research question asks what are the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK.

The second aspect of the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity that the current study will explore concerns how far churchgoers in the UK are similar to or different from other groups. It is recognised that in order to interpret the type preferences of churchgoers in a meaningful way, it is necessary to know how far they are similar to or different from the wider population. Therefore, the second research question asks how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers differ from or are similar to other groups such as the UK population norms, non-churchgoers, or clergy.

The third aspect of the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity that the current study will explore concerns how psychological type preferences are related to demographic characteristics. It is necessary to determine how far the psychological type

preferences of churchgoers are influenced by variables such as age, sex, marital status, and geographical location in order to better understand the needs of churchgoers of different backgrounds. Therefore, the third research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and key demographic characteristics.

The fourth aspect of the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity that the current study will explore concerns how psychological type preferences are related to Christian practice. It is necessary to explore how the psychological type preferences of churchgoers are related to different aspects of Christian practice in order to determine if there are elements of Christian practice which may attract particular psychological types. Such an analysis may help to identify whether there are elements of Christian practice that attract those types that are underrepresented among churchgoers. Therefore, the fourth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and Christian practice, such as private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience.

The fifth aspect of the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity that the current study will explore concerns how psychological type is related to congregational dynamics. It is necessary to explore the psychological type preferences of congregations in order to understand more fully the nature of congregational dynamics, which in turn, can inform and congregational strategy. Therefore, the fifth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and congregational dynamics.

The sixth aspect of the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity that the current study will explore concerns how psychological type is related to church satisfaction. It

is necessary to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences of churchgoers and church satisfaction in order to determine if overrepresented types in the church are more satisfied with the church than underrepresented types in the church and to recognise and to meet more effectively the needs of those churchgoers who feel marginalised and unwelcome. Therefore, the sixth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and church satisfaction.

The seventh aspect of the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity that the current study will explore concerns how psychological type is related to denomination. It is necessary to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation in order to determine if churchgoers with different psychological type preferences are attracted to different denominations, which in turn, can inform ecumenical discussion. Therefore, the seventh research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation.

The eighth aspect of the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity that the current study will explore concerns how psychological type is related to church orientation. It is necessary to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and church orientation in order to determine if churchgoers with different psychological type preferences identify themselves differently in terms of their personal identification as conservative/liberal, evangelical/catholic, and positive or negative influence of the charismatic movement. Therefore, the eighth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and church orientation.

The ninth aspect of the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity that the current study will explore concerns how psychological type is related to faith origination. It is necessary to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith origins in order to determine if the faith of churchgoers with different psychological type preferences originates in different ways. Therefore, the ninth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith origins.

The tenth aspect of the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity that the current study will explore concerns how psychological type is related to faith styles. It is necessary to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles in order to determine if churchgoers with different psychological type preferences develop their faith in different ways. This, in turn, could help the church to retain its members and to help develop their spiritual growth. Therefore, the tenth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles.

These ten research questions will be addressed by means of an original empirical study conducted within the context of a critical examination of psychological type theory and of a critical evaluation of previous church-related empirical studies within this field. The structure of the current study will now be outlined. Chapters 1, 2, and 3 provide an introduction to and a rationale for the empirical study. Chapters 4 through 13 address each of the ten research questions by reviewing existing research, describing the method and results of the current empirical study, and discussing the implications of the findings. Chapter 14 draws together and discusses the implications of the findings of the current study.

Chapter 1 introduces the current study by outlining the nature of psychological type theory, tracing its development from its original formation by Jung (1971) through its subsequent operationalisations. Having outlined the theory of psychological type and reviewed different operationalisations of this theory, an aphoristic account of the value of psychological type theory for the current study is offered.

Chapter 2 provides a rationale for the focus of the current study by summarising existing research concerned with the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity. It reviews previous studies which report on the psychological type preferences of Christian groups and notes limitations of these studies. It provides a rationale for choice of sample in the current study and formulates research questions.

Chapter 3 shows how the research questions are addressed in the current study. The design of the questionnaire is described and related to these research questions. The method of the current study is outlined and the process of data-gathering is described. An overview of the sample is provided, focusing on three main areas: personal information, church, and religiosity.

Chapter 4 profiles the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers in the UK. Previous studies of churchgoers in the UK are reviewed to contextualise the current empirical study. The psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers are then outlined and compared with the previous studies of churchgoers in order to investigate whether the current study supports previous research. The psychometric properties of the measure of psychological type used in this study are assessed. The implications of the psychological type preferences of the current sample are explored.

Chapter 5 assesses the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers in comparison with three other samples. First, in order to determine how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers reflect the psychological type preferences of the UK as a whole, the current sample is compared with the UK population norms. Second, in order to determine how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers differ from the psychological type preferences of those who do not claim to have a faith, the current sample is compared with an amalgamated sample of self-identified agnostics and atheists. Third, in order to determine points of similarity and difference between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and those of clergy, the current sample is compared with an amalgamated sample of clergy. Justification is provided for this choice of samples and the implications of each analysis are discussed in turn.

Chapter 6 assesses the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers in relation to their background, focusing on the variables of sex, age, marital status, and church environment. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and sex, age, marital status, and church environment are reviewed and the findings of the current study are compared and contrasted with the findings of previous studies in relation to each of these variables. The implications of these analyses are discussed.

Chapter 7 assesses the relationship between the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers and aspects of Christian practice, specifically, private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience are reviewed and the findings of the current study are compared and contrasted with the findings of these previous studies in relation to each of these variables. The implications of these analyses are discussed.

Chapter 8 assesses the psychological type preferences of whole congregations in the current sample. The psychological type profiles of the congregations that participated in the current study are outlined. Previous studies of church congregations are reviewed and the findings of the current study are compared with the findings of these previous studies. The implications of these analyses are discussed.

Chapter 9 explores the relationship between the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers and church satisfaction. Previous studies concerned with the relationship between psychological type preferences and satisfaction, both among secular groups and among Christian groups, are reviewed. A new scale of church satisfaction is introduced and its reliability is assessed. The psychological type preferences of churchgoers are analysed in relation to this new scale and related to previous studies. The implications of these analyses are discussed.

Chapter 10 explores the relationship between the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers and denominational affiliation. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and denomination are reviewed. The psychological type preferences of the current sample are analysed in relation to their denominational affiliation by comparing and contrasting the psychological type preferences of churchgoers of different denominational groups. The implications of these analyses are discussed.

Chapter 11 explores the relationship between the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers and church orientation. The meaning of church orientation is explored and previous studies concerned with psychological type and church orientation are reviewed.

The psychological type preferences of the current sample are analysed in relation to their church orientation. The implications of these analyses are discussed.

Chapter 12 explores the relationship between the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers and faith origins. The meaning of faith origins is explored and previous studies concerned with psychological type and faith origins are reviewed. A new scale of faith origins is introduced and the psychological type preferences of the current sample are analysed in relation to this scale. The implications of these analyses are discussed.

Chapter 13 explores the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and faith styles. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and spirituality are reviewed. A new scale of faith styles is introduced and the psychological type preferences of the current sample are analysed in relation to this scale. The implications of these analyses are discussed.

Chapter 14 provides an overview of the current study. The results of the current study are evaluated in relation to the stated research questions. The findings of the study as a whole are discussed and recommendations for the church are made. Suggestions for future research are made.

-CHAPTER ONE-

PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE: THEORY, MEASUREMENT, AND VALUE

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. What is Psychological Type Theory?**
 - a. Orientations
 - b. Judging Functions
 - c. Perceiving Functions
 - d. Type Dynamics
- 3. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator**
- 4. Alternative Operationalisations of Psychological Type Theory**
- 5. The Francis Psychological Type Scales**
- 6. Why Use Psychological Type Theory?**
- 7. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The primary aim of the current study is to profile churchgoers in the United Kingdom (UK) using psychological type theory. However, in order to undertake this task, it is necessary to understand what psychological type theory proposes, how it is operationalised, and what its value is. This chapter will provide a brief outline of the nature of psychological type theory, tracing its development from its original formation by Jung through to its subsequent operationalisations. Having outlined the theory of psychological type and reviewed different operationalisations of this theory, a description of the value of psychological type theory for the current study will be offered.

2. What is psychological type theory?

Psychological type theory refers to the system for understanding and identifying the basic elements of the human psyche, as proposed by Carl Gustav Jung in his important work *Psychological Types* (1971: first published 1921). Jung argues that there are three major indices of the psyche which divide the human race. These are:

- orientations (or attitude-types);
- judging (or rational) functions;
- perceiving (or irrational) functions.

Before defining the meaning and implications of these three indices, it should be noted that Jung's theory develops a long-standing and ancient tradition of categorising people. Jung acknowledges his debt to previous typologies (see, for example, Jung, 1971, p 510). Nevertheless, he is critical of the way in which 'the ancients' held an 'almost entirely biological valuation' of others, while 'the medieval man' held a 'metaphysical valuation' (Jung, 1971, p 8).

In contrast to these preceding typologies, Jung seeks to formulate a 'personal valuation... which alone can form the basis of objective psychology' (Jung, 1971, p 8). Therefore, Jung proposes a typology that is neither biologically, spiritually, nor morally based; rather psychological type theory is psychologically based. Jung is concerned with those differences of personality that form a 'fundamental contrast, sometimes quite clear, sometimes obscured, but always apparent when one is dealing with individuals whose personality is any way pronounced' (Jung, 1971, p 331). These differences are more than 'idiosyncrasies of character peculiar to individuals' (Jung, 1971, pp 330-331) or 'isolated individual instances' (Jung, 1971, p 331) but quintessential paradigms of the psyche.

Jung proceeds to argue that these contrasts of personality are seen 'in all ranks of society' (Jung, 1971, p 331), among both men and women (Jung, 1971, p 331) and that the types 'seem to be distributed quite at random' (Jung, 1971, p 331). This apparently random distribution of the types leads Jung to believe that psychological type preferences are due to 'some unconscious, instinctive cause' and, therefore, must have 'some kind of biological foundation' (Jung, 1971, p 331). This is supported by the emergence of psychological type preferences in early childhood inasmuch as psychological type preferences emerge so early in children's development that 'in some cases one must speak of it as innate' (Jung, 1971, p 516). Indeed, Jung states that 'two children of the same mother may exhibit contrary attitudes at an early age, though no change in the mother's attitude can be demonstrated' (Jung, 1971, p 332), reinforcing the notion that psychological type tends to be a matter of 'nature' rather than 'nurture'.

a. Orientations

Jung holds that the most fundamental distinction of the psyche relates to attitude types or orientations, which are 'distinguished by the direction of their interest, or of the movement of the libido' (Jung, 1971, p 330). The libido refers to 'psychic energy' (Jung, 1971, p 455) and Jung proposes that this psychic energy is directed either toward or away from the object. If a person's libido is directed toward the object, then they are concerned with the outside world of people and things. This type of person is termed an *extravert*. In contrast, if a person's libido is withdrawn from the object, then they are less concerned with the outside world of people and things, and more concerned with the inner and subjective world. This type of person is termed an *introvert*.

This index of type theory is sometimes referred to as attitude types (see, for example, Jung, 1971, p 330). However, as subsequent studies (see, for example, Francis, 2004) have tended to refer to the index of extraversion and introversion as *orientations*, the latter terminology will be employed within the current study, for the sake of consistency and clarity. Moreover, in subsequent studies, extraversion has frequently been abbreviated to E and introversion has frequently been abbreviated to I (see, for example, Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Myers and Myers, 1995; Francis, 2004) and this shorthand will be employed in the current study.

The extravert is thought by Jung to 'subordinate the subject to the object, so that the object has higher value' (Jung, 1971, p 5), that is, the extravert tends to value the objective, outer world, over their subjective, inner world. As a consequence, the extravert's 'decisions and actions are determined not by subjective views but by objective conditions' (Jung, 1971, p 333). Jung argues that the extravert's 'interest and attention are directed to objective happenings, particularly those in his [or her] immediate environment' (Jung, 1971, p 334). The extravert is interested in

people and things (Jung, 1971, p 334) and is always relating to others in some way and, in turn, is affected by them (Jung, 1971, p 330).

The introvert is thought by Jung to give 'the subject a higher value than the object. And the object accordingly has a lower value' (Jung, 1971, p 5), that is, the introvert values their subjective, inner world over the objective, outer world. As a consequence, the introvert 'thinks, feels, and acts in a way that clearly demonstrates that the subjective is the prime motivating factor and the object is of secondary importance' (Jung, 1971, pp 452-453). The subject in this context is, according to Jung, 'man himself - we are the subject' (Jung, 1971, p 374). In other words, the introvert's libido is drawn away from the object, toward their personal, inner world of ideas. As a result, the introvert may appear 'reserved, inscrutable, rather shy' to the outside world (Jung, 1971, p 330).

Every person holds the capacity to display either the extraverted orientation or the introverted orientation at any given time. Nonetheless, it is Jung's view that people will adopt one of these two orientations habitually and, therefore, it is both possible and meaningful to categorise people into discrete types, based on their preferred orientation.

In addition to the two orientations, Jung postulated the presence of two pairs of psychological functions. Jung argues that the dominant orientation of the libido coexists with one of these four functions, namely, thinking, feeling, sensation, or intuition. Thinking and feeling are both classified as rational or judging functions, while sensation and intuition are both classified as irrational or perceiving functions. These two pairs of functions, rational and irrational, are both dichotomous indices. Hence, thinking and feeling stand in opposition to one another. Likewise,

sensing and intuition stand in opposition to one another.

b. Judging functions

The judging functions are those termed 'rational' functions by Jung because they are 'characterized by the reasoning and judging functions' (Jung, 1971, p 359). These functions comprise the dichotomous index of thinking and feeling. These functions are both concerned with evaluating, rather than merely receiving, data. These functions seek to order and to make judgements and decisions (Jung, 1971, p 360). Although Jung generally refers to these functions as 'rational', subsequent studies (see, for example, Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Myers and Myers, 1995; Francis, 2004) have tended to refer to them as the judging functions, and it is the latter terminology which will be followed in the current study, for the sake of consistency and clarity. Moreover, in subsequent studies, thinking has frequently been abbreviated to T and feeling has frequently been abbreviated to F (see, for example, Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Myers and Myers, 1995; Francis, 2004) and this shorthand will be employed in the current study.

The thinking type tends to be concerned primarily with making decisions and judgements based on reason and logic. Thinking is defined by Jung as the psychological function which by 'following its own laws, brings the contents of ideation into conceptual connection with one another' (Jung, 1971, p 481). However, for Jung, the psychological functions are not to be understood apart from the orientations. Consequently, Jung tends not to write about the 'thinking type' or the 'thinking function' *per se*. Rather, Jung conceives of the extraverted thinking type or the introverted thinking type. This principle holds true for the other psychological functions also; for Jung the psychological functions do not exist independently of the orientations.

The extraverted thinking type tends to be concerned with the objective; ideas are drawn from the objective, outer world and are directed back toward it (Jung, 1971, p 342). The introverted thinking type draws ideas from the subjective, inner world and 'new views rather than knowledge of new facts are its main concern' (Jung, 1971, p 380).

The feeling type tends to be concerned primarily with making decisions and judgements based on values and emotions. Feeling judgement differs from thinking judgement in that 'its aim is not to establish conceptual relations but to set up a subjective criterion of acceptance or rejection' (Jung, 1971, p 434). What matters to the feeling type is how they *feel* about a particular person, concept, or event. As with the thinking function, it is only legitimate to speak of the extraverted feeling type and the introverted feeling type.

The extraverted feeling type tends to be drawn to objective values, that is, the accepted values of the outside world, with 'the object being the indispensable determinant of the quality of feeling' (Jung, 1971, p 354). The introverted feeling type tends to be orientated toward the subjective and the inner world, being 'mainly guided by their subjective feelings, their true motives generally remain hidden' (Jung, 1971, p 389).

c. Perceiving functions

The perceiving functions are those termed 'irrational' functions by Jung because they are 'based not on rational judgement but on sheer intensity of perception' (Jung, 1971, p 370). The perceiving functions are concerned with receiving, rather than evaluating, data. Instead of seeking to consciously order data, the perceiving functions seek to respond directly to their perceptions rather than any preconceived assessment, with 'no selection being made by

judgement' (Jung, 1971, p 370). These functions comprise the dichotomous index of sensation (or sensing) and intuition. Although Jung generally refers to these functions as 'irrational', subsequent studies (see, for example, Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Myers and Myers, 1995; Francis, 2004) have tended to refer to them as the perceiving functions, and it is the latter terminology which will be followed in the current study, for the sake of consistency and clarity. Moreover, in subsequent studies, sensing has frequently been abbreviated to S and intuition has frequently been abbreviated to N (see, for example, Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Myers and Myers, 1995; Francis, 2004) and this shorthand will be employed in the current study.

According to Jung, sensation is 'the psychological function that mediates the perception of a physical stimulus. It is, therefore, identical with perception' (Jung, 1971, p 461). The extraverted sensation type tends to be concerned with the actual, with experience, and with what is really happening in the outside world. It is suggested by Jung that no other type 'can equal the extraverted sensation type in realism' (Jung, 1971, p 363). On the other hand, the introverted sensation type perceives things subjectively as objects are apprehended through the subjective senses. This is possible because 'sensation is related not only to external stimuli but to inner ones' as well (Jung, 1971, p 461).

Intuition is also concerned with perception, but it does not focus on what is to be sensed *per se*, rather, intuition looks to the possibilities beyond sensation. The intuitive function engages in a creative process of perception as it 'mediates perceptions in an *unconscious way*' (Jung, 1971, p 453, Jung's emphasis). To the intuitive type 'it is not the strongest sensation, in the physiological sense, that is accorded the chief value, but any sensation whatsoever whose value is enhanced by the intuitive's unconscious attitude (Jung, 1971, p 367). Again, the intuitive

function may be extraverted, and so be directed 'outwards to action and achievement' (Jung, 1971, p 454) and concerned with the objective and real. Alternatively, the intuitive function may be introverted, and so be 'directed inwards, to the inner vision' (Jung, 1971, p 454) and concerned with the subjective, inner world.

Jung summarises his view of the four psychological functions in a later work, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (1973), saying, 'Sensation establishes what is actually given, thinking enables us to recognize its meaning, feeling tells us its value, and finally intuition points to the possibilities of the whence and whither that lie within the immediate facts' (p 107). Each of the four functions manifest different modes of operation within the psyche.

d. Type dynamics

To summarise, psychological type theory proposes that there are three major indices which comprise the human psyche: the orientations (extraversion and introversion), the judging functions (thinking and feeling), and the perceiving functions (sensation and intuition). Jung proposes that every individual will belong to one of the two orientations. In addition, *one* of the four psychological functions (thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition) will dominate the psyche and be manifested through the preferred orientation. Therefore, it is possible to speak of eight main types, in accordance with Jung's theory as seen in table 1.1.

These eight types refer to the *dominant* function, that is, the function that is most preferred. In addition, Jung asserts that everyone possesses a secondary or *auxiliary* function, which may be consciously used when the dominant function is insufficient or inappropriate. The opposite of the *dominant* function is the *inferior* function, or least preferred function. Subsequently, Myers

and Briggs argue that in addition to the auxiliary function, everyone possesses a *tertiary* function (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998, p 30).

Table 1.1 The eight Jungian types

Extraverted thinking	Introverted thinking
Extraverted feeling	Introverted feeling
Extraverted sensation	Introverted sensation
Extraverted intuition	Introverted intuition

In summary, therefore every person will have:

- a most preferred function (dominant);
- a second preferred function (auxiliary);
- a third preferred function (tertiary);
- a fourth preferred function (inferior).

The inferior function is always on the same index as the dominant function. For example, if a rational function is dominant then the other, opposing rational function will be the inferior function; if the thinking function is dominant then the feeling function will be inferior. This is because the two rational functions are dichotomous and antipathetic to each other (Jung, 1971, p 406). Likewise, the two irrational functions are dichotomous and antipathetic to each other.

On the other hand, the auxiliary function cannot be on the same index as the dominant. This is because ‘only those functions can appear as auxiliary whose nature is not opposed to the dominant function’ (Jung, 1971, pp 405-406). For Jung, the auxiliary function is ‘possible and

useful only in so far as it *serves* the dominant function, without making any claim to the autonomy of its own principle' (Jung, 1971, p 406, Jung's emphasis). In this way, the auxiliary functions provides a balance between the judging and perceiving functions.

3. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Psychological type theory has been developed and applied by many theorists (see, for example, Gray and Wheelwright, 1946; Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Loomis, 1982; Ware, Yokomoto, and Morris, 1985; Mitchell, 1991; Rawling, 1992; Cranton and Knoop, 1995; Budd, 1997; Kier, Melancon, and Thompson, 1998; Francis, 2004). However, the most well-known development of psychological type theory has been by Katherine Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers. This mother and daughter team studied and developed Jung's theory over many years, eventually producing a self-report questionnaire which they assert operationalises Jung's theory (Myers and Myers, 1995, p xiii). They hold that this questionnaire, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), is able to measure and categorise individuals according to their psychological type preferences.

However, the underlying theory of the MBTI differs from Jung's original formulation of psychological type theory in several noteworthy ways. Perhaps most significantly Myers and Briggs propose the existence of an additional index: attitude toward the outside world or the Judging-Perceiving (JP) index. The addition of the JP index is, according to Myers and Myers (1995, p 23), resultant from unpublished personality research by Katherine Briggs prior to her acquaintance with Jung's *Psychological Types* (1971). Recognising some of her own ideas in the writings of Jung, Briggs argues that people favour one of the two sets of functions in the outside world; *either* the perceiving functions (sensing or intuition) *or* the judging functions (thinking or feeling). Briggs believes that all people will habitually employ either the perceiving

functions or the judging functions in the outside world.

People who prefer to use perceiving when dealing with the outside world like ‘to continue gathering information as long as possible before comfortably coming to closure’ (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998, p 26). On the other hand, people who prefer to use judgement when dealing with the outside world like ‘to come to conclusions and achieve closure quickly’ (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998, p 26). In other words, perceiving types are more comfortable using their preferred perceiving function in the outer world in order to gather information. Perceiving types are open-ended, flexible, and adaptable (Myers, 2000, p 10). In contrast, judging types are more comfortable using their preferred judging function in the outside world in order to make decisions. Judging types are systematic, organised, and value closure (Myers, 2000, p 10).

It is important to note that the JP index is concerned with attitude toward the *outside* world and that the process employed in the outside world is not necessarily the most preferred. For example, introverts will employ their dominant function in their inner world and use their auxiliary function in the outer world. In contrast, extraverts will employ their dominant function in their outer world and use their auxiliary function in their inner world. This is highly significant for the theory of *type dynamics* in the MBTI model; the judging-perceiving index is thought to be ‘intimately and revealingly connected with the introversion-extraversion polarity’ (Spoto, 1995, p 174). The JP index, in combination with the EI index, determines which functions are dominant, auxiliary, tertiary, and inferior.

Rawling (1992) questions the usefulness of the JP index’s role in type dynamics. However,

many other researchers see the JP index as a natural development of an implicit idea in Jung's writings (see, for example, Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Ware, Yokomoto, and Morris, 1985; Mitchell, 1991; Budd, 1997; Kier, Melancon, and Thompson, 1998; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998; Francis, 2004).

Thus, Myers and Briggs include in their paradigm of psychological typology, the fourth index of attitude toward the outside world, in addition to the orientations, the perceiving functions, and the judging functions. Therefore, the four indices of type preference used in MBTI theory are summarised as:

- Extraversion and Introversion (orientations);
- Sensing and iNtuition (perceiving functions);
- Thinking and Feeling (judging functions);
- Perceiving and Judging (attitudes toward the outside world).

Those theorists that make use of the JP index argue that there are sixteen discrete types, rather than eight as proposed by Jung (see, for example, Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Ware, Yokomoto, and Morris, 1985; Mitchell, 1991; Budd, 1997; Kier, Melancon, and Thompson, 1998; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998; Francis, 2004). The sixteen types may be seen in table 1.2.

Table 1.2 The sixteen psychological types

ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP
ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ

4. Alternative operationalisations of psychological type theory

The MBTI is thought to be the most well-researched and most popular operationalisation of Jung's psychological type theory, being administered to over 2,000,000 people every year (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998, p 9). However, it is important to note that it is by no means the only operationalisation of psychological type theory. Indeed, the MBTI was preceded by the Gray-Wheelwright Jungian Type Survey (Gray and Wheelwright, 1946). This inventory differs from the MBTI in that it does not make use of the JP index. This inventory has been found to measure broadly the same constructs as the MBTI, despite being developed independently (see, for example, Stricker and Ross, 1964; Karesh, Pieper and Holland, 1994).

Subsequent to the development of the Gray-Wheelwright Jungian Type Survey and the MBTI, a number of other operationalisations of psychological type theory have been proposed. In particular, a number of scales have attempted to make use of psychological type theory while rejecting the dichotomous scoring and the forced-choice format of the MBTI. For example, The Singer-Loomis Inventory of Personality (SLIP; Loomis, 1982) was developed by two Jungian analysts who questioned the bipolarity of the psychological types. The SLIP uses a normative scoring system, unlike the ipsative scoring system employed by the MBTI and the Gray-Wheelwright Jungian Type Survey. However, Karesh, Pieper and Holland (1994) conducted an

empirical comparison of the SLIP, MBTI and the Gray-Wheelwright Jungian Type Survey. On the basis of this analysis they argue that the SLIP is measuring different constructs to its predecessors, the MBTI and the Gray-Wheelwright Jungian Type Survey. The PET Check (Cranton and Knoop, 1995) also attempts to operationalise psychological type theory and like the Singer-Loomis Inventory of Personality it uses a normative scoring system. However, scale comparisons with other operationalisations of psychological type theory are not available for the PET Check. A further scale which also uses normative scoring is the Personal Preferences Self-Description questionnaire (PPSDQ; Kier, Melancon and Thompson, 1998). The PPSDQ has been found to demonstrate high concurrent validity with the MBTI (Vacha-Haase and Thompson, 2002). To summarise, the SLIP, the PET Check, and the PPSDQ all present alternative understandings of psychological type theory to the bipolar model proposed by Myers and Briggs (see, for example, Myers and Myers, 1995).

Other operationalisations of psychological type theory have attempted to distance Jung's theory from aspects of Myers and Briggs paradigm. For example, some researchers (Mitchell, 1991; Rawling, 1992) question the type dynamics proposed by Myers and Briggs and critique the way in which in which the MBTI designates dominant and auxiliary types (see, for example, Myers and Myers, 1995). In order to counter the weaknesses they perceive in the MBTI's type dynamics, Mitchell (1991) devised the Type Differentiation Indicator and Rawling (1992) devised the Cambridge Type Inventory.

Other researchers have modelled their operationalisations of psychological type theory on the Myers-Briggs paradigm. For example, Keirsey and Bates (1978) designed their own operationalisation of the psychological type theory called the Keirsey Temperament Sorter

(KTS). The KTS is based on the same principles as the MBTI, employing the JP index and making use of a forced-choice format, and ipsative scoring. However, the KTS has three advantages over the MBTI: first, the KTS is less time-consuming than the MBTI; second, the KTS is less expensive than the MBTI; third, people using the KTS are able to work out their own score without the assistance of a qualified practitioner, as is required to determine MBTI results. The value of the KTS is, by the authors' admission, its convenience rather than its accuracy (Keirsey and Bates, 1978, p 4). A further operationalisation of psychological type theory that is modelled on the Myers-Briggs paradigm is the Jung Type Indicator (JTI; Budd, 1997). The JTI, like the MBTI and the KTS, makes use of the JP index, forced-choice format, and ipsative scoring.

Similarly, Dwyer (1995), Johnson (1995), Oswald and Kroeger (1988), and Keating (1997) have all produced short, simple, self-administered, and self-scored inventories for use in their introductory works on psychological type theory, all of which follow the paradigm provided by Myers-Briggs. Like Keirsey and Bates (1978) these authors acknowledge the superior accuracy of the MBTI but see their inventories as a means to 'informal determination of... preferences' (Oswald and Kroeger, 1988). Quinn, Lewis and Fischer (1992) argue that this type of inventory may be more appropriate than the MBTI when 'cost and ease of administration are important factors' (p 280) .

5. The Francis Psychological Type Scales

The Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS) have been developed as a research tool (Francis, 2004) and claim to operationalise psychological type theory. The FPTS have been developed independently of the MBTI and it is not claimed that they result in an accurate MBTI type profile.

However, like many other operationalisations of psychological type theory (see, for example, Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Ware, Yokomoto, and Morris, 1985; Mitchell, 1991; Budd, 1997; Kier, Melancon, and Thompson, 1998; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998) the FPTS do make use of the fourth index of the psyche implied by Jung and developed by Myers and Briggs (see, for example, Myers and Myers, 1995), that is, *attitude toward the outside world* or the JP index. The FPTS follow a self-report, pencil and paper, forced-choice format and comprise forty items, each consisting of two pairs of characteristics. Participants are asked to select the characteristic that they feel best represents their personality. Like many other operationalisations of psychological type theory (see, for example, Gray and Wheelwright, 1946; Keirsey and Bates, 1978; Ware, Yokomoto, and Morris, 1985; Mitchell, 1991; Budd, 1997; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998) the FPTS use an ipsative scoring system and a forced-choice format.

The psychometric properties of the FPTS are outlined by Francis (2004), in terms of internal consistency and concurrent validity. First, Francis explores the internal consistency of the eight scales which comprise the FPTS. An alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951) of .70 or above indicates satisfactory statistical internal consistency according to Kline (2000), while DeVellis (2003) suggests that an alpha coefficient of .65 or above is acceptable. According to Francis (2004) the eight scales of the FPTS achieved alpha coefficients ranging from .84 to .90, well above the levels thought to indicate satisfactory statistical internal consistency according to either Kline (2000) or DeVellis (2003). This would suggest that the FPTS are internally consistent; indeed, in Francis' study the FPTS have achieved greater internal consistency than other operationalisations, such as the MBTI, have achieved in other studies (see, for example, Stricker and Ross, 1963). Francis (2004) does not provide any information regarding the test-retest reliability of the FPTS.

Second, Francis (2004) investigates the concurrent validity of the FPTTS. A test may be said to have concurrent validity if it correlates significantly with other tests that claim to measure the same thing. In order to demonstrate concurrent validity the FPTTS should achieve high correlations with other psychological type inventories. Francis (2004) found the FPTTS achieved high correlations with the MBTI. The FPTTS categorised participants in the same way as the MBTI on each of the four indices in 83.2% to 88.8% of cases. Overall, it was found that the FPTTS categorised individuals to the same discrete four-letter type as the MBTI in 58.4% of cases. This result may be viewed positively when it is compared to the test-retest data available for the type categorisation of the MBTI. Data of this nature are reported, for example, by Sticker and Ross (1964), Levy, Murphy and Carlson (1972), Howes and Carskadon (1979), McCarley and Carskadon (1983), Silberman, Freeman and Lester (1992), Johnson (1992), Bents and Wierschke (1996) and Tsuzuki and Matsui (1997). The proportion of subjects classified with identical categorisations at the retest varies considerably from one study to another. For example, Howes and Carskadon (1979), in a study among 117 undergraduates, found that after a five week period 49% were assigned the same type on both occasions, while 38% differed on one scale, and the remaining 14% differed on two scales. Levy, Murphy and Carlson (1972), in a study among 433 undergraduates, found that after a two month period 53% were assigned the same type on both occasions, while 35% differed on one of the four scales, 10% on two scales, and the remaining 2% on two scales. McCarley and Carskadon (1983) found that after a five week period 47% of their subjects retained their specific dichotomous type preferences across all four scales. Silberman, Freeman and Lester (1992), administered the MBTI to 161 dental students before the beginning of their first quarter and again near the end of their fourth year. They found that 24% were assigned the same type on both occasions, while the remaining 76% differed on at least one of the four scales. This study fails to report on the number of scales on which differences

occurred. Bents and Wierschke (1996) administered the MBTI to 40 adults twice over a six week period. They found that 68% were assigned the same type on both occasions, while 25% differed on one scale, and the remaining 8% differed on two scales. Tsuzuki and Matsui (1997) administered the MBTI to 88 students twice over a three month period. They found that 33% were assigned the same type on both occasions, while 48% differed on one scale, 16% differed on two scales and 3% differed on three scales.

These studies suggest that the MBTI has limited reliability over time, when considered as a type indicator. The percentage of achieved matches on all four indices of type as assessed by the FPTS and the MBTI is comparable with the test-retest reliability data of the MBTI. Francis (2004) does not claim that the FPTS can reproduce the MBTI profile. However, what is revealed by this study is that the FPTS are able to measure, in a meaningful way, the psychological types proposed by Jung and, therefore, the FPTS achieve concurrent validity.

In addition to achieving internal consistency reliability and concurrent validity, the FPTS hold the advantage of being a simple, short, and inexpensive means of determining psychological type preferences. Similarly to scales offered by Dwyer (1995), Johnson (1995), Oswald and Kroeger (1988), and Keating (1997), the FPTS do not have the same problems of length and cost associated with some psychological type inventories, such as the MBTI. However, unlike the scales offered by Dwyer (1995), Johnson (1995), Oswald and Kroeger (1988), and Keating (1997), the FPTS have evidence in support of their internal consistency reliability and concurrent validity.

The FPTS have recently been successfully used in two recent studies concerned with aspects of

Christianity. The first study, by Francis and Robbins (2002), investigated the psychological type preferences of 57 male evangelical church leaders in the UK using the FPTTS. They found that this sample preferred introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving. This result is consistent with the findings of other studies among clergy in the UK which use other operationalisations of psychological type theory (Irvine, 1989; Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001; Francis and Payne, 2002).

The second study, by Francis, Robbins, Boxer, Lewis, McGuckin and McDaid (2003), investigated the psychological type preferences of 149 university students using the FPTTS. Participants also completed the Francis Scale of Attitude toward Christianity. They found that among this sample feeling types reported significantly higher scores than thinking types on the Francis Scale of Attitude toward Christianity. This finding, which suggests that feeling types are more positive toward Christianity, confirms the findings of an earlier study which used a different operationalisation of psychological type theory (Jones and Francis, 1999), although this finding is not confirmed by another study (Fearn, Francis and Wilcox, 2001).

6. Why use psychological type theory?

Having outlined the theory of psychological type and reviewed different operationalisations of this theory, a brief rationale for the use of psychological type theory for the current study will be offered. There are three major reasons why psychological type theory will be explored in the current study rather than other personality models.

The first reason that the current study focuses on psychological type theory is that this is a value-neutral model. There is no hierarchy within the psychological type model proposed by Jung

(1971); the types are not ranked and none is judged to be better than the others. They are morally, intellectually, and spiritually neutral preferences, and not reflective of issues such as class, education or race. No type is judged to be superior to another.

This stands in sharp contrast with three other major models of personality. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, designed by Cattell, Eber, Tatsuoka (1970), proposes that sixteen key factors determine personality: reserved/outgoing, less intelligent/more intelligent, emotionally less stable/emotionally stable, humble/assertive, sober/happy go lucky, expedient/conscientious, shy/venturesome, tough-minded/tender-minded, trusting/suspicious, practical/imaginative, forthright/shrewd, self-assured/apprehensive, conservative/experimenting, group-dependent/self-sufficient, undisciplined/controlled, and relaxed/tense. Eysenckian personality theory is operationalised, for example, in the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975) and proposes that three key factors determine personality: extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism. The NEO Personality Inventory, designed by Costa and McCrae (1985), proposes that five key factors determine personality: openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. Each of these three models use value-laden models. For example, both Costa and McCrae (1985) and Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) are concerned with neuroticism, which may be considered to be a highly negative concept. Likewise, Cattell, Eber, Tatsuoka (1970) are concerned with concepts such as 'more intelligent' against 'less intelligent'. Psychological type theory does not set out to provide a total description of human personality but rather to assess *a priori* defined mental processes and there is nothing within this model that purports to be explicitly concerned with individual differences in, for example, emotionality, intelligence, anxiety, or psychopathology. The strength of Jung's model is that it claims to provide a neutral assessment of the key aspects of personality.

The second reason that the current study focuses on psychological type theory is that this theory is enjoying popularity and research interest. Psychological type theory has been developed and applied by many theorists (see, for example, Gray and Wheelwright, 1946; Keirse and Bates, 1978; Loomis, 1982; Ware, Yokomoto, and Morris, 1985; Mitchell, 1991; Rawling, 1992; Cranton and Knoop, 1995; Budd, 1997; Kier, Melancon, and Thompson, 1998; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998; Francis, 2004). Moreover, psychological type theory has been successfully employed in a number of areas including career development (see, for example, Apostol, 1991; McCaulley and Martin, 1995; Lundberg, Osborne, and Miner, 1997), counselling (see, for example, Bayne, 1995; Wyman, 1998; McCaulley, 2000), management and decision-making (see, for example, Furnham and Stringfield, 1993; Reponen, Pärnistö and Viitanen, 1996; Church and Waclawski, 1998), and educational practice (see, for example, Forqurean, Meisgeier and Swank, 1990; Miller, 1991; Nyland, Ybarra, Sammut, Rienecker and Kameda, 2000).

The third reason that the current study focuses on psychological type theory is that this is already a very popular tool within parts of the contemporary church (Delmage, 1996). Indeed, the use of psychological type theory in the church has been seen to be beneficial by a great many authors, as reviewed by Craig (2002). The myriad of literature regarding the theoretical applications of psychological type theory to Christian practice may be seen to support the notion of the popularity of psychological type theory in the church (see, for example, Kelsey, 1978; Clarke, 1983; Grant, Thompson and Clarke, 1983; Michael and Norrisey, 1984; Sanford, 1987; Oswald and Kroeger, 1988; Duncan, 1993; Goldsmith, 1994; Edwards, 1998; Butler, 1999; Baab, 2000; Francis and Atkins, 2000, 2001, 2002; Martínez, 2001; Francis, 2003).

In addition, psychological type theory is increasingly being put to practical use in the church.

Payne (2001) points out that there are many retreat centres that make use of psychological type theory to help Christians in their spiritual quest. Francis (2001) notes that both clergy and the laity are increasingly attending psychological type theory workshops. Moreover, Francis (2001) notes that in the Church in Wales psychological type theory is used at key points in clergy training. For example, psychological type theory is employed to help ordinands during initial training to develop self-knowledge and to improve relationships. There is a growing trend for clergy throughout the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Canada, to make use of psychological type theory in their ministry.

7. Conclusion

This chapter has provided an aphoristic outline of the nature of psychological type theory, tracing its development from its original formation by Jung through to its subsequent operationalisations. In particular, this chapter has focused on two operationalisations of Jung's theory which claim to be able to measure psychological type preferences: the MBTI (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998) and the FPTTS (Francis, 2004). Having outlined the theory of psychological type and reviewed different operationalisations of this theory, a justification for the use of psychological type theory for the current study will be offered. The next chapter will provide a more detailed rationale for the current empirical study.

-CHAPTER TWO-

RATIONALE FOR THE EMPIRICAL STUDY

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Psychological Type and Christianity**
- 3. Limitations of Previous Research**
- 4. Research Agenda**
- 5. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The previous chapter has outlined the nature and development of psychological type theory. It also described the value of psychological type theory for the current study. This chapter goes on to summarise the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity. It reviews previous studies which reported on the psychological type preferences of Christian groups and notes limitations of these studies. Based on this review a rationale is provided for choice of sample in the current study and research questions are formulated.

2. Psychological type theory and Christianity

The previous chapter asserted that psychological type theory has become very popular within parts of the contemporary church (Delmage, 1996; Francis, 2001). This chapter will now explore further the way in which psychological type theory has been employed in Christian contexts.

There a number of possible explanations for the popularity of psychological type theory in Christian contexts. For example, various commentators argue that psychological type theory helps Christians to identify and appreciate individual differences (see, for example, Osborn and Osborn, 1991), that psychological type theory is useful as a tool for deepening self-knowledge (see, for example, Repicky, 1981), and that psychological type theory may be employed to enhance spiritual development (see, for example, Duncan, 1993).

Psychological type theory has been applied to many areas of Christian belief and practice, such as evangelism (see, for example, Butler, 1999), prayer (see, for example, Clarke, 1983; Michael and Norrissey, 1984; Duncan, 1993; Fowke, 1997; Martínez, 2001), the person of Christ (Sanford, 1987), leadership (Oswald and Kroeger, 1988), the reading and preaching of scripture (Francis

and Atkins, 2000, 2001, 2002; Francis, 2003), congregations (see, for example, Edwards, 1998; Baab, 2000), and spirituality (Kelsey, 1978; Grant, Thompson and Clarke, 1983; Goldsmith, 1994).

There are also a growing number of *empirical* studies which have employed psychological type theory in the church. Studies assessing psychological type preferences of Christian groups have been included samples of people training for the ministry (Harbaugh, 1984; Holsworth, 1984; MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz, 1986), religious education professionals and students (MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz, 1986; Fearn, Francis and Wilcox, 2001; Francis, Penson and Jones, 2001), members of religious orders (Cabral, 1984; MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz, 1986; Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis, 1988), clergy (MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz, 1986; Irvine, 1989; Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Oswald and Kroeger, 1988; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001) and Christian affiliates (Carskadon, 1981; Gerhardt, 1983; Michael and Norrisey, 1984; Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin, 1989; Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1993, 1995; Calahan, 1996; Rehak, 1998; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis and Ross, 2000; Francis, 2002a). A general trend evident in these studies is that among both religious professionals and Christian affiliates there is an overwhelming predominance of feeling types and judging types. It has also been suggested that the relationship between religious affiliation and the EI and SN indices is related to other variables, including geographical location and denominational association (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001).

Moreover, there is evidence to support relationships between the psychological type preferences of Christians and sex (Ross, 1995; Oswald and Kroeger, 1988; Francis, Penson and Jones, 2001), geographical location (Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis, 1988), attitude toward

Christianity (Jones and Francis, 1999; Fearn, Francis and Wilcox, 2001; Francis, Robbins, Boxer, Lewis, McGuckin and McDaid, 2003), denomination (Carskadon, 1981; Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1993), conservatism of belief (Carskadon, 1981; Ross, Weiss and Jackson, 1996; Francis and Ross, 1997; Francis and Jones, 1998; Francis and Jones, 1999a), attitude toward charismatic experience (Francis and Jones, 1997), mystical orientation (Francis and Loudon, 2000; Francis, 2002a), happiness (Francis and Jones, 2000b), prayer preferences (Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin, 1989), and styles of religious leadership (Payne, 2001; Francis and Payne, 2002).

3. Limitations of previous research

Empirical studies concerning psychological type theory and the church have provided valuable insights into the way in which individual differences impact on the Christian faith. However, there are three main ways in which previous research in this area may be seen to be limited. This study aims to review previous research in order to identify these limitations and attempt to address them through means of an original, empirical study.

The first limitation of existing research is that many previous studies which report on the psychological type preferences of Christian groups have been focused on Christian professionals, rather than the laity. Harbaugh, (1984), Holsworth (1984), and MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz (1986), Oswald and Kroeger (1988), Irvine (1989), Goldsmith and Wharton (1993), Francis, Payne and Jones (2001), Francis, Penson and Jones (2001), and Francis and Robbins (2002) all focus their studies on people engaged in ministry or training for the ministry, while Cabral (1984), MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz (1986), and Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis (1988) all focus their studies on members of religious orders. Research among the laity has been conducted by Carskadon (1981), Gerhardt (1983), Michael and Norrisey (1984), Ware, Knapp

and Schwarzin (1989), Delis-Bulhoes (1990), Goldsmith and Wharton (1993), Ross (1993, 1995), Calahan (1996), Rehak (1998), Francis and Jones (1998, 2000b), Jones and Francis (1999), Francis and Ross (2000), and Francis, (2002a).

The second limitation of existing research is that most previous studies which report on the psychological type preferences of Christian groups have been conducted outside the UK. Carskadon (1981), Gerhardt (1983), Cabral (1984), Harbaugh, (1984), Holsworth (1984), Michael and Norrisey (1984), MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz (1986), Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis (1988), Oswald and Kroeger (1988), Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989), Calahan (1996), and Rehak (1998) all conducted their studies in the United States of America, while Delis-Bulhoes (1990), Ross (1993, 1995), and Francis and Ross (2000) all conducted their studies in Canada. Research among Christian groups in the UK has been conducted by Irvine (1989), Goldsmith and Wharton (1993), Francis and Jones (1998, 2000b), Jones and Francis (1999), Francis, Payne and Jones (2001), Francis, Penson and Jones (2001), Francis and Robbins (2002), and Francis (2002a).

The third limitation of existing research is that most previous studies which report on the psychological type preferences of Christian groups have used relatively small samples. Carskadon (1981) investigated the psychological type preferences of 300 college students of different denominations. Gerhardt (1983) investigated the psychological type preferences of 83 adult Unitarian Universalists and 60 teenagers in the Unitarian Universalist movement. Michael and Norrisey (1984) investigated the psychological type preferences of 415 participants attending their prayer project. Cabral (1984) investigated the psychological type preferences of 150 professed Catholic sisters. Harbaugh, (1984) investigated the psychological type preferences of

60 students within a Lutheran seminary. Holsworth (1984) investigated the psychological type preferences of 146 Roman Catholic seminarians.

MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz, (1986) used a number of very large samples: 534 clergy 'of all denominations (except priests)'; 102 ordained Roman Catholic Deacons; 1,554 Protestant ministers; 85 Protestants in specialised ministries; 1,298 Roman Catholic priests; 114 Brothers in Roman Catholic religious orders; 1,147 Roman Catholic nuns 'and other religious workers'; 2,002 sisters in Roman Catholic religious orders; 633 Protestant seminarians; and 51 Roman Catholic seminarians.

Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis (1988) investigated the psychological type preferences of two samples of members of the congregation of the Sisters of St Joseph of Carondelet, one in San Francisco (N = 47) and the other in the Western Province (N = 641). Oswald and Kroeger (1988) also conducted a large study, using a sample of 1,319 ordained clergy. Irvine (1989) investigated the psychological type preferences of 147 clergy in the Church of Scotland. Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989) investigated the psychological type preferences of a mixed sample of 170 people who considered themselves to be Christians. Delis-Bulhoes (1990) investigated the psychological type preferences of 154 Protestant active church members and 46 Catholic active church members. Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) investigated the psychological type preferences of curates, two samples of people involved in post-ordination training, one sample of clergy, three samples of laity, and two samples of people attending theological colleges. However, they do not provide details of the number of participants in their studies. Ross (1993) investigated the psychological type preferences of 116 urban members of the Anglican Church of Canada. Ross (1995) investigated the psychological type preferences of

116 Anglophone Catholic women and 59 Anglophone Catholic men. Calahan (1996) investigated the psychological type preferences of 113 married couples in a mid-western, conservative church setting. Rehak (1998) investigated the psychological type preferences of 76 active members of Redeemer Lutheran Church.

Francis and colleagues report on the psychological type preferences of a number of Christian groups. Francis and Jones (1998) investigated the psychological type preferences of 315 participants attending courses on the topic of personality and spirituality. Jones and Francis (1999) investigated the psychological type preferences of 82 student churchgoers. Francis and Jones (2000b) investigated the psychological type preferences of 284 participants attending courses on the topic of personality and spirituality. Francis and Ross (2000) investigated the psychological type preferences of 64 people attending a course preparing them to be Catholic lay teachers. Francis, Payne and Jones (2001) investigated the psychological type preferences of 427 male Anglican clergy. Francis, Penson and Jones (2001) investigated the psychological type preferences of 491 Bible college students. Francis and Robbins (2002) investigated the psychological type preferences of 57 male evangelical church leaders. Francis (2002a) investigated the psychological type preferences of 543 participants attending courses on the topic of personality and spirituality.

From this review it may be seen that only MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz, (1986) and Oswald and Kroeger (1988) used samples of more than 1,000 participants. All other studies among Christian groups have used samples of less than 1,000 participants and some have used samples of less than 100 participants (Gerhardt, 1983; Harbaugh, 1984; Rehak, 1998; Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis and Ross, 2000; Francis and Robbins, 2002). Although these sample sizes are

quite substantial in comparison with some of the empirical studies within the psychological type literature, the distribution of the number of participants across 16 psychological type cells leads to unacceptably small numbers in some cells.

These three limitations of empirical studies using psychological type theory among Christian groups can be summarised thus: many studies have concerned clergy rather than laity, many studies have been conducted in the United States of America and Canada rather than the UK, and many studies have used insufficiently sized samples. Only Goldsmith and Wharton (1993), Francis and Jones (1998, 2000b), Jones and Francis (1999) and, Francis (2002a) have conducted studies among churchgoers in the UK and none of these studies uses samples of more than 1,000.

It is important to conduct a new empirical study which addresses these limitations as this will establish whether the churches in the UK are attracting and retaining high numbers of people with particular psychological type preferences. It should also indicate how far the psychological type preferences of a large sample of churchgoers reflect the findings of previous studies using smaller samples (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, 2002a). By addressing these limitations, a thorough understanding of the psychological type profile of churchgoers will be achieved. This, in turn, will help to identify areas of strength and weakness in the contemporary church and enable meaningful application of psychological type theory to ministry and mission.

Therefore, the first research question asks what are the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK. The current study aims to address this research question by conducting a study among churchgoers rather than clergy or members of religious orders, by using a UK sample, and by using a sufficiently sized sample. The generalisability of existing studies by

comparing a new, large sample of churchgoers with these existing, smaller studies of churchgoers will be explored.

4. Research agenda

It has already been noted that the growing number of empirical studies concerning psychological type theory and the church has provided valuable insights into the way in which individual differences impact on the Christian faith. However, this body of existing knowledge raises important questions about what we do not yet know about the relationship between psychological type theory and aspects of Christianity. There are a number of important areas which previous research has not addressed. The current study aims to explore the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK and, moreover, through this process to build on previous research in nine ways.

The first way in which the current research aims to build on existing research concerns how groups of churchgoers are similar to or different from other groups. Most previous studies among churchgoers in the UK do not report whether there are any statistically significant differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in comparison with either other Christian or non-Christian groups. Focusing on the five studies that report on the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, 2002a), none of these studies attempt to analyse their samples in comparison with other groups. Although these five studies have provided psychological type profiles of churchgoers, these profiles are meaningless without a basis for comparison. In order to interpret the type preferences of churchgoers in a meaningful way, it is necessary to know how far they are similar to or different from the wider population,

in order to determine if there is anything distinctive about churchgoers, in terms of psychological type preferences, in comparison with the general population. It is necessary to know how far churchgoers are similar to or differ from non-churchgoers, in order to determine if psychological type preferences impact on the decision to attend church or not. It is necessary to know how far churchgoers are similar to or differ from clergy, in order to understand if points of conflict and contention between the clergy and the laity are precipitated by issues of type.

Therefore, the second research question asks how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers differ from or are similar to other groups, such as the UK population norms, non-churchgoers, or clergy. The current study will address this research question by performing statistical analysis to determine how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers reflect the psychological type profile of the UK as a whole, how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers differ from the psychological type preferences of those who do not claim to have a religious faith, and, how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers reflect the psychological type preferences of church leaders.

The second way in which the current research aims to build on existing research concerns how psychological type preferences are related to demographic characteristics. Most previous studies among churchgoers in the UK do not take proper account of the relationship between psychological type preferences and key demographic information. Focusing on the five studies that report on the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, 2002a), none of these studies attempt to assess the impact of potentially influential background variables, such as age, sex, marital status and geographical location. It is necessary to determine how far the

psychological type preferences of churchgoers are influenced by variables such as age, sex, marital status, and geographical location, in order to better understand the needs of churchgoers of different backgrounds.

Therefore, the third research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and key demographic characteristics. The current study will address this research question by performing statistical analysis to determine how far demographic characteristics, including sex, age, marital status, and geographical location are related to the psychological type preferences of churchgoers.

The third way in which the current research aims to build on existing research concerns how psychological type preferences are related to Christian practice. Most previous studies among churchgoers in the UK do not take proper account of the relationship between psychological type preferences and Christian practice. Focusing on the five studies that report on the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, 2002a), none of these studies attempt to assess the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and aspects of Christian practice, such as, private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience. It is necessary to determine how the psychological type preferences of churchgoers are related to different aspects of Christian practice, in order to determine if there are elements of Christian practice which may attract particular psychological types. Such an analysis may help to identify whether there are elements of Christian practice that attract those types that are underrepresented among churchgoers.

Therefore, the fourth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and Christian practice. The current study will address this research question by performing statistical analysis to determine how far different aspects of Christian practice, such as private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience, are related to the psychological type preferences of churchgoers.

The fourth way in which the current research aims to build on existing research concerns how psychological type is related to congregational dynamics. Previous studies among churchgoers in the UK do not take proper account of the relationship between psychological type preferences and congregational dynamics. Although a small number of studies have reported on the psychological type profiles of congregations (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1995; Rehak, 1998), these studies are limited to countries outside the UK, and, therefore, their findings cannot be generalised to UK congregations. It is necessary to explore the psychological type preferences of congregations as a whole in order to understand how far the psychological type preferences of whole congregations reflect the psychological type preferences of churchgoers when considered as individuals.

Therefore, the fifth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and congregational dynamics. The current study will address this research question by reporting the psychological type profiles of whole congregations.

The fifth way in which the current research aims to build on existing research concerns how psychological type is related to church satisfaction. Previous studies among churchgoers in the UK do not take proper account of the relationship between psychological type preferences and

church satisfaction. Currently, no empirical studies have been conducted among Christians to determine the relationship between psychological type and church satisfaction in either the UK or abroad. It is necessary to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences of churchgoers and church satisfaction in order to determine whether overrepresented types in the church are more satisfied with the church than underrepresented types in the church.

Therefore, the sixth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and church satisfaction. The current study will address this research question by performing statistical analysis to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and church satisfaction.

The sixth way in which the current research aims to build on existing research concerns how psychological type is related to denomination. Previous studies among churchgoers in the UK do not take proper account of the relationship between psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation. Although a small number of studies have investigated this area empirically (Carskadon, 1981; Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1993), these studies are limited to countries outside the UK, and, therefore, their findings cannot be generalised to churchgoers in the UK. It is necessary to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation to determine if churchgoers with different psychological types preferences are attracted to different denominations.

Therefore, the seventh research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation. The current study will address this research question by performing statistical analysis to compare the psychological type profiles of churchgoers of

different denominations.

The seventh way in which the current research aims to build on existing research concerns how psychological type is related to church orientation. Previous studies among churchgoers in the UK do not take proper account of the relationship between psychological type preferences and church orientation. Although a small number of studies in the UK have empirically investigated the related areas of conservatism of belief (Francis and Ross, 1997; Francis and Jones, 1998; Francis and Jones, 1999a), evangelicalism (Craig, Horsfall and Francis, 2004), and charismatic experience (Francis and Jones, 1997), these studies are limited in that they do not explicitly set out to investigate the relationship between psychological type preferences and church orientation. It is necessary to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and church orientation in order to determine whether churchgoers with different psychological type preferences identify themselves differently in terms of their personal church orientation, such as conservative/liberal orientation, evangelical/catholic orientation, and positive or negative influence of the charismatic movement.

Therefore, the eighth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and church orientation. The current study will address this research question by performing statistical analysis to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and church orientation.

The eighth way in which the current research aims to build on existing research concerns how psychological type is related to faith origination. Previous studies among churchgoers in the UK do not take proper account of the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith

origins. Although some type theorists in the UK have begun to speculate about this area (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Butler, 1999; Cook, 2003), these studies are limited in that they do not empirically verify their assertions. It is necessary to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith origins in order to determine whether the faith of churchgoers with different psychological type preferences originates in different ways.

Therefore, the ninth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith origins. The current study will address this research question by performing statistical analysis to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith origins.

The ninth way in which the current research aims to build on existing research concerns how psychological type is related to faith styles. Previous studies among churchgoers in the UK do not take proper account of the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles. Although a number of type theorists have suggested that psychological type theory can contribute to faith development (see, for example, Kelsey, 1978; Grant, Thompson and Clarke, 1983; Clarke, 1983; Michael and Norrisey, 1984; Duncan, 1993; Goldsmith, 1994; Fowke, 1997; Butler, 1999), these studies are limited in that they do not empirically verify their assertions. It is necessary to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles in order to determine if churchgoers with different psychological type preferences develop their faith in different ways.

Therefore, the tenth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles. The current study will address this research question by performing

statistical analysis to explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles.

It is, therefore, the intention of the current study to conduct an empirical study which addresses these ten research questions. This study will identify the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK; will use a larger sample than previous studies; will compare and contrast the psychological type preferences of churchgoers with other groups such as the UK population norms, non-churchgoers, or clergy; will assess the relationship between psychological type preferences and key demographic characteristics; will assess the relationship between psychological type preferences and aspects of Christian practice; will assess the relationship between psychological type preferences and congregational dynamics; will assess the relationship between psychological type preferences and church satisfaction; will assess the relationship between psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation; will assess the relationship between psychological type preferences and church orientation; will assess the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith origins; and, will assess the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has briefly reviewed existing studies concerned with the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity. Limitations of previous research concerned with assessing psychological type preferences of Christians have been noted and a number of previously unexplored areas were identified. As a result of this review ten research questions have been outlined, which the current empirical study aims to address. Based on this review of previous studies which reported on the psychological type preferences of Christian groups, ten

research questions were formulated. The first research question asks what are the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK and how far the psychological type preferences of a large sample of churchgoers will reflect the findings of previous studies using smaller samples. The second research question asks how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers differ from or are similar to other groups, such as the UK population norms, non-churchgoers, or clergy. The third research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and key demographic characteristics. The fourth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and Christian practice. The fifth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and congregational dynamics. The sixth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and church satisfaction. The seventh research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation. The eighth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and church orientation. The ninth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith origins. The tenth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles. The next chapter will outline how these research questions will be addressed in the current study.

-CHAPTER THREE-

METHODOLOGY: DESIGNING THE EMPIRICAL STUDY

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Questionnaire Design**
- 3. Data Collection and Analysis**
- 4. The Sample**
 - a. Personal Information
 - b. Church
 - c. Religiosity
- 5. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The previous chapter reviewed existing research concerned with assessing the psychological type preferences of Christian groups. A number of limitations of previous research in this area were noted and as a result ten research questions were proposed. This chapter will show how these research questions will be addressed in the current study. The design of the questionnaire will be described and related to the research questions. The method of the current study will be outlined and the process of data-gathering will be described. An overview of the sample will be provided, focusing on three main areas: personal information, church, and religiosity.

2. Questionnaire design

The previous chapter outlined the rationale for the current study, based on limitations of previous research. Based on this review ten research questions were formulated. In order to address these research questions a questionnaire was designed for use among Christian congregations. The design of the questionnaire took place in two stages. First, a draft questionnaire was devised by the researcher with the assistance of three clergy working in the area of personality and faith (The Revd Professor Leslie J Francis; The Revd Dr Susan H Jones; The Revd Angela Butler). A pilot study was then conducted using this draft version of the questionnaire (see Appendix 1). Overall, 9 congregations agreed to complete the questionnaire and 144 usable questionnaires were returned.

As a consequence of the findings of the pilot study two major changes were made to the content and format of the questionnaire.

First, as a consequence of the findings of the pilot study the content and format of the Index of

Faith Styles (IFS) was altered. The IFS was designed to operationalise psychological type theory in relation to personal growth in the area of Christian faith. In the pilot study this index consisted of 30 items, each of which made use of a bipolar dimension. For example:

In my prayer life I have been influenced most by...
 Solitary prayer 1 2 3 4 5 4 3 2 1 Praying as part of a group

In my study of scripture I have been influenced most by...
 Investigating details 1 2 3 4 5 4 3 2 1 Exploring themes

However, participants in the pilot study complained that this scale was confusing and unclear. This confusion was reflected in the poor response rate. Only 95 participants who returned otherwise useable questionnaires, completed any part of this scale correctly. Given that 144 participants returned useable questionnaires which made use of the bipolar version of the IFS, this represents a response rate of 66% for this section.

As a consequence of these findings, the IFS was changed from a bipolar format to a Likert type scale (Likert, 1932), now containing 80 items. A Likert type scale consists of short, aphoristic statements which embody just one main idea. Participants are asked to rate each of the 80 statements in response to the question 'How much do you feel the following have helped your faith to grow?', ranging from 'very little', through 'a little', 'medium', 'much', to 'very much'.

So, for example:

How much do you feel the following have helped your faith to grow?

practising solitary prayer	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
praying as part of a group	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
examining Bible passages in detail	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
exploring themes in the Bible	little	1	2	3	4	5	much

Second, as a consequence of the findings of the pilot study the Psalm Type Scale was removed from the questionnaire; this scale operationalised psychological type theory using extracts from

the psalms (Appendix 1, Part 5). The inclusion of this scale considerably increased the time required to complete the questionnaire, making it impractical for use during church services. Therefore, the scale was removed.

The final version of the questionnaire consists of eight pages divided into four parts (see Appendix 2). The questionnaire was presented in an A5 booklet. Due to the nature of the sample copies of a large-print version of the questionnaire were also made available.

Part one of the final questionnaire contains two sections. First, it contains the Faith Origins Scale (FOS), a new seven-item scale concerned with how churchgoers feel their faith first began. Participants are given seven statements about how their faith may have begun, for example, 'I always believed' and 'I drifted into faith'. Participants are then asked to respond to these statements on a five-item Likert type scale ranging from 'very little', through 'a little', 'medium', 'much', to 'very much'. The second section in part one contains the Index of Faith Styles (IFS), a new, 80-item index concerned with elements of Christian belief and practice which helped churchgoers' faith to grow. This index was designed to assess whether preference for different faith styles corresponds to participants' psychological type profile. Each of the eight psychological type preferences (extraversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving) is applied to different areas of Christian belief and practice. For example, extraversion is represented by activities such as 'finding God in other Christians', 'praying as part of a group', and 'engaging in discussion of Christianity with others'. Participants are asked to rate each of the 80 items in response to the question 'How much do you feel the following have helped your faith to grow?' Participants are asked to rate the items on a five-item Likert type scale ranging from 'very little', through 'a little', 'medium', 'much', to 'very much'.

Part two contains a measure of psychological type preferences, the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS; Francis, 2004). This is a set of eight scales determining psychological type preferences on four indices: orientation (extraversion/introversion); perceiving process (sensing/intuition); judging process (thinking/feeling); and attitude toward the outside world (judging/perceiving). The FPTS comprise 80 items and follow a forced-choice format. It was decided to use this measure of psychological type preferences for three reasons. First, the FPTS hold the advantage of being a simple, short, and inexpensive means of determining psychological type preferences, which makes it appropriate for use in the context of a church service. Lengthier, more complex instruments such as the MBTI or the KTS were impractical for the purposes of this project. Second, the FPTS have been shown to be psychometrically sound in that there is evidence in support of their internal reliability and concurrent validity. Third, the FPTS have recently been successfully used in recent studies concerned with aspects of Christianity (Francis and Robbins, 2002; Francis, Robbins, Boxer, Lewis, McGuckin and McDaid, 2003).

Part three contains two sections. First, this section contains the Church Satisfaction Scale (CSS), a new nine-item scale, designed to assess participants' feelings about their place in their congregation. The CSS was constructed as a semantic differential grid. Participants are asked to respond to the statement 'In this congregation I feel....' on nine bipolar descriptors: unwelcome-welcome, uncomfortable-comfortable, discontent-content, unhappy-happy, not valued-valued, uneasy-at ease, dissatisfied-satisfied, do not fit in-fit in, and do not belong-belong, each of which contain seven response categories. Second, this section contains the Randall Scale of Churchmanship (Randall, 2001) which will be referred to throughout the current study as the Randall Scale of Church Orientation (RSCO), in order to reflect that this scale is appropriate for

use by both sexes. The RSCO contains three bipolar descriptors relating to personal identification as conservative/liberal, evangelical/catholic, and positive or negative influence of the charismatic movement.

Part four contains questions concerned with personal information including sex, age, marital status, and church environment. This section also contains questions concerned with religious background including frequency of church attendance, frequency of private prayer, frequency of private bible reading, and reporting of religious experience.

On the final page of the questionnaire participants were invited to make comments about the questionnaire. The questionnaire is set out in its entirety in Appendix 2.

The questionnaire was designed to address the ten research questions of the current study in the following ways. The first research question asks what are the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK. This research question will be addressed by using a measure of psychological type, the FPTTS, and administering the questionnaire to church congregations in the UK. By ensuring the questionnaire is as short, simple, and easy to administrate as possible it is intended to ensure the maximum number of participants. The questionnaire will also be administered to more churches than in previous studies.

The second research question asks how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers differ from or are similar to other groups such as the UK population norms, non-churchgoers, or clergy. This research question will be addressed by finding appropriate samples and then performing a statistical analysis to compare these groups.

The third research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and key demographic characteristics. This research question will be addressed by including questions regarding personal information in the questionnaire, including sex, age, marital status, and church environment.

The fourth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and Christian practice. This research question will be addressed by including questions regarding Christian practice in the questionnaire, including frequency of private prayer, frequency of private bible reading, and reporting of religious experience.

The fifth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and congregational dynamics. This research question will be addressed by keeping data for each congregation separate, so that the psychological type profile of churchgoers can be analysed both in terms of congregations and in terms of individual churchgoers.

The sixth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and church satisfaction. This research question will be addressed by including a measure of church satisfaction (CSS) in the questionnaire.

The seventh research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation. This research question will be addressed by noting the denomination of each participating church, so that the psychological type preferences of churchgoers can be analysed in terms of denominational affiliation.

The eighth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and church orientation. This research question will be addressed by including a measure of church orientation (RSCO) in the questionnaire.

The ninth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith origins. This research question will be addressed by including a measure of faith origins (FOS) in the questionnaire.

The tenth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles. This research question will be addressed by including a new measure of faith styles (IFS) in the questionnaire.

3. Data collection and analysis

Church leaders were invited to use the questionnaire with their congregations. The church leaders approached were found from three main sources:

- i. Church leaders who had previously attended courses on spirituality and psychological type theory (N = 245);
- ii. Church leaders associated with the Baptist Union of Great Britain (N = 150);
- iii. Church leaders who had recently conducted research in association with the Department of Theology and Religious Studies at University of Wales, Bangor (N = 43).

In total, 438 church leaders were invited to take part in the project. These church leaders were sent a copy of the questionnaire, along with a project statement (see Appendix 3) outlining the aims and design of the project. Church leaders were invited to administer the questionnaire to

their congregation(s) during a normal church service. In return, church leaders were offered feedback, detailing the psychological type preferences of their congregation(s) and outlining the value and the applications of psychological type theory for the church.

Of those church leaders invited to take part, 49 agreed to participate. In many cases, church leaders administered the questionnaire to several congregations. In total, 95 congregations participated in the project. A total of 2,718 usable questionnaires were returned.

Each questionnaire was individually coded by the researcher and the data were analysed by means of the SPSS software package (SPSS for Windows, Release 11.0.0; SPSS Inc., 1988).

4. The Sample

A brief description of the sample will now be provided, focusing on three main areas: personal information, church, and religiosity. In each case the percentages have been rounded up or down as appropriate; accordingly, the percentages may not always add up to 100%.

a. Personal Information

The personal information provided by participants in the current study included information concerning sex, age, and marital status.

Regarding sex, within the current sample, there was a clear majority of female participants (65%), rather than male participants (35%). This reflects current research regarding churchgoers which suggests that female churchgoers significantly outnumber male churchgoers. For example, Brierley (1991a), in a study conducted among a number of denominations in England, found that

58% of churchgoers are female, while only 42% are male. Gelder and Escott (2001), in a study conducted among a number of Christian denominations in England, found that 65% of churchgoers are female, while only 35% are male. The findings of these studies suggest that the current sample reflects the general trend in the Christian church of attracting a greater number of women than men.

Table 3.1 Sex of participants

	N	%
male	947	35
female	1,735	65

Regarding age, within the current sample, there was a clear majority of older participants (aged 50 or over: 63%), rather than younger participants (aged 49 or under: 37%). Again, this reflects research regarding churchgoers which suggests that older churchgoers clearly outnumber younger churchgoers. For example, Brierley (1991a) in a study conducted among a number of denominations in England, found that 41% of churchgoers are aged 45 or older, while only 34% are aged 15-44. Brierley (2000, p 93), in a study conducted among a number of Christian denominations in England, found that 49% of churchgoers are aged 45 or older, while only 32% are aged 15-44. Gelder and Escott (2001), in a study conducted among a number of Christian denominations in England, found that 56% of churchgoers are aged 45 or older, while only 29% are aged 15-44. Francis (2002b), in a survey conducted among *Church Times* readers, found that 78% are aged 50 or older, while only 22% are aged under 50. The findings of these studies suggest that the current sample reflects the general trend in the Christian church of attracting older people.

Table 3.2 Age of participants

	N	%
<15	29	1
15-19	58	2
20-29	168	6
30-39	316	12
40-49	434	16
50-59	551	21
60-69	553	21
70-79	441	16
>80	140	5

Regarding marital status, within the current sample married participants (67%) clearly outnumber unmarried participants ('single', 'living with a partner', 'widowed', 'separated' or 'divorced': 33%). Currently, there has been little research into the marital status of churchgoers. Francis (2002b), in a survey conducted among *Church Times* readers, found that 65% of participants were married. The findings of this study suggest that the current sample reflects the general trend in the Christian church of attracting married people.

Table 3.3 Marital status of participants

	N	%
married	1,773	67
single	385	15
widowed	321	12
divorced	108	4
living with a partner	50	2
separated	24	1

b. Church

There are three main ways in which information about the churches attended by participants may be assessed: geographical location, church environment, and denomination.

Regarding geographical location of participants' churches, this information is gained by examining the addresses given by participating church leaders. The number of churchgoers in each country are detailed in table 3.4. Table 3.4 clearly demonstrates that the current sample is overwhelmingly comprised of English churchgoers (93%).

Table 3.4 Country of participants' church

	N	%
England	2,529	93
Scotland	52	2
Wales	137	5

Table 3.5 Church environment

	N	%
scattered rural village	111	4
market town	677	26
small town	203	8
large town	478	18
suburban	553	21
inner city	397	15
	239	9

Regarding church environment, this information is gained by noting the description of the environment of the church given by participants. Table 3.5 shows the responses given by churchgoers to the question ‘In what type of environment is your church?’ Table 3.5 shows a fairly even spread of church locations, with the largest single group of participants attending churches in villages (26%).

Regarding denomination, within the current study, the term ‘denomination’ has been used to describe the church actually attended at the time of the survey, rather than to describe the participants’ self-description. Therefore, participants completing questionnaires within a particular church are designated as belonging to that denomination. For example, a participant completing a questionnaire in a Baptist church, has been ascribed the denomination ‘Baptist’.

Table 3.6 Denominational frequencies

	N	%
Church of England	1,875	69
Baptist	422	16
Methodist	190	7
Church in Wales	121	5
Episcopal	32	1
Catholic	31	1
Independent Evangelical	21	1
LEP	17	1
URC	9	0

Table 3.6 demonstrates that the current sample predominantly consists of Church of England churchgoers (69%).

c. Religiosity

There are six main ways in which information about participants' religiosity was assessed in this study: frequency of church attendance, frequency of private prayer, frequency of private bible reading, reported religious experience, church orientation, and faith origins.

Regarding frequency of church attendance, within the current study participants were asked to respond to the question 'How often do you normally come to a church service?' Within the current sample there was a clear majority of participants who reported that they attend church weekly (66%).

Table 3.7 Frequency of church attendance

	N	%
less than once a year	2	0
at least once a year	11	0
at least six times a year	49	2
at least once a month	97	4
at least twice a month	362	14
weekly	1,735	66
more than one day a week	372	14

Regarding frequency of private prayer, within the current study participants were asked to respond to the question 'How often do you pray by yourself?' Within the current sample there was a clear majority of participants who reported that they pray by themselves nearly every day (69%).

Table 3.8 Frequency of private prayer

	N	%
never	39	2
occasionally	269	10
at least once a month	42	2
at least once a week	452	17
nearly every day	1,795	69

Regarding frequency of private bible reading, within the current study participants were asked to respond to the question ‘How often do you read the bible by yourself?’. Within the current sample, participants most frequently reported that they read the bible by themselves nearly every day (33%).

Table 3.9 Frequency of private bible reading

	N	%
never	224	9
occasionally	823	32
at least once a month	197	8
at least once a week	508	19
nearly every day	847	33

Regarding reported religious experience, within the current study participants were asked to respond to the question ‘Have you ever had something you would describe as a “religious experience”?’ Within the current sample, participants most frequently responded ‘yes’, they had had a religious experience (45%).

Table 3.10 Reported Religious Experience

	N	%
no	614	24
perhaps	514	20
probably	302	12
yes	1,162	45

Regarding church orientation, participants completed the Randall Scale of Church Orientation (RSCO), which contains 3 bipolar descriptors relating to personal identification as conservative/liberal, evangelical/catholic, and positive or negative influence of the charismatic movement. As tables 3.11, 3.12, .313, and 3.14 demonstrate, participants most frequently reported that they are very liberal (18%) on the conservative/liberal index, that they are very evangelical (23%) on the evangelical/catholic index, and that they are neutrally influenced (23%) by the charismatic movement on the positive/negative influence by the charismatic index.

Table 3.11 Church orientation - conservative/liberal orientation

	N	%
Extremely liberal	313	13
Very liberal	442	18
Liberal	296	12
Neutral	361	15
Conservative	409	12
Very conservative	409	17
Extremely conservative	315	13

Table 3.12 Church orientation - evangelical/catholic orientation

	N	%
Extremely catholic	166	7
Very catholic	250	10
Catholic	233	10
Neutral	364	15
Evangelical	318	13
Very evangelical	551	23
Extremely evangelical	536	22

Table 3.13 Church orientation - charismatic influence

	N	%
Extremely positively	384	15
Very positively	416	17
Positively	370	15
Neutral	571	23
Negatively	196	8
Very negatively	184	8
Extremely negatively	404	16

Regarding faith origins, participants completed the Faith Origins Scale (FOS), a new seven-item scale concerned with how churchgoers feel their faith first began. Participants are given seven statements about how their faith began, for example, 'I always believed' and 'I drifted into faith'. Participants are asked to respond on a five-item Likert type scale ranging from 'very little', through 'a little', 'medium', 'much', to 'very much'. Table 3.14 lists the number of participants who felt that the statement 'very much' reflected their personal experience of faith origination; full details of responses to each statement is presented in chapter 12. Participants most frequently reported that the item 'made a clear decision' (37%) described the way their faith began.

Table 3.14 Faith Origins Scale

	N	%
Very much always believed	713	30
Very much made a clear decision	725	37
Very much had a sudden conversion	174	10
Very much had a gradual conversion	390	20
Very much drifted into faith	68	4
Very much still searching	213	12
Very much never believed	18	1

5. Conclusion

This chapter has shown how the research questions will be addressed in the current study. The design of the questionnaire was described and related to these research questions. The method of the current study was outlined and the process of data-gathering was described. An overview of the sample was provided, focusing on three main areas: personal information, in terms of sex, age, and marital status; church, in terms of geographical location, church environment, and denomination; and, religiosity, in terms of frequency of church attendance, frequency of private prayer, frequency of private bible reading, reported religious experience, church orientation, and faith origins. The next chapter will describe the psychological type preferences of the current sample.

-CHAPTER FOUR-

PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE PREFERENCES OF CHURCHGOERS IN THE UK

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Previous Studies of Churchgoers in the UK**
- 3. Psychological Type Preferences of the Current Sample**
- 4. Francis Psychological Type Scales**
 - a. Internal Consistency
 - b. Construct Validity
- 5. Discussion**
- 6. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The previous chapters have outlined the rationale for, and design of the current study. This chapter will outline the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers in the UK. Previous studies of churchgoers in the UK will be reviewed to see if there is any consistently emerging pattern of psychological type preferences among churchgoers. The psychological type preferences of the current sample will then be outlined and compared with the previous studies of churchgoers, to see if the current study confirms previous research. The psychometric properties of the measure of psychological type used in this study, the FPTTS, will then be assessed. The implications of the psychological type preferences of the current sample will be discussed and conclusions concerning the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK will be drawn.

2. Previous studies of churchgoers in the UK

In order to develop hypotheses regarding the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers, previous studies of churchgoers in the UK will be reviewed. There have been five studies conducted among churchgoers in the UK for which details of participants' psychological type preferences are provided (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, 2002a). Unless stated otherwise, each of these studies makes use of the MBTI.

Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) investigated the psychological type preferences of three samples of churchgoers taken from English dioceses. They do not provide details of the number of participants in their studies or participants' backgrounds. It was found that within the first sample 71% of churchgoers preferred introversion and 29% extraversion, 53% preferred sensing

and 47% intuition, 94% preferred feeling and 7% thinking, and 58% preferred judging and 42% perceiving. It was found that within the second sample 80% of churchgoers preferred introversion and 20% extraversion, 65% preferred sensing and 35% intuition, 70% preferred feeling and 30% thinking, and 80% preferred judging and 20% perceiving. It was found that within the third sample that 78% of churchgoers preferred introversion and 22% extraversion, 56% preferred intuition and 44% sensing, 67% preferred feeling and 33% thinking, and 66% preferred judging and 34% perceiving.

Francis and Jones (1998) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 315 participants attending courses on the topic of personality and spirituality, of whom 96% attended church at least once a week. It was found that within this sample 55% preferred introversion and 45% extraversion, 55% preferred sensing and 45% intuition, 66% preferred feeling and 34% thinking, and 64% preferred judging and 36% perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (17%) and ESFJ (11%).

Jones and Francis (1999) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 82 student churchgoers, using the KTS. It was found that within this sample 57% preferred introversion and 43% extraversion, 61% preferred intuition and 39% sensing, 60% preferred feeling and 40% thinking, and 82% preferred judging and 18% perceiving. Jones and Francis (1999) do not provide complete details of the 16 psychological types.

Francis and Jones (2000b) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 284 participants attending courses on the topic of personality and spirituality, of whom 93% attended church at least once a week. It was found that within this sample 57% preferred introversion and

44% extraversion, 66% preferred sensing and 34% intuition, 58% preferred feeling and 42% thinking, and 74% preferred judging and 26% perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (19%) and ISTJ (14%).

Francis (2002a) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 543 participants attending courses on the topic of personality and spirituality, of whom 87% attended church at least once a week. It was found that within the total sample 57% preferred introversion and 44% extraversion, 59% preferred sensing and 41% intuition, 63% preferred feeling and 37% thinking, and 69% preferred judging and 31% perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (16%) and ESFJ (12%).

Each of these five studies (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, 2002a) demonstrates that churchgoers in the UK prefer introversion over extraversion, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving. The majority of studies (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a) also reveal that churchgoers prefer sensing over intuition.

Only two studies may be seen to disagree with the finding that churchgoers in the UK prefer sensing over intuition. Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) report on three samples, and within the third sample 56% of participants preferred intuition, while only 44% of participants preferred sensing. Similarly, Jones and Francis (1999) found that more of the participants in their study preferred intuition over sensing. The finding of these two studies (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Jones and Francis, 1999) conflict with all other studies of UK churchgoers which suggest that churchgoers in the UK tend to prefer sensing over intuition (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993;

Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a). However, it is difficult to generalise from the studies of Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) and Jones and Francis (1999). Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) do not provide details of the number of participants in their study or information about their background. Jones and Francis (1999) study employ only a small sample (N = 82). Therefore, the generalisability of these studies is limited.

In summary, it may be said that the majority of studies among churchgoers in the UK agree that churchgoers prefer introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. Moreover, *all* studies among churchgoers in the UK agree with the finding that churchgoers prefer introversion, feeling, and judging.

Based on the findings of these current studies it is hypothesised that the current sample of churchgoers will demonstrate preferences for introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving.

3. Psychological type preferences of the current sample

The full details of the psychological type preferences for the current sample of 2,718 churchgoers in the UK are outlined in table 4.1. Table 4.1 follows the convention of psychological type literature, presenting the psychological type preferences of the sample in a 'type table' (see, for example, Myers and Myers, 1995; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998).

Table 4.1. Type distribution
for churchgoers in the UK.
N = 2,718 + = 1% of N

The Sixteen Complete Types

ISTJ n = 492 (18.1%) ++++ ++++ ++++ +++	ISFJ n = 632 (23.3%) ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ +++	INFJ n = 98 (3.6%) ++++	INTJ n = 126 (4.6%) ++++
---	---	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

ISTP n = 32 (1.2%) +	ISFP n = 77 (2.8%) +++	INFP n = 66 (2.4%) ++	INTP n = 24 (0.9%) +
-------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------

ESTP n = 15 (0.6%) +	ESFP n = 102 (3.8%) ++++	ENFP n = 71 (2.6%) +++	ENTP n = 40 (1.5%) ++
-------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

ESTJ n = 273 (10.0%) ++++ ++++	ESFJ n = 522 (19.2%) ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++	ENFJ n = 83 (3.1%) +++	ENTJ n = 65 (2.4%) ++
--	--	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

Dichotomous Preferences

E	n = 1,171	(43.1%)
I	n = 1,547	(56.9%)
S	n = 2,145	(78.9%)
N	n = 573	(21.1%)
T	n = 1,067	(39.3%)
F	n = 1,651	(60.7%)
J	n = 2,291	(84.3%)
P	n = 427	(15.7%)

Pairs and Temperaments

IJ	n = 1,348	(49.6%)
IP	n = 199	(7.3%)
EP	n = 228	(8.4%)
EJ	n = 943	(34.7%)
ST	n = 812	(29.9%)
SF	n = 1,333	(49.0%)
NF	n = 318	(11.7%)
NT	n = 255	(9.4%)
SJ	n = 1,919	(70.6%)
SP	n = 226	(8.3%)
NP	n = 201	(7.4%)
NJ	n = 372	(13.7%)
TJ	n = 956	(35.2%)
TP	n = 111	(4.1%)
FP	n = 316	(11.6%)
FJ	n = 1,335	(49.1%)
IN	n = 325	(12.0%)
EN	n = 290	(10.7%)
IS	n = 1,222	(45.0%)
ES	n = 881	(32.4%)
ET	n = 393	(14.5%)
EF	n = 778	(28.6%)
IF	n = 873	(32.1%)
IT	n = 674	(24.8%)

Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)		Dominant Types				
n	%	n	%	n	%			
E-TJ	338	12	I-TP	56	2	Dt. T	394	14.5
E-FJ	605	22	I-FP	143	5	Dt. F	748	27.5
ES-P	86	3	IS-J	1,124	41	Dt. S	1210	44.5
EN-P	142	5	IN-J	224	8	Dt. N	366	13.5

Charlotte Craig
Psychological types of
UK churchgoers.

Within the current sample it was found that 57% of participants preferred introversion and 43% preferred extraversion, 79% preferred sensing and 21% preferred intuition, 61% preferred feeling and 39% preferred thinking, and 84% preferred judging and 16% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types were found to be ISFJ (23%) and ESFJ (19%).

The psychological type preferences of churchgoers, divided by sex are shown in table 4.2 and table 4.3. The psychological type preferences of male churchgoers in the current sample (N = 947) are outlined in table 4.2. Within this sample of male churchgoers it was found that 65% preferred introversion and 35% preferred extraversion, 74% preferred sensing and 26% preferred intuition, 58% preferred thinking and 42% preferred feeling, and 83% preferred judging and 17% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISTJ (28%) and ISFJ (17%).

The psychological type preferences of female churchgoers in the current sample (N = 1,735) are outlined in table 4.3. Within this sample of female churchgoers it was found that 53% preferred introversion and 47% preferred extraversion, 81% preferred sensing and 19% preferred intuition, 71% preferred feeling and 29% preferred thinking, and 85% preferred judging and 15% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (27%) and ESFJ (24%).

**Table 4.2 Type distribution
for male churchgoers
N = 947 += 1% of N**

The Sixteen Complete Types

Dichotomous Preferences

ISTJ <i>n</i> = 274 (28.3%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 161 (16.6%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 27 (2.8%) +++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 76 (7.9%) +++++ ++
ISTP <i>n</i> = 16 (1.7%) ++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 21 (2.2%) ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 37 (3.8%) ++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 13 (1.3%) +
ESTP <i>n</i> = 11 (1.1%) +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 24 (2.5%) +++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 21 (2.2%) ++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 21 (2.2%) ++
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 117 (12.1%) +++++ +++++ ++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 95 (9.8%) +++++ +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 21 (2.2%) ++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 32 (3.3%) +++

E	<i>n</i> = 342	(35.4%)
I	<i>n</i> = 625	(64.6%)
S	<i>n</i> = 719	(74.4%)
N	<i>n</i> = 248	(25.6%)
T	<i>n</i> = 560	(57.9%)
F	<i>n</i> = 407	(42.1%)
J	<i>n</i> = 803	(83.0%)
P	<i>n</i> = 164	(17.0%)

Pairs and Temperaments

IJ	<i>n</i> = 538	(55.6%)
IP	<i>n</i> = 87	(9.0%)
EP	<i>n</i> = 77	(8.0%)
EJ	<i>n</i> = 265	(27.4%)
ST	<i>n</i> = 418	(43.2%)
SF	<i>n</i> = 301	(31.1%)
NF	<i>n</i> = 106	(11.0%)
NT	<i>n</i> = 142	(14.7%)
SJ	<i>n</i> = 647	(66.9%)
SP	<i>n</i> = 72	(7.4%)
NP	<i>n</i> = 92	(9.5%)
NJ	<i>n</i> = 156	(16.1%)
TJ	<i>n</i> = 499	(51.6%)
TP	<i>n</i> = 61	(6.3%)
FP	<i>n</i> = 103	(10.7%)
FJ	<i>n</i> = 304	(31.4%)
IN	<i>n</i> = 137	(14.2%)
EN	<i>n</i> = 98	(10.1%)
IS	<i>n</i> = 488	(50.5%)
ES	<i>n</i> = 244	(25.2%)
ET	<i>n</i> = 181	(18.7%)
EF	<i>n</i> = 161	(16.6%)
IF	<i>n</i> = 246	(25.4%)
IT	<i>n</i> = 379	(39.2%)

Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types		Charlotte Craig Psychological types of male churchgoers
<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		
E-TJ	149	15.4	I-TP	29	3.0	Dt. T	178	18.4
E-FJ	116	12.0	I-FP	58	6.0	Dt. F	174	18.0
ES-P	32	3.3	IS-J	435	45.0	Dt. S	467	48.3
EN-P	45	4.7	IN-J	103	10.7	Dt. N	148	15.3

Table 4.3 Type distribution
for female churchgoers
N = 1,735 + = 1% of N

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ n = 224 (12.7%) +++++ +++++ +++	ISFJ n = 467 (26.5%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	INFJ n = 73 (4.1%) ++++	INTJ n = 52 (3.0%) +++	E n = 829 (47.0%)	I n = 933 (53.0%)
ISTP n = 16 (0.9%) +	ISFP n = 55 (3.1%) +++	INFP n = 35 (2.0%) ++	INTP n = 11 (0.6%) +	S n = 1,427 (81.0%)	N n = 335 (19.0%)
ESTP n = 4 (0.2%)	ESFP n = 79 (4.5%) +++++	ENFP n = 51 (2.9%) +++	ENTP n = 19 (1.1%) +	T n = 512 (29.1%)	F n = 1,250 (70.9%)
ESTJ n = 156 (8.9%) +++++ ++++	ESFJ n = 426 (24.2%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ ++++	ENFJ n = 64 (3.6%) ++++	ENTJ n = 30 (1.7%) ++	J n = 1,492 (84.7%)	P n = 270 (15.3%)
				Pairs and Temperaments	
				IJ n = 816 (46.3%)	IP n = 117 (6.6%)
				EP n = 153 (8.7%)	EJ n = 676 (38.4%)
				ST n = 400 (22.7%)	SF n = 1,027 (58.3%)
				NF n = 223 (12.7%)	NT n = 112 (6.4%)
				SJ n = 1,273 (72.2%)	SP n = 154 (8.7%)
				NP n = 116 (6.6%)	NJ n = 219 (12.4%)
				TJ n = 462 (26.2%)	TP n = 50 (2.8%)
				FP n = 220 (12.5%)	FJ n = 1,030 (58.5%)
				IN n = 191 (10.8%)	EN n = 192 (10.9%)
				IS n = 742 (42.1%)	ES n = 637 (36.2%)
				ET n = 209 (11.9%)	EF n = 620 (35.2%)
				IF n = 630 (35.8%)	IT n = 303 (17.2%)

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		Charlotte Craig Psychological types of female churchgoers.	
	n	%		n	%	n	%		
E-TJ	186	10.6	I-TP	27	1.5	Dt. T	213		12.1
E-FJ	490	27.8	I-FP	90	5.1	Dt. F	580		32.9
ES-P	55	3.1	IS-J	691	39.2	Dt. S	746	42.3	
EN-P	98	5.6	IN-J	125	7.1	Dt. N	223	12.7	

4. Francis Psychological Type Scales

Psychological type preferences in the current study were measured using the FPTTS (Francis, 2004). It is possible to contribute to the literature concerning the psychometric properties of the FPTTS in two ways. First, by assessing their internal consistency and second, by assessing their construct validity.

a. Internal consistency

The first way in which the psychometric properties of the FPTTS will be evaluated in the current study is by assessing their internal consistency reliability. The internal consistency of the FPTTS can be assessed by determining how far the eight scales that comprise the FPTTS display item homogeneity; this is done by calculating the alpha coefficient of the eight scales of the FPTTS. Tables 3.4 through 3.11 present the percentage endorsement for each of the items, the item retest correlations, and alpha coefficients for each of the of the eight scales of the FPTTS. An alpha coefficient of .70 or above indicates satisfactory statistical internal consistency according to Kline (2000), while DeVellis (2003) suggests that an alpha coefficient of .65 or above is acceptable. Each of the eight scales which comprise the FPTTS produced alpha coefficients in excess of .65, suggesting that the scales are satisfactorily internally consistent, according to DeVellis (2003).

Table 4.4 displays the FPTTS extraversion (E) scale. This scale is intended to indicate people who are orientated to the outer world, that is, extraverts. Extraverts are characterised by being active, being sociable, having many friends, enjoying parties, gaining energy from others, enjoying working in groups, social involvement, talkativeness, perceiving themselves as extraverted, and speaking before thinking.

Table 4.4 shows that on the FPTS E scale participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'socially involved' (60%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'speak before thinking' (34%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'sociable' (.6629) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'speak before thinking' (.1499). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .7950.

Table 4.4 Reliability analysis of Francis Psychological Type Scales - extraversion

Item	r	Item endorsement %
Active	.3880	51
Sociable	.6629	46
Having many friends	.3822	37
Like parties	.4589	59
Energised by others	.4397	58
Happier working in groups	.4166	46
Socially involved	.5956	60
Talkative	.5829	50
An extravert	.6088	41
Speak before thinking	.1499	34
Alpha	.7950	

Table 4.5 displays the FPTS introversion (I) scale. This scale is intended to indicate people who are orientated to the inner world, that is, introverts. Introverts are characterised by being reflective, being private, having a few deep friendships, disliking parties, being drained by spending time with too many people, enjoying working alone, social detachment, reservedness, perceiving themselves as introverted, and thinking before speaking.

Table 4.5 shows that on the FPTS I scale participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'think before speaking' (66%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'socially

detached' (40%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'private' (.6629) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'think before speaking' (.1499). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .7950.

Table 4.5 Reliability analysis of Francis Psychological Type Scales - introversion

Item	r	Item endorsement %
Reflective	.3880	49
Private	.6629	54
A few deep friendships	.3822	63
Dislike parties	.4589	41
Drained by too many people	.4397	42
Happier working alone	.4166	54
Socially detached	.5956	40
Reserved	.5829	50
An introvert	.6088	59
Think before speaking	.1499	66
Alpha	.7950	

Table 4.6 displays the FPTTS sensing (S) scale. This scale is intended to indicate people who perceive information using the five senses, that is, sensing types. Sensing types are characterised by being interested in facts, being practical, preferring the concrete, preferring to make, being conventional, being concerned for detail, being sensible, focusing on present realities, preferring to keep things as they are, and being 'down to earth'.

Table 4.6 shows that on the FPTTS S scale participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'down to earth' (89%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'prefer to keep things as they are' (22%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'practical' (.5103) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is

'prefer to keep things as they are' (.1777). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .7187.

Table 4.6 Reliability analysis of Francis Psychological Type Scales - sensing

Item	r	Item endorsement %
Interested in facts	.3770	75
Practical	.5103	77
The concrete	.5069	77
Prefer to make	.3456	67
Conventional	.4856	65
Concerned about detail	.2553	41
Sensible	.4684	66
Focused on present realities	.3378	64
Prefer to keep things as they are	.1777	22
Down to earth	.3473	89
Alpha	.7187	

Table 4.7 displays the FPTS intuition (N) scale. This scale is intended to indicate people who perceive and take in information using intuition, that is, intuitive types. Intuitive types are characterised by being interested in theories, being inspirational, preferring the abstract, preferring to design, being inventive, being concerned for meaning, being imaginative, focusing on future possibilities, preferring to improve things, and a tendency to be 'up in the air'.

Table 4.7 shows that on the FPTS N scale participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'prefer to improve things' (78%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'up in the air' (11%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'inspirational' (.5103) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'prefer to improve things' (.1777). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .7187.

Table 4.7 Reliability analysis of Francis Psychological Type Scales - intuition

Item	r	Item endorsement %
Interested in theories	.3770	25
Inspirational	.5103	23
The abstract	.5069	23
Prefer to design	.3465	33
Inventive	.4856	35
Concerned for meaning	.2553	59
Imaginative	.4684	34
Focused on future possibilities	.3378	36
Prefer to improve things	.1777	78
Up in the air	.3473	11
Alpha	.7187	

Table 4.8 Reliability analysis of Francis Psychological Type Scales - thinking

Item	r	Item endorsement %
Concerned for justice	.2809	45
Analytic	.5154	31
Thinking	.3329	45
Tend to be firm	.4002	37
Critical	.3354	44
Logical	.3872	55
Truthful	.2247	46
Sceptical	.3225	29
Seek for truth	.3256	48
Fair-minded	.3754	36
Alpha	.6891	

Table 4.8 displays the FPTs thinking (T) scale. This scale is intended to indicate people who make judgements using objective, rational principles, that is, thinking types. Thinking types are characterised by being concerned for justice, being analytical, preferring to think, being firm,

being critical, being logical, being truthful, being sceptical, being concerned for truth, and being fair-minded.

Table 4.8 shows that on the FPTTS T scale participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'logical' (55%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'sceptical' (29%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'analytic' (.5154) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'truthful' (.2247). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .6891.

Table 4.9 Reliability analysis of Francis Psychological Type Scales - feeling

Item	r	Item endorsement %
Concerned for harmony	.2809	55
Sympathetic	.5154	69
Feeling	.3329	56
Tend to be gentle	.4002	63
Affirming	.3354	56
Humane	.3872	45
Tactful	.2247	54
Trusting	.3225	71
Seek for peace	.3256	52
Warm-hearted	.3754	64
Alpha	.6892	

Table 4.9 displays the FPTTS feeling (F) scale. This scale is intended to indicate people who make judgements using subjective, personal values, that is, feeling types. Feeling types are characterised by being concerned for harmony, being sympathetic, preferring to feel, being gentle, being affirming, being humane, being tactful, being trusting, being concerned for peace, and being warm-hearted.

Table 4.9 shows that on the FPTS F scale participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'trusting' (71%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'humane' (45%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'sympathetic' (.5154) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'tactful' (.2247). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .6892.

Table 4.10 Reliability analysis of Francis Psychological Type Scales - judging

Item	r	Item endorsement %
Happy with routine	.2949	79
Structured	.4656	47
To act on decisions	.3504	67
Like to be in control	.2215	41
Orderly	.5134	49
Organised	.5470	65
Punctual	.3781	71
Like detailed planning	.4269	71
Happier with certainty	.2472	86
Systematic	.5517	66
Alpha	.7406	

Table 4.10 displays the FPTS judging (J) scale. This scale is intended to indicate people who make decisions using a judging function in their dealings with the outside world, that is, judging types. Judging types are characterised by preferring routine, preferring structure, preferring to act on decisions, preferring to be in control, preferring order, preferring organisation, preferring to be punctual, preferring to plan, being happier with certainties, and preferring to be systematic.

Table 4.10 shows that on the FPTS J scale participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'happier with certainty' (86%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'like to be

in control' (41%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'systematic' (.5517) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'like to be in control' (.2215). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .7406.

Table 4.11 Reliability analysis of Francis Psychological Type Scales - perceiving

Item	r	Item endorsement %
Unhappy with routine	.2949	21
Open-ended	.4656	53
To act on impulse	.3504	33
Like to be adaptable	.2215	59
Easygoing	.5134	51
Spontaneous	.5470	35
Leisurely	.3781	29
Dislike detailed planning	.4269	29
Happy with uncertainty	.2472	14
Casual	.5517	34
Alpha	.7406	

Table 4.11 displays the FPTPS perceiving (P) scale. This scale is intended to indicate people who make decisions using a perceiving function in their dealings with the outside world, that is, perceiving types. Perceiving types are characterised by a preference for avoiding routine, being open-ended, acting on impulse, being adaptable, being easygoing, being spontaneous, being leisurely, avoiding planning, being happier with uncertainties, and for being casual.

Table 4.11 shows that on the FPTPS P scale participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'like to be adaptable' (59%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'happier with uncertainty' (14%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'casual' (.5517) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'like

to be in adaptable' (.2215). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .7406.

b. Construct validity

The second psychometric property of the FPTs to be evaluated in the current study is construct validity. Construct validity refers, in this case, to the extent to which a scale can predict a measurable construct. The construct validity of the FPTs can be demonstrated by correlating a prediction of type theory with measurable behaviour. Most previous studies, using either the MBTI or the KTS, have shown that churchgoers in the UK tend to prefer introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. Using the FPTs, it has again been found that churchgoers in the UK tend to prefer introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. This suggests that the FPTs are able to determine psychological type preferences among a criterion group in a way that coheres with previous empirical research carried out with established, valid measures (see Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a). The finding that the FPTs are able to determine psychological type preferences among a criterion group in a way that coheres with previous empirical research, supports their construct validity.

5. Discussion

Comparison of the current sample with previous studies of UK churchgoers demonstrates that the current study supports earlier findings regarding the psychological type preferences of UK churchgoers. UK churchgoers in both the current sample and most previous studies (see Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a) have demonstrated preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. The current sample confirms that churches in the UK are attracting and retaining high numbers of people with preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. It will now be explored why some

types appear to be attracted to the church more than others.

The ISFJ type is characterised in the following way:

Quiet, friendly, responsible and conscientious. Committed and steady in meeting their obligations. Thorough, painstaking and accurate. Loyal, considerate, notice and remember details about people who are important to them, concerned with how other people feel. Strive to create an orderly and harmonious environment at work and at home (Myers, 2000, p 13).

Therefore, ISFJ churchgoers may be characterised as quiet and reflective (I), practical and realistic (S), gentle and sympathetic (F), and organised and decision-orientated (J). It is possible to see how these characteristics may attract people with preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging to the church. They may be attracted by the opportunity for 'sacred space' during church services, and times of reflection and contemplation (I). They may be attracted to the sensory experiences of church services such as the sight of the cross, the sound of familiar hymns, the touching of hands in the peace, the smell of incense, and the taste of communion wine, as well as the practical applications of the Christian faith (S). They may be attracted to the interpersonal values of Christian teaching, such as love, harmony, peace, and compassion for humankind (F). They may be attracted by the structure of church services, the rhythm of weekly services, and the order prescribed by the liturgical calendar (J).

It might be expected that ESFJ churchgoers are attracted by many similar elements of church life that attract ISFJ churchgoers. Be that as it may, ESFJ churchgoers may find times of quiet and stillness in church services draining or constricting, due to their preference for extraversion. However, ESFJ churchgoers may be attracted by the community atmosphere in the church and the opportunity to share and discuss their ideas and feelings among friends, as these are elements

of church life which may appeal to the ESFJ's preference for extraversion.

It might be expected that ISTJ churchgoers are attracted by many similar elements of church life that attract ISFJ churchgoers. Be that as it may, ISTJ churchgoers may find that the emphasis on interpersonal values and feelings in the church does not tap into their logic-based way of operating; this emphasis may even seem simplistic or sentimental to the ISTJ. However, ISTJ churchgoers may be attracted by the emphasis in Christian teaching on the truth of doctrine and the uncompromising call for righteousness and justice, as these are elements of church life which may appeal to the ISTJ's preference for thinking.

These three types, ISFJ, ESFJ, and ISTJ, all share a preference for SJ. Nearly three quarters (71%) of churchgoers in the current sample prefer SJ. People with a preference for SJ might be expected to hold a disciplined commitment to structure, detail, tradition, and routine. It might well be expected that people with a preference for SJ will be drawn to organisations that are focused on tradition, order, and convention.

6. Conclusion

The current chapter has reviewed previous studies among churchgoers in the UK which make use of psychological type theory, concluding that most studies have found preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. The current chapter then went on to state the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers, concluding that this sample likewise showed preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. The psychometric properties of the measure of psychological type used in this study, the FPTTS, were assessed in terms of internal consistency reliability and construct validity. It was found the eight scales of

the FPTTS demonstrated satisfactory levels of internal reliability. It was also found that the FPTTS are able to determine psychological type preferences among a criterion group in a way that coheres with previous empirical research, supporting its construct validity. Finally, the implications of the preferences of the current sample of churchgoers were discussed. The next chapter will compare the psychological type preferences of current sample of churchgoers with other Christian and non-Christian groups.

-CHAPTER FIVE-

COMPARING CHURCHGOERS WITH OTHER GROUPS

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Comparisons with the UK Population Norms**
 - a. Collection of the UK Population Norms
 - b. Comparisons
 - c. Discussion
- 3. Comparisons with Non-Churchgoers**
 - a. Finding a Sample of Non-Churchgoers
 - b. Comparisons
 - c. Discussion
- 4. Comparisons with Clergy**
 - a. Review of Previous Studies of UK Clergy
 - b. Comparisons
 - c. Discussion
- 5. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The previous chapter outlined the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers and confirmed previous research which suggests that churchgoers in the UK prefer introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. However, the analysis contained in the previous chapter does not show how far churchgoers are similar to or differ from other groups of people. This chapter will statistically analyse the psychological type preferences of the current sample in comparison with three other samples. First, in order to determine how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers reflect the psychological type preferences of the UK as a whole, the current sample will be compared with the UK population norms. Second, in order to determine how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers differ from the psychological type preferences of those who do not claim to have a Christian faith, the current sample will be compared with an amalgamated sample of self-identified agnostics and atheists. Third, in order to determine points of similarity and difference between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and those of clergy, the current sample will be compared with an amalgamated sample of clergy. The implications of each analysis will be discussed in turn. General patterns will be noted and conclusions about how the psychological type profile of churchgoers differs from the psychological type profile of other groups of people will be drawn.

2. Comparisons of UK churchgoers with UK population norms

In order to determine how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers reflect the psychological type preferences of the UK as a whole, the current sample will now be compared with the UK population norms reported by Kendall (1998). These population norms are based on the results of a study commissioned by Oxford Psychologists Press and conducted by the 'Office of National Statistics' (sic). Kendall (1998, p 60) provides details of how this study was

conducted.

a. Collection of UK population norms

Kendall (1998) reports that, in order to ensure a representative portrayal of the psychological type preferences of people in the UK, a sample of 100 postal sectors was selected, having been stratified by region, proportion of households renting from local authorities, and socio-economic group. Within each of these postal sectors, 30 addresses were selected at random. For each of these addresses one person was selected randomly from the household, interviewed, and asked to complete the MBTI questionnaire, among other research instruments. Participants who completed and returned the MBTI questionnaires each were paid £10. From the 3,000 individuals selected, 1,634 supplied useable data on the MBTI items, representing a response rate of 54%. Kendall (1998, p 60) notes that there was 'no significant drop-out within the sample (from being interviewed, to agreeing to complete a questionnaire, to returning it)'. However, because demographic information had already been gathered about participants, it is evident that certain participants tended to drop out more frequently than others during the course of the study. Kendall (1998, p 60) notes that males dropped out slightly more often than females; that younger participants (16 to 29) dropped out slightly more often than older participants; that ethnic minority participants dropped out slightly more often than white participants; and that participants from lower socio-economic groups dropped out more often than participants from higher socio-economic groups.

Kendall (1998, p 61) argues that the resulting sample reflects the census figures published in 1994 for ethnicity and gender (as reported by the Office for National Statistics). On this basis, it may be argued that the resultant UK population norms provide a representative sample of the

distribution of psychological type preferences in the UK.

However, it is noteworthy that within Kendall's (1998) sample only 54% of participants invited to complete the MBTI successfully completed and returned the instrument, suggesting the data may be less than truly representative of the population as a whole. In addition, Kendall's (1998) sample has not been assessed alongside other attempts to establish population norms for the UK. It may be argued that further studies are needed to support Kendall's findings.

Nonetheless, the population norms provided by Kendall (1998) are the best representation of the UK population psychological type profile currently available. Therefore, bearing in mind the caveats identified above, Kendall's (1998) study will be used as an indicator of the psychological type preferences of the UK population.

b. Comparisons

Table 5.1 employs the self-selection ratio and the chi-square test of statistical significance to compare the psychological type preferences of the current sample of UK churchgoers with the psychological type preferences of the UK population norms. Table 5.1 demonstrates that among churchgoers introverts, feeling types, and judging types are significantly ($P < .001$) overrepresented, compared to the UK population norms. Conversely, extraverts, thinking types, and perceiving types are significantly ($P < .001$) underrepresented compared to the UK population norms. Churchgoers with preferences for IJ, EJ, SF, SJ, NJ, TJ, FJ, IS, IF, EFJ, ISJ, INJ, ISTJ, ISFJ, INFJ, INTJ, and ESFJ are all significantly ($P < .001$) overrepresented, compared to the UK population norms. In addition, churchgoers with preferences for IN and dominant sensing are significantly ($P < .01$) overrepresented, compared to the UK population norms and churchgoers

Table 5.1 Type distribution
for the churchgoers in the UK
and SRTT comparison with UK population norms.

N = 2,718 += 1% of N I = Selection Ratio Index *P<.05. **P<.01 ***P<.001

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ n = 492 (18.1%) I = 1.32*** ++++ ++++ ++++ +++	ISFJ n = 632 (23.3%) I = 1.83*** ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ +++	INFJ n = 98 (3.6%) I = 2.10*** ++++	INTJ n = 126 (4.6%) I = 3.29*** ++++	E n = 1,171 (43.1%) I n = 1,547 (56.9%) S n = 2,145 (78.9%) N n = 573 (21.1%) T n = 1,067 (39.3%) F n = 1,651 (60.7%) J n = 2,291 (84.3%) P n = 427 (15.7%)	***I = 0.82 ***I = 1.19 I = 1.03 I = 0.90 ***I = 0.86 ***I = 1.12 ***I = 1.45 ***I = 0.38
ISTP n = 32 (1.2%) I = 0.18*** +	ISFP n = 77 (2.8%) I = 0.46*** +++	INFP n = 66 (2.4%) I = 0.76 ++	INTP n = 24 (0.9%) I = 0.36*** +	Pairs and Temperaments	
				IJ n = 1,348 (49.6%) IP n = 199 (7.3%) EP n = 228 (8.4%) EJ n = 943 (34.7%) ST n = 812 (29.9%) SF n = 1,333 (49.0%) NF n = 318 (11.7%) NT n = 255 (9.4%) SJ n = 1,919 (70.6%) SP n = 226 (8.3%) NP n = 201 (7.4%) NJ n = 372 (13.7%) TJ n = 956 (35.2%) TP n = 111 (4.1%) FP n = 316 (11.6%) FJ n = 1,335 (49.1%) IN n = 325 (12.0%) EN n = 290 (10.7%) IS n = 1,222 (45.0%) ES n = 881 (32.4%) ET n = 393 (14.5%) EF n = 778 (28.6%) IF n = 873 (32.1%) IT n = 674 (24.8%)	***I = 1.68 ***I = 0.40 ***I = 0.36 ***I = 1.21 ***I = 0.82 ***I = 1.22 *I = 0.84 I = 0.98 ***I = 1.43 ***I = 0.31 ***I = 0.50 ***I = 1.55 ***I = 1.24 ***I = 0.23 ***I = 0.48 ***I = 1.65 **I = 1.32 ***I = 0.65 ***I = 1.16 **I = 0.89 ***I = 0.66 I = 0.94 ***I = 1.35 I = 1.03
ESTP n = 15 (0.6%) I = 0.09*** +	ESFP n = 102 (3.8%) I = 0.43*** ++++	ENFP n = 71 (2.6%) I = 0.41*** +++	ENTP n = 40 (1.5%) I = 0.53** ++		
ESTJ n = 273 (10.0%) I = 0.97 ++++ ++++	ESFJ n = 522 (19.2%) I = 1.52*** ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++	ENFJ n = 83 (3.1%) I = 1.11 +++	ENTJ n = 65 (2.4%) I = 0.81 ++		

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types						
n	%	index	n	%	index	n	%	index				
E-TJ	338	12.4	0.93	I-TP	56	2.1	0.23***	Dt. T	394	14.5	0.65***	Charlotte Craig
E-FJ	605	22.3	1.45***	I-FP	143	5.3	0.57***	Dt. F	748	27.5	1.12*	Psychological types of
ES-P	117	4.3	0.30***	IS-J	1,124	41.4	1.56***	Dt. S	1,241	45.7	1.12**	
EN-P	111	4.1	0.45***	IN-J	224	8.2	2.64***	Dt. N	335	12.3	1.01	UK churchgoers

with preferences for dominant feeling are significantly ($P < .05$) overrepresented, compared to the UK population norms. Conversely, churchgoers with preferences for IP, EP, ST, SP, NP, TP, FP, EN, ET, ESP, ITP, IFP, ISTP, ISFP, INTP, ESTP, ESFP, ENFP, ENTP, and dominant thinking are all significantly ($P < .001$) underrepresented compared to the UK population norms. In addition, churchgoers with preferences for ES are significantly ($P < .01$) underrepresented compared to the UK population norms and churchgoers with preferences for NF are significantly ($P < .05$) underrepresented compared to the UK population norms.

c. Discussion

The findings of the current analysis present four points of interest. The first point of interest is the finding that the current sample of churchgoers prefers introversion significantly ($P < .001$) more frequently than the UK population norms. Both the current sample and previous studies of churchgoers (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999, Francis, 2002a) have demonstrated that UK churchgoers tend to prefer introversion over extraversion. Conversely, the UK population norms have shown preferences for extraversion (53%) over introversion (47%).

The second point of interest is the finding that the current sample of churchgoers does not differ significantly from the UK population norms in terms of the SN index. Both the current sample of churchgoers and the UK population norms report preferences for sensing over intuition.

The third point of interest is the finding that the current sample of churchgoers prefers feeling significantly ($P < .001$) more frequently than the UK population norms. Both the current sample and previous studies of churchgoers (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998,

2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999, Francis, 2002a) have demonstrated that UK churchgoers tend to prefer feeling over thinking. Although the UK population norms have also shown preferences for feeling (54%) over thinking (46%), this preference is significantly less pronounced than in the current sample, which has demonstrated a preference for feeling (61%) over thinking (39%).

The fourth point of interest is the finding that the current sample of churchgoers prefers judging significantly ($P < .001$) more frequently than the UK population norms. Both the current sample and previous studies of churchgoers (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999, Francis, 2002a) have demonstrated that UK churchgoers tend to prefer judging over thinking. Although the UK population norms have also shown preferences for judging (58%) over perceiving (42%), this preference this preference is significantly less pronounced than in the current sample, which has demonstrated a preference for judging (84%) over perceiving (16%).

To summarise, the current analysis demonstrates that UK churchgoers are significantly different from the general population on three of the four indices of psychological type. This finding suggests that the Christian church is attracting and retaining particular types more than others.

3. Comparisons with non-churchgoers

The above comparison of the current sample of UK churchgoers with the UK population norms has revealed some illuminating points of similarity and difference between the two samples. In order to determine how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers differ from those who do not attend church, the current sample will now be compared with a further group, which is held to be comprised of non-churchgoers.

a. Finding a sample of non-churchgoers

Kendall (1998) reports the psychological type preferences of two samples (taken from the overall UK population norms) who identify themselves as either agnostic or atheist. While it must be recognised that religious belief does not necessarily imply religious practice, self-identification with a religious group is positively correlated with religious practice (see, for example, Wulff, 1997). Likewise, it can be reasonably assumed that people who identify themselves as atheist or agnostic are unlikely to be churchgoers. Therefore, for the purpose of this study the sample of self-identified agnostics and the sample of self-identified atheists will be termed 'non-churchgoers'. If these two groups of non-churchgoers are contrasted with the current sample of churchgoers, then a clearer picture of the similarities and differences between non-churchgoers and churchgoers may be obtained.

Kendall (1998, p 50) found that among 83 participants in the UK describing themselves as agnostic, 53% preferred extraversion and 48% preferred introversion, 51% preferred intuition and 49% preferred sensing, 52% preferred thinking and 48% preferred feeling, and 54% preferred perceiving and 46% preferred judging. The most frequently occurring types in this sample were found to be ENFP (11%) and INTP (10%).

In addition, Kendall (1998, p 51) found that among 90 participants describing themselves as atheist, 52% preferred extraversion and 47% preferred introversion, 59% preferred sensing and 41% preferred intuition, 58% preferred thinking and 42% preferred feeling, and 58% preferred perceiving and 42% preferred judging. The most frequently occurring types in this sample were found to be ISTJ (14%) and ENFP (10%).

Table 5.2 Type distribution
for the churchgoers in the UK
and SRTT comparison with atheists and agnostics.

$N = 2,718$ += 1% of N I = Selection Ratio Index * $P < .05$ ** $P < .01$ *** $P < .001$

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ $n = 492$ (18.1%) $I = 1.57^*$ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++	ISFJ $n = 632$ (23.3%) $I = 4.47^{***}$ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++	INFJ $n = 98$ (3.6%) $I = 1.56$ ++++	INTJ $n = 126$ (4.6%) $I = 2.67$ +++++	E $n = 1,171$ (43.1%) * $I = 0.82$	I $n = 1,547$ (56.9%) * $I = 1.20$
ISTP $n = 32$ (1.2%) $I = 0.14^{***}$ +	ISFP $n = 77$ (2.8%) $I = 0.82$ +++	INFP $n = 66$ (2.4%) $I = 0.35^{***}$ ++	INTP $n = 24$ (0.9%) $I = 0.12^{***}$ +	S $n = 2,145$ (78.9%) *** $I = 1.45$	N $n = 573$ (21.1%) *** $I = 0.46$
ESTP $n = 15$ (0.6%) $I = 0.10^{***}$ +	ESFP $n = 102$ (3.8%) $I = 0.65$ ++++	ENFP $n = 71$ (2.6%) $I = 0.25^{***}$ +++	ENTP $n = 40$ (1.5%) $I = 0.20^{***}$ ++	T $n = 1,067$ (39.3%) *** $I = 0.71$	F $n = 1,651$ (60.7%) *** $I = 1.35$
ESTJ $n = 273$ (10.0%) $I = 1.45$ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++	ESFJ $n = 522$ (19.2%) $I = 2.77^{***}$ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++	ENFJ $n = 83$ (3.1%) $I = 0.75$ +++	ENTJ $n = 65$ (2.4%) $I = 0.46^*$ ++	J $n = 2,291$ (84.3%) *** $I = 1.92$	P $n = 427$ (15.7%) *** $I = 0.28$
				Pairs and Temperaments	
				IJ $n = 1,348$ (49.6%) *** $I = 2.38$	IP $n = 199$ (7.3%) *** $I = 0.28$
				EP $n = 228$ (8.4%) *** $I = 0.28$	EJ $n = 943$ (34.7%) ** $I = 1.50$
				ST $n = 812$ (29.9%) $I = 0.91$	SF $n = 1,333$ (49.0%) *** $I = 2.29$
				NF $n = 318$ (11.7%) *** $I = 0.49$	NT $n = 255$ (9.4%) *** $I = 0.43$
				SJ $n = 1,919$ (70.6%) *** $I = 2.30$	SP $n = 226$ (8.3%) *** $I = 0.35$
				NP $n = 201$ (7.4%) *** $I = 0.23$	NJ $n = 372$ (13.7%) $I = 1.03$
				TJ $n = 956$ (35.2%) ** $I = 1.38$	TP $n = 111$ (4.1%) *** $I = 0.14$
				FP $n = 316$ (11.6%) *** $I = 0.44$	FJ $n = 1,335$ (49.1%) *** $I = 2.66$
				IN $n = 325$ (12.0%) ** $I = 0.62$	EN $n = 290$ (10.7%) *** $I = 0.35$
				IS $n = 1,222$ (45.0%) *** $I = 1.57$	ES $n = 881$ (32.4%) * $I = 1.32$
				ET $n = 393$ (14.5%) *** $I = 0.57$	EF $n = 778$ (28.6%) $I = 1.05$
				IF $n = 873$ (32.1%) *** $I = 1.79$	IT $n = 674$ (24.8%) $I = 0.84$

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types						
n	%	index	n	%	index	n	%	index				
E-TJ	338	12.4	1.02	I-TP	56	2.1	0.13***	Dt. T	394	14.5	0.51***	Charlotte Craig Psychological types of UK churchgoers
E-FJ	605	22.3	2.03***	I-FP	143	5.3	0.51**	Dt. F	748	27.5	1.29	
ES-P	117	4.3	0.37***	IS-J	1,124	41.4	2.47***	Dt. S	1,241	45.7	1.61***	
EN-P	111	4.1	0.23***	IN-J	224	8.2	2.04*	Dt. N	335	12.3	0.56***	

b. Comparisons

The samples of agnostics and atheists, termed 'non-churchgoers' for the purposes of this study, are combined and then analysed in comparison with the current sample of UK churchgoers in table 5.2. Table 5.2 demonstrates that among churchgoers sensing, feeling types, and judging types are significantly ($P < .001$) overrepresented, compared to non-churchgoers. Conversely, intuitive types, thinking types, and judging types are significantly ($P < .001$) underrepresented compared to non-churchgoers. Churchgoers with preferences for IJ, SF, SJ, FJ, IS, IF, EFJ, ISJ, ISFJ, ESFJ, and dominant sensing are all significantly ($P < .001$) overrepresented, compared to non-churchgoers. In addition, churchgoers with preferences for EJ and TJ are significantly ($P < .01$) overrepresented, compared to non-churchgoers and churchgoers with preferences for introversion, ES, INJ, and ISTJ are significantly ($P < .05$) overrepresented, compared to non-churchgoers. Conversely, churchgoers with preferences for IP, EP, NF, NT, SP, NP, TP, FP, EN, ET, ESP, ENP, ITP, ISTP, INFP, INTP, ESTP, ENFP, ENTP, dominant intuition and dominant thinking are all significantly ($P < .001$) underrepresented compared to non-churchgoers. In addition, churchgoers with preferences for IN and IFP, are significantly ($P < .01$) underrepresented compared to non-churchgoers, and churchgoers with preferences for extraversion and ENTJ are significantly ($P < .05$) underrepresented compared to non-churchgoers.

c. Discussion

The findings of the current analysis present four points of interest. The first point of interest is the finding that the current sample of churchgoers prefers introversion significantly ($P < .05$) more frequently than non-churchgoers. The sample of non-churchgoers (atheists and agnostics) prefers extraversion (53%) over introversion (47%). This suggests that churchgoing is more attractive to those who prefer introversion. On the one hand, this result is surprising given that

churchgoing is essentially a social activity; church attendance involves meeting with fellow Christians and belonging to a community. On the other hand, it may be that introverts are attracted to church going because it provides the opportunity for reflection, contemplation, and exploring one's inner world through prayer. Non-churchgoers, such as the sample of agnostics and atheists, may be more attracted to the objective, outer world of people and things, rather than the subjective, inner world of spirituality and ideas.

The second point of interest is the finding that the current sample of churchgoers prefers sensing significantly ($P < .001$) more frequently than non-churchgoers. While the sample of non-churchgoers (atheists and agnostics) also prefers sensing (54%) over intuition (46%), this preference is significantly ($P < .001$) less frequent than among the current sample, which has demonstrated preference for sensing (79%) over intuition (21%). On the one hand, this finding is surprising, given that intuitive types may be hypothesised to be attracted to the splendour, mystery, and otherness of the Christian faith. Goldsmith and Wharton (1993, p 140) summarise the attractiveness of Christian spirituality to intuitive types, suggesting they are 'excited by the possibilities of the Gospel, its cosmic scope, its worldwide fellowship transcending cultural and racial and national barriers; they will respond to Kingdom theology, to the idea of transforming the world and of being stewards of creation'. On the other hand, this finding is perhaps not that surprising given that intuitive types are characterised by a focus on possibilities and variety; it may be that intuitive types find the conventions of traditional churchgoing too restricting. This is supported by the findings of previous studies, which have shown that, compared to intuitive types, sensing types are more likely to prefer traditional forms of Christian spirituality (Francis and Ross, 1997), hold more conservative Christian beliefs (Francis and Jones, 1998), and are less tolerant of religious uncertainty (Francis and Jones, 1999). Moreover, in one study sensing types

have been shown to hold a more positive attitude toward Christianity than perceiving types (Fearn, Francis and Wilcox, 2001), although this finding is not confirmed by other studies (Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, Robbins, Boxer, Lewis, McGuckin and McDaid, 2003).

The third point of interest is the finding that the current sample of churchgoers prefers feeling significantly ($P < .001$) more frequently than non-churchgoers. The sample of non-churchgoers (atheists and agnostics) prefers thinking (55%) over feeling (45%). This finding is not really surprising given that thinking types are characterised by an emphasis on logic, objectivity, and reason; it may well be that thinking types find churchgoing illogical, irrational, and sentimental. The finding that churchgoers prefer feeling more frequently than non-churchgoers may be seen to confirm most previous studies in the UK both among clergy (Irvine, 1989; Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001; Francis and Payne, 2002; Francis and Robbins, 2002) and laity (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, 2002a), which have demonstrated the overrepresentation of feeling types in the Christian church. Moreover, two studies have shown that feeling types record significantly higher scores than thinking types on the Francis Scale of Attitude toward Christianity (Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, Robbins, Boxer, Lewis, McGuckin and McDaid, 2003), although this finding is not confirmed by another study (Fearn, Francis and Wilcox, 2001).

The fourth point of interest is the finding that the current sample of churchgoers prefers judging significantly ($P < .001$) more frequently than non-churchgoers. The sample of non-churchgoers (atheists and agnostics) prefers perceiving (56%) over judging (44%). On the one hand, this finding is surprising, given that perceiving types may be 'attracted by the sense of spontaneous adventure within the Gospel, by the new insights which it can shed on events and by the sense

of there being more and more new things to discover, new experiences to reflect upon, and the sheer variety and scope of the worldwide Christian fellowship' (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993, p 141). On the other hand, this finding is perhaps not surprising given that perceiving types are attracted by openness, flexibility and responsiveness; it may be that perceiving types find that the fixed traditions and the absolute truth claims of the church are too rigid and constraining. This finding supports almost all studies in the UK, both among clergy (Irvine, 1989; Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001; Francis and Payne, 2002; Francis and Robbins, 2002) and the laity (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, 2002a), which have demonstrated the overrepresentation of judging types in the Christian church. Moreover, in one study judging types have been shown to hold a more positive attitude toward Christianity than perceiving types (Fearn, Francis and Wilcox, 2001), although this finding is not confirmed by other studies (Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, Robbins, Boxer, Lewis, McGuckin and McDaid, 2003).

To summarise, the current analysis demonstrates that churchgoers are significantly different to non-churchgoers on all of the four indices of psychological type. This finding implies that the church may be attracting more people of certain psychological types than others. It is possible that certain types are staying away from the church, perhaps not because of the message of the church but because of its structure and style. It could be that extraverts, intuitive types, thinking types, and perceiving types are marginalised within the church, and stay away as a consequence.

4. Comparisons with clergy

In order to better understand the findings of the current study, the type preference of the current sample will now be compared and contrasted with the psychological type preferences of clergy

found in previous studies in the UK. This analysis is intended to address two questions. The first question is concerned with which psychological type preferences churchgoers and clergy share and with the implications of these shared preferences. The second question is concerned with which psychological type preferences churchgoers and clergy do *not* share and with the implications of these divergent preferences.

a. Review of previous studies of UK Clergy

There have been five studies conducted among clergy in the UK for which details of participants psychological type preferences are provided (Irvine, 1989; Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001; Francis and Payne, 2002; Francis and Robbins, 2002). Unless stated otherwise, each of these studies makes use of the MBTI.

Irvine (1989) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 147 clergy in the Church of Scotland. It was found that 58% of the sample preferred introversion and 42% preferred extraversion, 61% preferred sensing and 39% preferred intuition, 69% preferred feeling and 31% preferred thinking, and 72% preferred judging and 28% preferred perceiving. Irvine (1989) does not provide complete details of the 16 psychological types.

Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) also do not provide complete details of the 16 psychological types for their samples. Nor do they provide details of the number of participants in the samples or participants' background. However, they do present the psychological type preferences of four samples of British clergy. Within the first sample (curates in a British province) it was found that 71% preferred introversion and 29% preferred extraversion, 52% preferred sensing and 48% preferred intuition, 60% preferred feeling and 40% preferred thinking, and 55% preferred judging

and 45% preferred perceiving. Within the second sample (clergy involved in post-ordination training in an English diocese) it was found that 62% preferred introversion and 38% preferred extraversion, 74% preferred intuition and 26% preferred sensing, 64% preferred feeling and 36% preferred thinking, and 70% preferred judging and 30% preferred perceiving. Within the third sample (clergy involved in post-ordination training in an English diocese) it was found that 67% preferred introversion and 33% preferred extraversion, 67% preferred intuition and 33% preferred sensing, 56% preferred feeling and 44% preferred thinking, and 72% preferred judging and 28% preferred perceiving. Within the fourth sample (clergy in an English diocese) it was found that 69% preferred introversion and 31% preferred extraversion, 72% preferred intuition and 28% preferred sensing, 72% preferred feeling and 28% preferred thinking, and 66% preferred judging and 34% preferred perceiving.

Francis, Payne and Jones (2001) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 427 male Church in Wales clergy. It was found that 59% of this sample preferred introversion and 42% preferred extraversion, 57% preferred sensing and 44% preferred intuition, 69% preferred feeling and 31% preferred thinking, and 68% preferred judging and 32% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (20%) and ESFJ (13%).

Francis and Payne (2002) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 191 male Church in Wales clergy. It was found that 61% of their sample preferred introversion and 39% preferred extraversion, 61% preferred sensing and 39% preferred intuition, 64% preferred feeling and 36% preferred thinking, and 73% preferred judging and 27% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (19%) and ISTJ

(15%). However, Francis and Payne (2002, p 129) note that the 191 male clergy who participated in this study 'were part of the larger sample of 427 clergymen who completed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, as reported by Francis, Payne and Jones (2001)'. For this reason, the data provided by Francis and Payne (2002) will be excluded from the current analysis.

Francis and Robbins (2002) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 57 male evangelical church leaders using the FPTTS. It was found that 51% of their sample preferred introversion and 49% preferred extraversion, 53% preferred sensing and 47% preferred intuition, 56% preferred feeling and 44% preferred thinking, and 68% preferred judging and 32% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ESFJ (18%) and ISFJ (11%).

Generally, the results of the studies by Irvine (1989), Goldsmith and Wharton (1993), Francis, Payne and Jones (2001), and Francis and Robbins (2002) suggest that clergy in the UK tend to prefer introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving. However, three of the four samples provided by Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) conflict with all other studies of UK clergy which suggest that clergy in the UK prefer sensing over intuition. Be that as it may, Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) do not provide details of the number of participants in their study or information about their backgrounds. Therefore, the generalisability of this study is limited.

In order to analyse further how far the findings of the current study are consistent with the findings of previous studies of churchgoers in the UK a secondary analysis will now be conducted. The current sample of churchgoers will be compared with a base sample of male UK

clergy, using the data provided by Francis, Payne and Jones (2001) and Francis and Robbins (2002). As Irvine (1989) and Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) do not provide complete details of the 16 psychological types for their samples, their findings cannot be included in this analysis.

b. Comparisons

When the data from the two samples of UK clergy (Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001; Francis and Robbins, 2002) were amalgamated a total sample of 484 was achieved. For this amalgamated sample of UK clergy the following psychological type preferences were found: 58% prefer introversion and 42% prefer extraversion, 56% prefer sensing and 44% prefer intuition, 67% prefer feeling and 33% prefer thinking, and 68% prefer judging and 32% prefer perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (19%) and ESFJ (13%).

A statistical analysis of this sample of UK clergy with the current sample of UK churchgoers may be seen in table 5.3. Table 5.3 demonstrates that among churchgoers sensing and judging types are significantly ($P < .001$) overrepresented, compared to clergy. Conversely, intuitive types and perceiving types are significantly ($P < .001$) underrepresented compared to clergy. Churchgoers with preferences for IJ, EJ, ST, SF, SJ, TJ, IS, ES, ISJ, ISTJ, ESTJ, and dominant sensing are all significantly ($P < .001$) overrepresented, compared to clergy. In addition, churchgoers with preferences for thinking, ESFJ, and ETJ are significantly ($P < .01$) overrepresented, compared to non-churchgoers. Conversely, churchgoers with preferences for IP, EP, NF, NT, NP, NJ, TP, FP, IN, EN, ENP, ITP, IFP, INFJ, INFP, INTP, ENFP and dominant intuition are all significantly ($P < .001$) underrepresented compared to clergy. In addition, churchgoers with preferences for

Table 5.3 Type distribution
for the churchgoers in the UK
and SRTT comparison with UK clergy.

$N = 2,718$ $+ = 1\%$ of N $I =$ Selection Ratio Index $*P < .05$ $**P < .01$ $***P < .001$

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ $n = 492$ (18.1%) $I = 1.86^{***}$ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++	ISFJ $n = 632$ (23.3%) $I = 1.21$ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++	INFJ $n = 98$ (3.6%) $I = 0.56^{**}$ ++++	INTJ $n = 126$ (4.6%) $I = 0.77$ +++++	E $n = 1,171$ (43.1%) I $n = 1,547$ (56.9%)	$I = 1.02$ $I = 0.99$
ISTP $n = 32$ (1.2%) $I = 1.14$ +	ISFP $n = 77$ (2.8%) $I = 0.76$ +++	INFP $n = 66$ (2.4%) $I = 0.32^{***}$ ++	INTP $n = 24$ (0.9%) $I = 0.22^{***}$ +	S $n = 2,145$ (78.9%) N $n = 573$ (21.1%)	$***I = 1.40$ $***I = 0.48$
ESTP $n = 15$ (0.6%) $I = 0.33^{**}$ +	ESFP $n = 102$ (3.8%) $I = 1.30$ ++++	ENFP $n = 71$ (2.6%) $I = 0.31^{***}$ +++	ENTP $n = 40$ (1.5%) $I = 0.59$ ++	T $n = 1,067$ (39.3%) F $n = 1,651$ (60.7%)	$**I = 1.20$ $**I = 0.90$
ESTJ $n = 273$ (10.0%) $I = 2.11^{***}$ +++++ +++++	ESFJ $n = 522$ (19.2%) $I = 1.43^{**}$ +++++ +++++ +++++	ENFJ $n = 83$ (3.1%) $I = 0.55^{**}$ +++	ENTJ $n = 65$ (2.4%) $I = 0.77$ ++	J $n = 2,291$ (84.3%) P $n = 427$ (15.7%)	$***I = 1.24$ $***I = 0.49$
				Pairs and Temperaments	
				IJ $n = 1,348$ (49.6%) IP $n = 199$ (7.3%) EP $n = 228$ (8.4%) EJ $n = 943$ (34.7%)	$***I = 1.20$ $***I = 0.45$ $***I = 0.54$ $***I = 1.29$
				ST $n = 812$ (29.9%) SF $n = 1,333$ (49.0%) NF $n = 318$ (11.7%) NT $n = 255$ (9.4%)	$***I = 1.74$ $***I = 1.25$ $***I = 0.42$ $***I = 0.61$
				SJ $n = 1,919$ (70.6%) SP $n = 226$ (8.3%) NP $n = 201$ (7.4%) NJ $n = 372$ (13.7%)	$***I = 1.50$ $I = 0.89$ $***I = 0.33$ $***I = 0.61$
				TJ $n = 956$ (35.2%) TP $n = 111$ (4.1%) FP $n = 316$ (11.6%) FJ $n = 1,335$ (49.1%)	$***I = 1.49$ $***I = 0.45$ $***I = 0.51$ $I = 1.10$
				IN $n = 325$ (12.0%) EN $n = 290$ (10.7%) IS $n = 1,222$ (45.0%) ES $n = 881$ (32.4%)	$***I = 0.48$ $***I = 0.49$ $***I = 1.35$ $***I = 1.48$
				ET $n = 393$ (14.5%) EF $n = 778$ (28.6%) IF $n = 873$ (32.1%) IT $n = 674$ (24.8%)	$I = 1.21$ $I = 0.94$ $*I = 0.87$ $I = 1.10$

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types						
<i>n</i>	%	<i>index</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>index</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>index</i>				
E-TJ	338	12.4	1.58**	I-TP	56	2.1	0.42***	Dt. T	394	14.5	1.13	Charlotte Craig Psychological types of UK churchgoers
E-FJ	605	22.3	1.17	I-FP	143	5.3	0.46***	Dt. F	748	27.5	0.91	
ES-P	117	4.3	0.95	IS-J	1,124	41.4	1.43***	Dt. S	1,241	45.7	1.36***	
EN-P	111	4.1	0.37***	IN-J	224	8.2	0.66**	Dt. N	335	12.3	0.53***	

feeling, INFJ, ESTP, ENFJ, and INJ are significantly ($P < .01$) underrepresented compared to clergy, and churchgoers with preferences for IF are significantly ($P < .05$) underrepresented compared to clergy.

c. Discussion

The findings of the current analysis present three points of interest. The first point of interest is the finding that the current sample of churchgoers prefers sensing significantly ($P < .001$) more frequently than clergy. This finding is of interest as it suggests that although sensing types are more frequently found among churchgoers than intuitive types, clergy are more likely to prefer intuition than both churchgoers and the general population. While only 56% of clergy prefer sensing, 77% of the UK population norms prefer sensing, and in the current sample 79% of the churchgoers prefer sensing. This finding coheres with the theories of Goldsmith and Wharton (1993, p 143), who suggest that many intuitive types 'move into ministry or into church leadership as part of their search for meaning... they tend to look at reality holistically, and so it is not surprising that they are drawn into the ministry in a greater proportion than their numbers in the population generally'.

The disparity between the frequency of sensing types among churchgoers and clergy may be the cause of conflict in church life. It is probable that many sensing types find themselves led by an intuitive cleric. The sensing type may be baffled by the intuitive type minister's focus on future possibilities, innovative changes, and inspiration; the intuitive type minister may be disheartened by the sensing type's focus on tradition, practical day-to-day realities, and established procedure. At worst, this situation may lead to a dissatisfied congregation, who feel unsupported by a minister with his or her head in the clouds. It may also lead to the minister experiencing burnout,

feeling frustrated by an unimaginative, sterile congregation. However, at best, this situation may lead to appreciation and development of different methods of perception on the part of both the minister and members of the congregation. It may also lead to a greater appreciation and inclusion of the underrepresented intuitive types in the congregation.

The second point of interest is the finding that the current sample of churchgoers prefers thinking significantly ($P < .01$) more frequently than clergy. This finding is of interest as it suggests that although feeling types are more frequently found among churchgoers than thinking types, clergy are more likely to prefer feeling than churchgoers. While only 33% of clergy prefer thinking, 39% of the current sample of churchgoers prefer thinking. This is particularly interesting given that the sample of clergy is comprised entirely of males, while the sample of churchgoers is comprised of just 35% males. It is both a theoretically and an empirically well-established phenomenon that men prefer thinking more frequently than women, while women prefer feeling more frequently than men (Jung, 1971; Kendall, 1998; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998).

The disparity between the frequency of thinking types among churchgoers and clergy may be the cause of conflict in church life. It is probable that some thinking types find themselves led by a feeling type cleric. The thinking type may be baffled by the feeling type minister's focus on harmony, compassion, community, and unconditional love; the feeling type minister may be disheartened by the thinking type's focus on justice, truth, wisdom, and reason. At worst, this situation may lead to a dissatisfied congregation, who feel unsupported by a sentimental, irrational minister, who is unable to make tough but necessary decisions. It may also lead to the minister experiencing burnout, feeling frustrated by a hostile, unfeeling, cold-hearted

congregation. However, at best, this situation may lead to an appreciation and development of different methods of judgment on the part of both the minister and members of the congregation. It may also lead to a greater appreciation and inclusion of the underrepresented thinking types in the congregation.

The third point of interest is the finding that the current sample of churchgoers prefers judging significantly ($P < .001$) more frequently than clergy. This finding is of interest as it suggests that although judging types are more frequently found among churchgoers than perceiving types, clergy are more likely to prefer perceiving than churchgoers. While only 68% of clergy prefer judging, 84% of the current sample of churchgoers prefer judging.

The disparity between the frequency of judging types among churchgoers and clergy may be the cause of conflict in church life. It is probable that some judging types find themselves led by a perceiving type cleric. The judging type may be baffled by the perceiving type minister's focus on spontaneity, flexibility, and openness; the perceiving type minister may be disheartened by the judging type's focus on routine, structure, and closure. At worst, this situation may lead to a dissatisfied congregation, who feel unsupported by a disorganised, fickle minister, who is unable to make and stick with decisions. It may also lead to the minister experiencing burnout, feeling frustrated by a stubborn, inflexible, closed congregation. However, at best, this situation may lead to an appreciation and development of different attitudes toward the outside world on the part of both the minister and members of the congregation. It may also lead to a greater appreciation and inclusion of the underrepresented perceiving types in the congregation.

To summarise, the current analysis demonstrates that churchgoers are significantly different to

clergy on three of the four indices of psychological type. This finding implies that the church may be attracting more of certain psychological types than others. It is possible that certain types are staying away from the church, perhaps not because of the message of the church but because of its structure and style. It could be that sensing, thinking, and judging types feel unsupported by more intuitive, feeling, and perceiving clergy. It may be that STJs feel marginalised within the church, and either stay away as a consequence or remain while experiencing dissatisfaction.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has assessed the psychological type preferences of the current sample in comparison with three other samples. First, in order to determine how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers reflects the psychological type preferences of the UK as a whole, the current sample was compared with the UK population norms. Second, in order to determine how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers differ from the psychological type preferences of those who do not claim to have a faith, the current sample was compared with an amalgamated sample of self-identified agnostics and atheists. Third, in order to determine points of similarity and difference between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and those of clergy, the current sample was compared with an amalgamated sample of clergy. From these three analyses, four general points may be noted. The first point is that churchgoers in the current sample prefer introversion over extraversion, and prefer introversion significantly more frequently than the UK population norms. The second point is that churchgoers in the current sample prefer sensing over intuition, and prefer sensing significantly more frequently than non-churchgoers and clergy. The third point is that churchgoers in the current sample prefer feeling over thinking, and prefer feeling significantly more frequently than the UK population norms and non-churchgoers; however churchgoers in the current sample prefer feeling significantly less

frequently than the clergy. The fourth point is that churchgoers in the current sample prefer judging over perceiving significantly more frequently than the UK population norms, non-churchgoers, and clergy. This chapter has discussed the implications of these findings. The next chapter will analyse the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in relation to their backgrounds, focusing on the variables of sex, age, marital status, and church environment.

-CHAPTER SIX-

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Sex**
 - a. Previous Studies Among Christian Groups
 - b. Current Study
 - c. Discussion
- 3. Age**
 - a. Previous Studies Among Christian Groups
 - b. Current Study
 - c. Discussion
- 4. Marital status**
 - a. Previous Studies Among Christian Groups
 - b. Current Study
 - c. Discussion
- 5. Church Environment**
 - a. Previous Studies Among Christian Groups
 - b. Current Study
 - c. Discussion
- 6. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The previous chapter analysed the psychological type preferences of the current sample in comparison with the UK population norms, non-churchgoers, and clergy. This chapter will analyse the psychological type preferences of participants in relation to key demographic characteristics, focusing on the variables of sex, age, marital status, and church environment. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and sex, age, marital status, and church environment will be reviewed and the findings of the current study will be compared and contrasted with the findings of previous studies in relation to each of these variables. The implications of these analyses will be discussed and conclusions will be drawn about the relationship between psychological type and key demographic characteristics.

2. Sex

Sex has always been accepted as related to psychological type preferences. Specifically, it is both a theoretically and an empirically well-established phenomenon that sex influences psychological type preferences on the TF index (Jung, 1971; Kendall, 1998; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998). Jung (1971) himself believed that the TF index was predominantly determined by sex. Jung saw thinking as primarily occurring among men; conversely, he saw feeling as primarily occurring among women. Jung (1971, p 356) argued that feeling is 'undeniably a more obvious characteristic of feminine psychology than thinking', that 'the most pronounced feeling types are to be found in women', and that 'examples of this type... are, almost without exception women'.

Empirical evidence does not support Jung's (1971) hypothesis unequivocally. There are many men who demonstrate feeling psychological type preferences and many women who demonstrate

thinking psychological type preferences. Nonetheless, men prefer thinking more frequently than women, while women prefer feeling more frequently than men as demonstrated in the UK population norms. Kendall (1998) reports on the UK population norms for men (N = 748) and for women (N = 865). She found that 65% of men in the UK prefer thinking and 35% prefer feeling. Conversely, she found that 70% of women in the UK prefer feeling and 30% prefer thinking. This finding is also reflected in the United States of America. Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer (1998) report on the United States of America population norms for men (N = 1,478) and for women (N = 1,531). They found that 57% of men in the United States of America prefer thinking and 43% prefer feeling. Conversely, they found that 76% of women in the United States of America prefer feeling and 24% prefer thinking.

It is currently unclear whether these sex-related differences on the TF index are due to genuine type differences between the sexes or to socialisation. Although psychological type preferences are held to be innate and unchanging (Jung, 1971, p 331), it is also acknowledged by type theorists that people may give answers to psychological type indicators that do not reflect their 'True Type' (see, for example, Carr, 1997). It may be the case that social influences cause men and women to give answers that reflect their perception of their gender role. In this way, Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer (1998, p 122) identify that 'social demands can also provide different pressures for men and women on the T-F dichotomy. Men are encouraged toward more Thinking activities and women toward more Feeling activities'.

Regardless of whether these differences are due to genuine disparities between the psychological type preferences of the sexes or are due to social demands, it remains true that empirical studies have consistently found that men and women differ in their psychological type preferences on

the TF index.

In order to understand the relationship between sex and psychological type preferences in the current sample, the relationship between sex and psychological type preferences in previous studies of Christian groups will first be outlined. The current sample will then be divided on the basis of sex; the psychological type preferences of male churchgoers and female churchgoers will be compared and contrasted. Differences between the psychological type preferences of men and women will be investigated.

a. Previous studies among Christian groups

A number of empirical studies among Christian churchgoers, leaders, and seminarians have distinguished between samples on the basis of sex (see, for example, Ross, 1995; Oswald and Kroeger, 1988; Francis, Penson and Jones, 2001). Unless stated otherwise, each of these studies makes use of the MBTI.

Ross (1995) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 175 Anglophone Catholic Canadian churchgoers, distinguishing on the basis of sex. Among Anglophone Catholic men (N = 59) it was found that 54% of the sample preferred introversion and 46% preferred extraversion, 51% preferred sensing and 49% preferred intuition, 59% preferred thinking and 41% preferred feeling, and 59% preferred judging and 41% preferred perceiving. Among Anglophone Catholic women (N = 116) it was found that 53% of the sample preferred introversion and 47% preferred extraversion, 54% preferred sensing and 46% preferred intuition, 75% preferred feeling and 25% preferred thinking, and 61% preferred judging and 39% preferred perceiving. Ross (1995) found that there were significantly ($P < .001$) more feeling types among

the sample of Anglophone Catholic women than among the sample of Anglophone Catholic men. It seems likely that the stronger preference for feeling among female Catholics is due to sex differences, as this coheres with previous empirical findings (Kendall, 1998; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998).

Oswald and Kroeger (1988) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 1,319 clergy in the United States of America, distinguishing on the basis of sex. Among male clergy (N = 1,247) it was found that 62% preferred extraversion and 38% preferred introversion, 56% preferred intuition and 44% preferred sensing, 68% preferred feeling and 32% preferred thinking, and 71% preferred judging and 29% preferred perceiving. Among female clergy (N = 72) it was found that 53% preferred extraversion and 47% preferred introversion, 76% preferred intuition and 24% preferred sensing, 68% preferred feeling and 32% preferred thinking, and 51% preferred perceiving and 49% preferred judging. Oswald and Kroeger (1988) make the caveat that the sample of female clergy is too small to make any reliable generalisations. However, their sample suggests that female clergy tend to be more introverted, more intuitive, and more perceiving than male clergy. Given that very few studies have investigated the psychological type preferences of female clergy this seems to be an area in need of further research, in order to determine if Oswald and Kroeger's (1988) findings are representative of female clergy. It is possible that different types of women are attracted to the role of cleric, compared with the types of men that are attracted to this role. Given that the role of cleric is a traditionally male role it is perhaps unsurprising that this career attracts innovative (N) and flexible (P) women.

Francis, Penson and Jones (2001) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 491 Bible college students in the UK, distinguishing on the basis of sex. Among male Bible

college students (N = 278) it was found that 53% preferred introversion and 47% extraversion, 66% preferred sensing and 34% intuition, 50% preferred thinking and 50% preferred feeling, and 62% preferred judging and 38% preferred perceiving. Among female Bible college students (N = 213) it was found that 54% preferred introversion and 46% extraversion, 66% preferred sensing and 34% intuition, 81% preferred feeling and 19% preferred thinking, and 68% preferred judging and 32% preferred perceiving. This study would suggest that female Bible college students prefer feeling over thinking more frequently than male Bible college students. It seems likely that this difference is due to sex differences, as this coheres with previous empirical findings (Kendall, 1998; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998).

These studies (Oswald and Kroeger, 1988; Francis, Penson and Jones, 2001), with the exception of Ross (1995), fail to analyse statistically the relationship between sex and psychological type preferences within their samples. However, one general trend may be noted; these empirical studies reveal that in Christian samples men generally tend to prefer thinking more frequently than women (see, Ross, 1995; Francis, Penson and Jones, 2001). As has already been noted, it seems probable that this trend is due to sex differences, as this coheres with previous empirical findings (Kendall, 1998; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998). In contrast, Oswald and Kroeger (1988) found that both male and female clergy tend to prefer feeling. However, this finding is consistent with other studies of male clergy (MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz, 1986; Irvine, 1989; Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001; Francis and Payne, 2002; Francis and Robbins, 2002) which have shown that male clergy tend to prefer feeling more frequently than thinking. Goldsmith and Wharton (1993) suggest that feeling types are more frequently drawn to the ministry than thinking types, regardless of sex.

In addition, Oswald and Kroeger (1988) found in their study of clergy that female clergy tend to be more introverted, more intuitive, and more perceiving than male clergy. However, Ross (1995) and Francis, Penson and Jones (2001) found no differences between men and women on the EI, SN, and JP indices. In their studies both more men and more women demonstrated preferences for introversion, sensing, and judging.

Having reviewed these empirical studies among Christian groups which differentiate on the basis of sex, the following four hypotheses may be suggested concerning the current sample. First, that there will be no significant relationship between sex and preferences on the EI index. Second, that there will be no significant relationship between sex and preferences on the SN index. Third, that male churchgoers will prefer thinking significantly more frequently than female churchgoers. Fourth, that there will be no significant relationship between sex and preferences on the JP index.

b. Current study

Within the current sample, there was a clear majority of female participants (65%), compared with male participants (35%). As noted in chapter 3, this reflects current research regarding churchgoers which suggests that female churchgoers significantly outnumber male churchgoers (Brierley, 1991a, Gelder and Escott, 2001).

The psychological type preferences of male churchgoers in the current sample (N = 947) are outlined in chapter 4, table 4.2. Among this sample 65% of male churchgoers preferred introversion and 35% preferred extraversion, 74% preferred sensing and 26% preferred intuition, 58% preferred thinking and 42% preferred feeling, and 83% preferred judging and 17% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISTJ (28%)

and ISFJ (17%).

The psychological type preferences of female churchgoers in the current sample (N = 1,735) are outlined in chapter 4, table 4.3. Among this sample 53% of female churchgoers preferred introversion and 47% preferred extraversion, 81% preferred sensing and 19% preferred intuition, 71% preferred feeling and 29% preferred thinking, and 85% preferred judging and 15% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (27%) and ESFJ (24%).

Table 6.1 T-Test: Sex and psychological type preferences

Scale	<u>Male churchgoers</u>		<u>Female churchgoers</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.39	2.81	5.05	2.95	-5.62	.001
Introversion	5.61	2.81	4.95	2.95	5.62	.001
Sensing	7.07	2.42	7.63	2.28	-5.95	.001
Intuition	3.93	2.42	3.37	2.28	5.95	.001
Thinking	6.12	2.51	4.50	2.31	16.85	.001
Feeling	4.88	2.51	6.50	2.31	-16.85	.001
Judging	8.49	2.47	8.37	2.47	1.18	NS
Perceiving	1.51	2.60	1.63	2.47	-1.18	NS

In table 6.1 the mean FPTS scores of male and female churchgoers are compared using an Independent Samples T-Test. Table 6.1 demonstrates that there are significant (P< .001) differences between males and females on the FPTS extraversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, and feeling scales. In the current sample, female churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS extraversion, sensing, and feeling scales than male churchgoers. In contrast, male churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS introversion, intuition, and thinking

scales than female churchgoers.

c. Discussion

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between sex and psychological type preferences on the EI index. Although both male and female churchgoers prefer introversion over extraversion, female churchgoers achieve significantly ($P < .001$) higher scores on the FPTS E scale than male churchgoers. On the one hand, this result is surprising as it does not reflect the findings of previous studies (see, for example, Ross, 1995; Oswald and Kroeger, 1988; Francis, Penson and Jones). Most of these studies report that both male and female members of Christian groups prefer introversion in roughly equal proportions, with the exception of Oswald and Kroeger (1988), who found that both male and female clergy preferred extraversion in roughly equal proportions. On the other hand, this result is not so surprising given that, according to the population norms provided by Kendall (1998), women in the UK prefer extraversion more frequently than men (57% compared with 47%). It may be that the current sample reflects a larger trend in the UK for women to prefer extraversion.

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between sex and psychological type preferences on the SN index. Although both male and female churchgoers prefer sensing over intuition, male churchgoers achieved significantly ($P < .001$) higher scores on the FPTS N scale than female churchgoers. On the one hand this finding is surprising as it conflicts with the studies of Ross (1995) and Penson and Jones (2001) who found that men and women preferred sensing in roughly equal proportions. This finding also conflicts with the study of Oswald and Kroeger (1988) who found that female

clergy preferred intuition more frequently than male clergy. On the other hand, this result is not so surprising given that, according to the population norms provided by Kendall (1998), men in the UK prefer intuition more frequently than women (27% compared with 21%). It may be that the current sample reflects a larger trend in the UK for men to prefer intuition.

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that male churchgoers will prefer thinking more frequently than female churchgoers. Male churchgoers achieved significantly ($P < .001$) higher scores on the FPTST scale than female churchgoers. Within this sample, male churchgoers prefer thinking (58%) over feeling (42%), while female churchgoers prefer feeling (71%) over thinking (29%). This reflects both the findings of previous studies among Christian groups (Ross, 1995; Francis, Penson and Jones, 2001) and UK population norms (Kendall, 1998).

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between sex and psychological type preferences on the JP index. Both male and female churchgoers in the current sample. Although female churchgoers prefer judging slightly more frequently (85%) than male churchgoers (83%), there is no significant difference between male and female churchgoers psychological type preferences on the JP index.

The finding that male churchgoers are significantly more likely to display preferences for introversion, intuition, and thinking, while female churchgoers are significantly more likely to prefer extraversion, sensing, and feeling, has a number of implications for the church. In particular, given that significantly more women attend church than men (see, for example, Brierley, 1991a; Gelder and Escott, 2001), it may be argued that attention to psychological type

preferences may facilitate an increase in male churchgoing.

It has been noted that the preference of male churchgoers for introversion, intuition, and thinking reflects larger trends in the UK population norms (Kendall, 1998). It is possible that one of the reasons for the smaller number of male churchgoers is that the church over-emphasises issues and actions that appeal to extraverts, sensing types, and feeling types. Potential male churchgoers may feel that they have to conform to an environment that is not only highly feminised, but goes against their natural preferences of attitude and behaviour.

3. Age

It is generally held among type theorists that a person's psychological type preferences do not change over time (see, for example, Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998). This principle is based on Jung's (1971) original paradigm, for he suggested that psychological type preferences must have 'some kind of biological foundation' (Jung, 1971, p 331). He saw psychological type preferences as emerging early in childhood, regardless of environmental conditions suggesting that their origin is in 'nature' rather than 'nurture' and suggested that psychological type preferences are both innate and unchanging.

Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer (1998) concede that people may develop their inferior and tertiary functions as they age. However, they do not see this as changing one's psychological type preferences because 'type does not change over the life span' (p 28). Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer (1998) are able to support this assertion empirically. Using differential item functioning (DIF) to determine the relationship between age and the four type indices of the MBTI, they found that '*no items* from any of these scales can be flagged as producing appreciable

levels of DIF' (p 153, authors' emphasis) when using a stringent cut-off point. However, Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer (1998) do not specify the number of participants involved in this analysis.

While people may retain an unchanging type preference, how this is expressed may 'vary in accordance with different stages of life and different life circumstances' (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998, p 28). Indeed, environmental interference may cause a person's innate psychological type preferences to be distorted or suppressed. In this way, while psychological type preferences do not change over time, the way a person *reports* their psychological type preferences may change during their lifespan. In addition, Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer (1998, p 5) argue that 'younger persons are generally less clear and consistent in their preferences than are mature individuals'. This is because young people are presumed to have less developed self-insight. In this way, again, psychological type preferences may be *reported* incorrectly.

Kendall (1998) does not discuss the relationship between age and psychological type preferences in the UK population norms. However, McCrae and Costa (1989) investigated the psychological type preferences of 468 people aged 19 to 93. They found that age was negatively correlated ($r = -.28, P < .01$) with the JP index, denoting that older participants were more likely than younger participants to prefer judging over perceiving. Warr, Miles and Platts (2001) examined the correlation between age and psychological type preferences among a sample of 1,240 people aged 16 to 64. They found that preferences on the EI, SN, and JP indices were significantly correlated with age. They report that older participants were more likely than younger participants to prefer introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, and judging over

perceiving. In contrast, they report that younger participants preferred extraversion over introversion, intuition over sensing, and perceiving over judging. Preferences on the TF index were found to be unrelated to age. Warr, Miles and Platts (2001) do not present details of the statistical significance or strength of the correlation and, therefore, it is difficult to generalise from this finding.

If psychological type preferences are correlated with age as the findings of McCrae and Costa (1989) and Warr, Miles and Platts (2001) suggest then there are two possible explanations for this phenomenon. On the one hand, it may be that people change the way they *report* their psychological type preferences, that is, people report that they prefer introversion, sensing, and judging more frequently as they become older. On the other hand, it may be that the social environment has changed over time, from promoting and supporting introversion, sensing, and judging behaviours and attitudes, to promoting and supporting extraversion, intuition, and perceiving behaviours and attitudes. The latter explanation seems likely given the increasing emphasis on activity and communication (E), ideas and possibilities (N), and spontaneity and flexibility (P) in modern, western society.

a. Previous studies among Christian groups

No published data have been identified as being specifically concerned with the relationship between age and psychological type preferences among broadly defined Christian groups. However, a number of studies have been conducted among young churchgoers, which may then be compared with older churchgoers.

For example, Jones and Francis (1999) investigated the psychological type preferences of a

sample of 82 student churchgoers, using the KTS. It was found that participants preferred intuition (61%) over sensing (39%), a finding which conflicts with most other studies of churchgoers (see, for example, Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Ross, 1995; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Rehak, 1998; Francis, 2002a).

Similarly, Gerhardt (1983) investigated the psychological type preferences of 60 teenagers in the Unitarian Universalist movement in the United States of America. It was found that 85% of the sample preferred intuition and 15% preferred sensing, a finding which again conflicts with the findings of most other studies of churchgoers.

These studies by Jones and Francis (1999) and Gerhardt (1983) suggest that younger churchgoers may be more likely to prefer intuition over sensing than older churchgoers, a supposition that is supported by the findings of Warr, Miles and Platts (2001).

In almost all studies among religious professionals and among Christian affiliates there have been clear preferences for judging over perceiving with two exceptions (Gerhardt, 1983; Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin, 1989). Gerhardt (1983) found that in a sample of teenagers in the Unitarian Universalist movement 85% preferred perceiving and 15% preferred judging. On the one hand, the Unitarian Universalist movement is an extremely liberal Christian movement and it may be argued that the high percentage of perceiving types is due to denominational differences rather than age. On the other hand, Gerhardt (1983) also conducted a study among adult affiliates of the Unitarian Universalist movement, and found that 67% of reported judging psychological type preferences. This suggests that age may be an influential variable on the JP index.

Similarly, Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989) investigated the psychological type preferences of a mixed sample of 170 people who considered themselves to be Christians. It was found that 52% of this sample preferred perceiving and 48% preferred judging. Given that the average age of participants was 26 years (much lower than would normally be expected in a church context, see, for example, Brierley, 1991a, 2000; Gelder and Escott, 2001; Francis, 2002b), it is possible that the relatively young age of the majority of the sample may contribute to its higher perceiving scores. This supposition is supported by the findings of McCrae and Costa (1989) and Warr, Miles and Platts (2001).

On the basis of these studies it can be argued that there is some limited evidence to suggest that age is related to psychological type preferences on the SN and JP indices.

It is difficult to make predictions about the current study of churchgoers based on previous studies among churchgoers. However, it is possible to make four tentative hypotheses. First, that younger churchgoers will prefer extraversion significantly more frequently than older churchgoers. Second, that younger churchgoers will prefer intuition significantly more frequently than older churchgoers. Third, that there will be no significant relationship between age and preferences on the TF index. Fourth, that younger churchgoers will prefer perceiving significantly more frequently than older churchgoers.

b. Current study

In order to analyse the relationship between psychological type preferences and age, the current sample of UK churchgoers was divided into four groups on the basis of age. Within the current sample 9% of participants (N = 255) reported that they are aged 29 years or younger; this group

is termed '≤29 churchgoers'. Within the current sample 28% of participants (N = 750) reported that they are aged between 30 and 49 years; this group is termed '30-49 churchgoers'. Within the current sample 41% of participants (N = 1,104) reported that they are aged between 50 and 69 years; this group is termed '50-69 churchgoers'. Within the current sample 21% of participants (N = 581) reported that they are aged 70 years or older; this group is termed '≥70 churchgoers'.

In table 6.2 the FPTTS scores of each of the four age groups are compared using a F-Test. Table 6.2 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences of psychological type preferences between the four age groups on the FPTTS extraversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving scales .

c. Discussion

The findings of the current analysis partially support the hypothesis that younger churchgoers will prefer extraversion significantly more frequently than older churchgoers. There were significant ($P < .001$) differences in the preferences of the four age groups on the EI index and the age group which was found to prefer extraversion most frequently was the youngest group (≤29 churchgoers). However, the age group which recorded the second highest level of extraversion scores was the oldest group (≥70 churchgoers).

Table 6.2 F-Test: Age and psychological type preferences

Scale	<u>≤29 churchgoers</u>		<u>30-49 churchgoers</u>		<u>50-69 churchgoers</u>		<u>≥70 churchgoers</u>		F	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	5.74	2.82	4.69	2.96	4.62	2.89	4.99	2.87	11.43	.001
Introversion	4.26	2.82	5.31	2.96	5.38	2.89	5.01	2.87	11.43	.001
Sensing	6.27	2.19	6.84	2.47	7.65	2.31	8.30	1.88	71.83	.001
Intuition	4.73	2.19	4.16	2.47	3.35	2.31	2.70	1.88	71.83	.001
Thinking	5.37	2.49	5.26	2.64	5.06	2.53	4.72	2.23	6.57	.001
Feeling	5.63	2.49	5.74	2.64	5.94	2.53	6.28	2.23	6.57	.001
Judging	7.78	2.66	8.19	2.65	8.64	2.51	8.52	2.20	10.94	.001
Perceiving	2.22	2.66	1.81	2.65	1.36	2.51	1.48	2.20	10.94	.001

On the one hand, this conflicts with the findings of a previous study by McCrae and Costa (1989) who found no significant relationship between age and psychological type preferences. On the other hand, this finding partially coheres with the findings of by Warr, Miles and Platts (2001), which indicated that younger people are more likely than older people to prefer extraversion over introversion.

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that younger churchgoers will prefer intuition significantly more frequently than older churchgoers. It was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) differences between the four age groups on the SN index. Moreover, the age group which was found to prefer intuition most frequently was the youngest group (≤ 29 churchgoers) and the age group which recorded the lowest level of intuition scores was the oldest group (≥ 70 churchgoers).

This reflects the findings of previous studies by Warr, Miles and Platts (2001) which indicated that younger people are more likely to prefer intuition than older people. The current study also reflects the studies of Gerhardt (1983) and Jones and Francis (1999) which suggest that younger churchgoers are likely to prefer intuition than older churchgoers.

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that there will be no significant differences between the four age groups' psychological type preferences on the TF index. It was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) differences between the four age groups on the TF index. Moreover, the age group which was found to prefer thinking most frequently was the youngest group (≤ 29 churchgoers) and the age group which was found to prefer thinking least frequently was the oldest group (≥ 70 churchgoers).

This finding does not reflect the previous studies regarding the relationship between age and psychological type preferences conducted by McCrae and Costa (1989) and Warr, Miles and Platts (2001). However, given that the current study was conducted among churchgoers, it may be that religiosity is a contributory factor.

The findings of the current analysis partially support the hypothesis that younger churchgoers will prefer perceiving significantly more frequently than older churchgoers. There were significant ($P < .001$) differences in the preferences of the four age groups on the JP index and the age group which was found to prefer perceiving most frequently was the youngest group (≤ 29 churchgoers). However, the oldest group (≥ 70 churchgoers) was not found to prefer perceiving least frequently.

This result partially reflects the findings of previous studies regarding the relationship between age and psychological type preferences conducted by McCrae and Costa (1989) and Warr, Miles and Platts (2001). The current study also reflects the studies of Gerhardt (1983) and Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989) which suggest that younger churchgoers are more likely to prefer perceiving than older churchgoers.

There are two possible interpretations of the findings of the current study regarding the relationship between age and psychological type preferences. The first interpretation is based on empirical studies by Brierley (1991a, 2000), Gelder and Escott (2001), and Francis (2002b) and suggests that there is a general trend in the Christian church of attracting older people. This trend is reflected in the current sample, in which 63% of participants are aged 50 or over. The current sample has demonstrated that older churchgoers tend to prefer ISFJ. Given that most studies of both UK churchgoers and UK clergy have shown preferences for ISFJ, it could be that

the church is an environment in which older people are finding their psychological type preferences accommodated and encouraged, whereas younger people are finding their psychological type preferences (more frequently ENTP) are not accommodated and are discouraged. It may be that the reason for the greater proportion of older people attending church is that their psychological type preferences are better met than those of young people. If this is the case, then the church might be better served by trying to create an environment which also accommodates and encourages ENTP preferences, in which more young people may feel welcome.

A second possible interpretation is that older people and younger people attend church for different reasons. Attitudes toward the church have shifted over the past few generations; church attendance is becoming less expected by society. So, on the one hand, it may be that older people who attend church do so for because it offers an opportunity for reflection (I), because it appeals to their sense of tradition and need for certainties (S), because it facilitates a sense of community or because it pleases others (F), and because they appreciate the unchanging sense of order and routine (J). On the other hand, it may be that younger people who attend church do so because it provides an opportunity for socialising (E), because it provides an inspirational way of exploring their spirituality, which is counter to the materialistic, secularised culture of the modern UK (N), in spite of other people's disapproval or incomprehension (T), because it promotes important principles such as justice and truth (T), or because they are trying out different spiritualities (P). While these suggestions are by no means comprehensive, they do indicate that younger and older churchgoers may gain different things from the church and find their psychological type preferences encouraged in different ways.

4. Marital Status

Those variables already investigated, age and sex, are variables which people are unable to control; people are not able to choose their sex or age. It is presumed, therefore, that any relationship between age or sex and psychological type preferences is caused by the uncontrollable variables, that is, age and sex. In contrast, the relationship between marital status and psychological type preferences may be seen to be more complex. On the one hand, it is possible that marital status may cause people to report their psychological type preferences in differing ways, as being married, single or divorced may promote differing attitudes or behaviours. On the other hand, it is possible that people of differing psychological type preferences may be more attracted to differing marital statuses. For example, it may be hypothesised that the stability of marriage is attractive to judging types, while the flexibility of being single is attractive to perceiving types.

No published data have been identified which investigate the relationship between marital status and psychological type preferences. Although a number of empirical studies have been conducted to assess the impact of psychological type preferences on married couples (see, for example, Carlson and Williams, 1984; Douglass and Douglass, 1993; Nordvik, 1994; Myers and Myers, 1995), no empirical research has been conducted to investigate whether particular types of people are more likely to cohabit, marry, divorce, remarry, or remain single.

a. Previous studies among Christian groups

No published data have been identified as being concerned with the relationship between marital status and psychological type preferences among Christian groups. However, Calahan (1996) investigated the psychological type preferences of 113 married couples in the United States of

America, in a conservative church setting, using the KTS. Calahan (1996) does not provide a full analysis of the results. However, it was found that 171 (76%) of the sample were sensing-judging types, 25 (11%) of the sample were sensing-perceiving types, 25 (11%) of the sample were intuitive-feeling types, and 5 (2%) of this sample were intuitive-thinking types. It is difficult to draw conclusions from such a superficial disclosure of results. It is unclear how far the psychological type preferences of this group are due to sex, age, or denominational affiliation. As a consequence it is not possible to say whether the high proportion of SJ types is due to all participants being married or whether this is due to other variables.

Given that there have been no studies conducted to investigate the relationship between marital status and psychological type preferences, it is difficult to propose hypotheses about the results of the current study. However, based on the findings of Calahan (1996) it may be hypothesised that married churchgoers will be more likely to prefer sensing and judging than single churchgoers.

b. Current study

In order to analyse the relationship between psychological type preferences and marital status, the current sample of UK churchgoers was divided into two groups on the basis of marital status. Within the current sample 67% of participants (N = 1,773) reported that they are married; this group is termed 'married churchgoers'. Within the current sample, 15% of participants (N = 385) reported that they are 'single'; this group is termed 'single churchgoers'. Churchgoers who reported that they were 'widowed', 'separated', or 'divorced' were excluded from the current analysis.

In table 6.3 the mean FPTS scores of married churchgoers and single churchgoers were compared using an Independent Samples T-Test.

Table 6.3 T-Test: marital status and psychological type preferences

Scale	Single churchgoers		Married churchgoers		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.76	3.07	4.73	2.89	0.18	NS
Introversion	5.24	3.07	5.27	2.89	-0.18	NS
Sensing	6.66	2.46	7.53	2.32	-6.60	.001
Intuition	4.34	2.46	3.47	2.32	6.60	.001
Thinking	5.32	2.54	5.13	2.55	1.30	NS
Feeling	5.68	2.54	5.87	2.55	-1.30	NS
Judging	8.12	2.63	8.55	2.52	-3.00	.01
Perceiving	1.88	2.63	1.45	2.52	3.00	.01

Table 6.3 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences between married churchgoers and single churchgoers on the FPTS sensing and intuition scales. In addition, table 6.3 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .01$) differences between married churchgoers and single churchgoers on the FPTS judging and perceiving scales. In the current sample, married churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS sensing and judging scales than single churchgoers. In contrast, single churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS intuition and perceiving scales than married churchgoers.

c. Discussion

The findings of the current study support the hypothesis that married churchgoers are more likely to prefer sensing and judging than single churchgoers, as suggested by a previous study by Calahan (1996). Married churchgoers are significantly ($P < .001$) more likely to prefer sensing

than single churchgoers, and single churchgoers are significantly ($P < .001$) more likely to prefer intuition than married churchgoers. Likewise, married churchgoers are significantly ($P < .01$) more likely to prefer judging than single churchgoers, and single churchgoers are significantly ($P < .01$) more likely to prefer perceiving than married churchgoers.

Given that the majority of churchgoers both in this study and in others (Francis, 2002b) are married, it is perhaps not surprising that married churchgoers are more likely to prefer SJ, as we have seen that this is the preferred type of the majority of churchgoers (see chapter 4). It may be that the church attracts the same type of people who are attracted to marriage, that is, people who are practical and conventional (S), and who enjoy routine and order (J).

5. Church environment

There are several ways in which the relationship between church environment and psychological type may be interpreted. On the one hand, it is possible that church environment may cause people to report their psychological type preferences in differing ways, as attending church (and by implication, residing) in a village, a market town, or in an inner city area may promote differing attitudes or behaviours. On the other hand, it is possible that people of differing psychological type preferences may be more attracted to differing church environments, and by implication differing residential areas. For example, it is possible that living in a sparsely populated rural environment is attractive to introverts, while living in a more densely populated urban environment is attractive to extraverts.

While a number of empirical studies have investigated the relationship between psychological type preferences and nationality (see, for example, Abramson, Lane, Nagai and Takagi, 1991;

Tobacyk, Cryson and Tobacyk, 2000), few have attempted to investigate the relationship between psychological type preferences and geographical environment (see Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis, 1988).

a. Previous studies among Christian groups

There has been only one empirical study conducted among Christian groups to expressly investigate the relationship between geographical location and psychological type preferences. Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis (1988) investigated the psychological type preferences of two geographically disparate congregations of Roman Catholic sisters, one sample being in San Francisco (N = 47) and the other in the Western Province (N = 641). Although age, denomination, and occupation were thought to be comparable for the samples, Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis (1988) found that the San Francisco sisters tend to be more extraverted, more intuitive, more thinking, and more perceiving than the West Province sisters. Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis (1988) suggest that these differences in psychological type preferences may be due to geographical location, arguing that more intuitive-perceiving types may be drawn to the San Francisco area 'because of its reputation as open and innovative'. Although this study does not provide details of the environment in which the sisters in the Western Province lived, it does suggest that intuitive and perceiving types may be attracted to urban areas.

Given that there have been no other studies conducted to investigate the relationship between church environment and psychological type preferences, it is difficult to make hypotheses about the results of the current study. However, based on the findings of Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis (1988) it may be hypothesised that churchgoers in city areas will be more likely

to prefer intuition and perceiving than churchgoers in other areas.

b. Current study

In order to analyse the relationship between psychological type preferences and church environment, the current sample of UK churchgoers was divided into three groups on the basis of response to the questionnaire item 'In what type of environment is your church?'. Within the current sample, 30% of participants (N = 788) reported that the environment of their church is 'scattered rural' or 'village'; this group is termed 'rural churchgoers'. Within the current sample 26% of participants (N = 681) reported that the environment of their church is 'market town', or 'small town'; this group is termed 'community town churchgoers'. Within the current sample 45% of participants (N = 1,189) reported that the environment of their church is 'large town', 'suburban', or 'inner city'; this group is termed 'urban churchgoers'.

In table 6.4 the FPTs scores of each of the three location groups are compared using a F-Test. Table 6.4 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences between the three location groups on the FPTs sensing and intuition scales. In addition, table 6.4 demonstrates there are significant differences between the three location groups on the FPTs thinking and feeling scales.

c. Discussion

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that urban churchgoers are more likely to prefer intuition. Urban churchgoers achieve the highest mean scores on the FPTs N scale, followed by community town churchgoers, followed by rural churchgoers. There are significant ($P < .001$) differences between the three location groups on the FPTs SN index. This finding coheres with the previous study by Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis (1988).

Table 6.4 F-Test: Church environment and psychological type preferences

Scale	Rural churchgoers		Community Town churchgoers		Urban churchgoers		F	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.81	2.98	4.91	2.84	4.78	2.93	0.40	NS
Introversion	5.19	2.98	5.09	2.84	5.22	2.93	0.40	NS
Sensing	7.68	2.34	7.56	2.23	7.21	2.40	10.79	.001
Intuition	3.32	2.34	3.44	2.23	3.79	2.40	10.79	.001
Thinking	4.95	2.47	4.96	2.46	5.20	2.54	3.02	.05
Feeling	6.05	2.47	6.04	2.46	5.80	2.54	3.02	.05
Judging	8.38	2.40	8.49	2.50	8.39	2.58	0.47	NS
Perceiving	1.62	2.40	1.51	2.50	1.16	2.58	0.47	NS

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that there are significant ($P < .05$) differences between the three location groups on the FPTS TF index. Urban churchgoers achieve the highest mean scores on the FPTS T scale, followed by community town churchgoers, then by rural churchgoers. Although this does not reflect the findings of Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault and Avis (1988), the more detailed nature of the current study suggests that the TF index may indeed be related to church environment.

The findings of the current analysis do not support the hypothesis that urban churchgoers are more likely to prefer perceiving than rural churchgoers. There is no significant difference between urban churchgoers and rural churchgoers on the JP index.

There are two possible interpretations of the findings of the current study. On the one hand it may be the case that people living in urban, community town, and rural environments generally have differing psychological type preferences. It may be that NT types are attracted to the possibilities and inspirations (N) and the challenges and need for tough-mindedness of living in an urban environment. In this way, the psychological type preferences of urban, community town, and rural churchgoers simply reflect their geographical environment.

A second possible interpretation, is that the churches in urban, community town, and rural environments are different. It may be that urban churches better accommodate NT preferences, while community town and rural churches better accommodate SF preferences.

In either case it is clear that urban, community town, and rural churchgoers do have different psychological type preferences and different needs.

6. Conclusion

This chapter has assessed the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and aspects of their background, focusing on the variables of sex, age, marital status, and church environment. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and sex, age, marital status, and church environment were reviewed and the findings of the current study were compared and contrasted with the findings of previous studies in relation to each of these variables. It was found that male churchgoers are more likely to prefer introversion, sensing, and thinking than female churchgoers; that older churchgoers are generally more likely to prefer introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging than younger churchgoers; that married churchgoers are more likely to prefer sensing and judging than single churchgoers; and, that urban churchgoers are more likely to prefer intuition and thinking than community town churchgoers and rural churchgoers. The implications of these analyses were discussed. The next chapter will analyse the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in relation to aspects of Christian practice.

-CHAPTER SEVEN-

CHRISTIAN PRACTICE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Private Prayer**
 - a. Previous Studies
 - b. Current Study
 - c. Discussion
- 3. Private Bible Reading**
 - a. Previous Studies
 - b. Current Study
 - c. Discussion
- 4. Religious Experience**
 - a. Previous Studies
 - b. Current Study
 - c. Discussion
- 5. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The previous chapter analysed the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in relation to their background, focusing on the variables of sex, age, marital status, and church environment. This chapter will assess the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and aspects of Christian practice, specifically, private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience will be reviewed and the findings of the current study will be compared and contrasted with the findings of these previous studies. The implications of these analyses will be discussed and conclusions will be drawn about the relationship between psychological type and aspects of Christian practice.

There are two major reasons for assessing the psychological type preferences of the current sample in relation to prayer, bible reading, and religious experience. The first reason is that, although the current sample is comprised of churchgoers, it is unclear how much church attendance discloses about other aspects of participants' religiosity. This chapter aims to investigate other important elements of Christian experience and practice. Within the current sample of churchgoers the areas of frequency of private prayer, frequency of private bible reading, and extent of religious experience will be addressed.

The second reason for assessing the psychological type preferences of the current sample in relation to Christian practice is to investigate if there are elements of Christian practice which may attract particular psychological types. Such an analysis may help to identify whether there are elements of Christian practice that attract those types that are underrepresented among churchgoers. It may be suggested that some types will find that their needs are better supported

by Christian practice *outside* the framework of the church. This issue will be investigated by assessing the relationship between the psychological type preferences of participants and their reported frequency of private prayer, frequency of bible reading, and extent of religious experience.

2. Private prayer

There is a great wealth of theoretical literature regarding the relationship between prayer and psychological type theory (see, for example, Repicky, 1981; Bryant, 1983; Clarke, 1983; Keating, 1987; Williams, 1987; Oswald and Kroeger, 1988; Osborn and Osborn, 1991; Duncan, 1993; Goldsmith, 1994; Fowke, 1997; Baab, 2000; Martínez, 2001). However, only four empirical studies have been conducted to support these theoretical hypotheses (Michael and Norrisey, 1984; Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin, 1989; Ross, Weis and Jackson, 1996; Francis and Ross, 1997).

a. Previous studies

In a first study, Michael and Norrisey (1984) investigated the psychological type preferences of a sample of 415 participants attending their prayer project in 1982. Michael and Norrisey (1984) do not provide complete details of the 16 psychological whole types. However, they do report that the most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (16%) and INFP (13%). They also report that 98% of their participants attending their prayer project agreed that they found it valuable to find a prayer form which was compatible with their psychological type preferences. Although Michael and Norrisey (1984) provide theoretical models of the most appropriate prayer styles for different psychological type preferences, they do not support these models with empirical research.

In a second study, Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989) conducted an empirical investigation to determine the relationship between prayer forms and psychological type theory among 170 self-reported Christians. Their study makes use of the Knapp-Ware Prayer form questionnaire, an unpublished inventory which assesses various elements of prayer including attitude toward community prayer, structured prayer, liturgy, meditations from the New Testament, and passages from the gospels. Items assessing attitude toward the prayer, liturgy, meditations from the New Testament, and passages from the gospels were intended to correspond to the four temperaments identified by Keirse and Bates (1978), which are SJ, SP, NF, and NT. Keirse (1998) defends the identification of the temperaments, arguing that it is convenient and useful to partition the sixteen types into four groups. He argues that the four NFs are alike in many ways, as are the four NTs, the four SJs, and the four SPs. He concludes that type identification, 'from then on was a lot easier, the four groups, SPs, SJs, NFs, and NTs – being light years apart in attitudes and actions' (Keirse, 1998, p 18). Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989) report four findings relating to prayer. First, they found that SJ types were significantly more likely to rate structured prayer highly, when compared with the other temperaments. Second, they found that feeling types and judging types were significantly more likely to rate community prayer highly. Third, regarding the forms of liturgy designed for the different temperaments, they found that 'three of the four types of liturgy (SJ, NF, SP) were rated highest by the SJ temperament' (p 42). Fourth, they found that NT types were significantly more likely to give low ratings to all but the NT liturgy, when compared with the other temperaments.

In a third study, Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996) investigated the relationship between psychological type and religious attitudes and practices among 195 participants, of whom 85% were active churchgoers. Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996) report that thinking types were

significantly ($P < .05$) more likely to report that 'praying directly to a higher being is difficult'. This finding suggests that feeling types may find prayer easier and potentially more attractive than thinking types.

A fourth study that investigated the relationship between psychological type and private prayer was conducted by Francis and Ross (1997). They report on private prayer as part of a seven item scale of traditional Christian spirituality ('attending a church service', 'eucharist/holy communion', 'hymn singing', 'listening to a sermon', '*personal prayer*' [current author's emphasis], reading the bible'). Given that Francis and Ross (1997) found that sensing types recorded significantly ($P < .001$) higher scores on this scale than intuitive types, it may be hypothesised that sensing types will report higher frequencies of private prayer.

When assessing the relationship between prayer and psychological type theory, a further consideration is that the question 'How often do you pray by yourself?' may hold implicit type bias. Extraverts 'direct their energy and attention outwards and receive energy from interacting with people and from taking action' (Myers, 2000, p 9) while introverts 'direct their energy and attention inwards and receive energy from reflecting on their thoughts, memories and feelings' (Myers, 2000, p 9). As a consequence, it seems likely that introverts will be more attracted to and energised by private prayer than extraverts.

Therefore, four hypotheses can be proposed about the relationship between frequency of private prayer and psychological type preferences. First, that more frequent prayers will prefer introversion significantly more often than less frequent prayers. Second, that more frequent prayers will prefer sensing significantly more often than less frequent prayers. Third, that more

frequent prayers will prefer feeling significantly more often than less frequent prayers. Fourth, that there will be no significant different differences between more frequent and less frequent prayers on the JP index.

b. Current study

Within the current study participants were asked to respond to the question ‘How often do you pray by yourself?’ by selecting one of five possible answers (cf table 3.8). Within the current sample 69% (N = 1,795) of participants reported that they pray alone ‘nearly every day’, 17% (N = 452) of participants reported that they pray alone ‘at least once a week’, 2% (N = 42) of participants reported that they pray alone ‘at least once a month’, 10% (N = 269) of participants reported that they pray alone ‘occasionally, or ‘never’, and only 2% (N = 39) of participants reported that they ‘never’ pray alone.

For the purpose of analysis, four categories were collapsed into one group in order to achieve a greater number of participants in each category. The FPTS mean scores of the ‘more frequent prayers’ (those who pray ‘nearly every day; N = 1,795) were compared with the FPTS mean scores of the ‘less frequent prayers’ (those who pray ‘never’, ‘occasionally’, ‘at least once a month’, or ‘at least once a week’; N = 802). In table 7.1 the mean FPTS scores of more frequent prayers and less frequent prayers were compared using an Independent Samples T-Test.

Table 7.1 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences between more frequent prayers and less frequent prayers on the FPTS sensing, intuition, thinking and feeling scales. In the current sample, more frequent prayers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS intuition and feeling scales than less frequent prayers. In contrast, less frequent prayers achieved higher mean

scores on the FPTTS sensing and thinking scales than more frequent prayers.

Table 7.1 T-Test: Frequency of private prayer and psychological type preferences

Scale	<u>More frequent prayers</u>		<u>Less frequent prayers</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.84	2.94	4.79	2.89	-0.38	NS
Introversion	5.16	2.94	5.21	2.89	0.38	NS
Sensing	7.30	2.38	7.73	2.23	4.26	.001
Intuition	3.70	2.38	3.27	2.23	-4.26	.001
Thinking	4.89	2.47	5.46	2.52	5.40	.001
Feeling	6.12	2.47	5.54	2.52	-5.40	.001
Judging	8.40	2.54	8.47	2.47	0.66	NS
Perceiving	1.60	2.54	1.53	2.47	-0.66	NS

c. Discussion

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that more frequent prayers will prefer introversion significantly more often than less frequent prayers. There is no significant difference between the mean scores of more frequent prayers and less frequent prayers on the EI index.

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that more frequent prayers will prefer sensing significantly more often than less frequent prayers. Rather, more frequent prayers achieve significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTTS N scale than less frequent prayers. On the one hand, this finding is surprising as it conflicts with the findings of previous studies. For example, Francis and Ross (1997) found that sensing types were significantly more likely to prefer ‘traditional’ methods of worship, including personal prayer, than intuitive types. On the other hand, it is perhaps not that surprising that intuitive types are drawn to private prayer,

because many aspects of prayer reflect intuitive psychological type preferences. Intuitive types are 'imaginative and verbally creative' (Myers, 2000, p 9) and they 'trust inspiration' (Myers, 2000, p 9). Intuitive types 'have a transcendent view of God, and can be captivated by allowing their minds to contemplate the splendour and the mystery and the otherness' (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993, p 161). Moreover, intuitive types tend to score highly on scales of mystical orientation (Francis and Loudon, 2000). In addition, Francis and Jones (1999a), in a study using the KTS among 315 adult churchgoers, found that intuitive types scored significantly ($P < .001$) higher on an index of Christian agnosticism than sensing types. This suggests that 'Christians who prefer intuition rather than sensing are more tolerant of religious uncertainty' (p 253). Moreover, Francis and Jones (1998), in a study among 315 adult churchgoers, found that intuitive types scored significantly ($P < .001$) lower on an index of conservative Christian belief than sensing types. This suggests that intuitive types are less likely to hold traditional beliefs than sensing types. Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996, p 264) also found that 'religious doubt was more upsetting and rules more important for S types, in contrast to overall vision for N types, who were also more open to religious change'. These four studies (Ross, Weis and Jackson, 1996; Francis and Jones, 1998, 1999a; Francis and Loudon, 2000) suggest that in matters of religiosity intuitive types tend to be unconventional, open-minded, explorative, and questioning. It may be that private prayer enables intuitive types to explore their spirituality away from the conventions of structured religion. Private prayer might be an opportunity for intuitive types to ask questions, to explore possibilities, and to open up to wonder and mystery.

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that more frequent prayers will prefer feeling significantly more frequently than less frequent prayers. In the current study, those who pray more frequently achieve significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTTS F scale

than those who pray less frequently. This confirms the findings of Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996) who found that thinking types were more likely to report difficulty with prayer than feeling types. In addition, there is an overwhelming predominance of feeling types among both UK churchgoers (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999, Francis, 2002a) and UK clergy (Irvine, 1989; Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001; Francis and Payne, 2002; Francis and Robbins, 2002). Moreover, feeling types have been found to hold a more positive attitude toward Christianity than thinking types (Jones and Francis, 1999; Francis, Robbins, Boxer, Lewis, McGuckin and McDaid, 2003). It is, therefore, unsurprising that feeling types are attracted to prayer, as this is such an important component of Christian practice. More specifically, people who prefer feeling over thinking have been found to achieve significantly higher scores on the scales of mystical orientation (Francis and Loudon, 2000; Francis, 2002a). Like intuitive types, feeling types may find that private prayer affords them the opportunity to explore their mystical side and to open up to wonder and mystery. In addition, it is not surprising that feeling types are attracted to private prayer as 'feeling spirituality is personal and subjective, and it yearns for intimacy... with God' (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993, p 165). Prayer is essentially concerned with intimacy, communication, and building relationships, all of which are important to the feeling type (Myers and Myers, 1995).

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between more frequent prayers and less frequent prayers on the JP index. This finding is perhaps not surprising given that previous research has found no differences among judging and perceiving types in terms of frequency of private prayer.

To summarise, the findings of the current analysis show that there are significant differences between the types preferences of more frequent and less frequent prayers. More frequent prayers are significantly ($P < .001$) more likely to prefer intuition and feeling.

3. Private bible reading

The relationship between psychological type theory and the Bible has been discussed by type theorists in three main ways. First, some type theorists suggest that different books of the Bible are likely to be more attractive to different types (Jones, 1991; Duncan, 1993). Second, other type theorists have attempted to apply psychological type theory to the reading of gospel passages, with a view to helping people with different psychological type preferences to appreciate different aspects and interpretations of the gospels (Francis and Atkins, 2000, 2001, 2002; Francis, 2003). Third, other type theorists, such as Baab (2000), have explored the way in which different functions can be seen in the components of Bible study. She promotes the conscious use of each of the psychological functions when studying the Bible: observing (S), considering possibilities of meaning (N), analysing (T), and responding (F). However, only two empirical studies have been conducted to investigate these claims (Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin, 1989; Francis and Ross, 1997).

a. Previous studies of psychological type and bible reading

Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989) conducted an empirical investigation to determine the relationship between bible reading and psychological type theory among a sample of 170 people described as Christians. Their study makes use of the Knapp-Ware Prayer form questionnaire, which includes items assessing attitude toward meditations from the New Testament and passages from the gospels, which were intended to correspond to the four temperaments

identified by Keirse and Bates (1978), which are SJ, SP, NF, and NT. For example, a meditation from the New Testament which was deemed to represent the NF temperament is the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37). Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989) found that NT's tended to rank the NF gospel passage significantly higher than the other three temperaments. However, they found no significant relationship between temperament and rating of meditations from the New Testament. Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989) do not report on the relationship between frequency of private bible reading and psychological type theory.

A further study which reports on the empirical relationship between psychological type theory and bible reading was conducted by Francis and Ross (1997). They report on bible reading as part of a seven item scale of traditional Christian spirituality ('attending a church service', 'eucharist/holy communion', 'hymn singing', 'listening to a sermon', 'personal prayer', *reading the bible*' [current author's emphasis]). Given that Francis and Ross (1997) found that sensing types were significantly more likely to prefer 'traditional' methods of worship, including bible reading, than intuitive types, it may be hypothesised that sensing types will report higher frequencies of private bible reading.

When assessing the relationship between psychological type theory and the Bible, a further consideration is that the question 'How often do you read the Bible by yourself?' may hold implicit type bias. Extraverts 'direct their energy and attention outwards and receive energy from interacting with people and from taking action' (Myers, 2000, p 9) while introverts 'direct their energy and attention inwards and receive energy from reflecting on their thoughts, memories and feelings' (Myers, 2000, p 9). As a consequence, it seems likely that introverts will be more attracted to and energised by private bible reading than extraverts. In addition, the relationship

between book reading in general and psychological type theory has been investigated in three empirical studies (Hicks, 1984, 1989; Hammer, 1985). Hicks (1984) found that intuitive types reported reading significantly ($P < .001$) more books than sensing types, that intuitive types were significantly ($P < .01$) more likely to hold a library card than sensing types, and that intuitive types were significantly ($P < .001$) more likely to rank books above newspapers and magazines than sensing types. Hicks (1989) found that intuitive types reported significantly ($P < .001$) higher annual book-reading than sensing types. These two studies (Hicks, 1984, 1989) suggest that intuitive types may engage in private reading more frequently than sensing types. Conversely, Hammer (1985) found no significant relationship between the MBTI SN scale and reported book-reading. However, Hammer (1985) found that introverts were significantly ($P < .05$) more likely to read nonfiction books than extraverts. If the Bible is thought of as a nonfiction text, then it is possible that introverts will read it more frequently than extraverts.

On the basis of these previous studies it is difficult to hypothesise about the results of the current study. On the one hand, intuitive types have been found to report reading more books than sensing types (Hicks, 1984, 1989). On the other hand, sensing types have been found to score more highly than intuitive types on a scale of traditional Christian spirituality which included reading the bible (Francis and Ross, 1997), which suggests that sensing types will be likely to read the bible more frequently than intuitive types. As a consequence, no hypothesis will be proposed regarding the relationship between the SN scale of the MBTI and frequency of reported private bible reading.

However, given that psychological type theory suggests that introverts appreciate quiet, reflection, and solitude (Myers, 2000) and that introverts are more likely to read nonfiction books

(Hammer, 1985) it is hypothesised that more frequent bible readers will prefer introversion significantly more frequently than less frequent bible readers.

b. Current study

Within the current study participants were asked to respond to the question 'How often do you read the bible by yourself?' by selecting one of five possible answers (cf table 3.9). Within the current sample 33% (N = 847) of participants reported that they read the bible alone 'nearly every day', 19% (N = 508) of participants reported that they read the bible alone 'at least once a week', 8% (N = 197) of participants reported that they read the bible alone 'at least once a month', 32% (N = 823) of participants reported that they read the bible alone occasionally, and 9% (N = 224) of participants reported that they 'never' read the bible alone.

For the purpose of analysis, four categories were collapsed into one group in order to achieve a greater number of participants in each category. In order to investigate the relationship between bible reading and psychological types the FPTTS mean scores of the 'more frequent readers' (those who read the Bible 'nearly every day'; N = 847) were compared with the FPTTS mean scores of 'less frequent readers' (those who read the Bible 'never', 'occasionally', 'at least once a month', or 'at least once a week'; N = 1,752). In table 7.2 the mean FPTTS scores of more frequent readers and less frequent readers were compared using an Independent Samples T-Test.

Table 7.2 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences between the psychological type preferences of more frequent readers and less frequent readers on the FPTTS sensing and intuition scales. In the current sample, more frequent readers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTTS intuition scale than less frequent readers. In contrast, less frequent readers achieved

higher mean scores on the FPTTS sensing scale than more frequent readers.

Table 7.2 T-Test: Frequency of private bible reading and psychological type preferences

Scale	<u>More frequent readers</u>		<u>Less frequent readers</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.71	2.96	4.87	2.90	1.27	NS
Introversion	5.29	2.96	5.13	2.90	-1.27	NS
Sensing	7.04	2.44	7.62	2.27	6.04	.001
Intuition	3.96	2.44	3.38	2.27	-6.04	.001
Thinking	4.98	2.55	5.11	2.47	1.29	NS
Feeling	6.02	2.55	5.89	2.47	-1.29	NS
Judging	8.31	2.60	8.46	2.48	1.41	NS
Perceiving	1.69	2.60	1.54	2.48	-1.41	NS

c. Discussion

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that more frequent bible readers prefer introversion significantly more frequently than less frequent bible readers. There is no significant difference between the mean scores of more frequent bible readers and less frequent bible readers on the EI index.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that more frequent bible readers achieve significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTTS N scale than less frequent bible readers. On the one hand, this result is surprising given that Francis and Ross (1997) found that sensing types were significantly more likely to prefer 'traditional' methods of worship, including bible reading, than intuitive types, which suggests that sensing types would report higher frequencies of private bible reading. On the other hand, this result is not so surprising given that intuitive types have been found to report more frequent reading of books than sensing types (Hicks, 1984,

1989). In addition, as has been suggested with regard to private prayer, it may be that private bible reading affords intuitive types the opportunity to explore their spirituality away from the conventions of structured religion. Private bible reading might be an opportunity for intuitive types to ask questions of scripture, to challenge conventional interpretation, and to find new meanings and insights.

The findings of the current analysis suggest that there is no significant difference between more frequent bible readers and less frequent bible readers on the TF index. This finding is perhaps not surprising given that previous research has found no differences among thinking and feeling types in terms of frequency of private bible reading.

The findings of the current analysis suggest that there is no significant difference between more frequent bible readers and less frequent bible readers on the JP index. This finding is perhaps not surprising given that previous research has found no differences among judging and perceiving types in terms of frequency of private bible reading.

To summarise, the findings of the current analysis are that there are significant differences between the psychological type preferences of more frequent and less frequent bible readers. More frequent bible readers are significantly ($P < .001$) more likely to prefer intuition than less frequent bible readers.

4. Religious Experience

There is a difficulty in defining what is meant by 'religious experience'. In one sense, church attendance in itself may be termed a religious experience, that is, participation in and experience

of the religious rituals of a particular faith. However, the term religious experience, is generally held to refer to something more exceptional. William James (1982; first published in 1902) in his classic work *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, defines religious experience as the essence of religion. For James (1982, p 31) religion is '*the feelings, acts, and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine* [James' emphasis]'. James defines religious experience as essentially personal and individualistic, rather than corporate, and is concerned with an individual's meeting with the divine. James (1982) outlines the way in which religious experiences may differ among types of people, characterised as the 'healthy-minded' person and the 'sick-souled'.

More recently, Argyle (2000, p 47) distinguishes between two understandings of religious experience, that is, '(1) experience of contact with a transcendent being or of the presence of a holy other, what Otto (1917) called a 'numinous' experience; (2) experience of the immanent unity of all things, sometimes called 'mystical' experience'. This distinction is of particular importance in relation to psychological type theory, for while only one study has investigated theoretically the relationship between religious experience and psychological type theory (Cook, 2003), two studies have empirically investigated the relationship between *mystical* experience and psychological type theory (Francis and Loudon, 2000; Francis, 2002a).

a. Previous studies of psychological type and religious experience

Regarding *religious* experience, Cook (2003, p 153) reviewed William James' understanding of religious experience in relation to psychological type theory, speculating that extraverts may be the healthy-minded types who are 'once-born' and that thinking types may be the 'twice-born'

types. However, Cook (2003) does not speculate if particular psychological types are more likely to report having undergone a religious experience.

Regarding *mystical* experience, Francis and Loudon (2000) investigated a sample of 100 student and adult churchgoers, who completed the Index of Mystical Orientation and the KTS. The Index of Mystical Orientation asks participants to report on whether they have undergone phenomena associated with mystical experiences. They report that churchgoers who preferred intuition and feeling reported higher scores on the Index of Mystical Orientation than churchgoers who preferred sensing and thinking. Francis (2002a) investigated a sample of 543 participants, of whom 87% were churchgoers, who completed the Short Index of Mystical Orientation and the MBTI. Francis (2002a) reports that thinking types and dominant thinking types achieved significantly lower scores on the Short Index of Mystical Orientation. On the one hand, the findings of these two studies indicate that intuitive types and feeling types are more likely to report having a mystical experience, which suggests that they may also be more likely to report having a *religious* experience. On the other hand, it is important to remember that mystical experience and religious experience are not synonymous or corresponding factors and they may be independent of one another (Argyle, 2000, p 48).

A further possible understanding of religious experience may involve charismatic phenomena such as a dramatic conversion or speaking in tongues. In a study among churchgoers, Francis and Jones (1997) found that thinking types achieved significantly higher scores on the Index of Charismatic Experience than feeling types.

In the current study, participants are asked to respond to the question 'Have you ever had

something you would describe as a ‘religious experience’?’. The emphasis in this question is clearly on the participant’s personal interpretation of the term ‘religious experience’. For some participants, religious experience may well be synonymous with mystical experience, as defined above. For others, religious experience may be associated with charismatic phenomena. Given that the relationship between psychological type theory and religious experience *per se* has not previously been empirically investigated it is difficult to make hypotheses concerning the current study. However, generalising from the findings of Francis and Loudon (2000) regarding mystical experience and psychological type, it may be hypothesised that intuitive types will be significantly more likely than sensing types to report having a religious experience. It is more difficult to form hypotheses regarding the TF index, given that different studies have found different results (Francis and Jones, 1997; Francis, 2002a) and, therefore, no hypothesis will be proposed concerning this index.

b. Current study

Within the current study participants were asked to respond to the question ‘Have you ever had something you would describe as a ‘religious experience’?’ by selecting one of four possible answers (cf table 3.10). Within the current sample 43% (N = 1,162) of participants answered ‘yes’ to this question, 11% (N = 302) of participants answered ‘probably’ to this question, 19% (N = 514) of participants answered ‘perhaps’ to this question, and 23% (N = 614) of participants answered ‘no’ to this question.

In order to investigate further the relationship between religious experience and psychological type the mean scores of those who have had a religious experience (those who responded ‘yes’; N = 1,162) were compared with those who have not had a religious experience (those who

responded 'no'; N = 614). In table 7.3 the mean FPTS scores of those who have had a religious experience and those who have not had a religious experience were compared using an Independent Samples T-Test.

Table 7.3 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences between the psychological type preferences of those who have had a religious experience and those who have not had a religious experience on the FPTS sensing, intuition, judging, and perceiving scales. In addition, table 7.3 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .05$) differences between the psychological type preferences of those who have had a religious experience and those who have not had a religious experience on the FPTS extraversion and introversion scales. In the current sample, those who have had a religious experience achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS extraversion, intuition, and perceiving scales than those who have not had a religious experience. In contrast, those who have not had a religious experience achieved higher mean scores on the scales introversion, sensing, and judging than those who have had a religious experience.

Table 7.3 T-Test: Religious experience and psychological type preferences

Scale	Had a religious experience		Not had a religious experience		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.94	2.99	4.57	2.87	-2.55	.05
Introversion	5.06	2.99	5.43	2.87	2.55	.05
Sensing	6.82	2.46	8.32	1.97	13.05	.001
Intuition	4.18	2.46	2.68	1.37	-13.05	.001
Thinking	4.99	2.56	5.09	2.35	0.79	NS
Feeling	6.01	2.56	5.91	2.35	-0.79	NS
Judging	8.17	2.64	8.78	2.31	4.79	.001
Perceiving	1.83	2.64	1.22	2.31	-4.79	.001

c. Discussion

The first finding of the current analysis is that those who have had a religious experience achieved significantly ($P < .05$) higher mean scores on the FPTS extraversion scale than those who have not had a religious experience. On the one hand, this finding is surprising given that psychological type theory suggests that extraverts tend to prefer activity, variety, and socialising while introverts tend to prefer reflection, contemplation, and privacy. On this basis it might be thought that introverts would be more likely to undergo the kind of religious experience that William James (1982, p 31) described as '*experiences of individual men in their solitude*'. On the other hand, this finding is not so surprising if our definition of religious experience is broadened beyond James' definition. Religious experience may be a communal or corporate experience, for example, inspired by the sense of belonging to a spiritual community during the Eucharist or engaging in action or conversation with others. In addition, one of the main distinctions between the introvert and the extravert is the focus and origin of energy; for introverts energy is focused on and gained from the inner world, while for extraverts energy is focused on and gained from the outer world. If religious experience is thought of as a meeting point with an external, divine being then it is reasonable to suppose that extraverts will be more likely to attribute a particular experience to an external agent (that is, God), while introverts will be more likely to attribute a particular experience to an internal agent (that is, their own inner, psychic world).

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that those who report that they have had a religious experience will prefer intuition more frequently than those who report that they have not had a religious experience. In the current study, those who reported that they had a religious experience achieved significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS N scale

than those who reported that they had not had a religious experience. This confirms the generalisability of findings concerning the relationship between psychological type and mystical experience (Francis and Louden, 2000) to the relationship between psychological type and religious experience. In addition, it may be argued that the intuitive type may be drawn to many of the features of religious experience; according to Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer (1998, p 24) intuition is concerned with perception 'beyond what is visible to the senses', with 'perception by way of the unconscious', with the imagination, creativity, and abstract ideas. Conversely, according to Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer (1998, p 24) sensing 'establishes what exists', and is concerned with 'the immediate experiences available to the their five senses', and with realism, practicality, and down-to-earth, material facts. It is possible, therefore, that intuitive types and sensing types may interpret similar experiences differently; an event that an intuitive type might describe as a 'religious experience', a sensing type might validly describe in more ordinary, everyday terms. These two types may describe the same situation in totally different ways because the intuitive type will be focused on meanings and possibilities, while the sensing type will be focused on realities and experiences; what is a 'religious experience' to an intuitive type, may not be so to a sensing type.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that there is no significant difference between those who report having had a religious experience and those who report not having had a religious experience on the TF index. This finding is perhaps not surprising given the conflicting results of earlier studies. On the one hand, it has been found that thinking types have been found to achieve higher mean scores on the Index of Charismatic Experience, which includes phenomena such as 'being born again' and glossolalia (Francis and Jones, 1997). On the other hand, Francis and Louden (2000) and Francis (2002a) found that feeling types were more likely

to achieve higher scores on measures of mystical orientation than thinking types. Therefore, two explanations for the finding that there is no significant difference between those who report having had a religious experience and those who report not having had a religious experience on the TF index may be offered. First, it may be that there is no relationship between the TF index and religious experience. Second, it may be that there is a relationship between the TF index and religious experience but that thinking types and feeling types are drawn to different elements of religious experience (charismatic experience and mystical experience, respectively).

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that churchgoers who report that they have had a religious experience achieved significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTSP scale than churchgoers who report that they have not had a religious experience. On the one hand, this finding is surprising given that no previous research has found differences among judging and perceiving types in terms of religious experience. On the other hand, perceiving types are thought to be 'spontaneous, curious, adaptable, and open to what is new and changeable' (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998, p 27); this may mean perceiving types are more likely than judging types open to the possibility of interpreting an experience as religious.

To summarise, the findings of the current analysis are that there are significant differences between the types preferences of those who have had a religious experience and those who have not had a religious experience. Participants who reported having a religious experience are significantly ($P < .001$) more likely to prefer intuition and perceiving and are significantly ($P < .05$) more likely to prefer extraversion.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has assessed the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and aspects of Christian practice, specifically, private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience were reviewed and the findings of the current study were compared and contrasted with the findings of these previous studies in relation to each of these variables. It was found that, although the current sample consists predominantly of churchgoers with preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging, it is in fact churchgoers who prefer extraversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving who report greater commitment to Christian practice in terms private prayer (N and F), private bible reading (N), and religious experience (E, N, and P). The implications of these analyses were discussed. The next chapter will assess the psychological type profile of congregations in the current sample.

-CHAPTER EIGHT-

CONGREGATIONAL PROFILING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Previous Studies of Church Congregations**
- 3. Congregational Profiling in the Current Study**
- 4. Discussion**
- 5. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

Thus far, the current study has analysed the psychological type preferences of churchgoers as *individuals*. For example, the previous chapter assessed the relationship between the psychological type preferences of individual churchgoers in relation to Christian practice, specifically, private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience. In contrast, this chapter will address the sample in a different way. Rather than looking at the psychological type preferences of individual churchgoers, psychological type preferences of *congregations* will be assessed. This chapter will review previous studies of church congregations. The psychological type profiles of the congregations that participated in the current study will be outlined and compared and contrasted with the findings of previous studies. The implications of these analyses will be discussed and conclusions will be drawn about the psychological type profiles of congregations in the current study.

2. Previous studies of church congregations

A number of type theorists have identified the value of psychological type theory in a congregational context (Harbaugh, 1990; Jones, 1991; Edwards, 1998; Baab, 2000).

Harbaugh (1990, p 126) argues that if, within church congregations, it is recognised that church members are of different psychological types then 'there is no longer the expectation that everyone will contribute to congregational life in exactly the same ways'. Psychological type theory can help church congregation members to recognise that some of their practices are not necessarily 'correct' or absolute, but due to matters of *preference*.

Jones (1991) believes that congregations as a whole are able to, indeed are inclined to, take on

a specific psychological type. He suggests that ST churches tend to be well organised around precise and measurable objectives and tend to be concerned with the issues of the here and now. SF churches he sees as being inclined toward practical helping, enjoying an informal, loving environment. NF churches he sees as being interested in creativity, growth, and openness with a minimum of structure. NT churches he sees as tending to value intelligence, education, and global vision. Jones' (1991) suggestions provide a basis for 'typing' congregations, that is, for determining the overall psychological type preferences of a church congregation.

Edwards (1998, p 51) argues that an awareness of psychological type theory can help church members to understand and be mindful of the different needs of other members of the congregation. He states that many people tend to 'see their own point of view, their own feelings and perceptions and judgements, as a norm'. Psychological type theory can provide an awareness that different modes of spiritual practice are appropriate, both privately and in the context of the corporate body of the congregation.

Baab (2000) points out the need for congregational activities to implement different elements of psychological type theory and for programs that address the needs of people with different psychological type preferences. For example, she suggests that retreats that are primarily geared toward the introverted orientation, should also allow room for individuals to act through their extraverted orientation as well. Baab (2000) also examines the value of bearing in mind the different aspects of psychological type in worship, preaching, classes, and for congregational life in general. Her purpose is not to 'overwhelm' but to ensure that no preferences are neglected. Baab (2000, p 121) also provides guidelines for 'typing a congregation', that is, identifying its most common type patterns, which 'may not be the same as the type of the congregation'. In

other words, a congregation may develop a pattern of functioning that is not necessarily consistent with the preferences of the members of the congregation. Baab (2000) goes on to provide sketches of what she believes extravert and introvert, sensing and intuitive, thinking and feeling, and judging and perceiving congregations look like and offers models for supporting the needs of these different congregations.

In summary, it may be said that type theorists have argued that psychological type theory may be useful for church congregations in order to identify strengths and weaknesses within the group. However, the studies of Harbaugh (1990), Jones (1991), Edwards (1998), and Baab (2000) are based entirely on a theoretical understanding of psychological type. There are just three studies which have attempted to empirically profile church congregations in terms of psychological type (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1995; Rehak, 1998). Unless stated otherwise, each of the empirical studies makes use of the MBTI.

Delis-Bulhoes (1990) investigated the psychological type profile of two Francophone congregations 'in the Montreal metropolitan area' (p 27) in Canada, using a Canadian-French version of the MBTI. The first congregation comprised 154 Evangelical Protestant 'active church members' and consisted of 57% females and 43% males with a mean age of 33 years. It was found that 71% of this sample preferred introversion and 29% preferred extraversion, 88% preferred sensing and 12% preferred intuition, 62% preferred thinking and 38% preferred feeling, and 62% preferred judging and 38% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among Evangelical Protestant active church members were found to be ISTJ (27%) and ISTP (14%).

The second congregation investigated by Delis-Bulhoes (1990), comprised 46 Catholic 'active church members' and consisted of 67% females and 33% males with a mean age of 30 years. It was found that 65% of this sample preferred introversion and 35% preferred extraversion, 72% preferred sensing and 28% preferred intuition, 57% preferred feeling and 43% preferred thinking, and 67% preferred judging and 33% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among Catholic active church members were found to be ISTJ (24%) and ISFJ (17%).

When the two samples studied by Delis-Bulhoes (1990) are compared, it becomes apparent that there are differences between the two denominationally discrete groups. The Evangelical Protestant sample displays a greater preference for introversion, sensing, thinking, and perceiving than the Catholic sample. However, the small number of participants in the Catholic sample ($N = 46$) limits the generalisability of this finding.

Delis-Bulhoes (1990) notes that when the male and female church members are compared (without controlling for denomination), it becomes apparent that females are significantly ($P < .001$) more likely to prefer feeling over thinking. Delis-Bulhoes (1990) also evaluates the two congregations against a comparison group comprised of 870 Francophone Canadian university students. Among the whole sample of active church members, it was found that there were significantly more ISFJ types ($P < .001$) and ISTP types ($P < .01$) than among university students. In addition, among the sample of active churchgoers the following types are significantly underrepresented compared to university students: INTJ ($P < .05$), INTP ($P < .05$), ENTP ($P < .05$), ESTJ ($P < .05$), and ENTJ ($P < .05$).

Ross (1995) investigated the psychological type profile of four amalgamated Anglophone

Catholic churches in southern Ontario, Canada. Within this sample, Ross (1995) distinguishes between churchgoers on the basis of sex. Among the sample of 116 Anglophone Catholic women the mean age was found to be 43 years. A mean of 14 years of education was reported for this sample. In addition, this sample of Anglophone Catholic women comprised 27% professionals. It was found that 53% of this sample preferred introversion and 47% preferred extraversion, 54% preferred sensing and 46% preferred intuition, 75% preferred feeling and 25% preferred thinking, and 61% preferred judging and 39% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among Anglophone Catholic women were found to be ISFJ (20%) and ENFP (15%).

Among Ross' (1995) sample of 59 Anglophone Catholic men the mean age was found to be 41 years. A mean of 16 years of education was reported for this sample. In addition, this sample of Anglophone Catholic men comprised 47% professionals. It was found that 54% of this sample preferred introversion and 46% preferred extraversion, 51% preferred sensing and 49% preferred intuition, 59% preferred thinking and 41% preferred feeling, and 59% preferred judging and 41% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among Anglophone Catholic men were found to be ESTJ (15%) and ISTJ (14%).

When Ross' (1995) two samples of Anglophone Catholics are compared on the basis of sex, it becomes apparent that there is a greater prevalence of feeling types among female Anglophone Catholics than male Anglophone Catholics. Ross (1995) compares the types of Anglophone Catholics with the Center for Applications of Psychological Type (CAPT) Databank Total Population (reported by MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz, 1986). Among female Anglophone Catholics ISFJ types were significantly overrepresented ($P < .001$) compared to CAPT female

population norms. There were no significant differences between the sample of male Anglophone Catholics and the CAPT male population norms. Ross (1995) also compared the sample of Anglophone Catholics with Francophone Catholics, Anglophone Anglicans, Francophone Evangelical Protestants, and Catholic Priests. Ross (1995) collates the psychological type profiles of the congregations in his study, rather than reporting on the psychological type profiles of the four individual congregations.

Rehak (1998) conducted a study to compare and contrast the psychological type preferences of active members of the Redeemer Lutheran Church with former members, classified as 'inactive'. He investigated the psychological type profile of 76 'active members' of Redeemer Lutheran Church in Northern California, in the United States of America. Rehak (1998) reports that this sample consisted of 38% males and 62% females. Within this sample, 14% of participants were aged under 20, 17% aged 30-39, 22% aged 40-49, 24% aged 50-59, 16% aged 60-69, and 7% aged 70 or over. Within this sample, 97% of participants were Caucasian. The congregation was in an 'upper middle class neighbourhood in an urban setting' (p 40). Rehak (1998) found that 68% of this sample preferred introversion and 32% preferred extraversion, 50% of his sample preferred sensing and 50% preferred intuition, 74% preferred feeling and 26% preferred thinking, and 51% preferred judging and 49% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be INFP (18%) and ISFJ (15%).

Rehak (1998) compared this sample of 76 active members of Redeemer Lutheran Church with a CAPT normative sample of 9,320 high school students. Among active members of Redeemer Lutheran Church the following types were significantly overrepresented compared to a CAPT normative sample: ISFJ ($P < .001$), INFJ ($P < .001$), and INFP ($P < .001$). Among active members

of Redeemer Lutheran Church the following types were significantly underrepresented compared to the CAPT normative sample: ESFP ($P < .05$) and ESTJ ($P < .05$). Rehak (1998) also compares this sample of active members of Redeemer Lutheran Church with 51 'inactive' members of Redeemer Lutheran Church; Rehak (1998, p 39) defines inactive members as 'people who had left the group'. Among active members of Redeemer Lutheran Church the ESFJ types were significantly ($P < .001$) overrepresented compared to inactive members of Redeemer Lutheran Church. In addition, among active members of Redeemer Lutheran Church the following types were significantly underrepresented compared to inactive members of Redeemer Lutheran Church: ISFP ($P < .05$) and INFP ($P < .05$).

The findings of these three studies reveal that congregations tend to prefer introversion, sensing, and judging. Preferences on the TF index seem to be related to sex distributions within the congregations.

These three studies have in common three factors. First, the three studies all claim to profile church *congregations* as opposed to churchgoers as individuals, although this distinction is less clear in the study by Ross (1995) as the psychological type profiles of the congregations are amalgamated. Second, the three studies all provide information regarding the background of these congregations, including variables such as age, sex, geographical location, language, and denominational affiliation. Moreover, the three studies are concerned to see how certain variables interact with psychological type preferences among the congregations. For example, Delis-Bulhoes (1990) compares two congregations based on denominational affiliation, while Ross (1995) compares four congregations on the basis of sex. Third, the three studies compare the psychological type profiles of the congregations studied with other samples, for example,

with CAPT population norms (Ross, 1995; Rehak, 1998) or other population norms (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990), with other religious groups (Ross, 1995), or with inactive members of the congregation (Rehak, 1998).

There are six ways in which future research can build on these existing studies. First, although these existing studies provide some demographic information on the congregations and have begun to analyse how variables such as sex (Ross, 1995) and denominational affiliation (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990) are related to psychological type, further analysis of these relationships is desirable. For example, Delis-Bulhoes (1990) and Rehak (1998) do not distinguish within their samples on the basis of sex, although it is both a theoretically and an empirically well-established phenomenon that sex influences psychological type preferences, particularly on the TF index (Jung, 1971; Kendall, 1998; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998).

The second way in which future research can build on these existing studies is to take account of religious variables such as church orientation, faith origins, faith styles, and commitment to Christian practices such as Bible reading and private prayer, which are not addressed in these three studies.

The third way in which future research can build on these existing studies is to take account of the issue of congregational satisfaction in relation to psychological type theory, which is not addressed in these three studies. It is not apparent, for example, how happy underrepresented types are within a congregation. Rehak (1998) does address this issue, indirectly, by comparing active church members with inactive church members. In this way, Rehak (1998) is able to identify those dissatisfied congregation members who have 'voted with their feet'. However,

Rehak's (1998) study does not reveal the satisfaction levels of remaining congregation members whose type differs from the rest of the congregation.

The fourth way in which future research can build on these existing studies is to take account of response rate. Delis-Bulhoes (1990) and Ross (1995) do not specify how far their samples are representative of the congregations studied as neither study offers a response rate, unlike Rehak (1998), who claims that 'essentially, every active adult member' was included in his sample. While collecting data from every congregation member may not always be possible, a response rate is needed to demonstrate how far the reported psychological type distribution is representative of the congregation.

The fifth way in which future research can build on these existing studies is to increase the number of participants in each study. The size of the samples used in these three studies limits the generalisability of the findings. As only a small number of congregations are surveyed within these studies, it remains questionable how far these findings reflect or differ from the psychological type profile within other congregations.

The sixth way in which future research can build on these existing studies is to conduct similar research in the UK. These studies were not conducted in the UK, they were conducted in Canada (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1995) and the United States of America (Rehak, 1998). Therefore, the generalising of the findings of these studies to UK congregations is inadvisable.

3. Congregational profiling in the current study

Thus far, the current study has analysed the psychological type preferences of churchgoers as

individuals. These churchgoers will now be profiled in terms of congregation; all participants completed the questionnaire within the context of a church congregation. Table 8.1 demonstrates the overall congregation type for each participating congregation. Congregation type is based on the dichotomous preferences of the individuals that comprise the congregation. For example, if a congregation is comprised mainly of extraverts, sensing types, thinking types, and judging types, then that congregation's type is ESTJ. This applies even if the most frequently occurring *whole* type was different (for example, ISFJ). If a congregation contains an equal balance on a dichotomous index then item weightings are employed, to ensure all participants are assigned to a type category. The item weightings recommended by Francis (2004) are towards introversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving

As the data were often collected from churches which comprised a number of congregations, administrators of the questionnaire were told to instruct participants to complete the questionnaire in only *one* service, even if they belonged to more than one congregation in a church. This accounts for the small number of participants in some congregations; most participants had already completed the questionnaire in an earlier service.

Table 8.1 Congregation whole types

Congregation Code	N	Location	Denomination	Congregation Type
1	238	England	Baptist	ISFJ
2	172	England	Church of England	ISFJ
3	80	England	Church of England	ISFJ
4	76	England	Baptist	ISFJ
5	74	England	Church of England	ISFJ
6	74	England	Church of England	ISFJ
7	73	England	Church of England	ISFJ
8	69	England	Church of England	ISFJ

Congregation Code	N	Location	Denomination	Congregation Type
9	68	England	Church of England	ISFJ
10	68	England	Methodist	ISFJ
11	54	England	Church of England	ISFJ
12	51	England	Church of England	ISFJ
13	49	England	Church of England	ISFJ
14	49	England	Methodist	ISFJ
15	41	England	Church of England	ISFJ
16	40	England	Church of England	ISFJ
17	40	England	Church of England	ESFJ
18	38	England	Church of England	ISFJ
19	38	England	Church of England	ESFJ
20	37	England	Methodist	ISFJ
21	35	England	Church of England	ISFJ
22	35	England	Church of England	ISTJ
23	33	England	Church of England	ESFJ
24	33	England	Church of England	ISFJ
25	32	Scotland	Episcopal	ISFJ
26	32	England	Church of England	ISFJ
27	31	England	Roman Catholic	ISFJ
28	29	England	Church of England	ISTJ
29	29	England	Church of England	ISFJ
30	29	England	Church of England	ISFJ
31	27	England	Church of England	INFJ
32	26	England	Church of England	ISTJ
33	26	England	Church of England	ISFJ
34	25	England	Church of England	ESFJ
35	25	England	Church of England	ISFJ
36	25	England	Church of England	ISFJ
37	24	England	Church of England	ISTJ

Table 8.1 Congregation whole types (continued)

Congregation Code	N	Location	Denomination	Congregation Type
38	23	England	Methodist	ISFJ
39	22	England	Church of England	ISFJ
40	22	England	Church of England	ISFJ
41	22	England	Church of England	ISFJ
42	22	England	Church of England	ISTJ
43	21	England	Church of England	ISFJ
44	21	England	Independent Evangelical	ESTJ
45	21	Wales	Church in Wales	ISFJ
46	20	England	Church of England	ISFJ
47	20	England	Church of England	ISFJ
48	20	Scotland	Baptist	ISFJ
49	19	England	Church of England	ISFJ
50	18	England	Church of England	ISFJ
51	18	Wales	Church in Wales	ESFJ
52	17	England	Church of England	ISFJ
53	17	England	Local Ecumenical Project	ESFJ
54	17	England	Church of England	ISFJ
55	16	England	Church of England	ISFJ
56	16	Wales	Baptist	ESFJ
57	16	England	Church of England	ISFJ
58	15	England	Church of England	ISFJ
59	15	England	Church of England	ISFJ
60	15	England	Church of England	ISFJ
61	15	England	Baptist	ESTJ
62	14	Wales	Church in Wales	ISFJ
63	14	England	Church of England	ISFJ
64	14	England	Church of England	INFJ
65	13	England	Baptist	ISFJ
66	13	Wales	Church in Wales	ISFJ

Table 8.1 Congregation whole types (continued)

Congregation Code	N	Location	Denomination	Congregation Type
67	13	England	Church of England	ESFJ
68	13	England	Methodist	ESFJ
69	13	England	Church of England	ESFJ
70	12	England	Baptist	ESFP
71	12	England	Church of England	ESTJ
72	12	England	Church of England	ISFJ
73	12	England	Baptist	ESFJ
74	12	England	Baptist	ISFJ
75	11	England	Church of England	INTJ
76	11	England	Church of England	ISFJ
77	11	Wales	Church in Wales	ISTJ
78	11	Wales	Church in Wales	ISFJ
79	10	England	Church of England	ISFJ
80	10	England	Church of England	ESFJ
81	10	England	Church of England	ISFJ
82	9	England	Church of England	ISFJ
83	9	England	Church of England	ISFJ
84	9	England	United Reformed Church	ISFJ
85	8	England	Church of England	ENFJ
86	8	Wales	Church in Wales	ISFJ
87	8	Wales	Church in Wales	ISFJ
88	8	Wales	Church in Wales	ISFJ
89	8	Wales	Church in Wales	ISFJ
90	8	England	Baptist	ISFJ
91	8	England	Church of England	ISTJ
92	7	England	Church of England	ISTJ
93	7	England	Church of England	INTJ
94	6	England	Church of England	ISFJ
95	1	Wales	Church in Wales	ESFJ

Table 8.1 demonstrates that the majority of church congregations that participated in this study are ISFJ (N = 65, 68%). Within the current study 13 congregations demonstrated preferences for ESFJ, 8 congregations demonstrated preferences for ISTJ, 3 congregations demonstrated preferences for ESTJ, 2 congregations demonstrated preferences for INTJ, 2 congregations demonstrated a preference for INFJ, 1 congregation demonstrated a preference for ESFP, and 1 congregation demonstrated a preference for ENFJ. The dichotomous preferences of the 95 congregations are outlined in table 8.2.

Table 8.2 Dichotomous preferences of congregations

Dichotomous Preferences	Number of Congregations
Extravert	18
Introvert	77
Sensing	90
Intuition	5
Thinking	13
Feeling	82
Judging	94
Perceiving	1

4. Discussion

There are five findings of interest in the current study. First, perhaps the most striking finding of this analysis is that only one congregation demonstrated preferences for perceiving over judging. This finding reflects the results of all previous studies among church congregations which are summarised in table 8.3 (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1995; Rehak, 1998) which all found preferences for judging in the congregations they studied.

Table 8.3 Summary of previous studies among church congregations

Author(s)	Sample	Country	N	Sex %		Type
				Male	Female	
Delis-Bulhoes (1990)	Evangelical Protestant	Canada	154	43	57	ISTJ
Delis-Bulhoes (1990)	Catholic	Canada	46	33	67	ISFJ
Ross (1995)	Anglophone Catholic	Canada	116	0	100	ISFJ
Ross (1995)	Anglophone Catholic	Canada	59	100	0	ISTJ
Rehak (1998)	Redeemer Lutheran	USA	76	38	62	ISFJ

Second, the majority of congregations (N = 90) demonstrated preferences for sensing over intuition. Again, this finding reflects the results of all previous studies among church congregations (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1995; Rehak, 1998).

Third, the majority of congregations (N = 77) demonstrated preferences for introversion over extraversion. Again, this finding reflects the results of all previous studies among church congregations (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1995; Rehak, 1998).

Fourth, the majority of congregations (N = 82) demonstrated preferences for feeling over thinking. This finding is less clearly supported by previous studies among church congregations. While Rehak (1998) found that his sample of members of a Redeemer Lutheran congregation preferred feeling, in other studies among congregations preference for feeling and thinking seemed to be related to sex (Ross, 1995) or to denomination (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990). Given that the majority of churchgoers in the current study are female (65%) it seems likely that the predominance of feeling congregations is attributable to sex; this also reflects the findings of previous studies among Christian groups (Ross, 1995; Francis, Penson and Jones, 2001) and UK population norms (Kendall, 1998). Fifth, almost all the congregations expressed preferences for

SJ (N = 89, 94%). The preference for SJ tends to be associated with commitment to structure, detail, tradition, and routine. This finding reflects the results of all previous studies among church congregations (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1995; Rehak, 1998).

From examining the current sample of 95 church congregations it may be concluded that the majority of congregations (N = 65, 68%) prefer introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. This finding is unsurprising given that when the churchgoers were analysed as individuals, rather than as congregations, it was found that 57% of participants preferred introversion and 43% preferred extraversion, 79% preferred sensing and 21% preferred intuition, 61% preferred feeling and 39% preferred thinking, and 84% preferred judging and 16% preferred perceiving types (see table 4.1). It is also noteworthy that all congregations with over 40 participants expressed preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging.

There are two theoretically reasonable explanations for this phenomenon. The first explanation is that church congregations appeal more to particular types than others; it may be that the structures and the traditions of the church attract and nurture people with preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. Therefore, the reason that most congregations tend to be ISFJ is that this is the type most drawn to the church because of *what* the church is.

Alternatively, a second explanation is that the church is not necessarily a place that attracts and nurtures people with preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. Rather because there already exists a majority of churchgoers with preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging, people of other types feel awkward and unwelcome. Repicky (1981, p 434) identifies that 'the most recurring type among the individuals in a group will have an impact

upon the character of that group and will determine the “type” of the group’. There is a danger that less frequently recurring types within a congregation will become alienated and marginalised. This marginalisation may be aggravated by the fact that most clergy in the UK also tend to prefer introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging (see, for example, Irvine, 1989; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001; Francis and Payne, 2002; Francis and Robbins, 2002). It could be the case that people with preferences for extraversion, intuition, thinking, or perceiving feel that there is no place for them within church congregations; not because of what church is, but because of *who* belongs to the church. They are repelled not by the structures, traditions, or doctrines of the church in themselves, but because these structures, traditions, or doctrines are safeguarded by ISFJ churchgoers and ISFJ clergy. If this is the case it may be that as Goldsmith (1994, p 65) suggests: ‘much contemporary debate and division in theology is, to my mind, not so much about theology as about personality’.

Moreover, it seems likely that congregations where a particular type dominates are likely to attract people of that same type because they will find their own interests, attitudes, and behaviours supported. So, for example, in an extraverted congregation, extraverts might find their enthusiasm for chatting before and after the service, for working in groups, and for social activities will be supported. However, in an introverted congregation, extraverts might feel that the same activities are frowned upon as frivolous and shallow. Conversely, introverts in an introverted congregation, might find their enthusiasm for contemplation, keeping social contact to a minimum, and reflecting on issues before reacting, will be supported. However, in an extraverted congregation, an introvert might feel that the same activities are frowned upon as demonstrating disinterest and detachment. It could be argued that this kind of conflict is to do with the dynamics of psychological type within a congregation, rather than issues of doctrine,

belief or practice.

Whichever of these explanation is correct, it seems reasonable to hypothesise that underrepresented types in church congregations will feel that their strengths and weaknesses often go unnoticed as they do not reflect the strengths and weaknesses of the congregation as a whole. The next chapter will address this issue by exploring the relationship between psychological type and church satisfaction.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has assessed the psychological type preferences of the current sample in terms of congregational profile. Previous studies among church congregations were summarised and then compared with the psychological type preferences of whole congregations in the current sample. It was found that the majority of congregations (N = 65, 68%) preferred introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging and nearly all congregations (N = 89, 94%) preferred SJ. Explanations for the predominance of ISFJ congregations were offered. The next chapter will explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and church satisfaction.

-CHAPTER NINE-

CHURCH SATISFACTION AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Previous Studies of Psychological Type and Satisfaction Among Secular Groups**
- 3. Previous Studies of Psychological Type and Satisfaction Among Christian Groups**
- 4. Current Study**
- 5. Discussion**
- 6. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The previous chapter assessed the current sample in terms of congregational profiles. This analysis highlighted the imbalance between congregations with preferences for ISFJ and congregations of other types. The previous chapter also raised the question whether underrepresented churchgoers are likely to be less satisfied with their congregations. This chapter will attempt to answer this questions by assessing the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and church satisfaction. Previous studies concerned with the relationship between psychological type preferences and satisfaction, both among secular groups and among Christian groups, will be reviewed. A new scale of church satisfaction will be introduced and its reliability will be assessed. The psychological type preferences of churchgoers will be analysed in relation to this new scale and related to previous studies. The implications of these analyses will be discussed and conclusions will be drawn about the relationship between psychological type and church satisfaction.

2. Previous studies of psychological type and satisfaction among secular groups

Studies which explore the relationship between psychological type and satisfaction in a secular context will now be summarised. Unless stated otherwise, each of the empirical studies makes use of the MBTI.

One of the major applications of psychological type theory aims to enable individuals to experience greater satisfaction, whether this is satisfaction with career, satisfaction with relationships or satisfaction with self. As a result psychological type theory is frequently used in career counselling (see, for example, Lawrence, 1993), relationship counselling (see, for example, Douglass and Douglass, 1993), and other types of counselling such as treatment for

chemical dependency (see, for example, Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998, p 246).

The current study is concerned with satisfaction, therefore, it seems relevant to review empirical research concerned with psychological type and satisfaction in most popular application, that is, in career counselling.

Tieger and Barron-Tieger (1993, p 50) advocate the use of psychological type theory in career counselling arguing that 'as professional counselors, the authors believe that matching a person's personality type... to a career is the best guarantee of finding a job match made in heaven'.

Myers and McCaulley (1985, p 78) argue that:

When there is a mismatch between type and occupation, the client usually reports feeling tired and inadequate. According to type theory, the mismatch causes fatigue because it is more tiring to use less-preferred processes. A mismatch also causes discouragement, because despite the greater expenditure of effort, the work product is less likely to show the quality of products that would be developed if the preferred processes were utilized. Tasks that call on preferred and developed processes require less effort for better performance, and give more satisfaction.

Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer (1998, p 303) note that 'performing satisfactorily i.e. success, is often a variable related to satisfaction'. An example of this kind is provided by Jacoby (1981) who conducted a study among 333 professional accountants, concluding that in his study success in public accounting practice is related to psychological type preferences. He also argues that 'knowledge of type may be effectively applied to improve staff recruitment and retention in accounting firms and to help accountants select practice specializations which are consonant with their psychological type preferences' (Jacoby, 1981, p 33). Satisfaction and success seem to be closely related.

A different perspective on job satisfaction is presented by Marcic, Aiuppa and Watson (1989)

who conducted a study among 102 managers. They found no relationship between job satisfaction and psychological type. However, they did find that participants with psychological types most similar to organizational norms had higher self-esteem and lower turnover rates. This suggests that it may not necessarily be a career that promotes satisfaction or dissatisfaction among different types, but similarity to colleagues psychological type preferences. For example, Jacoby (1981) in the study described above, found an overrepresentation of ISTJs among professional accountants. It could be speculated that accountants are drawn to this profession not only because of the job itself, but because they derive satisfaction from being around other people with preferences for ISTJ.

Another perspective is offered by Rahim (1981), who conducted a study among 586 students, assessing the relationship between psychological type, job satisfaction and occupational environment. Rahim found no significant relationship between psychological type and occupational environment; however, he did find that extraverts and judging types reported greater job satisfaction, irrespective of occupational environment. A similar result was found by Harrington and Loffredo (2001), who conducted a study among 97 college students, investigating life satisfaction. They found that extraverts scored significantly higher on a measure of life satisfaction than introverts. These two studies suggest that it may be the case that certain types are more satisfied than others, regardless of their situation. Specifically, it appears that extraverts express more satisfaction than introverts.

From this review of the role of psychological type in career counselling, three possible hypotheses may be suggested. The first hypothesis is that satisfaction is related to suitability to a situation, for example, a career. People who match their psychological type preferences to a

suitable career will experience greater levels of satisfaction (Tieger and Barron-Tieger, 1993; Myers and McCaulley, 1985; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998). The second hypothesis is that satisfaction is related to similarity to people in one's occupational context. People who share similar psychological type preferences to those around them will experience greater levels of satisfaction (Marcic, Aiuppa and Watson, 1989). The third hypothesis is that some types are generally more satisfied, regardless of environmental conditions (Rahim, 1981; Harrington and Loffredo, 2001).

3. Previous studies of psychological type and satisfaction among Christian groups

Concerns about satisfaction have been related to psychological type on both a congregational and an individual level. For example, the importance of congregational satisfaction, particularly among underrepresented types is emphasised by Repicky (1981). He identifies 'the most recurring type among the individuals in a group will have an impact upon the character of that group and will determine the "type" of the group' (p 434). Repicky then goes on to express concern that less frequently recurring types within congregations become alienated and marginalised. Butler (1999) also suggests that if the church fails to account for differences in personality this may lead to disunity.

On a more individual level concerns about spirituality imposed by the church are expressed by a number of authors. Fowke (1997, p 14) recalls her frustration at trying to follow a model of spirituality that did not reflect her psychological type preferences: 'it was a long time before I realized that I was doomed to disappointment and frustration if I continued to try and mould my prayer life only on a pattern than was at variance with my nature, the personality structure with which God had endowed me'. If people belong to a church where their psychological type

preferences are underrepresented they may feel compelled to continually act through their undeveloped, least preferred processes. Just as Myers and McCaulley (1985) noted that using least preferred processes in work will lead to fatigue and dissatisfaction, it can be inferred that using one's least preferred processes in prayer, worship, and communal church life will be equally fatiguing and dissatisfying.

Currently, no empirical studies have been conducted among Christians to determine the relationship between psychological type and church satisfaction. However, Francis and Jones (2000b), in a study using the MBTI, investigated levels of happiness in a study among 284 adult churchgoers who attended courses concerned with personality and spirituality. They found that this group displayed preferences for introversion (57%) over extraversion (43%), sensing (66%) over intuition (34%), feeling (58%) over thinking (42%), and judging (74%) over perceiving (26%). They found that extraverts scored significantly ($P < .001$) higher on the Oxford Happiness Inventory than introverts. No other significant differences were found on the other three type indices. Although participants were not asked about church satisfaction, this would suggest that extravert churchgoers are generally happier than introvert churchgoers, which reflects the findings of Rahim (1981) and Harrington and Loffredo (2001) which suggest that extraverts generally experience greater satisfaction levels than introverts.

Having reviewed previous studies concerned with satisfaction levels among secular groups and satisfaction levels among Christian groups three hypotheses can be made. First, it is hypothesised that sensing types will report higher levels of church satisfaction than intuitive types. Given that most churchgoers in the current sample prefer sensing (79%) over intuition (21%), and that the majority of congregations prefer sensing ($N = 90$), it seems likely that

intuitive types will feel marginalised, and consequently less satisfied within their congregation.

Second, it is hypothesised that feeling types will report higher levels of church satisfaction than thinking types. Given that most churchgoers in the current sample prefer feeling (61%) over thinking (39%), and that the majority of congregations prefer feeling (N = 76), it seems likely that thinking types will feel marginalised, and consequently less satisfied within their congregation.

Third, it is hypothesised that judging types will report higher levels of church satisfaction than perceiving types. Given that most churchgoers in the current sample prefer judging (84%) over perceiving (16%), and that the majority of congregations prefer judging (N = 94), it seems likely that perceiving types will feel marginalised, and consequently less satisfied within their congregation. In addition, a study by Rahim (1981) suggests that judging type generally tend to experience higher levels of satisfaction than perceiving types.

No hypothesis is made about the relationship between church satisfaction and preferences extraversion or introversion. On the one hand, it seems likely that given most churchgoers in the current sample prefer introversion (57%) over extraversion (43%) it could be suggested that extraverts will feel marginalised and, therefore, be less likely to express satisfaction with their congregation. On the other hand, studies by Rahim (1981), Francis and Jones (2000b), Harrington and Loffredo (2001) suggest that extraverts generally tend to experience higher levels of satisfaction and happiness than introverts. Therefore, no hypothesis will be made about the relationship between the EI index and church satisfaction.

4. Current study

A new scale was developed for the questionnaire, the Church Satisfaction Scale (CSS), consisting of nine items relating to satisfaction in the current congregation. Participants are asked to respond to the statement 'In this congregation I feel...' using nine bipolar descriptors: unwelcome/welcome, uncomfortable/comfortable, discontent/content, unhappy/happy, not valued/valued, uneasy/at ease, dissatisfied/satisfied, do not fit in/fit in, and do not belong/belong.

In order for the CSS to be considered internally consistent, each item on the scale must correlate satisfactorily with other items on that scale. A scale is reliable to the extent that each item is correlated with other independent items within that scale that are classifying the same behaviour (Stricker and Ross, 1963). Acceptable levels of statistical internal consistency are debated; an alpha coefficient of .70 or above indicates satisfactory statistical internal consistency according to Kline (2000), while DeVellis (2003) suggests that an alpha coefficient of .65 or above is acceptable.

Table 9.1 shows the alpha coefficient for the CSS, item rest-of-test correlations, and the percentage of participants who endorsed the positive side of the nine bipolar descriptors. The CSS was found to demonstrate an extremely high level of internal consistency within the current sample, producing an alpha coefficient of .9070. This is particularly impressive for such a short scale. This suggests that the items of the scale are reliably assessing the same construct. It is noteworthy that the majority of participants report high scores on the CSS; 90% of participants feel welcome and 84% feel happy in their congregation. The lowest scoring item was 'in this congregation I feel valued'; only 73% of participants feel valued in their congregation.

Table 9.1 Reliability analysis of Church Satisfaction Scale (CSS)

Item	r	Percentage item endorsement
<i>In this congregation I feel...</i>		
welcome	.5989	90
comfortable	.6412	77
content	.7276	76
happy	.7154	84
valued	.6671	73
at ease	.7296	82
satisfied	.7388	76
I fit in	.6859	79
I belong	.7271	78
Alpha	.9070	

Table 9.2 T-Test: Church satisfaction and dichotomous preferences

	Mean	Church Satisfaction Scale		P<
		SD	T	
Extraversion	54.74	9.46		
Introversion	52.41	10.14	5.68	.001
Sensing	54.14	9.52		
Intuition	50.80	10.84	6.84	.001
Thinking	51.75	10.48		
Feeling	54.53	9.36	-6.74	.001
Judging	53.76	9.69		
Perceiving	51.48	10.88	4.07	.001

In order to assess the relationship between psychological type and church satisfaction, each of the four indices of psychological type are compared with the mean scores on the CSS. In table 9.2 the mean scores of the dichotomous indices on the CSS were compared using an Independent Samples T-Test. Table 9.2 demonstrates that extraverts, sensing types, feeling types and judging

types report significantly ($P < .001$) higher levels of church satisfaction than introverts, intuitive types, thinking types, and perceiving types respectively.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that extraverts report significantly ($P < .001$) higher levels of church satisfaction than introverts. On the one hand, this result is surprising given the overrepresentation of introverts in the current sample, which could lead to extraverts feeling that they are marginalised and their gifts and needs are ignored and neglected. On the other hand, this result is not surprising given that extraverts have been found to experience higher levels of satisfaction and happiness than introverts (Rahim, 1981; Francis and Jones, 2000b; Harrington and Loffredo, 2001). It is noteworthy that despite the underrepresentation of extravert individuals (43%) and extravert congregations (19%) in the current sample, extraverts achieve the highest mean scores of any of the eight dichotomous types (54.74).

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that sensing types will report higher levels of church satisfaction than intuitive types. Sensing types report significantly ($P < .001$) higher levels of church satisfaction than intuitive types. There may be three possible causes for this relative lack of satisfaction among intuitive types. First, it may be the case that the church is itself an environment that nurtures and supports sensing type preferences over intuitive type preferences. The church's focus on tradition, conservatism, and practical realities may stifle the intuitive types' need to focus on meanings, variety, and future possibilities. Second, it may be that because clergy in the UK tend to be sensing types (see, for example, Irvine, 1989; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001; Francis and Payne, 2002; Francis and Robbins, 2002), the leadership of the church tends to focus on sensing types' gifts and needs, and fails to recognise the gifts and needs of intuitive types. Third, it may be the case that because most churchgoers in the current

sample are sensing types (79%) and because most other studies of churchgoers in the UK have shown a predominance of sensing types (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a) it could be that intuitive types feel out of place because their behaviours and attitudes are different to those of the sensing types who surround them.

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that feeling types will report higher levels of church satisfaction than thinking types. Feeling types report significantly ($P < .001$) higher levels of church satisfaction than thinking types. There may be three possible causes for this relative lack of satisfaction among thinking types. First, it may be the case that the church is itself an environment that nurtures and supports feeling type preferences over thinking type preferences. The church's focus on harmony, compassion, and personal values may frustrate the thinking types' need to focus on justice, fairness, and doctrinal truth. Second, it may be that because clergy in the UK tend to be feeling types (see, for example, Irvine, 1989; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001; Francis and Payne, 2002; Francis and Robbins, 2002), the leadership of the church tends to focus on feeling types' gifts and needs, and fails to recognise the gifts and needs of thinking types. Third, it may be the case that because most churchgoers in the current sample are feeling types (61%) and because most other studies of churchgoers in the UK have shown there to be a predominance of feeling types (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999, Francis, 2002a) it could be that thinking types feel out of place because their behaviours and attitudes are different to those of the feeling types who surround them.

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that judging types will report higher levels of church satisfaction than perceiving types. Judging types report significantly ($P < .001$)

higher levels of church satisfaction than perceiving types. There may be four possible causes for this lack of satisfaction among perceiving types. First, it may be the case that the church is itself an environment that nurtures and supports judging type preferences over perceiving type preferences. The church's focus on order, structure, and routine may stifle the perceiving types' need to focus on flexibility, spontaneity, and adaptability. Second, it may be that because clergy in the UK tend to be judging types (see, for example, Irvine, 1989; Francis, Payne and Jones, 2001; Francis and Payne, 2002; Francis and Robbins, 2002), the leadership of the church tends to focus on judging types' gifts and needs, and fails to recognise the gifts and needs of perceiving types. Third, it may be the case that because most churchgoers in the current sample are judging types (84%) and because most other studies of churchgoers in the UK have shown a predominance of judging types (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Jones and Francis, 1999, Francis, 2002a) it could be that perceiving types feel out of place because their behaviours and attitudes are different to those of the judging types who surround them. Fourth, it could be that judging type express more satisfaction than perceiving types in general as demonstrated in a study by Rahim (1981).

In order to explore further the relationship between church satisfaction and psychological type, the mean scores on the CSS of each of the 16 whole psychological types were compared. The result of this analysis are displayed in table 9.3.

Table 9.3 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences in the level of church satisfaction reported by the 16 types. The types that report the highest levels of church satisfaction are ESFP, ESFJ, and ENFJ. The types that report the lowest level of church satisfaction are INTP, ENTP, and ISTP.

Table 9.3 F-Test: Church satisfaction and whole psychological type preferences

	<u>Church Satisfaction Scale</u>			F	P<
	Mean	SD			
ESTJ	54.13	9.25			
ISTJ	52.07	10.10			
ENTJ	53.07	10.10			
INTJ	48.95	11.54			
ESFJ	56.04	9.02			
ISFJ	54.54	9.12			
ENFJ	54.58	8.75			
INFJ	51.37	9.35			
ESTP	50.29	10.21			
ISTP	47.54	10.85			
ENTP	47.28	13.20			
INTP	45.09	11.88			
ESFP	56.92	8.01			
ISFP	51.80	9.80			
ENFP	52.05	9.72			
INFP	49.62	11.81			
				9.78	.001

In order to explore further the relationship between church satisfaction and psychological type, the mean scores on the CSS of each of the four function pairs (ST, SF, NF, and NT) were compared. The result of this analysis are displayed in table 9.4.

Table 9.4 F-Test: Church satisfaction and function pairs

	<u>Church Satisfaction Scale</u>			F	P<
	Mean	SD			
ST	52.55	9.94			
SF	55.16	9.10			
NT	49.35	11.69			
NF	52.02	9.94			
				29.60	.001

Table 9.4 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences in the level of church satisfaction reported by the four function pairs. SFs report the highest levels of church satisfaction, while NTs report the lowest levels of church satisfaction.

In order to analyse further the relationship between church satisfaction and psychological type, the relationship between church satisfaction and dominant types was explored. The term *dominant function* is applied to the preferred function, that is, sensing or intuition, and thinking or feeling. Within psychological type theory, the dominant function plays a significant role; it is the function which is most developed by an individual. The *auxiliary function* is the second most developed of the four functions. The *tertiary function* is the third most developed of the four functions. The *inferior function* is the least developed of the four functions. However, the dominant function is not necessarily the function that has the highest preference score (as might be expected). Rather, there is a set method to determining which of the functions is the dominant, auxiliary, tertiary and inferior. The JP index, in combination with the EI index, determines which functions are dominant, auxiliary, tertiary, and inferior.

Briefly put, a judging type will use their preferred judging function (T or F) in the outside world, while a perceiving type will use their preferred perceiving function (S or N) in the outside world. If an individual is extraverted then the function determined by the JP index will be the dominant function. If an individual is introverted then the function determined by the JP index will be the auxiliary function. Using the example of ISTJ, the preferred attitude towards the outside world is J. J corresponds to the judging function and therefore, we know that whatever is the judging function (either Thinking or Feeling) is the function used in the outside world. For an ISTJ, this is T. So an ISTJ has introverted sensing as the dominant function and extraverted thinking as

the auxiliary function.

If the preferred attitude towards the outside world is P, then we know that this individual's attitude towards the outside world is their perceiving function, either Sensing or Intuition. So an ENFP has extraverted intuition as the dominant function and introverted feeling as the auxiliary function.

The mean scores on the CSS of each of four dominant types were compared. The result of this analysis are displayed in table 9.5.

Table 9.5 F-Test: Church satisfaction and dominant types

	Mean	Church Satisfaction Scale		F	P<
		SD			
S	53.68	9.58			
N	50.08	10.89			
T	52.83	10.04			
F	54.86	9.57		16.93	.001

Table 9.5 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences in the level of church satisfaction reported by the four dominant types. Dominant feeling types report the highest levels of church satisfaction, while dominant intuitive types report the lowest levels of church satisfaction.

5. Discussion

From these analyses three main findings may be identified. The first main finding is that there is a significant relationship between psychological type preferences and levels of church satisfaction.

The second major finding, is that extraverts are consistently more satisfied with the church than introverts, despite being underrepresented. This is consistent with the findings of previous studies, which also suggest that extraverts are generally more satisfied than introverts (Rahim, 1981; Harrington and Loffredo, 2001) and that extravert churchgoers are happier than introvert churchgoers (Francis and Jones, 2000b).

The third major finding is that, with the exception of the EI index, it appears that those types of people that are underrepresented in the church are most likely to express dissatisfaction with the church. Intuitive types, thinking types, and perceiving types are all underrepresented in the current sample and they all report significantly lower levels of church satisfaction than sensing types, feeling types, and judging types. Likewise, INTPs, ENTPs, and ISTPs report the lowest levels of church satisfaction of the sixteen complete types, and they comprise just 0.9%, 1.5%, and 1.2% of the current sample. In addition, they are all significantly underrepresented in the current sample compared to UK population norms (see table 5.1). NTs report the lowest levels of church satisfaction of the function pairs and they are also underrepresented, comprising less than one in ten of the current sample of churchgoers (9%). Dominant intuitive types report the lowest levels of church satisfaction of the dominant types and they are also underrepresented, comprising less than one in eight of the current sample of churchgoers (12.3%). To summarise, it would seem that churchgoers with a preference for intuition, for thinking, and for perceiving

feel on the margins of their churches. They are less likely to feel welcome, comfortable, content, happy, valued, at ease, satisfied, as though they fit in, and as though they belong, than other, better represented types.

The issue of church satisfaction may be seen to be particularly pertinent in the current climate of church decline. Richter and Francis (1998) report the estimate that 1,500 people leave British churches every week. Moreover, based on a random telephone survey, they argue that 62% of the people in England have at some point in their lives been churchgoers, attending church 'at least six times a year (not including Christmas and Easter)'. They go on to report that three out of five people interviewed no longer attend church, which based on the 1996 projected population figures, would suggest that 18.1 million people are church leavers. Richter and Francis (1998, p xii) summarise their findings:

Even allowing for the fact that a significant proportion of people in the British population may be exaggerating their past involvement or may have attended involuntarily as a child, there is a considerable number of people in the British population who have either been church members or have been happy to attend a church at some point in their lives, but do so no longer.

Richter and Francis (1998) explore a number of causes of church leaving, including loss of faith, changing cultural values, issues of faith development, 'changes and chances' (such as moving house), home background, cost (in terms of time, money, and energy), unfulfilled expectations of the church, and lack of a sense of belonging.

In particular, this lack of a sense of belonging may be to do with issues of psychological type. It may be the case that intuitive type, thinking type, and perceiving type churchgoers are leaving or failing to join churches because they feel their gifts and needs go unrecognised and unvalued.

Their dissatisfaction with the church may be the reason for their underrepresentation. Alternatively, it may be that because Ns, Ts, and Ps are underrepresented in the church, they feel there is no place for them. Their underrepresentation may be the reason for their dissatisfaction with the church.

In either case, the church may wish to address this issue by refocusing its structures and activities to accommodate better those who feel dissatisfied. The church might, for example, choose to emphasise the need for a creative vision of Christianity and the importance of symbols and mystery in the faith, in order to accommodate better the gifts and needs of intuitive types. The church might, for example, choose to emphasise the need for challenge and truth in Christianity and the importance of justice and integrity in the faith, in order to accommodate better the gifts and needs of thinking types. The church might, for example, choose to emphasise the need for breaking away from existing routines to explore change in Christianity and the spontaneity and flexibility in the faith, in order to accommodate better the gifts and needs of perceiving types. In this way, not only would Ns, Ts, and Ps who currently attend church feel more satisfied and less marginalised, but other Ns, Ts, and Ps who have either left the church or who have never joined may now feel there is a place for them.

6. Conclusion

This chapter has assessed the relationship between psychological type preferences and church satisfaction. Previous studies concerned with the relationship between psychological type preferences and satisfaction, both among secular groups and among Christian groups, were reviewed. A new scale of church satisfaction, the CSS, was described and it was found to demonstrate satisfactory internal consistency. The psychological type preferences of churchgoers

were analysed in relation to the CSS; it was found that churchgoers who prefer extraversion, sensing, feeling, and judging are more satisfied with their congregations than churchgoers who prefer introversion, intuition, thinking, and perceiving. The implications of these analyses were discussed. The next chapter will explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation.

-CHAPTER TEN-

DENOMINATION AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Previous Studies of Psychological Type and Denomination**
- 3. Current Study**
- 4. Discussion**
- 5. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The previous chapter explored the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and church satisfaction. This chapter explores the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and denominational affiliation. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and denomination will be reviewed. The psychological type preferences of the current sample will be analysed in relation to their denominational affiliation by comparing and contrasting the psychological type preferences of churchgoers of different denominational groups. The implications of these analyses will be discussed and conclusions will be drawn about the relationship between psychological type denominational affiliation.

2. Previous studies

A number of type theorists have made suggestions about the way in which psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation are related. Edwards (1998, p 19) suggests that denominations exist in order to 'provide a comfortable type-similar setting for particular types of people'. For example Kroeger and Thuesen (1988) propose that different denominations are likely to be attractive to different psychological types. They suggest that sensing types will be attracted to the 'no-frills' simplicity of the Methodist and Baptist churches; that intuitive types will be attracted to the symbolic and liturgical style of the Lutheran and Episcopalian churches; that thinking types, especially intuitive-thinking types, will be attracted to the conceptual and liberal style of Unitarianism and Christian Science; that sensing-perceiving types will be attracted to the 'holy-roller' style of the charismatic movement, and that sensing-judging types will be attracted to the conservative style of fundamentalist churches. Similarly, Jones (1991) suggests that 'fundamentalists are often "Sensors"; liberals tend to be "Intuitives"; charismatics are often "Feelers"; and unitarians tend to be "Thinkers"' (p 41).

The suggestions of Kroeger and Thuesen (1988), Jones (1991), and Edwards (1998) are based entirely on a theoretical understanding of psychological type. However, a number of theorists (Carskadon, 1981; Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1993) have conducted empirical studies among churchgoers to see if there is a relationship between psychological type preferences and denomination. Unless stated otherwise, each of the empirical studies makes use of the MBTI.

Carskadon (1981) investigated the relationship between denominational affiliation and psychological type preferences among 300 college students in the United States of America, claiming affiliation to various religious backgrounds: Baptist, Methodist, Catholic, Presbyterian, non-denominational, Episcopal, Church of Christ, agnostic, Lutheran, Church of God, none, Unitarian, atheist, 'Church of Fear', and Jewish.

Many of the samples used by Carskadon (1981) are unsuitable for comparison with the current sample due to their small size (for example, only one member of the Church of God was analysed). The larger samples include the profiles of Baptists (N = 119), Methodists (N = 56), and Catholics (N = 32). Among 119 Baptists he found that 63% preferred extraversion and 37% preferred introversion, 63% preferred sensing and 37% preferred intuition, 54% preferred feeling and 46% preferred thinking, and 56% preferred judging and 44% preferred perceiving. Among 56 Methodists he found that 59% preferred extraversion and 41% preferred introversion, 59% preferred sensing and 41% preferred intuition, 50 % preferred feeling and 50% preferred thinking, and 66% preferred judging and 34% preferred perceiving. Among 32 Catholics he found that 53% preferred introversion and 47% preferred extraversion, 62% preferred sensing and 38% preferred intuition, 50% preferred feeling and 50% preferred thinking, and 69% preferred judging and 31% preferred perceiving. The type profiles of these samples are fairly

typical of religious samples in the United States of America (see, for example, MacDaid, McCaulley and Kainz, 1986) except for the comparatively high frequency of thinking types. Carskadon (1981, p 77) argues that the 'one conclusion suggested by the results with reasonable consistency is that conservative, fundamentalist religions have a greater proportion of sensing types than do relatively liberal religions or groups of non-believers'.

Delis-Bulhoes (1990) investigated the psychological type preferences of two Francophone Canadian congregations. Among the first congregation, comprised of 154 Evangelical Protestant active church members, she found that 71% preferred introversion and 29% preferred extraversion, 88% preferred sensing and 12% preferred intuition, 62% preferred thinking and 38% preferred feeling, and 62% preferred judging and 38% preferred perceiving. Among the second congregation, comprised of 46 Catholic active church members, she found that 65% preferred introversion and 35% preferred extraversion, 72% preferred sensing and 28% preferred intuition, 57% preferred feeling and 43% preferred thinking, and 67% preferred judging and 33% preferred perceiving. The Evangelical Protestant sample displays a greater preference for introversion, sensing, thinking, and perceiving than the Catholic sample.

Ross (1993) conducted a study among 116 urban members of the Anglican Church of Canada. He found that 62% of this sample preferred introversion and 38% preferred extraversion, 64% preferred intuition and 36% preferred sensing, 69% preferred feeling and 31% preferred thinking, and 59% preferred judging and 41% preferred perceiving. Overall, the most frequent type among this sample of members of the Anglican Church of Canada was found to be INFP (18%), followed by ISFJ (12%).

Ross (1993) then goes on to compare this sample of Anglicans with the samples of Evangelical Protestants (N = 154) and Roman Catholics (N = 46) provided by Delis-Bulhoes (1990). He found that, compared to the Evangelical Protestants, intuitive types and feeling types were significantly ($P < .001$) overrepresented among members of the Anglican Church of Canada. He found that, compared to the Roman Catholics, intuitive types were significantly ($P < .001$) overrepresented among members of the Anglican Church of Canada. Ross (1993, p 33) suggests that ‘the fact that intuitive types were overrepresented among Anglicans compared to evangelicals and Catholics supports Carskadon’s (1981) association of intuition with “liberal religion”’.

These three studies (Carskadon; 1981, Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1993) would seem to suggest that there is a relationship between psychological type and denominational affiliation; members of more conservative denominations seem to prefer sensing, while members of more liberal denominations seem to prefer intuition. This would support the hypothesis of Jones (1991) that ‘fundamentalists are often “Sensors”; liberals tend to be “Intuitives”’.

Although only three empirical studies have explicitly proposed to examine the relationship between denominational affiliation and psychological type, it is possible to investigate this relationship by surveying the psychological type profiles of samples of members of different denominations as shown in table 10.1. The psychological type profiles of the samples are based on the dichotomous preferences of the individuals that comprise the sample. For example, if a sample is comprised mainly of extraverts, sensing types, thinking types, and judging types, then that sample’s type is ESTJ. This applies even if the most frequently occurring *whole* type was different (for example, ISFJ). If a sample contains an equal balance on a dichotomous index the

code X is given on that index. So, for example, if a sample is comprised mainly of introverts, sensing types, feeling types, but an equal number of judging types and perceiving types, then that sample's type is ISFX.

Table 10.1 Psychological type profiles of different denominations

Author	Denomination	Sample	N	Location	Type
Carskadon (1981)*	Baptist	student churchgoers	199	USA	ESFJ
Carskadon (1981)*	Methodist	student churchgoers	56	USA	ESXJ
Carskadon (1981)*	Roman Catholic	student churchgoers	32	USA	ISXJ
Gerhardt (1983)	Unitarian Universalists	adult members	83	USA	INTJ
Gerhardt (1983)	Unitarian Universalists	teenage members	60	USA	ENFP
Delis-Bulhoes (1990)	Roman Catholic	active Church members	46	Canada	ISFJ
Delis-Bulhoes (1990)	Evangelical Protestant	active church members	154	Canada	ISTJ
Ross (1993)	Anglican Church of Canada	urban church members	116	Canada	INFJ
Ross (1995)	Roman Catholic	Anglophone male churchgoers	59	Canada	ISTJ
Ross (1995)	Roman Catholic	Anglophone female churchgoers	116	Canada	ISFJ
Rehak (1998)	Redeemer Lutheran	active church members	76	USA	IXFJ
Francis and Ross (2000)	Roman Catholic	lay teachers (trainees)	64	Canada	ISFJ

* Only samples of 32 or greater are included from Carskadon's (1981) study.

From the twelve samples of churchgoers of different denominations shown in table 10.1 the following conclusions may be drawn. First, Catholic churchgoers tend to prefer introversion, sensing, and judging. Second, members of liberal Christian groups tend to prefer intuition (Gerhardt, 1983; Ross, 1993), while members of conservative Protestant groups tend to prefer sensing (Carskadon, 1981; Delis-Bulhoes, 1990).

3. Current Study

Within the current study, the term 'denomination' has been used to describe the church actually attended at the time of the survey, rather than to describe the participants' self-identification. Therefore, participants completing questionnaires within a particular church, are designated as belonging to that denomination. For example, participants completing a questionnaire in a Baptist church, are ascribed the denomination 'Baptist'. Within the current sample nine denominations are represented: Church of England (N = 1,875, 69%), Baptist (N = 422, 16%), Methodist (N = 190, 7%), Church in Wales (N = 121, 5%), Scottish Episcopal (N = 32, 1%), Roman Catholic (N = 31, 1%), Independent Evangelical (N = 21, 1%), Local Ecumenical Project (N = 17, 1%), and United Reformed Church (N = 9, 0%).

Among churchgoers attending a Scottish Episcopal church (N = 32), 53% preferred introversion and 47% preferred extraversion, 66% preferred sensing and 34% preferred intuition, 66% preferred feeling and 34% preferred thinking, and 66% preferred judging and 34% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring type among this sample was found to be ISFJ (19%).

Among churchgoers attending a Roman Catholic church (N = 31), 61% preferred introversion and 39% preferred extraversion, 84% preferred sensing and 16% preferred intuition, 55% preferred feeling and 45% preferred thinking, and 87% preferred judging and 13% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring type among this sample was found to be ISTJ (29%). These findings reflect those of previous studies conducted among Roman Catholic churchgoers (Carskadon, 1981; Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1995).

Among churchgoers attending an Independent Evangelical church (N = 21), 57% preferred

extraversion and 43% preferred introversion, 57% preferred sensing and 43% preferred intuition, 52% preferred thinking and 48% preferred feeling, and 67% preferred judging and 33% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring type among this sample was found to be ISFJ (24%).

Among churchgoers attending a Local Ecumenical Project (N = 17), 69% preferred extraversion and 41% preferred introversion, 71% preferred sensing and 29% preferred intuition, 65% preferred feeling and 35% preferred thinking, and 88% preferred judging and 12% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring type among this sample was found to be ESFJ (41%).

Among churchgoers attending a United Reformed Church (N = 9), 67% preferred introversion and 33% preferred extraversion, 89% preferred sensing and 11% preferred intuition, 78% preferred feeling and 22% preferred thinking, and 100% preferred judging and 0% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ESFJ (33%) and ISFJ (33%).

For the purposes of the further analysis, only denominational groups comprised of more than one congregation were included, as it is incongruous to generalise from one congregation to an entire denomination. Therefore, only churchgoers affiliated to the Church of England, the Baptist Church, the Methodist Church, and the Church in Wales were analysed.

The Church of England is the officially established Christian Church in England and its history can be traced from the seventh century and from Saint Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury. Perhaps the most significant event in the history of the Church of England is the break from the Roman Catholic church during the reign of Henry VIII (1509-1547). Two main

reasons may be suggested for this schism. The first reason is theological; Protestantism, as initiated by reformers such as Martin Luther (1483-1546) and John Calvin (1509-1564) was beginning to spread across Europe to England during the beginning of the sixteenth century. In addition, 'as early as the thirteenth century a strong anti-papal and anti-clerical movement developed in Britain' (Atkinson, 1990, p 386). Protest against corruption in the Catholic church and dissatisfaction with the polarisation of clergy and laity expedited the split of the church in England from the Roman Catholic church. The second reason is political and is summarised by Walker, Norris, Lotz and Handy (1997, p 481): 'the immediate occasion, though not the sufficient cause, of the English reformation was the "great question" of Henry's divorce from Catherine of Aragon and the drastic curtailment of the church's wealth and privileges'. Walker, Norris, Lotz and Handy (1997, p 481) continue:

In this respect, the Reformation was largely an act of state, imposed from above by a willful king, his adroit masters, and a pliable Parliament. At the same time, this political rebellion was abetted and eventually transformed by an indigenous movement of church reform and popular religious dissent that antedated the king's matrimonial problems and plans.

The church in England split from the Roman Catholic church on 3 November 1534, when parliament passed the Supremacy Act, which announced King Henry VIII (and his successors) as 'the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England' (Walker, Norris, Lotz and Handy, 1997, p 485).

It was during the reign of Elizabeth I (1558-1603) that the Church of England developed much of its foundational identity: 'its formularies including the Book of Common Prayer, the Ordinal, the Thirty-Nine Articles, and the two Books of Homilies became from Elizabeth's reign the basis of Anglican self-understanding, preaching, and doctrine' (Cross and Livingstone, 1997, p 65).

The Church of England is the founding member of the Anglican communion; today it is the only part of this Communion still retaining state establishment.

The Church of England is perhaps best characterised by its emphasis on scripture, tradition, and reason. Within this threefold authority a wide diversity of beliefs and values are held in tension.

Both liberal and conservative Christians, and evangelical and Anglo-catholic Christians find themselves at home in the Church of England. Bishop and Darton (1987, p 124) summarise this phenomenon:

It is a characteristic of Anglicanism in general, as part of its tradition of comprehensiveness, that it does not demand that doctrines which it holds to be integral to the faith are not yet capable of diverse theological interpretation.

Table 10.2 displays the psychological type profile of Church of England churchgoers (N = 1,919) attending 68 congregations. Within the current sample it was found that 57% of participants preferred introversion and 43% preferred extraversion, 79% preferred sensing and 21% preferred intuition, 60% preferred feeling and 40% preferred thinking, and 85% preferred judging and 15% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (23%) and ESFJ (19%). This is consistent with previous studies of UK churchgoers, where denomination has not been specified, which have also demonstrated preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging (Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a).

In order to examine the relationship between psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation, the psychological type preferences of Church of England churchgoers were compared with the preferences of Baptist churchgoers, Methodist churchgoers, and Church in Wales

**Table 10.2 Type distribution
for Church of England churchgoers.
N = 1,919 + = 1% of N**

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ n = 344 (18.3%) ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++	ISFJ n = 432 (23.0%) ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ +++	INFJ n = 70 (3.7%) ++++	INTJ n = 84 (4.5%) ++++	E n = 807 (43.0%)	I n = 1,068 (57.0%)	
				S n = 1,479 (78.9%)	N n = 407 (21.1%)	
				T n = 742 (39.6%)	F n = 1,133 (60.4%)	
				J n = 1,590 (84.8%)	P n = 285 (15.2%)	
ISTP n = 20 (1.1%) +	ISFP n = 58 (3.1%) +++	INFP n = 42 (2.2%) ++	INTP n = 18 (1.0%) +	Pairs and Temperaments		
				IJ n = 930 (49.6%)	IP n = 138 (7.4%)	
				EP n = 147 (7.8%)	EJ n = 660 (35.2%)	
				ST n = 570 (30.4%)	SF n = 909 (48.5%)	
				NF n = 224 (11.9%)	NT n = 172 (9.2%)	
ESTP n = 7 (0.4%)	ESFP n = 67 (3.6%) ++++	ENFP n = 49 (2.6%) +++	ENTP n = 24 (1.3%) +	SJ n = 1,327 (70.8%)	SP n = 152 (8.1%)	
				NP n = 133 (7.1%)	NJ n = 263 (14.0%)	
				TJ n = 673 (35.9%)	TP n = 69 (3.7%)	
				FP n = 216 (11.5%)	FJ n = 917 (48.9%)	
ESTJ n = 199 (10.6%) ++++ ++++ +	ESFJ n = 352 (18.8%) ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++	ENFJ n = 63 (3.4%) +++	ENTJ n = 46 (2.5%) +++	IN n = 214 (12.1%)	EN n = 182 (10.6%)	
				IS n = 854 (45.0%)	ES n = 625 (32.3%)	
				ET n = 276 (14.7%)	EF n = 531 (28.3%)	
				IF n = 602 (32.1%)	IT n = 466 (24.9%)	

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types			
	n	%		n	%	n	%		
E-TJ	245	13.1	I-TP	38	2.0	Dt. T	283	15.1	<i>Charlotte Craig</i> <i>Psychological types of</i> <i>Church of England churchgoers</i>
E-FJ	415	22.1	I-FP	100	5.3	Dt. F	515	27.5	
ES-P	74	3.9	IS-J	776	41.4	Dt. S	850	45.3	
EN-P	73	3.9	IN-J	154	8.2	Dt. N	227	12.1	

churchgoers, using the chi-square test of statistical significance.

The Baptist Church was established during the early seventeenth century, as a separatist movement from the Church of England. John Smyth (1570-1612), a former Church of England clergyman, led dissent and adopted separatist principles, becoming 'convinced that the apostolic method of admitting members to church fellowship was by baptism on profession of repentance toward God and faith in Christ (Walker, Norris, Lotz and Handy, 1997, p 550). Smyth fled to Amsterdam, Holland to escape the harsh rule of James I in England. The first Baptist congregations were established in Amsterdam around 1608, before returning to England around 1611.

The Baptist churches are so called because of their emphasis on the practice of 'believer's baptism', initiation into the church through adult baptism, following a confession of faith in Christ and the Gospel. This conflicted with the concurrent tradition of the Church of England, which at this time emphasised the baptism of infants. Smyth and his followers were keen to reestablish 'believer's baptism' in keeping with the traditions of the New Testament 'in the interests of a true doctrine of the nature of the Church' (Cross and Livingstone, 1997, p 154).

Today the Baptist Church is one of the largest Protestant and Free Church communions (Cross and Livingstone, 1997). In terms of beliefs, Cross and Livingstone (1997, p 155) argue that 'in spite of their variety and individualism, most Baptists have remained strongly attached to the truths of evangelical Christianity'. Scripture is of paramount significance in the Baptist Church and is seen to be the foundation of all doctrine and theology.

Table 10.3 displays the psychological type profile of Baptist churchgoers (N = 422) attending 10 congregations. Within the current sample it was found that 57% of participants preferred introversion and 43% preferred extraversion, 77% preferred sensing and 23% preferred intuition, 60% preferred feeling and 40% preferred thinking, and 79% preferred judging and 21% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (23%) and ESFJ (17%). This is consistent with previous studies of UK churchgoers, where denomination has not been specified, which have also demonstrated preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging (see Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a). However, this psychological type profile differs from that found by Carskadon (1981) among a sample of 199 students who were Baptist churchgoers; Carskadon found preferences for extraversion, sensing, feeling, and judging.

In addition, table 10.3 employs the self-selection ratio and the chi-square test of statistical significance to compare the psychological type preferences of the Baptist churchgoers with the psychological type preferences of Church of England churchgoers. Table 10.3 demonstrates that among Baptist churchgoers perceiving types are significantly ($P < .01$) overrepresented, compared to Church of England churchgoers. Conversely, judging types are significantly ($P < .01$) underrepresented, compared to Church of England churchgoers. Baptist churchgoers with preferences for EP, TP, and ESTP are significantly ($P < .01$) overrepresented, compared to Church of England churchgoers. In addition, Baptist churchgoers with preferences for SP, ISTP, and ESP are significantly ($P < .05$) overrepresented, compared to Church of England churchgoers. Conversely, Baptist churchgoers with preferences for SJ are significantly ($P < .05$) underrepresented, compared to Church of England churchgoers.

**Table 10.3 Type distribution
for Baptist churchgoers
and SRTT Comparison with Church of England churchgoers.**
N = 422 += 1% of N I = Selection Ratio Index *P<.05 **P<.01 ***P<.001

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ n = 72 (17.1%) I = 0.93 ++++ ++++ ++++ ++	ISFJ n = 95 (22.5%) I = 0.98 ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ +++	INFJ n = 15 (3.6%) I = 0.95 +++	INTJ n = 22 (5.2%) I = 1.16 ++++	E n = 181 (42.9%) I n = 241 (57.1%) S n = 325 (77.0%) N n = 97 (23.0%) T n = 170 (40.3%) F n = 252 (59.7%) J n = 335 (79.4%) P n = 87 (20.6%)	I = 1.00 I = 1.00 I = 0.98 I = 1.09 I = 1.02 I = 0.99 **I = 0.94 **I = 1.36
ISTP n = 10 (2.4%) I = 2.22* ++	ISFP n = 12 (2.8%) I = 0.92 +++	INFP n = 12 (2.8%) I = 1.27 +++	INTP n = 3 (0.7%) I = 0.74 +	Pairs and Temperaments	
				IJ n = 204 (48.3%) IP n = 37 (8.8%) EP n = 50 (11.8%) EJ n = 131 (31.0%) ST n = 124 (29.4%) SF n = 201 (47.6%) NF n = 51 (12.1%) NT n = 46 (10.9%) SJ n = 276 (65.4%) SP n = 49 (11.6%) NP n = 38 (9.0%) NJ n = 59 (14.0%) TJ n = 141 (33.4%) TP n = 29 (6.9%) FP n = 58 (13.7%) FJ n = 194 (46.0%) IN n = 52 (12.3%) EN n = 45 (10.7%) IS n = 189 (44.8%) ES n = 136 (32.2%) ET n = 63 (14.9%) EF n = 118 (28.0%) IF n = 134 (31.8%) IT n = 107 (25.4%)	I = 0.97 I = 1.19 **I = 1.51 I = 0.88 I = 0.97 I = 0.98 I = 1.01 I = 1.19 *I = 0.92 **I = 1.43 I = 1.27 I = 1.00 I = 0.93 **I = 1.87 I = 1.19 I = 0.94 I = 1.08 I = 1.10 I = 0.98 I = 0.97 I = 1.01 I = 0.99 I = 0.99 I = 1.02
ESTP n = 6 (1.4%) I = 3.81** +	ESFP n = 21 (5.0%) I = 1.39 ++++	ENFP n = 13 (3.1%) I = 1.18 +++	ENTP n = 10 (2.4%) I = 1.85 ++		
ESTJ n = 36 (8.5%) I = 0.80 ++++ ++++	ESFJ n = 73 (17.3%) I = 0.92 ++++ ++++ ++++ ++	ENFJ n = 11 (2.6%) I = 0.78 +++	ENTJ n = 11 (2.6%) I = 1.06 +++		

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types			Charlotte Craig Psychological types of Baptist churchgoers		
n	%	index	n	%	index	n	%	index			
E-TJ	47	11.1	0.85	I-TP	13	3.1	1.52	Dt. T	60	14.2	0.95
E-FJ	84	19.9	0.90	I-FP	24	5.7	1.07	Dt. F	108	25.6	0.93
ES-P	24	6.4	1.62*	IS-J	167	37.6	0.96	Dt. S	194	46.0	1.01
EN-P	23	5.5	1.40	IN-J	37	8.8	1.07	Dt. N	60	14.2	1.17

The Methodist Church began as a movement within the within the Church of England, initiated by the brothers John Wesley (1703-1791), his younger brother Charles (1707-1788) and George Whitefield (1714-1770). The movement was so called because it employed a methodical approach to scriptures. The movement began as a small society of students at Oxford, who met together between 1729 and 1735, and pledged to 'have regular private devotions and to meet each evening to read the Bible and pray' (Skovington Wood, 1990, p 453).

The Methodist movement was initially intended to exist within the framework of the Church of England. However, political issues resulted in schism. Following the American revolution, the Church of England rejected its members in America and withheld ordained ministers from them. John Wesley's decision to ordain ministers led to schism with the established church. A number of turning points for the movement occurred in America in 1784:

Wesley appointed Asbury and Coke as joint superintendents for America. Contrary to his wishes, the title of Methodist Episcopal church was adopted by the Christmas conference; Asbury and Coke were made bishops. This amounted to a declaration of independence; American Methodism now stood on its own feet as a separate body (Skovington Wood, 1990, p 456).

Doctrinally, the Methodist Church holds much in common with other Protestant churches, as it is biblically based, and accepts the Creeds of the early church and the principles of the Protestant Reformation. *A Catechism for the Use of the People Called Methodists* (2000) outlines five distinctive features of the Methodist Church. First, the significance of lay leadership, in areas including preaching, pastoral care, and congregational administration, is emphasised. Second, the significance of hymn-singing for worship and doctrinal instruction is emphasised. Third, congregations are divided into small groups for teaching, pastoral care, and fellowship. Fourth, the Methodist Church has developed a Circuit system which links local congregations within an

area. It has also developed Districts, which link numbers of Circuits. Fifth, all congregations are linked by the Connexional system through the annual conference.

Table 10.4 displays the psychological type profile of Methodist churchgoers (N = 190) attending 5 congregations. Within the current sample it was found that 55% of participants preferred introversion and 45% preferred extraversion, 83% preferred sensing and 17% preferred intuition, 64% preferred feeling and 36% preferred thinking, and 90% preferred judging and 10% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ESFJ (26%) and ISFJ (24%). This is consistent with previous studies of UK churchgoers, where denomination has not been specified, which have also demonstrated preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging (see Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a). However, this psychological type profile differs from that found by Carskadon (1981) among a sample of 56 students who were Methodist churchgoers; Carskadon found preferences for extraversion, sensing, judging, and equal preferences for thinking and feeling.

Table 10.4 employs the self-selection ratio and the chi-square test of statistical significance to compare the psychological type preferences of the Methodist churchgoers with the psychological type preferences of Church of England churchgoers.

Table 10.4 demonstrates that among Methodist churchgoers people with preferences for ESFJ and EFJ are significantly ($P < .05$) overrepresented, compared to Church of England churchgoers.

**Table 10.4 Type distribution
for Methodist churchgoers
and SRTT Comparison with Church of England churchgoers.**
N = 190 += 1% of N I = Selection Ratio Index *P<.05 **P<.01 ***P<.001

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ n = 32 (16.8%) I = 0.92 +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	ISFJ n = 46 (24.2%) I = 1.05 +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++	INFJ n = 5 (2.6%) I = 0.70 +++	INTJ n = 11 (5.8%) I = 1.29 +++++ +	E n = 85 (44.7%) I n = 105 (55.3%) S n = 158 (83.2%) N n = 32 (16.8%) T n = 68 (35.8%) F n = 122 (64.2%) J n = 170 (89.5%) P n = 20 (10.5%)	I = 1.04 I = 0.97 I = 1.06 I = 0.79 I = 0.90 I = 1.06 I = 1.06 I = 0.69
ISTP n = 1 (0.5%) I = 0.51 +	ISFP n = 5 (2.6%) I = 0.87 +++	INFP n = 3 (1.6%) I = 0.67 ++	INTP n = 2 (1.1%) I = 1.12 +	Pairs and Temperaments	
				IJ n = 94 (49.5%) IP n = 11 (5.8%) EP n = 9 (4.7%) EJ n = 76 (40.0%) ST n = 52 (27.4%) SF n = 106 (55.8%) NF n = 16 (8.4%) NT n = 16 (8.4%) SJ n = 146 (76.8%) SP n = 12 (6.3%) NP n = 8 (4.2%) NJ n = 24 (12.6%) TJ n = 64 (33.7%) TP n = 4 (2.1%) FP n = 16 (8.4%) FJ n = 106 (55.8%) IN n = 21 (11.1%) EN n = 11 (5.8%) IS n = 84 (44.2%) ES n = 74 (38.9%) ET n = 22 (11.6%) EF n = 63 (33.2%) IF n = 59 (31.1%) IT n = 46 (24.2%)	I = 0.99 I = 0.79 I = 0.60 I = 1.14 I = 0.90 I = 1.15 I = 0.70 I = 0.92 I = 1.09 I = 0.79 I = 0.58 I = 0.90 I = 0.94 I = 0.59 I = 0.72 I = 1.14 I = 0.96 I = 0.59 I = 0.97 I = 1.18 I = 0.79 I = 1.17 I = 0.97 I = 0.97
ESTP n = 1 (0.5%) I = 1.44 +	ESFP n = 5 (2.6%) I = 0.74 +++	ENFP n = 3 (1.6%) I = 0.58 ++	ENTP n = 0 (0.0%) I = 0.00		
ESTJ n = 18 (9.5%) I = 0.90 +++++ +++++	ESFJ n = 50 (26.3%) I = 1.41* +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +	ENFJ n = 5 (2.6%) I = 0.79 +++	ENTJ n = 3 (1.6%) I = 0.64 ++		

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types						
n	%	index	n	%	index	n	%	index				
E-TJ	21	11.1	0.85	I-TP	3	1.6	0.78	Dt. T	24	12.6	0.84	Charlotte Craig Psychological types of Methodist churchgoers
E-FJ	54	28.9	1.31*	I-FP	8	4.2	0.79	Dt. F	63	33.2	1.21	
ES-P	6	3.2	0.80	IS-J	78	41.1	0.99	Dt. S	84	44.2	0.98	
EN-P	3	1.6	0.41	IN-J	16	8.4	1.03	Dt. N	19	10.0	0.83	

**Table 10.5 Type distribution
for Church in Wales churchgoers
and SRTT Comparison with Church of England churchgoers.**
N = 121 I = Selection Ratio Index *P<.05 **P<.01 ***P<.001

The Sixteen Complete Types

Dichotomous Preferences

ISTJ n = 27 (22.3%) I = 1.22 ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ ++	ISFJ n = 36 (29.8%) I = 1.29 ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++	INFJ n = 2 (1.7%) I = 0.44 ++	INTJ n = 5 (4.1%) I = 0.92 ++++	E n = 46 (38.0%) I n = 75 (62.0%) S n = 104 (86.0%) N n = 17 (14.0%) T n = 43 (35.5%) F n = 78 (64.5%) J n = 110 (90.9%) P n = 11 (9.1%)	I = 0.88 I = 1.09 I = 1.09 I = 0.67 I = 0.90 I = 1.07 I = 1.07 I = 0.60
--	--	--	--	--	--

ISTP n = 0 (0.0%) I = 0.00	ISFP n = 1 (0.8%) I = 0.27 +	INFP n = 4 (3.3%) I = 1.48 +++	INTP n = 0 (0.0%) I = 0.00	Pairs and Temperaments	IJ n = 70 (57.9%) IP n = 5 (4.1%) EP n = 6 (5.0%) EJ n = 40 (33.1%)	I = 1.17 I = 0.56 I = 0.63 I = 0.94
--	---	---	--	-------------------------------	--	--

ESTP n = 0 (0.0%) I = 0.00	ESFP n = 2 (1.7%) I = 0.46 ++	ENFP n = 3 (2.5%) I = 0.95 +++	ENTP n = 1 (0.8%) I = 0.65 +	ST n = 36 (29.8%) SF n = 67 (56.2%) NF n = 10 (8.3%) NT n = 7 (5.8%) SJ n = 101 (83.5%) SP n = 3 (2.5%) NP n = 8 (6.6%) NJ n = 9 (7.4%)	I = 0.98 I = 1.16 I = 0.69 I = 0.63 **I = 1.18 I = 0.31 I = 0.93 *I = 0.53
--	--	---	---	---	---

ESTJ n = 9 (7.4%) I = 0.70 ++++ ++	ESFJ n = 29 (24.0%) I = 1.28 ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++	ENFJ n = 1 (0.8%) I = 0.25 +	ENTJ n = 1 (0.8%) I = 0.34 +	TJ n = 42 (34.7%) TP n = 1 (0.8%) FP n = 10 (8.3%) FJ n = 68 (56.2%) IN n = 11 (9.1%) EN n = 6 (5.0%) IS n = 64 (52.9%) ES n = 40 (33.1%) ET n = 11 (9.1%) EF n = 35 (28.9%) IF n = 43 (35.5%) IT n = 32 (26.4%)	I = 0.97 I = 0.22 I = 0.72 I = 1.15 I = 0.80 I = 0.51 I = 1.16 I = 0.99 I = 0.62 I = 1.02 I = 1.11 I = 1.06
--	--	---	---	--	--

Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types				Charlotte Craig Psychological types of Church in Wales churchgoers
n	%	index		n	%	index		n	%	index		
E-TJ	10	8.3	0.63	I-TP	0	0.0	0.00	Dt. T	10	8.3	0.55*	
E-FJ	30	24.8	1.12	I-FP	5	4.1	0.77	Dt. F	35	28.9	1.05	
ES-P	2	1.7	0.42	IS-J	63	52.1	1.26*	Dt. S	65	53.7	1.18	
EN-P	4	3.3	0.85	IN-J	7	5.8	0.70	Dt. N	11	9.1	0.75	

The Anglican Church in Wales was, from the period of the Reformation until 1920, part of the Church of England. The state Church in Wales was the Church of England. During the 19th century there was a dramatic growth of Nonconformist Churches in Wales, which Price (1990) sees as leading to the disestablishment of the Church of England in Wales. Issues of Welsh nationalism were also significant and it is suggested by Price (1990, p 2) that the Nonconformists in Wales focused much energy on disestablishing the Church of England in Wales which was seen as the spiritual face of 'landlordism'.

The first parliamentary motion for disestablishment occurred in 1870. However, it was not until 1920, some 50 years after this first motion that disestablishment took effect and a separate province was created. Therefore, the 'Church in Wales is no longer the Eglwys Lloegr (the "English Church") over-dependent on the landowners' (Cross and Livingstone, 1997). Rather, the Church in Wales is an independent and self-governing Church within the Anglican Communion. The Church in Wales is also independent of the state, unlike the Church of England.

Today, the Church in Wales is the largest denomination in Wales (Price, 1990). Like the Church of England, it maintains characteristic features of Anglicanism, including a wide breadth of beliefs and values. However, the Church in Wales is critiqued by Price (1990, p 48) as being 'conservative in its attitudes, especially in ecumenism and in liturgy, sometimes "like a mighty tortoise" slow to act'.

Table 10.5 displays the psychological type profile of Church in Wales churchgoers (N = 121) attending 11 congregations. Within the current sample it was found that 62% of participants

preferred introversion and 38% preferred extraversion, 86% preferred sensing and 14% preferred intuition, 65% preferred feeling and 35% preferred thinking, and 91% preferred judging and 9% preferred perceiving. The most frequently occurring types among this sample were found to be ISFJ (30%) and ESFJ (24%). This is consistent with previous studies of UK churchgoers, where denomination has not been specified, which have also demonstrated preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging (see Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a).

In addition, table 10.5 employs the self-selection ratio and the chi-square test of statistical significance to compare the psychological type preferences of the Church in Wales churchgoers with the psychological type preferences of Church of England churchgoers. Table 10.5 demonstrates that Church in Wales churchgoers with preferences for SJ are significantly ($P < .01$) overrepresented, compared to Church of England churchgoers. In addition, Church in Wales churchgoers with preferences for ISJ are significantly ($P < .05$) overrepresented, compared to Church of England churchgoers. Conversely, Church in Wales churchgoers with preferences for NJ and dominant thinking are significantly ($P < .05$) underrepresented, compared to Church of England churchgoers.

4. Discussion

In the current study churchgoers attending Church of England, Baptist, Methodist, and Church in Wales churches all expressed preferences for introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving. This finding is consistent with previous studies of UK churchgoers, where denomination has not been specified, which have also demonstrated preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging (see Goldsmith and

Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a). In terms of dichotomous preferences, Baptist churchgoers contain significantly ($P < .01$) more perceiving types than Church of England churchgoers; however, Methodist and Church in Wales churchgoers do not significantly differ from Church of England churchgoers in terms of dichotomous preferences.

The major finding of interest in this study is that denominational affiliation does not seem to make a very great difference to the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK. Three possible explanations may be offered for this finding. The first explanation for the similar psychological type profiles of different denominational groups is that the current analysis has assessed only Protestant samples. It may be that the major relationship between psychological type and denominational affiliation is concerned with the distinction between Protestant churchgoers and Roman Catholic churchgoers. This explanation is supported by the findings of Delis-Bulhoes (1990) and Ross (1993). Further research now needs to be conducted among Roman Catholic congregations in the UK, to investigate whether Roman Catholic churchgoers in the UK have a significantly different psychological type profile to Protestant churchgoers in the UK.

A second possible explanation for the similar psychological type profiles of different denominational groups is that the current analysis has attributed denomination to churchgoers by observing which church they attended at the time of the survey, rather than by assessing participants' self-description. It may be the case that some churchgoers consider themselves to belong to one denomination, despite attending a church of another denomination. This may be the case, for example, when it is not practically possible for an individual to attend a church of their chosen denomination because of reasons of distance. In particular, in rural areas where

churches are sparsely distributed, churchgoers may feel they do not have the luxury of attending a church of their preferred denomination.

A third possible explanation is that the current analysis has failed to account for church orientation. Given that the majority of churchgoers in the current sample are Protestant, it may be that a distinction needs to be made between the different church orientations of individuals, in terms of issues such as personal identification as catholic/evangelical, liberal/catholic, and positive or negative influence of the charismatic movement. The next chapter will address this issue by exploring the relationship between psychological type and church orientation.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has assessed the relationship between denominational affiliation and psychological type preferences. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and denomination were reviewed. The psychological type preferences of churchgoers of different denominations were outlined. The psychological type preferences of Church of England churchgoers were outlined and then compared and contrasted with other denominational groups. In the current study churchgoers attending Church of England, Baptist, Methodist, and Church in Wales churches all expressed preferences for introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving. Baptist churchgoers were found to have significantly more perceiving types than Church of England churchgoers. However, Methodist and Church in Wales churchgoers do not significantly differ from Church of England churchgoers in terms of dichotomous preferences. The implications of these analyses were discussed and it was judged that denominational affiliation does not seem to make a very great difference to the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK. Three explanations were offered for

this finding. The next chapter will explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and church orientation.

-CHAPTER ELEVEN-

CHURCH ORIENTATION AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Understanding Church Orientation**
- 3. Conservative/Liberal Orientation**
 - a. Previous Studies
 - b. Current Study
 - c. Discussion
- 4. Evangelical/Catholic Orientation**
 - a. Previous Studies
 - b. Current Study
 - c. Discussion
- 5. Charismatic Influence**
 - a. Previous Studies
 - b. Current Study
 - c. Discussion
- 6. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The previous chapter explored the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and denominational affiliation. This chapter will explore the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and church orientation. The meaning of church orientation will be explored and previous studies concerned with psychological type and church orientation will be reviewed. The psychological type preferences of the current sample will be analysed in relation to their church orientation. The implications of these analyses will be discussed and conclusions will be drawn about the relationship between psychological type and church orientation.

2. Understanding church orientation

Church orientation is concerned with differences of attitude and practice which transcend denominational distinctions; church orientation is concerned with the way in which churchgoers perceive their own positions on issues of doctrine, worship, and praxis. This chapter will explore the relationship between psychological type and church orientation, in terms of three dimensions identified by Randall (2001, 2002): these are personal identification as conservative/liberal evangelical/catholic, and positive or negative influence of the charismatic movement.

Randall (2001) conducted an extensive review of different methods of measuring and interpreting church orientation, from the work of Coneybeare (1853), through Daniel (1967, 1968), Bryman, Ranson and Hinings (1974), Towler and Coxon (1979), Brierley (1991b), and Francis and colleagues (see, for example, Francis, 1985; Francis and Lankshear, 1991). As a consequence of this review Randall developed the Randall Scale of Church Orientation (RSCO: Randall, 2001, 2002). In particular Randall draws heavily on the models of church orientation proposed

by Daniel (1967) and by Francis and colleagues (see, for example, Francis, 1985; Francis and Lankshear, 1991).

The RSCO contains three bipolar 7-point indices relating to personal identification as conservative/liberal, evangelical/catholic, and positive or negative influence of the charismatic movement. These dimensions are theoretically orthogonal so, for example, it is possible for a churchgoer to be a anti-charismatic liberal evangelical or a pro-charismatic conservative catholic. Each of these bipolar indices contained seven possible responses, ranging from extremely evangelical to extremely catholic, from extremely conservative to extremely liberal, and from extremely positively influenced by the charismatic movement to extremely negatively influenced by the charismatic movement.

Each of these three indices of church orientation will now be reviewed in turn and related to the psychological type preferences of the current sample.

3. Conservative/liberal

The first dimension which Randall (2001) deems to be of pivotal importance in understanding church orientation is conservative/liberal orientation. This dimension is concerned with transdenominational attitudes toward issues of doctrine and practice. Daniel (1967, p 45) explains the conservative/liberal church orientation dimension in terms of authority: conservative churchgoers appeal to the authority of tradition, while liberal churchgoers appeal to the authority of human reason.

a. Previous Studies

The most commonly suggested way in which conservative/liberal orientation is thought to be related to psychological type preferences is in terms of the perceiving functions, that is, the preference for sensing or intuition. This hypothesis is grounded in type theory. Sensing types are conceptualised as conservative, traditional, and conventional and with a preference for what is known and well-established (see, for example, Myers and Myers, 1995). Intuitive types are conceptualised as innovative, experimental, and creative and as aspiring to bring change to established conventions (see, for example, Myers and Myers, 1995). This understanding of the perceiving functions has subsequently been theoretically applied to the conservative/liberal orientation within the Christian faith. For example, Jones (1991) argues that fundamentalists are more often sensing types and that liberals are more often intuitive types. A number of empirical studies which have investigated the relationship between conservative/liberal orientation will now be reviewed; unless stated otherwise, each of the empirical studies makes use of the MBTI.

Carskadon (1981) wished to determine if there is a relationship between psychological type preferences and the level of conservatism in the denomination affiliated to by the participants. He investigated the psychological type preferences of 300 college students claiming affiliation to various religious backgrounds: Baptist, Methodist, Catholic, Presbyterian, non-denominational, Episcopal, Church of Christ, agnostic, Lutheran, Church of God, none, Unitarian, atheist, 'Church of Fear', and Jewish. Carskadon (1981) divided these denominations into two groups: conservative and fundamentalist (Baptist, Church of Christ, Church of God, and 'Church of Fear') and more liberal (Methodist, Catholic, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, non-denominational Christians, Lutherans, Unitarians, and Jews). Initially, Carskadon (1981) found no significant relationship between conservativeness of religious affiliation and psychological

type preferences. However, Carskadon (1981) then compared the results of participants with preference scores of 15 or more on the MBTI scales. This analysis revealed that members of the more conservative denominations were 76% sensing types and 24% intuitive types, while members of the more liberal denominations were 58% sensing types and 42% intuitive types. From this Carskadon (1981) concluded that the following trend is evident: 'conservative, fundamentalist religions have a greater proportion of sensing types than do relatively more liberal religions... particularly among persons with fairly strong preferences as to their psychological types' (p 77).

Ross, Weiss and Jackson (1996) conducted a study involving 195 participants, derived from attendants at spirituality and individual differences workshops. They found that intuitive types tended to be more open to religious change, while sensing types tended to find doubt distressing.

Francis and Ross (1997) investigated the relationship between preferences in Christian spirituality and the perceiving functions. They hypothesised that sensing types would prefer traditional and conservative styles of worship and belief, while intuitive types would prefer to be open to the 'experiential aspects of spirituality'. Using a sample of 379 participants, derived from people who attended 25 courses on the topic of personality and spirituality, this hypothesis was tested by offering participants a scale of traditional Christian spirituality and a scale of experiential spirituality. Francis and Ross (1997) found that sensing types did tend to rate traditional Christian spirituality more highly than intuitive types. In addition, intuitive types tended to rate experiential spirituality (for example, 'looking at a painting', 'reading poetry') more highly than sensing types.

Similarly, Francis and Jones (1998) conducted a study involving 315 participants derived from people who attended 21 courses on the topic of personality and spirituality. Participants completed the MBTI and the *Christian Belief Inventory*, a scale intended to assess strength of conservative Christian beliefs. Correlations between the two scales indicated that sensing types tended to achieve higher scores on the scale of conservative Christian belief. In addition, thinking types also tended to achieve higher scores on the scale of conservative Christian belief.

Francis and Jones (1999a) investigated the relationship between tolerance for religious uncertainty and psychological type. Using a sample of 315 participants, derived from people who attended courses on the topic of personality and spirituality, a ten-item scale of agnosticism was administered and scores correlated with psychological type preferences. It was found that participants who preferred intuition over sensing achieved significantly higher scores on the scale of agnosticism. This may suggest that intuitive types tend to be more tolerant of religious uncertainty even when committed to Christian belief.

In contrast, Francis and Ross (2000) correlated the psychological type profiles of 64 people attending a course preparing them to be Catholic lay teachers with the 6-item quest scale, an inventory intended to measure the extent to which a person perceives their religiosity to be open-ended, responsive, and questioning. Given the results of the above studies, it might be expected that the quest scale should correlate with the SN index of the MBTI. However, Francis and Ross (2000) found no significant relationship between psychological type preferences and quest scale scores.

With the exception of the study by Francis and Ross (2000), there does seem to be evidence for

suggesting that sensing types tend to prefer a more conservative and traditional attitude toward their Christian faith, while intuitive types tend to be more open and liberal about their Christian faith (Carskadon, 1981; Ross, Weiss and Jackson, 1996; Francis and Ross, 1997; Francis and Jones, 1998; Francis and Jones, 1999a). There is also some evidence that thinking types also have a more conservative and traditional attitude toward belief (Francis and Jones, 1998).

Having reviewed these empirical studies concerned with conservative/liberal orientation and psychological type the following four hypotheses can be made concerning the current sample. First, that there will be no significant relationship between conservative/liberal orientation and preferences on the EI index. Second, that conservative churchgoers will prefer sensing significantly more frequently than liberal churchgoers. Third, that conservative churchgoers will prefer thinking significantly more frequently than liberal churchgoers. Fourth, that there will be no significant relationship between conservative/liberal orientation and preferences on the JP index.

b. Current study

For the purpose of analysis, the conservative/liberal index was collapsed into two categories in order to achieve a greater number of participants in each category. Participants who identified themselves as 'neutral' (N = 361, 15%) on this index were excluded from this analysis. On the index of conservative/liberal orientation participants who identified themselves as conservative, very conservative, or extremely conservative were collapsed into the single category 'conservative churchgoers' (N = 1,051, 42%) and participants who identified themselves as liberal, very liberal, or extremely liberal were collapsed into a the single category 'liberal churchgoers' (N = 1,020, 43%).

Table 11.1 T-Test: Church orientation - liberal/conservative orientation

Scale	<u>Liberal churchgoers</u>		<u>Conservative churchgoers</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.97	2.89	4.56	2.95	3.17	.01
Introversion	5.03	2.89	5.44	2.95	-3.17	.01
Sensing	6.95	2.49	7.81	2.17	-8.30	.001
Intuition	4.05	2.49	3.19	2.17	8.30	.001
Thinking	4.88	2.46	5.32	2.60	-3.89	.001
Feeling	6.12	2.46	5.68	2.60	3.89	.001
Judging	7.91	2.56	8.97	2.39	-9.70	.001
Perceiving	2.09	2.56	1.03	2.39	9.70	.001

In table 11.1 the mean FPTS scores of liberal churchgoers and conservative churchgoers were compared using an Independent Samples T-Test. Table 11.1 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences between the psychological type preferences of conservative churchgoers and liberal churchgoers on the FPTS sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving scales. In addition, there are there are significant ($P < .01$) differences between the psychological type preferences of conservative churchgoers and liberal churchgoers on the FPTS extraversion and introversion scales. In the current sample, conservative churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS introversion, sensing, thinking, and judging scales than liberal churchgoers. In contrast, liberal churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS extraversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving scales than conservative churchgoers.

c. Discussion

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between conservative/liberal orientation and preferences on the EI index. The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that conservative churchgoers report significantly

($P < .01$) higher mean scores on the FPTS I scale than liberal churchgoers. Conversely, liberal churchgoers report significantly ($P < .01$) higher mean scores on the FPTS E scale than conservative churchgoers. On the one hand, this result is surprising given that previous studies concerned with levels of conservatism and psychological type have not shown there to be a relationship between conservative/liberal orientation and preferences on the EI index (Carskadon, 1981; Ross, Weiss and Jackson, 1996; Francis and Ross, 1997; Francis and Jones, 1998; Francis and Jones, 1999a; Francis and Ross, 2000). On the other hand, this result is not surprising if considered in the light of type theory. Extraverts are orientated toward the outside world of people and things, while introverts are orientated toward their inner world of ideas and reflections. It could be argued that as a consequence extraverts are more open and responsive to changes and events around them, as they constantly seek input from the outside world. Furthermore, it could be argued that as a consequence introverts are less open and responsive to changes and events around them, as they constantly seek to block out input from the outside world. It might be the case that introverts are more conservative in their church orientation as they do not feel the need to respond to developments in the church or wider society. The introvert may be more trusting of their personal position than of the demands of the outside world.

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that more conservative churchgoers will prefer sensing significantly more frequently than liberal churchgoers. The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that conservative churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS S scale than liberal churchgoers. Conversely, liberal churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS N scale than conservative churchgoers. This finding confirms the results of previous studies concerned with conservatism

of belief and psychological type (Carskadon, 1981; Ross, Weiss and Jackson, 1996; Francis and Ross, 1997; Francis and Jones, 1998; Francis and Jones, 1999a). In addition, this finding coheres with type theory which suggests that sensing types are more likely to be conservative and conventional while intuitive types are more likely to be experimental and open to change.

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that more conservative churchgoers will prefer thinking significantly more frequently than liberal churchgoers. The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that conservative churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS T scale than liberal churchgoers. Conversely, liberal churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS F scale than conservative churchgoers. This finding confirms the findings a previous study concerned with conservatism of belief and psychological type (Francis and Jones, 1998) in which thinking types also tended to achieve higher scores on a scale of conservative Christian belief. In addition, this finding coheres with type theory which suggests that thinking types make decisions and judgements based on reason and logic while feeling types make decisions and judgements based on interpersonal values. It could be argued that as a consequence feeling types may be willing to change their position or beliefs in order to accommodate the needs of others as harmony and feelings are important to them. Furthermore, it could be argued that thinking types may be less willing to change their positions or beliefs in order to accommodate the needs of others as integrity and principles of right and wrong are important to them.

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between conservative/liberal orientation and preferences on the JP index. The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that conservative churchgoers report significantly

($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS J scale than liberal churchgoers. Conversely, liberal churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS P scale than conservative churchgoers. On the one hand, this result is surprising given that previous studies concerned with levels of conservatism and psychological type have not shown there to be a relationship between conservative/liberal orientation and preferences on the JP index (Carskadon, 1981; Ross, Weiss and Jackson, 1996; Francis and Ross, 1997; Francis and Jones, 1998; Francis and Jones, 1999a; Francis and Ross, 2000). On the other hand, this result is not surprising if considered in the light of type theory. Judging types prefer to come to conclusions and achieve closure quickly' (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998, p 26). Perceiving types prefer 'to continue gathering information as long as possible before comfortably coming to closure' (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998, p 26). As a consequence, it could be argued that perceiving types may be willing to change their position or beliefs in order to accommodate the needs of others as they are more flexible and adaptable to new information or situation. Furthermore, it could be argued that judging types may be less willing to change their positions or beliefs in order to accommodate the needs of others as they prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once made.

4. Evangelical/catholic orientation

The second dimension which Randall (2001) deems to be of pivotal importance in understanding church orientation is evangelical/catholic orientation. Unlike the conservative/liberal orientation and the charismatic movement, the evangelical/catholic orientation is best understood within the context of Anglicanism. The evangelical movement is transdenominational and 'often takes the form of a movement within a mainstream denomination, working for renewal or reformation' (McGrath, 2001, p 121). However, the term 'catholic' here refers to continuing regard for

catholic principles, such as sacramental ministry, rather than to membership of the Roman Catholic Church and is best understood within the context of Anglican churches. The term Anglo-catholic is perhaps a more accurate description.

Daniel (1967, p 45) explains the evangelical/catholic orientation dimension in terms of authority: evangelical churchgoers appeal to the authority of scripture, while catholic churchgoers appeal to the authority of the church. The evangelical movement highlights the significance of scripture, evangelism, and personal faith and downplays the significance of tradition, church, and sacraments. The catholic movement highlights the significance of tradition, church, and sacraments and downplays the significance of scripture, evangelism, and personal faith.

The evangelical movement is identified by Francis and Lankshear (1996, p 5) as emphasising 'biblical theology, biblical inspiration and authority, personal conversion, justification by grace through faith, centrality of preaching ministry, and simplicity in clerical dress with cassock, surplice, preaching scarf and hood'. The catholic movement is identified by Francis and Lankshear (1996, p 5) as emphasising 'sacramental theology, sacramental grace, confession, centrality of sacramental ministry, and richness in Eucharistic vestments, ritual and ornaments'.

a. Previous studies

No published data have been identified on the relationship between evangelical/catholic orientation and psychological type preferences. However, a number of studies have compared groups which they have held to demonstrate different levels of evangelical orientation; unless stated otherwise, each of the empirical studies makes use of the MBTI.

Ross (1993) compares 116 urban members of the Anglican Church of Canada with a sample of Evangelical Protestants (N = 154) reported by Delis-Bulhoes (1990). He found that, compared to the Evangelical Protestants, intuitive types and feeling types were significantly ($P < .001$) overrepresented among members of the Anglican Church of Canada. This suggests that evangelical churchgoers may show a greater preference for sensing and thinking than other churchgoers.

Craig, Horsfall and Francis (2004) contrast different samples of male church leaders. While only 12% of the sample of Church in Wales clergy (N = 427) reported by Francis, Payne and Jones (2001) emerged as dominant thinking types, the proportion rose to 22% in the sample of male seminarians attending an Evangelical Bible College (N = 278) reported by Francis, Penson and Jones (2001), and to 23% in the sample of male seminarians attending Evangelical Anglican Theological Colleges (N = 81) reported by Francis, Butler and Craig (2004). Craig, Horsfall and Francis (2004) argue that 'comparisons between these three studies suggests that while there may indeed be a preference for 'feminine' feeling among male clergy serving in the Church in Wales, there seems also to be a more prominent place for 'masculine' thinking among male clergy or seminarians serving in the evangelical churches or in the evangelical wing of the Anglican Church'. In addition Craig, Horsfall and Francis found that their sample of male evangelical missionary personnel (N = 92) contained 36% dominant thinking types. This may suggest that those training for evangelical ministry are more likely to be thinking types than those training in other church traditions; thinking type men may be attracted to leadership roles within the evangelical tradition due its emphasis on justice, truth, and clear doctrine.

Given that the relationship between psychological type theory and evangelical/catholic

orientation *per se* has not previously been empirically investigated it is difficult to make hypotheses concerning the current study. However, it is possible to make tentative hypotheses based on the findings of Ross (1993) and Craig, Horsfall and Francis (2004). First, that there will be no significant relationship between evangelical/catholic orientation and preferences on the EI index. Second, that evangelical churchgoers will prefer sensing significantly more frequently than catholic churchgoers. Third, that evangelical churchgoers will prefer thinking significantly more frequently than liberal churchgoers. Fourth, that there will be no significant relationship between evangelical/catholic orientation and preferences on the JP index.

b. Current study

Given that the evangelical/catholic orientation is meaningful only within the Anglican church, only churchgoers attending Anglican churches were included in this analysis, that is, churchgoers attending Church of England or Church in Wales churches. For the purpose of analysis, the evangelical/catholic index was collapsed into two categories in order to achieve a greater number of participants in each category. Participants who identified themselves as 'neutral' (N = 277, 16%) on this index were excluded from this analysis. On the index of evangelical/catholic orientation participants who identified themselves as evangelical, very evangelical, or extremely evangelical were collapsed into the single category 'evangelical churchgoers' (N = 969, 54%) and participants who identified themselves as catholic, very catholic, or extremely catholic were collapsed into a the single category 'catholic churchgoers' (N = 536, 27%).

Table 11.2 T-Test: Church orientation - catholic/evangelical orientation

Scale	<u>Catholic churchgoers</u>		<u>Evangelical churchgoers</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.55	2.89	4.90	2.93	-2.23	.05
Introversion	5.45	2.89	5.10	2.93	2.23	.05
Sensing	7.63	2.35	7.14	2.39	3.85	.001
Intuition	3.37	2.35	3.86	2.39	-3.85	.001
Thinking	5.27	2.57	5.01	2.55	1.90	NS
Feeling	5.73	2.57	5.99	2.55	-1.90	NS
Judging	8.77	2.39	8.28	2.57	3.65	.001
Perceiving	1.23	2.39	1.72	2.57	-3.65	.001

In table 11.2 the mean FPTS scores of catholic churchgoers and evangelical churchgoers were compared using an Independent Samples T-Test. Table 11.2 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences between the psychological type preferences of catholic churchgoers and evangelical churchgoers on the FPTS sensing, intuition, judging, and perceiving scales. In addition, there are significant ($P < .05$) differences between the psychological type preferences of catholic churchgoers and evangelical churchgoers on the FPTS extraversion and introversion scales. In the current sample, catholic churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS introversion, sensing, thinking, and judging scales than evangelical churchgoers. In contrast, evangelical churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS extraversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving scales than catholic churchgoers.

c. Discussion

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between evangelical/catholic orientation and preferences on the EI index. The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that catholic churchgoers report significantly ($P <$

.01) higher mean scores on the FPTS I scale than evangelical churchgoers. Conversely, evangelical churchgoers report significantly ($P < .01$) higher mean scores on the FPTS E scale than catholic churchgoers. This result is perhaps unsurprising when considered in the light of type theory. Extraverts are orientated toward the outside world and are energised by the events and people around them, while introverts are orientated toward their inner world and are energised by their inner ideas and concepts. As a consequence, it could be argued that extraverts are attracted to the emphasis on preaching, mission, and evangelism in more evangelical churches, as this appeals to their need for communication, people, and external stimulation. Furthermore, it could be argued that introverts will be less attracted to the emphasis on preaching, mission, and evangelism in more evangelical churches, as they may feel drained by immoderate time spent communicating with others.

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that evangelical churchgoers will prefer sensing significantly more frequently than catholic churchgoers. Rather, the findings of the current analysis demonstrate that catholic churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS S scale than evangelical churchgoers. Conversely, evangelical churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS N scale than catholic churchgoers. On the one hand this result is surprising given that Ross (1993) reported an overrepresentation of sensing types among Evangelical Protestants when compared with members of the Anglican Church of Canada. On the other hand, this result is not so surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Sensing types are characterised by a preference for tradition, convention, and sensory experience, while intuitive types are characterised by a preference for change, variety, ideas, and possibilities. As a consequence, it may be argued that catholic churchgoers are drawn to the well-established traditions of more catholic churches, due

to their preference for the known and the conventional. Furthermore, evangelical churchgoers may be repelled by the well-established traditions of more catholic churches, due to their preference for experimentation and questioning. In addition, it may be argued that catholic churchgoers may be attracted to the sacramental emphasis of more catholic churches, along with ornamentation such as stained glass, incense, and vestments, which will appeal to the sensing types' need for sensory stimulation. Furthermore, it may be argued that evangelical churchgoers will be repelled by the sacramental emphasis and ornamentation of more catholic churchgoers, which they may see as a distraction from the need for speculation about issues of doctrine and practice.

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that evangelical churchgoers will prefer thinking significantly more frequently than catholic churchgoers. There are no significant differences between evangelical and catholic churchgoers on the FPTS TF index. This result is surprising given that Ross (1993) reported an overrepresentation of thinking types among Evangelical Protestants when compared with members of the Anglican Church of Canada. Moreover, Craig, Horsfall and Francis' (2004) review of different Christian leaders suggested that more evangelical leaders tended to prefer thinking more frequently. Further research is now needed to investigate further this dimension of church orientation in relation to the TF index.

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between evangelical/catholic orientation and preferences on the JP index. The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that catholic churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS J scale than evangelical churchgoers. Conversely, evangelical churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS P scale

than catholic churchgoers. However, this result is not so surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Judging types are characterised by a preference for structure, routine, and organisation, while perceiving types are characterised by a preference for spontaneity, flexibility, and adaptability. As a consequence, it may be argued that catholic churchgoers are drawn to the well-structured routines of more catholic churches, due to their preference for organisation and order. Furthermore, evangelical churchgoers may be repelled by the well-structured routines of more catholic churches, due to their preference for experimentation and spontaneity.

5. Charismatic influence

The third dimension which Randall (2001) deems to be of pivotal importance in understanding church orientation is influence by the charismatic movement. The charismatic movement is an international, transdenominational phenomenon which emphasises the importance of the *charismata* or spiritual gifts, such as glossolalia, healing, and prophecy for the life and worship of the church. Kay (2000) traces the early development of the Pentecostal and charismatic movement, highlighting the importance of the Keswick Convention initiated in 1875 which raised the issue of 'scriptural holiness' and 'holiness by faith' (pp 5-6). Kay sees the Keswick experience as contributing to the Welsh Revival (1904-1905). Evan Roberts (1878-1951), the leader of this revival, 'insofar as it had a leader' (p 8) was known for leading unconventional services: he would be 'invited to preach and would sometimes do so but also often pray, or pray and weep, and when members of the congregation would fall down, he would walk over to them and tend to them like a doctor visiting a patient' (Kay, 2000, p 10). The excitement of the Welsh revival spread to the United States of America and in 1906 Azusa Street in Los Angeles experienced a similar revival phenomenon. However, the experiences of Azusa Street were in some ways distinct from the Welsh revival. Specifically, the phenomenon of glossolalia and

'baptism in the Holy Spirit' were significant components of the revival in Los Angeles. The theology and ministry of the charismatic and Pentecostal movements were developed by Alexander Boddy (1854-1930) and William Hutchinson (1864-1928). Over time a number of Pentecostal denominations were formed, including the Assemblies of God, the Church of God, Elim, and the Apostolic Church.

It was in the 1960s that the charismatic movement (as distinct from the Pentecostal movement) developed. This movement was brought to the attention of the media and the churches when in Van Nuys, California 'a local episcopal rector told his congregation that he had been filled with the Holy Spirit and had spoken in tongues (McGrath, 2001, p 123). Essentially, the difference between the charismatic and Pentecostal movements is that the Pentecostal movement resulted in the establishment of new denominations, while the charismatic movement transcended denominational differences. Kay (2004, pp xxii-xxiii) writes that within churches influenced by the charismatic movements:

...the existing ecclesiastical structures and terminologies of the mainline denominations were left intact. Anglicans did not turn their bishops into apostles; Roman Catholics did not alter the functions of various parts of their hierarchy; Lutherans did not alter the initiation rites to their churches. In effect, the charismatic outpouring, after the early excitement, often turned into a spiritual renewal that was inward and personal rather than outward, institutional and evangelistic.

Both the Pentecostal movement and the charismatic movement share similar emphases and beliefs, both being characterised by spontaneity, enthusiasm, and, most significantly, emphasis on the importance of the *charismata*. Bax (1986) characterises churches influenced by the charismatic movement in the following ways: these churches tend to be aware of the work of the Holy Spirit within the church; to make use of small group structures; to encourage and rely on

lay participation; to promote development of a deep spiritual life; to explore new models of corporate worship; to emphasise the experiential; to support and promote extra-parochial communities; and to be committed to community.

a. Previous studies

Type theorists have attempted to apply psychological type theory to the charismatic phenomenon; it has been suggested by Kroeger and Thuesen (1988) that SPs are more likely to be attracted to charismaticism and by Jones (1991) that charismatics are often feeling types. However, only one empirical study has been undertaken to determine whether there is a relationship between charismatic experience and psychological type preferences.

Francis and Jones (1997) analysed the relationship between charismatic experience and psychological type preferences using the MBTI, among a sample of 368 participants, derived from people who attended 24 courses on the topic of personality and spirituality. They found that although scores on their Index of Charismatic Experience were unrelated to preferences on the EI, SN, and JP index, there was a significant relationship between the TF index and scores on the Index of Charismatic Experience. Francis and Jones (1997) found that thinking type participants were more likely to report having had charismatic experiences than feeling type participants. This contrasts with the predictions of Jones (1991) that feeling types would be more open toward charismatic experience.

Having reviewed this empirical study concerned with psychological type and charismatic experience the following four hypotheses can be made concerning the current sample. First, that there will be no significant relationship between positive/negative influence by the charismatic

movement and preferences on the EI index. Second, that there will be no significant relationship between positive/negative influence by the charismatic movement and preferences on the SN index. Third, that positively influenced churchgoers will prefer thinking significantly more frequently than negatively influenced churchgoers. Fourth, that there will be no significant relationship between positive/negative influence by the charismatic movement and preferences on the JP index.

b. Current study

For the purpose of analysis, the index of positive/negative influence on the charismatic movement was collapsed into two categories in order to achieve a greater number of participants in each category. Participants who identified themselves as 'neutral' (N = 571, 23%) on this index were excluded from this analysis. On the index of positively/negatively influenced by the charismatic movement participants who identified themselves as positively, very positively, or extremely positively influenced by the charismatic movement were collapsed into the single category 'positive charismatic churchgoers' (N = 1,170, 46%) and participants who identified themselves as negatively, very negatively, or extremely negatively influenced by the charismatic movement were collapsed into the single category 'negative charismatic churchgoers' (N = 784, 31%).

In table 11.3 the mean FPTTS scores of positive charismatic churchgoers and negative charismatic churchgoers were compared using an Independent Samples T-Test. Table 11.3 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences between the psychological type preferences of positive charismatic churchgoers and negative charismatic churchgoers on the FPTTS sensing, intuition, judging, and perceiving scales. In addition, there are there are significant ($P < .05$) differences

between the psychological type preferences of positive charismatic churchgoers and negative charismatic churchgoers on the FPTS extraversion and introversion scales. In the current sample, negative charismatic churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS introversion, sensing, and judging scales than positive charismatic churchgoers. In contrast, positive charismatic churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS extraversion, intuition, and perceiving scales than negative charismatic churchgoers.

Table 11.3 T-Test: Church orientation - positive/negative influence by the charismatic movement

Scale	<u>Positive charismatic</u>		<u>Negative charismatic</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.96	2.99	4.61	2.89	2.56	.05
Introversion	5.04	2.99	5.39	2.89	-2.56	.05
Sensing	6.97	2.41	7.76	2.29	-7.27	.001
Intuition	4.03	2.41	3.24	2.29	7.27	.001
Thinking	5.01	2.58	5.05	2.44	-0.38	NS
Feeling	5.99	2.58	5.95	2.44	0.38	NS
Judging	8.14	2.66	8.70	2.34	-4.78	.001
Perceiving	1.86	2.66	1.30	2.34	4.78	.001

c. Discussion

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between positive/negative influence by the charismatic movement and preferences on the EI index. The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that positive charismatic churchgoers report significantly ($P < .05$) higher mean scores on the FPTS E scale than negative charismatic churchgoers. Conversely, negative charismatic churchgoers report significantly ($P < .05$) higher mean scores on the FPTS I scale than positive charismatic churchgoers. On the one hand, this result is surprising given that previous studies have not shown there to be a

relationship between influence by the charismatic movement and preferences on the EI index (Francis and Jones, 1997). On the hand other hand, this finding is perhaps not so surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Extraverts are energised by noisy events, crowds of people, and stimulating and exciting environments. Introverts tend to feel drained by noisy events, crowds of people, and intrusive and loud environments as they enjoy solitude, silence, and contemplation. As a consequence, it may be argued that extraverts will thrive in the activity, noise, and excitement of charismatic services due to their need for external stimulation. Furthermore, it may be argued that introverts may feel drained by the activity, noise, and excitement of charismatic services due to their need for time and space for personal reflection.

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between positive/negative influence by the charismatic movement and preferences on the SN index. The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that positive charismatic churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS N scale than negative charismatic churchgoers. Conversely, negative charismatic churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS S scale than positive charismatic churchgoers. On the one hand, this result is surprising given that previous studies have not shown there to be a relationship between influence by the charismatic movement and preferences on the SN index (Francis and Jones, 1997). In addition, Kroeger and Thuesen (1988) have suggested that sensing types (especially SPs) are likely to be drawn to the charismatic movement. On the other hand, this result is not so surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Sensing types are characterised by a concern for the actual, the real, and the practical; they may be conventional and tend to prefer what is known and well-established. Intuitive types are characterised by a concern for information gained from the unconscious mind; indirect associations and concepts

impact their perceptions and they follow their inspirations enthusiastically. As a consequence, it may be argued that intuitive types may be open to the leading of the Holy Spirit, prepared to challenge conventions, and ready to be inspired by God, due to their need to explore new possibilities, visions, and dreams. Furthermore, it may be argued that sensing types will be less open to the leading of the Holy Spirit, less prepared to challenge conventions, and less ready to recognise divine inspiration, due to their need to retain a down to earth and matter of fact outlook.

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that positively influenced churchgoers will prefer thinking significantly more frequently than negatively influenced churchgoers. There is no significant difference between the mean scores of positive charismatic churchgoers and negative charismatic churchgoers on the TF index. This result is surprising given that a previous study has shown there to be a relationship between influence by the charismatic movement and psychological type on the TF index (Francis and Jones, 1997). Francis and Jones (1997) found that thinking type participants were more likely to report being influenced by the charismatic movement. Further research is now needed to investigate further this dimension of church orientation in relation to the TF index.

The findings of the current analysis fail to support the hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between positive/negative influence by the charismatic movement and preferences on the JP index. The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that positive charismatic churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS P scale than negative charismatic churchgoers. Conversely, negative charismatic churchgoers report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS J scale than positive charismatic churchgoers. On the one

hand, this result is surprising given that previous studies have not shown there to be a relationship between influence by the charismatic movement and preferences on the JP index (Francis and Jones, 1997). On the other hand, this finding is perhaps not so surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Perceiving types are characterised as being extemporary, flexible, and adaptable. Judging types are characterised by a preference for structure, organisation, and routine. It could be argued that as a consequence perceiving types feel comfortable within the context of the charismatic movement which tends to reject structured liturgy in favour of spontaneous and inspired worship and *charismata*. Furthermore, it could be argued that judging types may feel less comfortable within the context of the charismatic movement, as they may prefer a more structured and organised liturgy in church services.

6. Conclusion

This chapter has assessed the relationship between church orientation and psychological type preferences. This chapter has introduced three dimensions of church orientation and then reviewed previous studies concerned with psychological type and these dimensions of church orientation. The psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers were analysed in terms of church orientation. It was found that conservative churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS introversion, sensing, thinking, and judging scales than liberal churchgoers; catholic churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS introversion, sensing, and judging scales than evangelical churchgoers; and, positive charismatic churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS extraversion, intuition, and perceiving scales than negative charismatic churchgoers. The implications of these findings were discussed. The next chapter will explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith origins.

-CHAPTER TWELVE-

FAITH ORIGINS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Understanding Faith Origins**
- 3. Previous Studies of Psychological Type and Faith Origins**
- 4. Current Study**
- 5. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The previous chapter explored the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and church orientation, in terms of conservative/liberal orientation, evangelical/catholic orientation, and positive or negative influence of the charismatic movement. This chapter will explore the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and faith origins. The meaning of faith origins will be explored and previous studies concerned with psychological type and faith origins will be reviewed. A new scale of faith origins will be introduced and the psychological type preferences of the current sample will be analysed in relation to this scale. The implications of these analyses will be discussed and conclusions will be drawn about the relationship between psychological type and faith origins.

2. Understanding Faith Origins

Understanding how faith originates and develops is a difficult task because faith does not mean the same thing to all people, nor even to all Christians. The focus of this study will remain on the Christian church, rather than other faiths.

Trying to define the origins of faith can be difficult because for some Christians it may mean when they first began to attend church; for others it may mean when they were baptised or confirmed; for others it may mean when they made a personal, private promise to Christ; for others it may mean when they first experienced 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' or spoke in tongues; for others it may be a development to an already existing, but previously nominal, faith. Other people may argue that as they have always belonged to a church, they have always been a Christian. Others may argue that until a conscious decision to follow Christ was made, simply attending church can be a hollow, meaningless tradition. For others, faith may be entirely

separate from the church. Bailey (2000, p 39) argues that for some the term Christian is not 'a professional label but a character: Christ-ian or Christ-like. "Human" would be another description: one who is kind and treats other human beings as human beings, who are worthy of simple respect, without pre-condition or demand.'

In addition, people's interpretation of what faith means can vary widely. For some this means a commitment to attend church; for others it may mean a rejection of materialism; for others it may mean an ongoing relationship with Christ.

Many psychologists of religion have focused on conversion as a significant point for the origins of faith. William James (1982; first published in 1902, p 189) in his classic work *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, defines conversion in the following way:

To be converted, to be regenerated, to receive grace, to experience religion, to gain an assurance, are so many phrases which denote the process, gradual or sudden, by which a self hitherto divided, and consciously wrong, inferior and unhappy, becomes unified and consciously right and happy, in consequence of its firmer hold upon religious realities.

Batson, Schoenrade and Ventis (1993) report that they focus on dramatic experiences in their study because James (1982) suggested that 'the best approach is to focus on the most dramatic and intense experiences because in them one finds most clearly displayed the psychological process also present in less dramatic experiences'. Likewise, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1997, p 114) argue that although very few religious believers 'have changed labels... this tiny minority gets our well-deserved theoretical attention'.

However, James (1982, p 166) does not see dramatic conversion experiences as the only route

to faith. Rather, James speaks of the 'once-born' or 'healthy-minded' person and the 'twice-born' or 'sick-souled' person. There is a contrast between 'the ways of looking at life which are characteristic respectively of what we called the healthy-minded, who needs to be born only once, and of the sick-souls, who must be twice-born in order to be happy'. The twice-born person needs to undergo the process of conversion, to be 'born again', to experience spiritual rebirth, whereas the once-born person experiences a more balanced and harmonious spiritual development that does not require such dramatic changes. James (1982, p 128) description of repentance provides an example of the difference between the healthy-minded and sick-souled attitudes: 'repentance according to such healthy-minded Christians means *getting away from* the sin, no groaning and writhing over its commission' as the sick-souled person tends to do.

The healthy-minded person demonstrates a positive attitude toward life and religion, viewing the world as basically good and benign. The healthy-minded person 'can think no ill of man or God, and in whom religious gladness, being in possession from the outset, needs no deliverance from any antecedent burden' (James, 1982, p 80). This optimistic outlook is thought by James to lead to a relaxed, perhaps even complacent, attitude toward issues of faith. The healthy-minded person is unlikely to feel it necessary to agonize over issues of morality and faith or to seek conversion.

The sick-souled person demonstrates a negative attitude toward life and religion, viewing the world as basically evil and corrupt. The sick-souled person believes that 'there are two lives, the natural and the spiritual, and we must lose the one to participate in the other' (James, 1982, pp 166-167). James (1982, p 161) describes cases of sick-souled individuals, which emphasise 'the vanity of mortal things,... the sense of sin... and, the fear of the universe'. This negative outlook

is though by James to lead to a solemn, perhaps even neurotic attitude toward issues of faith. The sick-souled person is likely to feel it necessary to agonize over issues of morality and faith and to seek deliverance from their existential despair through conversion.

It could be argued, therefore, that there are two broad ways in which faith may originate: the first way can be conceived of as the once-born pathway, involving a continuing, balanced commitment to faith. This faith may deepen or develop over time but is broadly conceived as continuous and unified, rather than involving discontinuous and discrete stages. The second way in which faith may originate can be conceived of as the twice-born pathway, involving a clear and tangible change from unbelief to belief. This change may occur suddenly or over time but is broadly conceived as involving discontinuous and discrete stages of faith, rather than continuous and unified development.

Loewenthal (2000, p 46) recognises that not all religious people will identify themselves as converts. In trying to understand religious membership, identity, and history she suggests three possible responses for people who consider themselves to belong to a religious group, to be religious, or to be spiritual. She asks:

‘... which of the following is most applicable to you?’

- A. I have been that way as long as I can remember
- B. I changed quite suddenly. (Few days, hours, moments.)
- C. I changed slowly and gradually. (Over weeks, months, or years.)’

She notes that people who select option A may not see themselves as converts; they have not changed their position but have remained committed to a religious position. People who select option C may or may not see themselves as converts; on the one hand, they may see this as a

gradual development of religious awareness but, on the other hand, they may see this as a process of conversion because it involves a shift in identity. People who select option B are most likely to be seen as converts in the traditional sense. However, this does not necessarily mean that they will immediately belong to a religious group: 'Conversion always involves an identity shift, but this can sometimes happen without very active affiliation and participation' (Loewenthal, 2000, p 47). Loewenthal (2000, p 52) also reports that 'compared to gradual converts, lifelong religious and non-religious, sudden converts have been reported to be more dogmatic, but happier (since conversion)'.

Batson, Schoenrade and Ventis (1993) see religious experiences, such as conversion, as involving a four-stage model: existential crisis, self-surrender, development of a new vision, and advance into a new life. Hood, Spilka, Hunsberger and Gorsuch (1996), following James (1982), distinguish between sudden and gradual conversion. They see sudden conversions as occurring during middle to late adolescence, being emotional and suggestive, involving stern theology, giving a passive role to the convert, and facilitating a release from guilt and sin. In contrast, they see gradual conversions as occurring during late adolescence to early adulthood, being intellectual and rational, involving compassionate theology, giving an active role to the convert, and facilitating a search for meaning and purpose. Moreover, gradual conversions 'result in a transformation of self within a religious context... yet occur almost imperceptibly' they are usually distinguishable by not being associated with a single event (Hood, Spilka, Hunsberger and Gorsuch, 1996, p 281).

However, it is people who select option A in Loewenthal's scale that are thought to be most common, that is, people who have always belonged to a religious group. It should be recognised

that sudden and overwhelming conversions are not the norm for most churchgoers. Bailey (2000, p 39) notes that in the Church of England at least, 'overnight conversions, at this level of religion, do of course occur; but most people have never met examples. So "joining religion" tends to be understood (in the words of the psalmist) as "converting the soul": the proof and process are long-term, if not life-long'. As Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1997, p 114) sum up: 'the majority of religious believers carry the exact same religious labels as their parents before them'.

A number of psychologists of religion have suggested that weakness or vulnerability can be a contributing factor to conversion, especially dramatic conversion. James (1982) speaks of the melancholia and even suicidal ideation experienced by some individuals immediately prior to their conversion experiences. Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1997, p 117) suggest that 'psychological readiness, or vulnerability, or psychopathology, may be called upon to explain why particular individuals, and others in similar social situations, have chosen, or have grown into conversion experiences.' Moreover, they argue that 'individuals who have few personal ties to others and a weak sense of identification with family and friends are more likely to develop salvation careers'.

While it is recognised that a person's socio-economic background, parents' religious beliefs, social network, and general happiness will influence their faith origins, this study is concerned with the relationship between psychological type and faith origins. Furthermore, although a number of theorists have suggested that other personality factors such as neuroticism or psychoticism may influence conversion (see, for example, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle, 1997; Argyle, 2000) this study is concerned with the value-neutral personality constructs outlined in type theory. Psychological type theory does not set out to provide a total description of human

personality but rather to assess *a priori* defined mental processes and there is nothing within this model that purports to be explicitly concerned with individual differences in emotionality, anxiety, or psychopathology.

To summarise, it may be seen that faith originates in a number of different ways. Although dramatic conversion has been the focus of many psychologists of religion, it is also recognised that faith is a developmental process. Some may always hold a form of faith, yet feel that this faith deepens over time. Others may experience a gradual development of faith. Others may still consider themselves to be seekers, looking for answers to hard questions about faith. This chapter aims to explore these different positions in relation to psychological type.

3. Previous Studies of Psychological Type and Faith Origins

No published data have been identified on the relationship between faith origins and psychological type preferences. However, a number of type theorists have tried to apply psychological type theory to related issues such as evangelism, and have tried to interpret conversion in the light of psychological type theory.

The importance of psychological type theory for evangelism and mission has been recognised by Harbaugh (1990), Osborn and Osborn (1991), Goldsmith and Wharton (1993), and Butler (1999). The basic principle behind this interest is summarised by Harbaugh (1990), who argues that people are more likely to be receptive to the Christian gospel if it is initially presented in their own 'language'. As an illustration, Harbaugh (1990) suggests that intuitive types may be more immediately attracted to the possibilities of the Christian gospel while sensing types may be more immediately attracted to the practicalities.

Butler (1999, p 3), in her work *Communicating the Gospel*, is keen to establish that evangelism is concerned with *communication*, and that 'through understanding how our personalities affect the ways that we operate and communicate, our relationships with each other can suddenly become a fascinating exercise of trying to speak another person's language'. In other words, it is important to meet people 'where they are' in terms of psychological type, that is, to communicate in a way that appeals to their preferred psychological type preferences.

Butler (1999, p 4) grounds this argument in several biblical examples in order to demonstrate that 'the more we understand about people, the more effectively we will be able to adapt our evangelistic models and methods to bring the gospel to them'. She notes that in the New Testament Jesus demonstrated an ability to 'come alongside people as and where they were and lead them on from there' (p 5). Likewise, the disciples, after they were sent out to proclaim the gospel, would 'adapt and develop their evangelistic styles and methods to suit the situation or person they were with' (p 5). She then goes on to give practical examples of how preferences for extraversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving can be accommodated and implemented in evangelism. Butler (1999) recognises that people with different psychological type preferences will listen and respond in different ways. For example, she highlights differences between thinking types and feeling types by reporting how Christians in a workshop responded to the question 'What would you say it was that meant most to you when you registered belief for the first time?' Butler (1999, p 13) reports that thinking types replied 'Well, it was true' while feeling types replied 'I had an experience of God's love'. Butler (1999, p 23) concludes by emphasising the necessity of sensitivity, adaptability, and concern for the needs and preferences of others in evangelism and mission.

Goldsmith and Wharton (1993, p 140) also argue that evangelism demands awareness of psychological type preferences in order to make the Christian gospel meaningful, intelligible, and pertinent. For them, 'looking at the message which the churches proclaim through the eyes of type does suggest that both the content and the presentation need to be re-styled and reformed according to the type preference of the hearer'.

According to Osborn and Osborn (1991), there is 'one gospel but it is sufficiently rich to permit a presentation that engages *all* the psychological functions'. While they are keen to maintain the *content* of the Gospel, they argue that its *presentation* should be made accessible and relevant to the listener.

As well as applying type theory to evangelism, other type theorists have attempted to understand how psychological type preferences may impact on conversion. For example, Repicky (1981) suggests that religious conversion is often marked by the emergence of the inferior function. Sudden conversion is a point of crisis; a revolution of attitude. Therefore, it might be expected that the opposite of the dominant preference (that is, the inferior function) will be strongest at conversion. For many it is a time of relinquishing authority over their conscious will, and allowing the unconscious to come forth. Likewise, Butler (1999, p 20) suggests that 'it appears that sometimes God may use the shadow function to convert someone because he or she has least control over it'.

More specifically, Cook (2003) reviews William James' (1882) understanding of faith origins in relation to psychological type theory. Through reviewing previous empirical research Cook (2003) draws three main conclusions. The first conclusion is that extraverts are more likely to

be 'healthy-minded' and 'once-born': this is based on Francis and Jones' (2000b) finding that extraverts are more likely to score highly on the Oxford Happiness Inventory than introverts. Cook (2003) identifies that the Oxford Happiness Inventory may be seen as a measure of optimistic attitude, suggesting that high scorers (in this case, extraverts) are more likely to be 'healthy-minded'. The second conclusion is that thinking types are more likely to be 'twice-born' types: this is based on Francis and Jones' (1997) finding that thinking types are more likely to score highly on the Index of Charismatic Experience than feeling types. Cook (2003) identifies that the Index of Charismatic Experience is primarily concerned with the experience of being born again, suggesting that high scorers (in this case, thinking types) are more likely to be 'twice-born'. The third conclusion is that 'William James' understanding that the varieties of religious experience and belief are dependent upon the varieties of human nature may be seen to be of enduring importance' (Cook, 2003, p 153).

Although no empirical research has been conducted among Christian groups to determine the relationship between faith origins and psychological type preferences, two tentative hypotheses may be proposed based on the research of Cook (2003). First, that churchgoers who report having always had a faith or having developed a faith gradually (that is, healthy-minded types) will be extraverts. Second, that churchgoers who report having undergone a conversion experience (that is, twice-born types) will be thinking types.

4. Current Study

Based on the review above of different understandings of faith origins (James, 1982; Batson, Schoenrade and Ventis, 1993; Hood, Spilka, Hunsberger and Gorsuch, 1996; Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle, 1997; Bailey, 2000; Loewenthal, 2000) and the recognition that faith originates in

different ways, a new scale was developed to assess faith origins. The Faith Origins Scale (FOS) is a seven-item scale concerned with how churchgoers feel their faith first began. Participants are asked judge how far seven items reflected their own experience in response to the statement 'How your faith began...'. The seven items are: I always believed; I made a clear decision; I had a sudden conversion; I had a gradual conversion; I drifted into faith; I am still searching; and, I have never believed. Participants were asked to respond to each item on a 5-item Likert-type scale, ranging from 'very little', through 'a little', 'medium', 'much', to 'very much'. The results for the current sample of UK churchgoers on this scale can be seen in tables 12.1 through 12.7.

Table 12.1 Faith Origins Scale - always believed

	N	%
Very little	353	15
Little	260	11
Medium	576	24
Much	508	21
Very much	713	30

Table 12.2 Faith Origins Scale - clear decision

	N	%
Very little	369	19
Little	209	11
Medium	337	17
Much	347	18
Very much	725	37

Table 12.3 Faith Origins Scale - sudden conversion

	N	%
Very little	1,141	62
Little	228	13
Medium	171	9
Much	117	6
Very much	174	10

Table 12.4 Faith Origins Scale - gradual conversion

	N	%
Very little	546	28
Little	230	12
Medium	377	20
Much	389	20
Very much	390	20

Table 12.5 Faith Origins Scale - drifted into faith

	N	%
Very little	1,077	60
Little	253	14
Medium	273	15
Much	123	7
Very much	68	4

Table 12.6 Faith Origins Scale - still searching

	N	%
Very little	946	52
Little	189	10
Medium	246	14
Much	227	13
Very much	213	12

Table 12.7 Faith Origins Scale - never believed

	N	%
Very little	1,572	93
Little	49	3
Medium	37	2
Much	20	1
Very much	18	1

For the purpose of analysis, the five responses for each of the seven items were collapsed into two categories in order to achieve a greater number of participants in each category. Participants who identified themselves as 'medium' were excluded from this analysis for each of the items.

In response to the statement 'I always believed', participants who responded that this item reflected their experience much or very much were collapsed into the single category 'always believed' (N = 1,221, 51%) and participants who responded that this item reflected their experience little or very little were collapsed into the single category 'not always believed' (N = 613, 25%). In table 12.8 the mean FPTS scores of churchgoers who have always believed and churchgoers who have not always believed are compared using an Independent Samples T-Test.

Table 12.8 T-Test: Faith Origins Scale - always believed

Scale	<u>Always Believed</u>		<u>Not Always Believed</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	5.02	2.93	4.53	2.90	-3.42	.001
Introversion	4.97	2.93	5.47	2.90	3.42	.001
Sensing	7.70	2.25	6.74	2.51	-8.25	.001
Intuition	3.30	2.25	4.26	2.51	8.25	.001
Thinking	4.83	2.41	5.58	2.58	6.17	.001
Feeling	6.17	2.41	5.42	2.58	-6.17	.001
Judging	8.58	2.45	8.05	2.71	-4.20	.001
Perceiving	1.42	2.45	1.95	2.71	4.20	.001

Table 12.8 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who have always believed and churchgoers who have not always believed on the FPTS scales extraversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking and feeling, judging, and perceiving. In the current sample, churchgoers who have always believed achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS scales extraversion, sensing, feeling, and judging than churchgoers who have not always believed. In contrast, churchgoers who have not always believed achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS scales introversion, intuition, thinking, and perceiving than churchgoers who have always believed.

The findings of the current analysis support the hypothesis that churchgoers who have always believed will prefer extraversion significantly more frequently than churchgoers who have not always believed. The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that churchgoers who have always believed report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS E scale than churchgoers who have not always believed. Conversely, churchgoers who have not always believed report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS I scale than churchgoers who have always believed. This finding confirms Cook's (2003) hypothesis that extraverts are more likely to be healthy-minded and, therefore, less likely to undergo a conversion experience. In addition, given that extraverts tend to experience higher levels of church satisfaction than introverts (see chapter 9), it is not surprising that extraverts tend to remain within the church and to embrace its doctrines consistently.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that churchgoers who have always believed report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS S scale than churchgoers who have not always believed. Conversely, churchgoers who have not always believed report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS N scale than churchgoers who have always believed. This result is perhaps not surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Sensing types are characterised by a preference for being conservative, traditional, and conventional, while intuitive types are characterised by a preference for being experimental, questioning, and open to change. It could be argued that as a consequence sensing types are content to accept the doctrines and traditions of the church. Furthermore, it could be argued that intuitive types are not prepared simply to accept the doctrines and traditions of the Christian church, without questioning them first and perhaps exploring other faith traditions. In addition, given that sensing types tend to experience higher levels of church satisfaction than intuitive types (see

chapter 9), it is not surprising that sensing types tend to remain within the church and to embrace its doctrines consistently.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that churchgoers who have always believed report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPT S F scale than churchgoers who have not always believed. Conversely, churchgoers who have not always believed report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPT S T scale than churchgoers who have always believed.

This result is perhaps not surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Feeling types make decisions and judgements based on interpersonal values, while thinking types make decisions and judgements based on reason and logic. It could be argued that as a consequence feeling types may be willing to maintain their beliefs in order to accommodate the needs of others and to demonstrate loyalty to church or family. Furthermore, it could be argued that thinking types consider it necessary to analyse and test the doctrines and beliefs of the church before coming to accept faith. This proposition is supported by Cook's (2003) hypothesis that thinking types are more likely to be 'twice-born', that is, to undergo a conversion experience. In addition, given that feeling types tend to experience higher levels of church satisfaction than thinking types (see chapter 9), it is not surprising that feeling types tend to remain within the church and to embrace its doctrines consistently.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that churchgoers who have always believed report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPT S J scale than churchgoers who have not always believed. Conversely, churchgoers who have not always believed report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPT S P scale than churchgoers who have always believed.

This result is perhaps not surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Judging types

are characterised by a preference for structure and routine while perceiving types are characterised by a preference for change and spontaneity. It could be argued that as a consequence judging types will welcome the traditions and structures of the church, as they are inclined to be resistant to changes to established methods. Furthermore, it could be argued that perceiving types may feel confined by the traditions and structures of the church, which stifle their need for change and variety. In addition, given that judging types tend to experience higher levels of church satisfaction than perceiving types (see chapter 9), it is not surprising that judging types tend to remain within the church and to embrace its doctrines consistently.

In response to the statement 'I made a clear decision', participants who responded that this item reflected their experience much or very much were collapsed into the single category 'made clear decision' (N = 1,072, 54%) and participants who responded that this item reflected their experience little or very little were collapsed into the single category 'no clear decision' (N = 548, 29%). In table 12.9 the mean FPTTS scores of churchgoers who made a clear decision and churchgoers who did not make a clear decision are compared using an Independent Samples T-Test.

Table 12.9 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who have made a clear decision and churchgoers who did not make a clear decision on the FPTTS scales sensing and intuition. In addition, table 12.9 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .05$) differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who have made a clear decision and churchgoers who did not make a clear decision on the FPTTS scales thinking and feeling. In the current sample, churchgoers who made a clear decision achieved higher mean scores on the FPTTS scales intuition and feeling than

churchgoers who did not make a clear decision. In contrast, churchgoers who did not make a clear decision achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS scales sensing and thinking than churchgoers who did make a clear decision.

Table 12.9 T-Test: Faith Origins Scale - clear decision

Scale	<u>Made Clear Decision</u>		<u>No Clear Decision</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.86	2.96	4.66	2.84	-1.35	NS
Introversion	5.14	2.96	5.34	2.84	1.35	NS
Sensing	7.04	2.38	7.53	2.29	4.02	.001
Intuition	3.96	2.38	3.47	2.29	-4.02	.001
Thinking	5.11	2.48	5.37	2.56	2.01	.05
Feeling	5.89	2.48	5.63	2.56	-2.01	.05
Judging	8.36	2.59	8.48	2.54	0.94	NS
Perceiving	1.64	2.59	1.52	2.54	-0.94	NS

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that there is no significant difference between churchgoers who made a clear decision when their faith began and those who did not make a clear decision on the EI index.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that churchgoers who made a clear decision when their faith began report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS N scale than churchgoers who did not make a clear decision. Conversely, churchgoers who did not make a clear decision when their faith began report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS S scale than churchgoers who made a clear decision. This result is perhaps not surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Intuitive types are characterised by a tendency to make intuitive leaps and connections and to follow their inspirations enthusiastically, while sensing types are characterised by step-by-step thinking and a preference for concrete certainties

and facts. It could be argued that as a consequence intuitive types are more likely to make a clear decision about their faith as they will be comfortable with drawing together a number of ideas to make a clear, intuitive connection and then following this connection with zeal. Furthermore, it could be argued that sensing types will be less likely to make a clear decision as they will wish to ground any decision in known facts and certainties, and may, therefore, make a slower but more informed decision, or series of decisions.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that churchgoers who made a clear decision when their faith began report significantly ($P < .05$) higher mean scores on the FPTTS F scale than churchgoers who did not make a clear decision. Conversely, churchgoers who did not make a clear decision when their faith began report significantly ($P < .05$) higher mean scores on the FPTTS T scale than churchgoers made a clear decision. This result is perhaps not surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Feeling types make decisions and judgements based on interpersonal values, while thinking types make decisions and judgements based on reason and logic. It could be argued that as a consequence feeling types make their judgements about faith based on emotion and feelings; a clear decision or dramatic conversion may be rooted in emotional need. Furthermore, it could be argued that thinking types make their judgements about faith based on critical investigation which may mean they are less likely to make a clear, hasty decision as they will want to continue to interrogate and analyse their faith.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that there is no significant difference between churchgoers who made a clear decision when their faith began and those who did not make a clear decision on the JP index.

In response to the statement ‘I had a sudden conversion’, participants who responded that this item reflected their experience much or very much were collapsed into the single category ‘had sudden conversion’ (N= 291, 16%) and participants who responded that this item reflected their experience little or very little were collapsed into the single category ‘no sudden conversion’ (N = 1,369, 75%). In table 12.10 the mean FPTS scores of churchgoers who had a sudden conversion and churchgoers who did not have a sudden conversion are compared using an Independent Samples T-Test.

Table 12.10 T-Test: Faith Origins Scale - sudden conversion

Scale	<u>Sudden Conversion</u>		<u>No Sudden Conversion</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.69	2.97	4.74	2.94	0.28	NS
Introversion	5.31	2.97	5.26	2.94	-0.28	NS
Sensing	6.41	2.52	7.42	2.31	6.70	.001
Intuition	4.59	2.52	3.58	2.31	-6.70	.001
Thinking	5.19	2.52	5.20	2.54	0.10	NS
Feeling	5.81	2.52	5.80	2.54	-0.10	NS
Judging	8.05	2.74	8.48	2.74	2.54	.05
Perceiving	1.95	2.74	1.52	2.74	-2.54	.05

Table 12.10 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .001$) differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who had a sudden conversion and churchgoers who did not have a sudden conversion on the FPTS scales sensing and intuition. In addition, table 12.10 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .05$) differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who had a sudden conversion and churchgoers who did not have a sudden conversion on the FPTS judging and perceiving scales. In the current sample, churchgoers who had a sudden conversion achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS scales intuition and perceiving than churchgoers who did not have a sudden conversion. In contrast,

churchgoers who did not have a sudden conversion achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS scales sensing and judging than churchgoers who had a sudden conversion.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that there is no significant difference between churchgoers who had a sudden conversion and those who did not have a sudden conversion on the EI index.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that churchgoers who had a sudden conversion report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS N scale than churchgoers who did not have a sudden conversion. Conversely, churchgoers who did not have a sudden conversion report significantly ($P < .001$) higher mean scores on the FPTS S scale than churchgoers who did have a sudden conversion. This result is perhaps not surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Intuitive types are characterised by a tendency to make intuitive leaps and connections and to follow their ideas passionately, while sensing types are characterised by step-by-step thinking and a preference for concrete certainties and facts. It could be argued that as a consequence intuitive types are more likely to experience a sudden conversion as they will be comfortable with following this kind of inspiration enthusiastically, without necessarily having to take time to reflect on how this fits into known facts or experience. Furthermore, it could be argued that sensing types will be less likely to experience a sudden conversion as they will wish to ground any change in their religious position on known facts and certainties, and may, therefore, make a slower but more informed change, or series of changes.

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that there is no significant difference between churchgoers who had a sudden conversion and those who did not have a sudden conversion on

the TF index. This finding is surprising as it conflicts with the hypothesis that churchgoers who report having undergone a conversion experience (that is, twice-born types) will be thinking types (cf Cook, 2003).

The findings of the current analysis demonstrate that churchgoers who had a sudden conversion report significantly ($P < .05$) higher mean scores on the FPTTS P scale than churchgoers who did not have a sudden conversion. Conversely, churchgoers who did not have a sudden conversion report significantly ($P < .05$) higher mean scores on the FPTTS J scale than churchgoers who did have a sudden conversion. This result is perhaps not surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Perceiving types are characterised by a preference for the spontaneous and the extemporary, while judging types are characterised by a preference for routine and structure. It could be argued that as a consequence perceiving types are comfortable with making a sudden, seemingly impulsive decision about their faith, as they welcome change and variety. Furthermore, it could be argued that judging types will be less comfortable making sudden decisions about their faith because they are inclined to be resistant to changes in established methods, as they dislike disruption and having to modify their conclusions.

In response to the statement 'I had a gradual conversion', participants who responded that this item reflected their experience much or very much were collapsed into the single category 'had gradual conversion' ($N = 779, 40\%$) and participants who responded that this item reflected their experience little or very little were collapsed into the single category 'no gradual conversion' ($N = 776, 40\%$). In table 12.11 the mean FPTTS scores of churchgoers who had a gradual conversion and churchgoers who did not have a gradual conversion are compared using an Independent Samples T-Test.

Table 12.11 T-Test: Faith Origins Scale - gradual conversion

Scale	<u>Gradual Conversion</u>		<u>No Gradual Conversion</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.75	2.94	4.77	2.93	0.12	NS
Introversion	5.25	2.94	5.23	2.93	-0.12	NS
Sensing	7.18	2.39	7.27	2.43	0.69	NS
Intuition	3.82	2.39	3.73	2.43	-0.69	NS
Thinking	5.29	2.64	5.15	2.45	-1.08	NS
Feeling	5.71	2.64	5.85	2.45	1.08	NS
Judging	8.35	2.63	8.41	2.57	0.49	NS
Perceiving	1.65	2.63	1.59	2.57	-0.49	NS

Table 12.11 demonstrates that there are no significant differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who had a gradual conversion and churchgoers who did not have a gradual conversion on any of the FPTs scales.

Table 12.12 T-Test: Faith Origins Scale - drifted into faith

Scale	<u>Drifted into Faith</u>		<u>Not Drifted into Faith</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.74	2.93	4.80	2.96	0.23	NS
Introversion	5.26	2.93	5.20	2.96	-0.23	NS
Sensing	7.36	2.28	7.15	2.42	-1.12	NS
Intuition	3.64	2.28	3.85	2.42	1.12	NS
Thinking	5.18	2.54	5.20	2.57	0.10	NS
Feeling	5.82	2.45	5.80	2.57	-0.10	NS
Judging	7.87	2.64	8.47	2.57	2.99	.01
Perceiving	2.13	2.64	1.53	2.57	-2.99	.01

In response to the statement 'I drifted into faith', participants who responded that this item reflected their experience much or very much were collapsed into the single category 'drifted into faith' (N = 191, 11%) and participants who responded that this item reflected their experience

little or very little were collapsed into the single category 'not drifted into faith' (N = 1,330, 74%). In table 12.12 the mean FPTS scores of churchgoers who drifted into faith and churchgoers who did not drift into faith are compared using an Independent Samples T-Test.

Table 12.12 demonstrates that there are ($P < .01$) significant differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who drifted into faith and churchgoers who did not drift into faith on the FPTS scales judging and perceiving. In the current sample, churchgoers who had drifted into faith achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS scale perceiving than churchgoers who did not drift into faith. In contrast, churchgoers who did not drift into faith achieved higher mean scores on the FPTS scale judging than churchgoers who did drift into faith.

This result is perhaps not surprising when considered in the light of type theory. Perceiving types are characterised by an easy-going, adaptable approach to life and a preference for change and spontaneity, while judging types are characterised by an ordered, structured approach to life and a preference for closure. It could be argued that as a consequence perceiving types are comfortable with leaving decisions about their faith open, as they prefer to explore their options. Furthermore, it could be argued that judging types will be uncomfortable leaving decisions about their faith open, as they prefer to achieve closure and reach decisions.

In response to the statement 'I am still searching', participants who responded that this item reflected their experience much or very much were collapsed into the single category 'still searching' (N = 440, 24%) and participants who responded that this item reflected their experience little or very little were collapsed into the single category 'not still searching' (N = 1,135, 62%). In table 12.13 the mean FPTS scores of churchgoers who are still searching and

churchgoers who are not still searching are compared using an Independent Samples T-Test.

Table 12.13 T-Test: Faith Origins Scale - still searching

Scale	<u>Still Searching</u>		<u>Not Still Searching</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	4.61	2.83	4.86	2.99	1.51	NS
Introversion	5.39	2.83	5.14	2.99	-1.51	NS
Sensing	7.12	2.39	7.22	2.40	0.76	NS
Intuition	3.88	2.39	3.78	2.40	-0.76	NS
Thinking	5.29	2.52	5.23	2.56	-0.39	NS
Feeling	5.71	2.52	5.77	2.56	0.39	NS
Judging	8.08	2.52	8.53	2.56	3.13	.01
Perceiving	1.92	2.52	1.47	2.56	-3.13	.01

Table 12.13 demonstrates that there are significant ($P < .01$) differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who are still searching and churchgoers who are not still searching on the FPTTS scales judging and perceiving. In the current sample, churchgoers who are still searching achieved significantly higher mean scores on the FPTTS scale perceiving than churchgoers who are not still searching. In contrast, churchgoers who are not still searching achieved higher mean scores on the FPTTS scale judging than churchgoers who are still searching.

This result is perhaps not surprising if it is proposed that churchgoers who are still searching hold a similar approach to faith development as churchgoers who drifted into faith. It may be the case that churchgoers who drifted into faith, are at a later point in the growth of their faith than those who are still searching, but for both groups faith is seen as a developing, continuous process. The relationship with type theory for both groups may also be similar. So, again it could be argued that perceiving types are comfortable with leaving decisions about their faith open, as they prefer to explore their options. Furthermore, it could again be argued that judging types will be

uncomfortable leaving decisions about their faith open, as they prefer to achieve closure and reach decisions.

In response to the statement 'I have never believed', participants who responded that this item reflected their experience much or very much were collapsed into the single category 'never believed' (N = 38, 2%) and participants who responded that this item reflected their experience little or very little were collapsed into the single category 'have believed' (N = 1,621, 96%). In table 12.14 the mean FPTS scores of churchgoers who have never believed and churchgoers who have not never believed are compared using an Independent Samples T-Test.

Table 12.14 T-Test: Faith Origins Scale - never believed

Scale	<u>Never Believed</u>		<u>Have Believed</u>		T	P<
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Extraversion	5.55	3.01	4.75	2.94	-1.67	NS
Introversion	4.45	3.01	5.25	2.94	1.67	NS
Sensing	7.08	2.39	7.17	2.40	0.23	NS
Intuition	3.92	2.39	3.83	2.40	-0.23	NS
Thinking	5.13	2.30	5.24	2.57	0.26	NS
Feeling	5.87	2.30	5.76	2.57	-0.26	NS
Judging	8.92	2.26	8.40	2.60	-1.23	NS
Perceiving	1.08	2.26	1.60	2.60	1.23	NS

Table 12.14 demonstrates that there are no significant differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who have never believed and churchgoers who have not never believed on any of the FPTS scales.

This result is perhaps not surprising given the very small number of churchgoers who identify themselves as having never believed. Given that just 38 churchgoers in this sample identify

themselves as having never believed it may be that the number of cases is too small to generate statistically significant differences.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has assessed the relationship between faith origins and psychological type. The meaning of faith origins was explored and previous studies concerned with psychological type and faith origins were reviewed. The psychological type preferences of the current sample were analysed in relation to a new scale of faith origins, the FOS, and the implications of these analyses were discussed. From the findings of the current study four main points may be identified.

The first point is that there are significant differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who have always believed and those who have not always believed. Churchgoers who have always believed tend to prefer extraversion, sensing, feeling, and judging, while churchgoers who have not always believed tend to prefer introversion, intuition, thinking, and perceiving. This finding is particularly interesting given the earlier finding (chapter 9) that churchgoers who prefer extraversion, sensing, feeling, and judging are also more satisfied with their congregations than churchgoers who prefer introversion, intuition, thinking, and perceiving. This suggests that there may be particular types (extraverts, sensing types, feeling types, and judging types) who are more likely to remain within the church.

The second point is that churchgoers with preferences for intuition over sensing are significantly more likely to report having made a clear decision about their faith and experiencing a sudden conversion. Moreover, churchgoers with a preference for feeling are also more likely to report

having made a clear decision about their faith.

The third point is that churchgoers with preferences for perceiving over judging are significantly more likely to report having a sudden conversion, drifting into faith, and being still in the process of searching.

The fourth point is that there are no significant differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who experienced a gradual conversion and churchgoers who did not experience a gradual conversion, nor were there significant differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who have never believed and churchgoers who have believed.

The next chapter will explore the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles.

-CHAPTER THIRTEEN-

FAITH STYLES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Previous Studies of Psychological Type and Spirituality**
- 3. Current Study**
- 4. Discussion**
- 5. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

The previous chapter explored the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and faith origins. This chapter will explore the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and faith styles. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and spirituality will be reviewed. A new scale of faith styles will be introduced and the psychological type preferences of the current sample will be analysed in relation to this scale. The implications of these analyses will be discussed and conclusions will be drawn about the relationship between psychological type and faith styles.

2. Previous Studies of Psychological Type and Spirituality

Goldsmith (1994, p 29) identifies that 'it may come as a surprise to some people to realize that other people perceive and experience God in different ways, and to acknowledge that what supports and encourages one person in their spiritual journey may have no effect whatsoever upon someone else'. Nonetheless, there is a wide-ranging and developing body of literature concerned with the application of psychological type theory to Christian belief and practice, many based on the argument that psychological type theory can contribute to faith development (see, for example, Kelsey, 1978; Grant, Thompson and Clarke, 1983; Clarke, 1983; Michael and Norrisey, 1984; Duncan, 1993; Goldsmith, 1994; Fowke, 1997; Butler, 1999). These studies argue that people with different psychological type preferences develop their faith in different ways and will be drawn to different styles of spirituality. However, in the main, this literature is *theoretical* rather than empirical (Ross, Weis and Jackson, 1996).

Although, as Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996) assert, there have been few empirical studies reported to support the recommendations of many type theorists that different spiritual practices

are beneficial for different psychological types, there are three scales which apply psychological type to spirituality which have been empirically tested (Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin, 1989; Ross, Weis and Jackson, 1996; Francis and Payne, 2002). Unless stated otherwise, each of the empirical studies makes use of the MBTI. Goldsmith (1994) has also developed 'the spirituality questionnaire' in order to illustrate how people's psychological type preferences operate in the world of spirituality. However, Goldsmith (1994, p 35) does not empirically verify the spirituality questionnaire; he sees it 'only as an illustrative tool, for interest, and not as any sort of research instrument'.

Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989) investigated the relationship between prayer forms, scripture, and psychological type among 170 participants who indicated that they considered themselves to be Christians. Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989) base their study on the theoretical proposals of Michael and Norrisey (1984) who argued that different types would be attracted to different styles of prayer. Michael and Norrisey (1984) based their study on the four key combinations of types, that is, the temperaments, identified by Keirsey and Bates (1978). The temperaments are SJ, SP, NF, and NT.

Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989) developed the Knapp-Ware Prayer form questionnaire, an unpublished inventory which assesses various elements of prayer including attitude toward community prayer, structured prayer, liturgy, meditations from the New Testament, and passages from the gospels. Items assessing attitude toward the liturgy, meditations from the New Testament, and passages from the gospels were intended to correspond to the four temperaments.

Five major findings were revealed by the study of Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989). First, SJ

types were significantly more likely to rate structured prayer highly, when compared with the other temperaments. Second, although it was hypothesised that extraverts would rate community prayer more highly, in fact it was found that feeling types and judging types tended to rate community prayer more highly. Third, SJ's tended to rate highly three of the forms of liturgy (SP, SJ, and NF), when compared with the other temperaments. NT's rated low all but the NT liturgy, when compared with the other temperaments. Fourth, no significant relationship was found between temperament and rating of meditations from the New Testament. Fifth, when assessing the relationship between temperament and rating of passages from the gospels, it was found that NT's tended to rank the NF gospel passage significantly highly when compared to the other three temperaments. Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989, p 42) conclude that 'further research should focus on the further development of the prayer form questionnaire and testing of hypotheses generated by Michael and Norrisey'.

Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996) review Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin's (1989) study and take up their challenge to conduct further research. Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996, p 263) developed the Religious Beliefs and Practices Survey (RBPS) in order to investigate 'the many relations, assumed to be obtained by pastoral counselors and spiritual directors, between religious orientation and Jungian psychological type'. The RBPS contained a 100 items derived from literature concerned with the relationship between psychological type theory and pastoral counselling and spiritual direction. Participants were asked to respond to items on a 4-point Likert-type scale. Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996) administered the RBPS alongside the MBTI to a sample of 122 women and 73 men. This sample was comprised of 165 active members of either Anglican, Mennonite, or United Church of Canada churches; the remaining 30 participants were students in a first-year religious studies class.

Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996) report that the most significant differences on the RBPS were found on the SN index. They report that intuitive types emphasise the ineffability of divinity and are more open to religious change, while sensing types emphasise the separateness of the sacred and the secular, find religious doubt distressing, and consider rules to be more important. In addition, Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996) found that judging types tend to view religion as a structure for belief and practice, while perceiving types tend to view religion as a source of enriching experience. They found that extraverts found fellowship with others to be a source of spiritual renewal, whereas introverts found time alone to be a source of spiritual renewal. Finally, they found that thinking types tended to be more cynical, to experience more problems with prayer, and to prefer clear, reasoned, and articulate sermons, while feeling types reported finding interpersonal conflict and insensitivity from others to be distressing and to enjoy personal stories in sermons.

Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996, p 277) conclude that 'Jungian psychological type preferences have implications for individuals' religious orientation, including the perceived nature of the divine, the psychological role of religion, religious values, and attitude toward specific religious practices'. They continue, 'Differences were found in the predicted direction in respect to all four Jungian preference sets'. However, they concede that the limited sample size limits the rigour of the analysis, and also it may be inferred, the generalisability of the findings.

Payne (2001) developed a scale in order to examine the relationship between psychological type preferences and ministry styles. He hypothesised that for each of the psychological type preferences there exists a corresponding ministry style. He developed the Payne Inventory of Ministry Styles (PIMS), an eighty-item scale, containing ten items intended to operationalise

each of the eight psychological type scales. In designing this inventory he was attempting to 'develop questions similar to those used by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator but applying them directly to clergy and their role in ministry' (p 149). So, for example, the introverted ministry scale, was assessed by items such as 'I am energised by a contemplative style of prayer' and 'I am refreshed by spending time alone', to which participants responded on a 5-item Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly agree through to strongly disagree.

Francis and Payne (2002) report on the use of the PIMS in a study among 191 male stipendiary clergy in the Church in Wales. Following factor analysis and item rest-of-test correlation analysis they reduced the ten-item scales to just seven items. The resulting seven-item scales were found to achieve alpha coefficients ranging from .59 (sensing ministry style) to .79 (judging ministry style). These scores suggest that not all the scales of the PIMS achieve satisfactory internal reliability, which is thought to be indicated by an alpha coefficient of .70 or more (Kline, 2000) or .65 or more (DeVellis, 2003).

Francis and Payne (2002) found eight significant relationships between the MBTI psychological type preferences and the PIMS. First, it was found that the extraversion ministry style was correlated positively with MBTI extraversion, and correlated negatively with MBTI introversion. This suggests that extraverted clergy are energised by a ministry style that involves meeting and working with people, while introverted clergy are drained by this ministry style.

Second, the introversion ministry style (solitary and contemplative) was not correlated with any of the MBTI preferences.

Third, the sensing ministry style was correlated positively with MBTI sensing and judging, and correlated negatively with MBTI intuition and perceiving. This suggests that sensing and judging type clergy prefer a ministry style that is practical and detailed, while intuitive and perceiving type clergy prefer are less likely to prefer this ministry style.

Fourth, the intuitive ministry style was correlated positively with MBTI intuition, perceiving, and extraversion, and correlated negatively with MBTI sensing, judging, and introversion. This suggests that intuitive, perceiving and extraverted clergy prefer a ministry style that is innovative and questioning, while sensing, judging, and introverted clergy are less likely to prefer this ministry style.

Fifth, the thinking ministry style was correlated positively with MBTI thinking, and correlated negatively with feeling. This suggests that thinking type clergy prefer a ministry style that is objective, rational, and fair, while feeling type clergy are less likely to prefer this ministry style.

Sixth, the feeling ministry style was correlated positively with MBTI feeling, and negatively correlated with thinking and intuition. This suggests that feeling type clergy prefer a ministry style that is compassionate and focused on fellowship, while thinking and intuitive type clergy are less likely to prefer this ministry style.

Seventh, the judging ministry style was correlated positively with MBTI judging and sensing, and negatively correlated with perceiving and intuition. This suggests that judging and sensing type clergy prefer a well-planned and scheduled ministry style, while perceiving and intuitive type clergy are less likely to prefer this ministry style.

Eighth, the perceiving ministry style was correlated positively with MBTI perceiving, intuition, feeling, and extraversion, and negatively correlated with judging, sensing, thinking, and introversion. This suggests that perceiving, intuitive, feeling, and extraverted clergy prefer a ministry style that is flexible and spontaneous, while judging, sensing, thinking, and introverted clergy are less likely to prefer this ministry style.

These findings suggest that there is a relationship between psychological type and choice of ministry style. The fact that certain ministry styles are uncorrelated with the MBTI type they are supposed to operationalise (for example, introversion) and that other ministry styles are correlated with MBTI types they are *not* supposed to operationalise (for example, perceiving), may be due to the small sample, or to the unrefined nature of the PIMS. Francis and Payne (2002) recommend the development of longer and more reliable scales and replication studies among different groups of clergy.

The studies of Ware, Knapp and Schwarzin (1989), Ross, Weis and Jackson (1996), and Francis and Payne (2002) illustrate the usefulness of developing scales which apply psychological type theory to different aspects of spirituality. Based on this previous research, the current study intends to develop the current empirical literature by applying psychological type theory to faith styles.

3. Current Study

A new scale was developed for the questionnaire, the Index of Faith Styles (IFS), consisting of eighty items framing faith styles in psychological type theory. The scale applies the dichotomous indices of extraversion and introversion, sensing and intuition, thinking and feeling, and judging

and perceiving, to elements of Christian belief and practice which may contribute to faith development. Areas of Christian belief and practice which were considered included worship, prayer, bible reading, church services, images of God, and relationship with other Christians and with non-Christians. The IFS was constructed through a thorough review of the literature concerning the relationship between psychological type and Christian faith (see Craig, 2002) and in consultation with three qualified psychological type (specifically MBTI) practitioners engaged in Christian ministry. Participants were asked to judge how far eighty items reflected their experience in response to the statement 'How much do you feel the following have helped your faith to grow?' Participants were asked to respond to each item on a 5-item Likert-type scale ranging from 'very little', through 'a little', 'medium', 'much', to 'very much'. There are eight scales each containing 10 items; the eight scales relate to each of the psychological type preferences: extraversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving.

Tables 13.1 to 13.8 present the percentage endorsement for each of the items; in order to simplify the presentation of data, the two responses 'much' or 'very much' have been collapsed into the 'yes' category, the two responses 'little' and 'very little' have been collapsed into the category 'no' and, the response 'medium' has been expressed as 'medium'. Tables 13.1 to 13.8 also present the item rest-of-test correlations and alpha coefficients. An alpha coefficient of .70 or above indicates satisfactory statistical internal consistency according to Kline (2000), while DeVellis (2003) suggests that an alpha coefficient of .65 or above is acceptable. Each of the eight scales which comprise the IFS produced alpha coefficients in excess of .70, suggesting that the scales are internally reliable.

The scale of extraverted faith styles is intended to attract people who are orientated to the outer world. Extraverts are energised by the events and people around them. They enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and exciting environments. They prefer to act in a situation rather than to reflect on it. They may vocalise a problem or an idea, rather than thinking it through privately. They may be bored and frustrated by silence and solitude. They tend to focus their attention on what is happening outside of them and may be influenced by others' opinions. They are usually open people, easy to get to know, and enjoy having many friends.

Table 13.1 Reliability analysis of Index of Faith Styles - extraversion

Item	r	yes %	medium %	no %
worshipping with enthusiasm and energy	.4709	61	24	15
attending active and exciting church services	.5301	56	24	20
finding God in other Christians	.5809	72	19	9
meeting God in Christian fellowship	.6800	67	22	11
acting on my Christian faith	.5281	70	23	7
seeing God at work in the world around me	.4452	67	24	9
sharing my beliefs with others	.6423	47	30	23
praying as part of a group	.6302	40	23	37
discussing passages of scripture with a group	.6268	43	19	37
discussing Christianity with others	.6790	46	27	27
Alpha	.8658			

Based on this understanding of extraversion, it is hypothesised that extraverts will report that the elements of Christian belief and practice outlined in table 13.1 have helped their faith to grow. Participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'finding God in other Christians' (72%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'praying as part of a group' (40%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'meeting God in Christian fellowship' (.6800) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is

‘seeing God at work in the world around me’ (.4452). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .8658.

The scale of introverted faith styles is intended to attract people who are orientated to their inner world. Introverts are energised by their inner ideas and concepts. They may feel drained by events and people around them. They prefer to reflect on a situation rather than to act on it. They enjoy solitude, silence, and contemplation, as they tend to focus their attention on what is happening in their inner life. They may appear reserved and detached as they are difficult to get to know, and they may prefer to have a small circle of intimate friends rather than many acquaintances.

Table 13.2 Reliability analysis of Index of Faith Styles - introversion

Item	r	yes %	medium %	no %
quietly contemplating my faith	.5182	64	24	12
being still in God’s presence	.5453	70	19	11
contemplating passages of scripture alone	.4552	31	30	38
church services that encouraged reflection	.4676	58	27	15
seeing God at work in my inner life	.6135	59	25	16
practising solitary prayer	.5737	53	26	21
worshipping in quietness and stillness	.5879	65	22	13
finding God in my solitude	.6668	56	25	19
meeting God in the depth of my being	.6190	48	28	24
reflecting on Christian teaching	.5125	48	32	20
Alpha	.8531			

Based on this understanding of introversion, it is hypothesised that introverts will report that the elements of Christian belief and practice outlined in table 13.2 have helped their faith to grow.

Participants most frequently positively endorsed the item ‘being still in God’s presence’ (70%)

and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'contemplating passages of scripture alone' (31%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'finding God in my solitude' (.6668) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'contemplating passages of scripture alone' (.4552). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .8531.

The scale of sensing faith styles is intended to attract people who receive and process information using their five senses. Sensing types tend to focus on specific details, rather than the overall picture. They are concerned with the actual, the real, and the practical and tend to be down to earth and matter of fact. They may feel that particular details are more significant than general patterns. They are frequently fond of the traditional and conventional. They may be conservative and tend to prefer what is known and well-established.

Table 13.3 Reliability analysis of Index of Faith Styles - sensing

Item	r	yes %	medium %	no %
sermons that examined one theme thoroughly	.3900	61	26	13
examining Bible passages in detail	.3823	42	25	33
sights and sounds of church services	.2783	64	22	14
applying my Christian faith here and now	.4392	70	23	7
appreciating the church building	.0868	34	22	44
finding answers through prayer	.5218	65	22	13
examining the evidence for the resurrection	.4085	38	29	32
studying what Jesus said and did	.5548	66	23	11
worshipping in church	.5060	74	19	7
seeing God as one who provides answers	.5019	62	24	14
Alpha	.7326			

Based on this understanding of sensing, it is hypothesised that sensing types will report that the

elements of Christian belief and practice outlined in table 13.3 have helped their faith to grow. Participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'worshipping in church' (74%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'appreciating the church building' (34%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'studying what Jesus said and did' (.5548) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'appreciating the church building' (.0868); this is a particularly low rest-of-test correlation, and it is recommended that this item is revised or replaced in future development of the IFS. The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .7326.

The scale of intuitive faith styles is intended to attract people who receive and process information using their intuition. Intuitive types focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. They may feel that perception by the senses is not as valuable as information gained from the unconscious mind; indirect associations and concepts impact their perceptions. They focus on the overall picture, rather than specific facts and data. They follow their inspirations enthusiastically, but not always realistically. They can appear to be up in the air and may be seen as idealistic dreamers. They often aspire to bring innovative change to established conventions.

Based on this understanding of intuition, it is hypothesised that intuitive types will report that the elements of Christian belief and practice outlined in table 13.4 have helped their faith to grow. Participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'seeing God in the beauty of nature' (82%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'pursuing ideas in the Bible' (32%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'pursuing ideas in the Bible' (.5459) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'questioning my

religious beliefs' (.2734). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .7526.

Table 13.4 Reliability analysis of Index of Faith Styles - intuition

Item	r	yes %	medium %	no %
asking questions in prayer	.4118	50	29	21
encountering the Christ of faith	.4497	55	24	20
considering future possibilities of my faith	.4581	49	30	21
questioning my religious beliefs	.2734	45	29	26
exploring themes in the Bible	.4947	39	34	27
seeing God in the beauty of nature	.3722	82	12	6
pursuing ideas in the Bible	.5459	32	33	34
innovative and inventive church services	.3724	33	28	39
worshipping in the beauty of nature	.3690	58	25	18
speculating about the meaning of Easter	.4175	44	29	27
Alpha	.7526			

The scale of thinking faith styles is intended to attract people who make judgements based on objective, impersonal logic. Thinking types are known for their truthfulness and for their desire for fairness. They consider conforming to principles to be of more importance than cultivating harmony. They are often good at making difficult decisions as they are able to analyse problems to reach an unbiased and reasonable solution. They are sometimes seen as being 'tough-minded'. They may consider it more important to be honest and correct than to be tactful, when working with others.

Based on this understanding of thinking, it is hypothesised that thinking types will report that the elements of Christian belief and practice outlined in table 13.5 have helped their faith to grow. Participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'understanding God better through prayer' (61%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'analysing passages of the Bible

logically' (28%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'seeing God as concerned with justice' (.5899) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'church services that focused on teaching' (.4059). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .8123.

Table 13.5 Reliability analysis of Index of Faith Styles - thinking

Item	r	yes %	medium %	no %
being challenged by God's justice	.5061	37	32	31
thinking of God as a judge	.4142	31	25	44
church services that focused on teaching	.4059	52	31	18
appreciating the fairness of Christian morality	.4630	56	29	15
evaluating the truth of the Gospel	.5426	57	28	16
discovering meaning through faith	.5386	56	30	15
understanding God better through prayer	.5271	61	25	14
analysing passages of the Bible logically	.4235	28	27	45
seeing God as concerned with justice	.5899	52	30	18
worship that renews my sense of justice	.5246	34	35	31
Alpha	.8123			

The scale of feeling faith styles is intended to attract people who make judgements based on subjective, personal values. Feeling types value compassion and mercy. They are known for their tactfulness and for their desire for peace. They are more concerned to promote harmony, than to adhere to abstract principles. They may be thought of as 'people-persons', as they are able to take into account other people's feelings and values in decision-making and problem-solving, ensuring they reach a solution that satisfies everyone. They are sometimes seen as being 'warm-hearted'. They may find it difficult to criticise others, even when it is necessary. They find it easy to empathise with other people and tend to be trusting and encouraging of others.

Table 13.6 Reliability analysis of Index of Faith Styles - feeling

Item	r	yes %	medium %	no %
being accepted and forgiven by God	.6342	84	12	4
viewing God as concerned with mercy	.6081	67	23	10
relating to God as a father	.6274	70	18	12
feeling compassion for Christ's suffering	.6053	70	20	10
feeling forgiven by God's mercy	.7247	77	15	8
recognising God's love for me	.7468	81	14	5
feeling more of God's love through prayer	.6591	61	25	15
discovering personal peace through faith	.6419	74	19	8
sympathising with characters from the Bible	.4744	37	34	29
worship that fills me with compassion	.5379	58	27	15
Alpha	.8856			

Based on this understanding of feeling, it is hypothesised that feeling types will report that the elements of Christian belief and practice outlined in table 13.6 have helped their faith to grow. Participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'being accepted and forgiven by God' (84%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'sympathising with characters from the Bible' (37%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'recognising God's love for me' (.7468) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'sympathising with characters from the Bible' (.4744). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .8856.

The scale of judging faith styles is intended to attract people who seek to order and structure their outside world, as they actively judge external stimuli. Judging types have a planned, orderly approach to life. They enjoy routine and established patterns. They prefer to follow schedules in order to reach an established goal and may make use of lists, timetables, or diaries. They tend to be punctual, organised, and tidy. They may find it difficult to deal with unexpected

disruptions of their plans. Likewise, they are inclined to be resistant to changes to established methods. They prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once made.

Table 13.7 Reliability analysis of Index of Faith Styles - judging

Item	r	yes %	medium %	no %
reading the Bible at a set time every day	.2812	30	21	49
worshipping with familiar hymns or prayers	.4297	67	22	11
attending traditional religious services	.3973	50	23	27
discipline of regular church attendance	.5378	70	9	12
reading the Bible systematically	.3720	26	25	49
attending closely structured church services	.5262	31	28	41
praying at a set time every day	.4795	28	20	52
relying on my unchanging faith	.3871	53	27	20
participating in familiar church services	.4887	54	28	18
adopting a strict pattern of prayer	.5124	14	18	67
Alpha	.7704			

Based on this understanding of judging, it is hypothesised that judging types will report that the elements of Christian belief and practice outlined in table 13.7 have helped their faith to grow. Participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'discipline of regular church attendance' (70%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'adopting a strict pattern of prayer' (14%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'discipline of regular church attendance' (.5378) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'reading the Bible at a set time every day' (.2812). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .7704.

The scale of perceiving faith styles is intended to attract people who do not seek to impose order on the outer world, but are more reflective, perceptive, and open, as they passively perceive

external stimuli. They have a flexible, open-ended approach to life. They enjoy change and spontaneity. They prefer to leave projects open in order to adapt and improve them. Their behaviour may often seem impulsive and unplanned.

Table 13.8 Reliability analysis of Index of Faith Styles - perceiving

Item	r	yes %	medium %	no %
praying in a way that reflected my mood	.3596	55	29	16
reading scripture that catches my interest	.4247	50	27	23
exploring different ways of praying	.5515	35	28	37
trying out different forms of faith	.4301	9	14	76
taking part in spontaneous worship	.4583	42	25	34
exploring my spirituality	.5348	36	31	33
reading the Bible as the mood takes me	.3617	31	27	42
trying different ways of worshipping God	.6795	26	27	48
experiencing different sorts of churches	.4949	22	25	53
trying out new methods of worship	.6476	24	26	50
Alpha	.8142			

Based on this understanding of perceiving, it is hypothesised that perceiving types will report that the elements of Christian belief and practice outlined in table 13.8 have helped their faith to grow. Participants most frequently positively endorsed the item 'praying in a way that reflected my mood' (55%) and least frequently positively endorsed the item 'trying out different forms of faith' (9%). The item which had the highest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'trying different ways of worshipping God' (.6795) and the item which had the lowest rest-of-test correlation on this scale is 'praying in a way that reflected my mood' (.3596). The scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .8142.

Table 13.9 presents the correlation between the eight FPTs scales and the eight IFS scales. In

view of the number of correlations being tested, the probability level has been set at one percent.

Eight features of this correlation matrix are worthy of discussion.

First, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) positive correlations between the scale of extravert faith styles and FPTS extraversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving. In addition, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) negative correlations between the scale of extravert faith styles and FPTS introversion, sensing, thinking, and judging.

Second, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) positive correlations between the scale of introvert faith styles and FPTS intuition and feeling and significant ($P < .01$) positive correlations between the scales of introvert faith styles and FPTS perceiving. In addition, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) negative correlations between the scale of introvert faith styles and FPTS sensing and thinking and significant ($P < .001$) negative correlations between the scale of introvert faith styles and FPTS judging.

Third, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) positive correlations between the scale of sensing faith styles and FPTS extraversion and feeling. In addition, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) negative correlations between the scale of sensing faith styles and FPTS introversion and thinking.

Fourth, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) positive correlations between the scale of intuitive faith styles and FPTS introversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving. In addition, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) negative correlations between the scale of intuitive faith styles and FPTS extraversion, sensing, thinking, and judging.

Table 13.9 Pearson correlation (2-tailed) matrix

	IFS-E	IFS-I	IFS-S	IFS-N	IFS-T	IFS-F	IFS-J	IFS-P
FPTS-E	+0.2155 .001	-0.0484 NS	+0.1128 .001	-0.1012 .001	+0.0736 .001	+0.1065 .001	+0.0404 NS	+0.1083 .001
FPTS-I	-0.2155 .001	+0.0484 NS	-0.1128 .001	+0.1012 .001	-0.0736 .001	-0.1065 .001	-0.0404 NS	-0.1083 .001
FPTS-S	-0.1627 .001	-0.1913 .001	-0.0100 NS	-0.1991 .001	-0.0913 .001	-0.0741 .001	+0.1753 .001	-0.2953 .001
FPTS-N	+0.1627 .001	+0.1913 .001	+0.0100 NS	+0.1991 .001	+0.0913 .001	+0.0741 .001	-0.1753 .001	+0.2953 .001
FPTS-T	-0.1422 .001	-0.1598 .001	-0.1368 .001	-0.1082 .001	-0.0144 NS	-0.2070 .001	-0.1237 .001	-0.1068 .001
FPTS-F	+0.1422 .001	+0.1598 .001	+0.1368 .001	+0.1082 .001	+0.0144 NS	+0.2070 .001	+0.1237 .001	+0.1068 .001
FPTS-J	-0.1027 .001	-0.0653 .01	+0.0031 NS	-0.1072 .001	-0.0462 NS	-0.1001 .001	+0.1547 .001	-0.1870 .001
FPTS-P	+0.1027 .001	+0.0653 .01	-0.0031 NS	+0.1072 .001	+0.0462 NS	+0.1001 .001	-0.1547 .001	+0.1870 .001

FPTS= Francis Psychological Type Scales

IFS= Index of Faith Styles

Fifth, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) positive correlations between the scale of thinking faith styles and FPTS extraversion and intuition. In addition, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) negative correlations between the scale of thinking faith styles and FPTS introversion and sensing.

Sixth, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) positive correlations between the scale of feeling faith styles and FPTS extraversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving. In addition, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) negative correlations between the scale of feeling faith styles and FPTS introversion, sensing, thinking, and judging.

Seventh, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) positive correlations between the scale of judging faith styles and FPTS sensing, feeling, and judging. In addition, it was found that there were ($P < .001$) significant negative correlations between the scale of judging faith styles and the FPTS scales intuition, thinking, and perceiving.

Eighth, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) positive correlations between the scale of perceiving faith styles and FPTS extraversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving. In addition, it was found that there were significant ($P < .001$) negative correlations between the scale of perceiving faith styles and FPTS introversion, sensing, thinking, and judging.

4. Discussion

The pattern of relationships between the IFS and the FPTS suggests that the relationship between faith styles and psychological type is complex and does not support the hypothesis that particular types will develop their faith using their appropriate faith style. Introvert churchgoers do not

prefer an introvert faith style, sensing type churchgoers do not prefer a sensing faith style, nor do thinking type churchgoers prefer a thinking faith style. While extravert, intuitive, feeling, judging, and perceiving churchgoers all rate highly their appropriate faith styles, they also rate other faith styles highly. For example, feeling churchgoers rated highly not only the feeling faith style but also the extravert, introvert, sensing, intuitive, judging, and perceiving faith style. There are six explanations which may be offered for the complex pattern of relationships between the IFS and the FPTS.

The first explanation for the complex pattern of relationships between the IFS and the FPTS is that some types of churchgoers are indiscriminately pro-religious. FPTS extraversion is significantly positively correlated with five faith style scales, compared to FPTS introversion which is significantly positively correlated with only one faith style scale. FPTS intuition is significantly positively correlated with six faith style scales, compared to FPTS sensing which is significantly positively correlated with only one faith style scale. FPTS feeling is significantly positively correlated with seven faith style scales, compared to FPTS thinking which is not significantly positively correlated with any faith style scales. FPTS perceiving is significantly positively correlated with four faith style scales, compared to FPTS judging which is significantly positively correlated with only one faith style scale. It could be that extraverts, intuitive types, feeling types, and perceiving types are indiscriminately pro-religious and rate all the items in IFS which relate to Christian belief and practice highly. This explanation is supported, for example, by the findings of the current study (see chapter 7) that churchgoers who prefer extraversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving report greater commitment to Christian practice in terms of private prayer (N and F), private bible reading (N), and religious experience (E, N, and P).

The second explanation for the complex pattern of relationships between the IFS and the FPTTS is that the IFS has not yet undergone sufficient psychometric testing. Although all eight of the IFS scales have demonstrated satisfactory internal consistency in the current study, it has not yet been demonstrated that the IFS are valid measures of the underlying constructs. Against the background of the current empirical evidence further research is needed to explore the extent to which the IFS demonstrates validity.

The third explanation for the complex pattern of relationships between the IFS and the FPTTS recognises that many factors may contribute to faith growth. It may be that the faith styles of churchgoers has more to do with, for example, culture or tradition than with psychological type preferences.

The fourth explanation for the complex pattern of relationships between the IFS and the FPTTS develops the previous explanation; it suggests that psychological type theory is important but that the context and delivery of the questionnaire may have influenced their answers. It may be that completing the questionnaire in church leads to participants responding in the way in which they think the church expects them to. This phenomenon also occurs in work settings, where 'the respondent may feel torn between the demands of work and his or her own preferences' (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998, p 120). Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer (1998, p 120) identify that when psychological type indicators 'have been administered in a situation involving authority (e.g. for employment), sometimes respondents answer questions in terms of their perception of that authority's preferences instead of their own'. This influence on participant response may likewise occur in a church setting. This explanation is well described by Goldsmith (1994, p 35) who argues that:

When answering questions about the church and spiritual matters it is probable that people are over-influenced by their past experiences, and so what eventually emerges is a “profile” that has been warped by years of thinking and doing things in a particular way. We become steeped in a particular tradition, and even though that may not be what we would choose if we were “starting from scratch” we may well tend to “go with the stream” of our past experiences. We may also be influenced by our congregation and its culture and outlook... this could mean that when answering certain of the questions, rather than one’s “true type” coming out, the answer is unduly influenced by the culture (the ideas, outlook, and style) of the church to which a person belongs.

The fifth explanation for the complex pattern of relationships between the IFS and the FPTSS looks at the findings of the current analysis in the light of psychological type theory. It may be that those churchgoers who responded positively to most of the faith style scales, that is extraverts, intuitive types, feeling types, and perceiving types, are more open to exploring and developing their faith. Extraverts are characterised by a focus on what is happening outside of them and may be influenced by others’ opinions. It may be that they are more open to change and to developing their faith as they take in ideas and opinions from the world around them. In contrast, introverts may be more self-contained and so recognise less need for change. Intuitive types are characterised by openness to change and imagination. It may be that they are more open to change and to developing their faith as they explore new possibilities and inspirations. In contrast, sensing types may be more traditional and conservative, preferring the well-known and established and so recognise less need for change. Perceiving types are characterised by an adaptable, flexible and open-ended approach to life. It may be that they are more open to change and to developing their faith as they recognise the value of taking in new information to improve a situation, or perhaps, their spiritual character. The finding that feeling types responded positively to more of the faith style scales than thinking types is less easy to interpret. It may be that feeling types are more positive toward faith in general, which is supported by the finding that they have held a more positive attitude toward Christianity than thinking types (Jones and

Francis, 1999; Francis, Robbins, Boxer, Lewis, McGuckin and McDaid, 2003). Alternatively, it may be the case that not just the feeling faith style scale but many of the other items comprising the IFS are written in the feeling type language of Christian spirituality. The extravert faith style item 'finding God in other Christians' and the introvert faith style item 'meeting God in the depth of my being' may appeal to the subjective, personal values which inform feeling types, but may repel thinking types who are informed by objective, rational logic.

The sixth explanation for the complex pattern of relationships between the IFS and the FPTTS argues that people do not necessarily use their preferred psychological type processes when exploring their spirituality. In the previous chapter the argument that religious conversion is often marked by the emergence of the inferior function was discussed (Repicky, 1981; Butler, 1999). This principle may be generally applicable to spirituality; it may be that spirituality offers people the opportunity to explore their less developed preferences. Goldsmith identifies (1994, p 35) that 'when thinking about spiritual issues, it is more likely that many people explore them, not with their dominant processes, but with what is often called their "shadow"'.

Against the background of the current empirical evidence further research is needed to explore the way in which a wider range of faith style preferences map onto psychological type preferences.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has assessed the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and spirituality were reviewed and a new scale of faith styles, the IFS, was outlined. The psychological type preferences of the

current sample were analysed in relation to the IFS and the implications of these analyses were discussed. It was found that there is a complex pattern of relationships between psychological type and faith styles and six explanations were offered for this finding. The next chapter will summarise the findings of the current study, relate these findings to the stated research questions, and draw conclusions.

-CHAPTER FOURTEEN-

CONCLUSIONS

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Summary of Findings**
- 3. Addressing the Research Questions**
- 4. Discussion**
- 5. Recommendations for Future Research**
- 6. Conclusion**

1. Introduction

This chapter will provide an overview of the current study. In addition, the major findings of the current study will be evaluated in relation to the stated research questions. The findings of the study as a whole will be discussed and recommendations for the church will be made. Suggestions for future research will be made.

2. Summary of findings

The current study has examined the relationship between psychological type and a number of variables among churchgoers in the UK. These relationships have been assessed by means of an extensive empirical study. A summary of the content and findings of the current study will now be outlined. Following this summary, these findings will be evaluated in relation to the stated research questions.

Chapter 1 provided an outline of the nature of psychological type theory, tracing its development from its original formation by Jung through to its subsequent operationalisations. This chapter then focused on two operationalisations of Jung's theory which claim to be able to measure psychological type preferences: the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk and Hammer, 1998) and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2004). Having outlined the theory of psychological type and reviewed different operationalisations of this theory, this chapter offered a description of the value of psychological type theory for the current study.

Chapter 2 reviewed existing studies concerned with the relationship between psychological type theory and Christianity. It identified limitations in previous research concerned with assessing the psychological type preferences of Christian groups and identified previously unexplored areas

of research. As a result of this review ten research questions were formulated.

Chapter 3 described how the research questions were to be addressed in the current study. The design of the questionnaire was described and related to these research questions. The method of the current study and the process of data-gathering were described. This chapter offered an overview of the sample, focusing on three main areas: personal information, in terms of sex, age, and marital status; church, in terms of geographical location, church environment, and denomination; and, religiosity, in terms of frequency of church attendance, frequency of private prayer, frequency of private bible reading, reported religious experience, church orientation, and faith origins.

Chapter 4 reviewed previous studies among churchgoers in the UK which make use of psychological type theory, concluding that most studies have found preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. This chapter then went on to state the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers, concluding that this sample likewise showed preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. It assessed the psychometric properties of the measure of psychological type used in this study, the FPTTS, assessed in terms of internal consistency reliability and construct validity. It was found that the scales of the FPTTS demonstrated satisfactory levels of internal consistency. It was also found that the FPTTS are able to determine psychological type preferences among a criterion group in a way that coheres with previous empirical research, supporting their construct validity. The implications of these findings were then discussed.

Chapter 5 analysed the psychological type preferences of the current sample in comparison with

three other samples: the UK population norms, a sample of non-churchgoers (an amalgamated sample of self-identified agnostics and atheists), and an amalgamated sample of clergy. Chapter 5 noted four general points. The first point identified was that churchgoers preferred introversion significantly more frequently than the UK population norms. The second point identified was that churchgoers preferred sensing significantly more frequently than non-churchgoers and clergy. The third point identified was that churchgoers preferred feeling significantly more frequently than the UK population norms and non-churchgoers; however, churchgoers in the current sample prefer feeling significantly less frequently than the clergy. The fourth point identified was that churchgoers in the current sample preferred judging significantly more frequently than the UK population norms, non-churchgoers, and clergy. The implications of these findings were then discussed.

Chapter 6 assessed the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and aspects of their background, focusing on the variables of sex, age, marital status, and church environment. Chapter 6 reviewed previous studies concerned with psychological type and sex, age, marital status, and church environment and compared and contrasted the findings of the current study with these previous studies. Chapter 6 reported that male churchgoers were more likely to prefer introversion, sensing, and thinking than female churchgoers; that older churchgoers were generally more likely to prefer introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging than younger churchgoers; that married churchgoers were more likely to prefer sensing and judging than single churchgoers; and, that urban churchgoers were more likely to prefer intuition and thinking than community town churchgoers and rural churchgoers. The implications of these findings were then discussed.

Chapter 7 assessed the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and aspects of Christian practice, specifically, private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience. Chapter 7 reviewed previous studies concerned with psychological type and private prayer, private bible reading, and religious experience, and then contrasted the findings of the current study with these previous studies. Chapter 7 reported that although the current sample consists predominantly of churchgoers with preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging, it is in fact churchgoers who prefer extraversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving who report greater commitment to Christian practice in terms private prayer (N and F), private bible reading (N), and religious experience (E, N, and P). The implications of these findings were then discussed.

Chapter 8 assessed the psychological type preferences of the current sample in terms of congregational profile. Previous studies among church congregations were reviewed and then contrasted the findings of the current study with these previous studies. The psychological type profiles of congregations in the current study were outlined and it was reported that the majority of congregations (N = 56, 58%) preferred introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging and that nearly all congregations (N = 89, 94%) preferred SJ. The implications of these findings were discussed and explanations for the predominance of ISFJ congregations were offered.

Chapter 9 assessed the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and church satisfaction. Chapter 9 reviewed previous studies concerned with the relationship between psychological type preferences and satisfaction, both among secular groups and among Christian groups. Chapter 9 then introduced a new scale of church satisfaction, the CSS and reported that it was found to demonstrate satisfactory internal reliability. The psychological type

preferences of churchgoers were analysed in relation to the CSS and reported that churchgoers who preferred extraversion, sensing, feeling, and judging were more satisfied with their congregations than churchgoers who prefer introversion, intuition, thinking, and perceiving. The implications of these findings were then discussed.

Chapter 10 assessed the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and denominational affiliation. Previous studies concerned with psychological type were reviewed and denomination and the psychological type preferences of churchgoers of different denominations were outlined. The psychological type preferences of Church of England churchgoers were outlined and then compared and contrasted this sample with other denominational groups. It was reported that churchgoers attending Church of England, Baptist, Methodist, and Church in Wales churches all expressed preferences for introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving. Chapter 10 discussed the implications of these findings and judged that denominational affiliation does not seem to make a very great difference to the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK. Three explanations for this finding were offered.

Chapter 11 assessed the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and church orientation. Three dimensions of church orientation were introduced and then reviewed previous studies concerned with psychological type and church orientation. Chapter 11 analysed the psychological type preferences of the current sample of churchgoers in terms of church orientation. It was reported that conservative churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the scales introversion, sensing, thinking, and judging than liberal churchgoers; catholic churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the scales introversion, sensing, and judging than

evangelical churchgoers; and, positive charismatic churchgoers achieved higher mean scores on the scales extraversion, intuition, and perceiving than negative charismatic churchgoers. The implications of these findings were then discussed.

Chapter 12 assessed the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and faith origins. The meaning of faith origins were explored and reviewed previous studies concerned with psychological type and faith origins. The psychological type preferences of the current sample were analysed in relation to a new scale of faith origins, the FOS. Chapter 12 reported that extravert, sensing type, feeling type, and judging type churchgoers were more likely to report having always believed, that intuitive type churchgoers were more likely to report having made a clear decision about their faith and experiencing a sudden conversion, that feeling type churchgoers were also more likely to report having made a clear decision about their faith, and that perceiving type churchgoers were more likely to report having a sudden conversion, drifting into faith, and as still being in the process of searching. The implications of these findings were then discussed.

Chapter 13 assessed the relationship between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers and faith styles. Previous studies concerned with psychological type and spirituality were reviewed and introduced a new scale of faith styles, the IFS. The psychological type preferences of the current sample were analysed in relation to the IFS and the implications of these analyses were discussed. Chapter 13 reported that there was a complex pattern of relationships between psychological type and faith styles and six explanations were offered for this finding.

3. Addressing the research questions

Having summarised the content and results of the current study, its findings will now be reviewed in relation to the ten stated research questions.

The first research question asked what are the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK. The current study has shown that, in the current sample at least, churchgoers do show a distinctive psychological type profile. Churchgoers prefer introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving. This finding suggests that churches in the UK are attracting and retaining high numbers of people who are quiet and reflective (I), practical and realistic (S), compassionate and empathetic (F), and organised and decision-orientated (J). Moreover, more than seven out of ten churchgoers (71%) demonstrate a preference for SJ, suggesting that the churches are attractive to people who value tradition, convention, order, and routine. The current study has also shown that the current sample reflect the findings of most previous studies (see Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a) which have also reported that churchgoers have demonstrated preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging. This finding suggests that as the results of the current study confirm the results of previous research, these results are generalisable to other churchgoers in the UK.

The second research question asked how far the psychological type preferences of churchgoers differ from or are similar to other groups such as the UK population norms, non-churchgoers, or clergy. The current study has shown that introverts, feeling types, and judging types are overrepresented among churchgoers, compared to the UK population norms. This finding suggests that churchgoers are more likely to prefer introversion, feeling, and judging than the

population as a whole. The current study has shown that introverts, sensing types, feeling types, and judging types are overrepresented among churchgoers, compared to non-churchgoers (atheists and agnostics). This finding suggests that it could be that certain types are staying away from the church, perhaps not because of the message of the church but because of its structure and style. Finally, the current study has shown that sensing types, thinking types, and judging types are overrepresented among churchgoers, compared to clergy.

The third research question asked what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and key demographic characteristics, in terms of sex, age, marital status, and geographical location. The current study has shown that male churchgoers are more likely to prefer introversion, sensing, and thinking than female churchgoers. The current study has shown that older churchgoers are generally more likely to prefer introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging than younger churchgoers. The current study has shown that married churchgoers are more likely to prefer sensing and judging than single churchgoers. The current study has shown that urban churchgoers are more likely to prefer intuition and thinking than community town churchgoers and rural churchgoers.

The fourth research question asks what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and different aspects of Christian practice. The current study has shown that churchgoers who pray alone more frequently are more likely to prefer intuition and feeling than churchgoers who pray alone less frequently. The current study has shown that churchgoers who read the bible alone more frequently are more likely to prefer intuition than churchgoers who read the bible alone less frequently. The current study has shown that churchgoers who report having had a religious experience are more likely to prefer extraversion, intuition, and perceiving than

churchgoers who report not having had a religious experience.

The fifth research question asked what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and congregational dynamics. The current study has shown that the majority of congregations preferred introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving. This finding shows that the psychological type preferences of congregations closely reflect the psychological type preferences of individual churchgoers.

The sixth research question asked what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and church satisfaction. The current study has shown that, with the exception of the EI index, those types of people that are underrepresented in the church are most likely to express dissatisfaction with the church. Extraverts are consistently more satisfied with the church than introverts, despite being underrepresented, a result which is consistent with previous research findings that extraverts are consistently more satisfied which suggest that extraverts are generally happier and more satisfied than introverts.

The seventh research question asked what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and denominational affiliation. The current study has shown that denominational affiliation does not seem to make a very great difference to the psychological type preferences of churchgoers in the UK; regardless of denomination, most churchgoers in the current study preferred introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving.

The eighth research question asked what is the relationship between psychological type

preferences and church orientation. The current study has shown that conservative churchgoers are more likely to prefer introversion, sensing, thinking, and judging than liberal churchgoers. The current study has shown that catholic churchgoers are more likely to prefer introversion, sensing, and judging than evangelical churchgoers. The current study has shown that churchgoers who have been positively influenced by the charismatic movement are more likely to prefer extraversion, intuition, and perceiving than churchgoers who have been negatively influenced by the charismatic movement.

The ninth research question asked what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith origins. The current study has shown that churchgoers who report having always believed are more likely to prefer extraversion, sensing, feeling, and judging than churchgoers who report not having always believed, that churchgoers who report having made a clear decision about their faith or experiencing a sudden conversion are more likely to prefer intuition than churchgoers who report not having made a clear decision about their faith or not experiencing a sudden conversion, that churchgoers who report having a sudden conversion, drifting into faith, and being still in the process of searching are more likely to prefer perceiving than churchgoers who report not having a sudden conversion, drifting into faith, and being still in the process of searching, and that there are no significant differences between the psychological type preferences of churchgoers who experienced a gradual conversion and churchgoers who did not experience a gradual conversion, nor between churchgoers who have never believed and churchgoers who have always believed.

The tenth research question asked what is the relationship between psychological type preferences and faith styles. The current study has shown that although there does seem to be

a relationship between faith styles and the psychological type preferences of churchgoers, this relationship is complex. Further research is recommended to explore further this relationship.

4. Discussion

Having addressed the ten research questions some general comments about the findings of this study may be made.

Perhaps the most important finding of the current study is that there does seem to be a particular psychological type profile consistent among churchgoers in the UK. The current study of 2,718 churchgoers has shown participants to have clear preferences for introversion over extraversion, sensing over intuition, feeling over thinking, and judging over perceiving, which confirms the findings of most previous studies (see Goldsmith and Wharton, 1993; Francis and Jones, 1998, 2000b; Francis, 2002a). This profile also emerges when the sample is considered as *congregations* rather than as individuals, and when churchgoers of different denominational affiliations are compared. This profile is significantly different both from the general UK population and from non-churchgoers. People whose psychological type preferences for intuition, thinking, and perceiving are underrepresented among churchgoers and also experience less satisfaction with the church.

These findings may lead to the following conclusions: that churches are attracting and retaining more introverts, sensing types, feeling types, and judging types. It may be the case that the church itself is an introverted, sensing, feeling, and judging environment, focused on contemplation, reflection, and the inner world (I), tradition, conservatism, and practical realities (S), harmony, compassion, and personal values (F), and order, structure, and routine (J).

Alternatively, it may be the case that as most churchgoers and clergy demonstrate preferences for introversion, sensing, feeling, and judging that people with preferences for extraversion, intuition, thinking, and perceiving feel unwelcome. In either case, people with preferences for extraversion, intuition, thinking, and perceiving may feel marginalised within the church and find that their gifts and needs go unrecognised. This is not to suggest that people with preferences for extraversion, intuition, thinking, and perceiving are in any sense less spiritual or less effective Christians. Indeed, the current study has shown, for example, that extraverts, intuitive types, and perceiving types are more likely to undergo a religious experience than introverts, sensing types, and judging types. Rather, it may be argued that people with preferences for extraversion, intuition, thinking, and perceiving have different skills and strengths to the majority of churchgoers and that their faith may need to be nurtured and developed in different ways. This is precisely why psychological type theory may be so useful for the church. Myers and Myers (1995) preface their classic work on psychological type, *Gifts Differing*, with the biblical passage from which the title is derived:

For as we have many members in one body,
and all members have not the same office:
So we, being many, are one body...
And every one members one of another.
Having then gifts differing... (Romans 12: 4-8).

The emphasis here is on unity within diversity; no psychological type preference is better than another. All psychological type preferences are natural and all psychological type preferences are valuable.

The current study has shown that people with different psychological type preferences come to faith and develop that faith in different ways. Through recognition of these individual differences the church could come to appreciate the diversity of its members and to address

previously neglected areas of development. This does not mean rejecting the values and considerations of introverts, sensing types, feeling types, and judging types. Rather by refocusing its structures and activities to accommodate better those on the margins, the church might develop a more varied and more fruitful life.

So, for example, while retaining due regard for the importance of silence, contemplation, and reflection, the church might also emphasise the importance of social action, corporate experience, and excitement in worship, in order to accommodate better the needs of extraverts. While retaining due regard for the importance of tradition, convention, and practical matters, the church might also emphasise imagination, mystery, and the need for a creative vision of Christianity, in order to accommodate better the gifts and needs of intuitive types. While retaining due regard for the importance of harmony, peace, and personal values, the church might also emphasise the need for integrity, truth, reason, and conviction in matters of justice and doctrine, in order to accommodate better the gifts and needs of thinking types. While retaining due regard for the importance of order, structure, and routine, the church might also emphasise the need for adaptability, spontaneity, exploration, and extemporary and flexible worship, in order to accommodate better the gifts and needs of perceiving types.

Psychological type theory may assist the church in recognising and appreciating individual differences and, consequently, help develop a harmonious church that effectively utilises the gifts and services the needs of its members. By accounting for the strengths and weaknesses of its members, the church may continue to grow and flourish.

5. Recommendations for future research

The current study has extended and developed previous research concerned with the relationship between psychological type and Christianity in a number of ways. However, there are a number of ways in which future research could build on the current study.

First, the current study is limited in that nearly three quarters (N = 1996, 73%) of churchgoers who participated in the current study were attending Anglican services in either the Church of England or the Church in Wales. Many denominations in the current study were represented by a single congregation (Episcopal, Catholic, Independent Evangelical, Local Ecumenical Project, and the United Reformed Church). In addition, many denominations such as Elim, Assemblies of God, and House churches, are not represented in the current study. It may be that the overrepresentation of introverts, sensing types, feeling types, and judging types in the current sample is a feature of *Anglican* churchgoers. Therefore, it is recommended that future research should profile the psychological type preferences of churchgoers outside the Anglican tradition to see how far they are similar to or different from the current sample.

Second, the current study is limited in the way in which data were gathered. The questionnaires were administered by leaders of participating churches. Church leaders were asked to administer the questionnaire to their congregation(s) during a normal church service. No attempt was made to determine the number of people attending each service and, therefore, no response rate was calculated. As a result, it is unclear what percentage of people attending the church service completed the questionnaire, and, therefore, it is not known how far the data returned by each congregation is representative of that congregation. Therefore, it is recommended that future research should profile the psychological type preferences of whole congregations ensuring, as

far as possible, that all members of the congregation participate.

Third, the current study has attempted to profile the psychological types of church congregations. It has also assessed the levels of church satisfaction experienced by churchgoers with different psychological type preferences. However, it has not attempted to explore how the type profiles of church congregations and levels of church satisfaction within that congregation are related to the psychological type preferences of the church leadership. It would be fascinating to explore whether people are attracted to churches where the leadership reflects their own psychological type preferences. Likewise, it could be hypothesised that churchgoers who share a similar psychological type profile to the church leadership feel more satisfied within their congregations. Therefore, it is recommended that future research should profile the psychological type preferences of church leaders alongside their respective congregations.

Fourth, the current study has made use of a new scale intended to assess faith styles, that is, the Index of Faith Styles (IFS). However, the current study has demonstrated that the IFS does not correlate with the FPTS in the anticipated fashion; for example, introverts do not report preference for the introvert faith style. Although all eight of the IFS scales have demonstrated satisfactory internal consistency in the current study, it has not yet been demonstrated that the IFS are valid measures of the underlying constructs. Against the background of the current empirical evidence further research is needed to explore the extent to which the IFS demonstrates validity. It is also recommended that the suggestion that churchgoers will develop their spirituality most effectively by using a faith style which reflects their psychological type preferences be reassessed in the light of the findings of the current study.

6. Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of the current study. In addition, the major findings of the current study have been evaluated in relation to the stated research questions. The findings of the study as were discussed and recommendations were made as to how this study might contribute to the continuing development of the church. Recommendations for future research were made.

REFERENCES

- Abramson, N.R., Lane, H.W., Nagai, H. and Takagi, H. (1991), A comparison of Canadian and Japanese cognitive styles: implications for management interaction, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24, 575-587.
- Apostal, R.A. (1991), College students' career interests and sensing-intuition personality, *Journal of College Student Development*, 32, 4-7.
- Argyle, M. (2000), *Psychology of Religion: an introduction*, London, Routledge.
- Atkinson, J. (1990), Reform, in Dowley, T. (ed.), *The History of Christianity*, Oxford, Lion Publishing, pp 366- 400.
- Baab, L.M. (2000), *Personality Type in Congregations*, Washington DC, Alban Institute.
- Bailey, E. (2000), The implications of joining or leaving an established church, in L.J. Francis and Y.J. Katz (eds), *Joining and Leaving Religion*, pp 33-40, Leominster, Gracewing.
- Batson, C.D., Schoenrade, P. and Ventis, W.L. (1993), *Religion and the Individual: a social-psychological perspective*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Bax, J. (1986), *The Good Wine: spiritual renewal in the Church of England*, London, Church House Publishing.
- Bayne, R. (1995), Psychological type and counselling, *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 23 (1), 95-105.
- Bents, R. and Wierschke, A. (1996), Test-retest reliability of the Myers-Briggs Typenindikator, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 36, 42-46.
- Bigelow, E., Fitzgerald, R., Busk, P., Girault, E. and Avis, J. (1988), Psychological characteristics of Catholic sisters: relationships between the MBTI and other measures, *Journal of Psychological Types*, 14, 32-36.
- Bishop, P.D. and Darton, M. (eds) (1987), *The Encyclopaedia of World Faiths : a survey of the world's living religions*, London, Orbis.
- Brierley, P. (1991a), *Prospects for the Nineties*, London, MARC Europe.
- Brierley, P. (1991b), *'Christian' England: what the 1989 English Church Census reveals*, London, Marc Europe.
- Brierley, P. (2000), *The Tide is Running Out: what the English Church Attendance survey reveals*, London, Christian Research.
- Brierley, P. (2003), Good news for the church?, *Church of England Newspaper*, February 20, 9.

- Bryant, C. (1983), *Prayer and Different Types of People*, Gainesville, Florida, Center for Applications of Psychological Type.
- Bryman, A., Ranson, S. and Hinings, C.R. (1974), Churchmanship and ecumenism, *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 11, 467-475.
- Budd, R.J. (1997), *Manual for Jung Type Indicator*, Bedford, Psytech International.
- Bunker, D.E. (1991), Spirituality and the four Jungian personality functions, *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 19 (1), 26-34.
- Butler, A. (1999), *Personality and Communicating the Gospel*, Cambridge, Grove Books.
- Cabral, G.C. (1984), Psychological types in a Catholic convent: applications to community living and congregational data, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 16-22.
- Calahan, C.A. (1996), Keirsey's temperament types and religious preference for a conservative church setting, *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 82, 674.
- Campbell, J.B. and Heller, J.F. (1987), Correlations of extraversion, impulsivity and sociability with sensation seeking and MBTI-introversion, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 8 (1), 133-136.
- Carlson, R. and Williams, J. (1984), Studies of Jungian typology: III personality and marriage, *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 1, 87-94.
- Carr, S. (1997), *Type Clarification: finding the fit*, Oxford, Oxford Psychologists Press.
- Carskadon, T. (1977), Test-retest reliabilities of continuous scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, *Psychological Reports*, 41, 1011-1012.
- Carskadon, T. (1981), Psychological type and religious preferences, *Research in Psychological Type*, 4, 73-38.
- Cattell, R.B., Eber, H.W. and Tatsuoka, M.M. (1970), *Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF)*, Champaign, Illinois, Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Chae, J.H., Piedmont, R.L., Estadt, B.K and Wicks, R.J. (1995), Personological evaluation of Clance's Imposter Phenomenon Scale in a Korean sample, *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 65 (3), 468-485.
- Church, A.H. and Waclawski, J. (1998), The relationship between individual personality orientation and executive leadership behaviour, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 71, 99-125.
- Clarke, T.E. (1983), Jungian types and forms of prayer, *Review for Religious*, 42, 661-667.

- Coneybeare, W.J. (1853), Church parties, *Edinburgh Review*, 98, 273-342.
- Cook, C.C.H. (2003), William James' varieties of religious experience and Jungian varieties of human nature: the nature of the relationship between religious experience and psychological type, *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 24 (2), 141-154.
- Costa, P.T. and McCrae, R.R. (1985), *The NEO Personality Inventory*, Odessa, Florida, Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Craig, C.L. (2002), The relationship between Jungian type theory and aspects of contemporary Christianity, Unpublished MPhil dissertation, University of Wales, Bangor.
- Craig, C.L., Horsfall, T. and Francis, L.J. (2004), Psychological types of male evangelical missionary personnel training in England: a role for thinking type men?, *Pastoral Psychology*, in press.
- Cranton, P. and Knoop, R. (1995), Assessing Jung's psychological types: The PET Type Check, *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs*, 1231, 249-274.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1951), Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests, *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- Cross, F.L. and Livingstone, E.A. (eds) (1997), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Daniel, M.G. (1967), London clergymen: the ways in which their attitudes to themselves and their work have changed in the first ten years of their ministry. Unpublished MPhil dissertation, London School of Economics, University of London.
- Daniel, M.G. (1968), Catholic, evangelical and liberal in the Anglican priesthood, in D. Martin (ed.), *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, pp 115-123, London, SCM.
- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990), Jungian psychological types and Christian beliefs in active church members, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 20, 25-33.
- Delmage, A. (1996), On the use of personality testing for 'being', in K. Leech (ed.), *Myers-Briggs: Some Critical Reflections*, pp 35-8, Croydon, The Jubilee Group.
- DeVellis, R.F. (2003), *Scale Development: theory and applications*, Thousand Oaks, California, Sage.
- Douglass, F.M. and Douglass, R. (1993), The validity of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator for predicting expressed marital problems, *Family Relations*, 42, 422-426.
- Duncan, B. (1993), *Pray your way*, London, Darton, Longman and Todd.

Dwyer, M.T. (1995), *No Light Without Shadow: an exploration of personality types*, Thornbury, Victoria, Desbooks.

Edwards, L. (1998), *How We Belong, Fight, and Pray: the MBTI as key to congregational dynamics*, Washington DC, Alban Institute.

Eysenck, H.J. and Eysenck, S.B.G. (1975), *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (adult and junior)*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.

Fearn, M., Francis, L.J. and Wilcox, C. (2001), Attitude towards Christianity and psychological type: a survey among religious studies students, *Pastoral Psychology*, 49 (5), 341-348.

Forqurean, J.M., Meisgeier, C. and Swank, P. (1990), The link between learning styles and Jungian psychological type: a finding of two bipolar preference dimensions, *Journal of Experimental Education*, 58, 225-238.

Fowke, R. (1997), *Finding your Prayer Personality*, Nashville, Tennessee, Abingdon Press.

Francis, L.J. (1978), Attitude and longitude: a study in measurement, *Character Potential*, 8, 119-130.

Francis, L.J. (1985), *Rural Anglicanism*, London, Collins.

Francis, L.J. (1989), Measuring attitude toward Christianity during childhood and adolescence, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 10, 695-698.

Francis, L.J. (2001), Personality type and communicating the gospel, *Modern Believing*, 42 (1), 32-46.

Francis, L.J., (2002a), Psychological type and mystical orientation: anticipating individual differences within congregational life, *Sciences Pastorales*, 21 (1), 77-93.

Francis, L.J. (2002b), Respondents to the survey, *Church Times*, January, 25, 1.

Francis, L.J. (2003), Psychological type and biblical hermeneutics: SIFT method of preaching, *Rural Theology*, 1 (1), 13-23.

Francis, L.J. (2004), *Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS): technical manual*, Bangor, Welsh National Centre for Religious Education.

Francis, L.J. and Atkins, P. (2000), *Exploring Luke's Gospel: a guide to the gospel readings in the Revised Common Lectionary*, London, Mowbray.

Francis, L.J. and Atkins, P. (2001), *Exploring Matthew's Gospel: a guide to the gospel readings in the Revised Common Lectionary*, London, Mowbray.

Francis, L.J. and Atkins, P. (2002), *Exploring Mark's Gospel: an aid for readers and preachers using year B of the Revised Common Lectionary*, London, Continuum.

Francis, L.J., Butler, A. and Craig, C.L. (2004), Psychological types of male evangelical Anglican seminarians in England, *Journal of Psychological Type*, in press.

Francis, L.J. and Jones, S.H. (1997), Personality and charismatic experience among adult Christians, *Pastoral Psychology*, 45, 421-428.

Francis, L.J. and Jones, S.H. (1998), Personality and Christian belief among adult churchgoers, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 47, 5-11.

Francis, L.J. and Jones, S.H. (1999a), Psychological type and tolerance for religious uncertainty, *Pastoral Psychology*, 47, 253-259.

Francis, L.J. and Jones, S.H. (1999b), The scale properties of the MBTI Form G (Anglicised) among adult churchgoers, *Pastoral Sciences*, 18, 107-126.

Francis, L.J. and Jones, S.H. (2000a), The relationship between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire among adult churchgoers, *Pastoral Psychology*, 48, 377-386.

Francis, L.J. and Jones, S.H. (2000b), Psychological type and happiness: a study among adult churchgoers, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 54, 36-41.

Francis, L.J. and Lankshear, D.W. (1991), *Continuing in the Way: children, young people and the church*, London, National Society.

Francis, L.J. and Lankshear, D.W. (1996), The comparative strength of evangelical and catholic Anglican Churches in England, *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 9 (1), 5-21.

Francis, L.J. and Loudon, S.H. (2000), Mystical orientation and psychological type: a study among student and adult churchgoers, *Transpersonal Psychology Review*, 4 (1), 36-42.

Francis, L.J., Payne, V.J. and Jones, S.H. (2001), Psychological types of male Anglican clergy in Wales, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 56, 19-23.

Francis, L.J. and Payne, J.V. (2002), The Payne Index of Ministry Styles (PIMS): ministry styles and psychological type among male Anglican clergy in Wales, *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 13, 125-141.

Francis, L.J., Penson, A.W. and Jones, S.H. (2001), Psychological types of male and female Bible college students in England, *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 4, 23-32.

Francis, L.J. and Robbins, M. (2002), Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders, *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 23 (2), 217-220.

- Francis, L.J., Robbins, M., Boxer, A., Lewis, C.A., McGuckin, C. and McDaid, C.J. (2003), Psychological type and attitude toward Christianity: a replication, *Psychological Reports*, 92, 89-90.
- Francis, L.J. and Ross, C.F.J. (1997), The perceiving function and Christian spirituality: distinguishing between sensing and intuition, *Pastoral Sciences*, 16, 93-103.
- Francis, L.J. and Ross, C.F.J. (2000), Personality type and quest orientation of religiosity, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 55, 22-25.
- Francis, L.J. and Stubbs, M.T. (1987), Measuring attitudes toward Christianity: from childhood to adulthood, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 8, 741-743.
- Furnham, A. and Stringfield, P. (1993), Personality and occupational behavior: Myers-Briggs Type Indicator correlates of managerial practices in two cultures, *Human Relations*, 46 (7), 827-847.
- Furnham, A., Jackson, C.J., Förde, L. and Cotter, T. (2001), Correlates of the Eysenck Personality Profiler, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30, 587-594.
- Gelder, A. and Escott, P. (2001), *Faith in Life: a snapshot of church life in England at the beginning of the 21st century*, Churches Information for Mission.
- Gerhardt, R. (1983), Liberal religion and personality type, *Research in Psychological Type*, 6, 47-53.
- Glock, C.Y. and Stark, R. (1965), *Religion and Society in Tension*, Chicago, Illinois, Rand McNally.
- Goldsmith, M. (1994), *Knowing Me - Knowing God: exploring your spirituality with Myers-Briggs*, London, SPCK.
- Goldsmith, M. and Wharton, M. (1993), *Knowing Me - Knowing You: exploring personality type and temperament*, London, SPCK.
- Grant, W.H., Thompson, M. and Clarke, T.E. (1983), *From Image to Likeness: a Jungian path in the Gospel journey*, New York, Paulist Press.
- Gray, H. and Wheelwright, J.B. (1946), Jung's psychological types, their frequency of occurrence, *Journal of General Psychology*, 34, 3-17.
- Hammer, A.L. (1985), Psychological type and media preferences in an adult sample, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 10, 20-26.
- Harbaugh, G.L. (1984), The person in ministry: psychological type and the seminary, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 23-32.

Harrington, R. and Loffredo, D.A. (2001), The relationship between life satisfaction, self-consciousness, and the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory Dimensions, *Journal of Psychology*, 135 (4), 439-450.

Hicks, L.E. (1984), Conceptual and empirical analysis of some assumptions of an explicitly typological theory, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46 (5), 1118-1131.

Hicks, L.E. (1989), Bookishness and the null hypothesis, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 17, 14-19.

Holsworth, T.E. (1984), Type preferences among Roman Catholic seminarians, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 33-35.

Hood, R.W., Spilka, B., Hunsberger, B. and Gorsuch, R. (1996), *The Psychology of Religion: an empirical approach*, New York, The Guildford Press.

Howes, R.J. and Carskadon, T.G. (1979), Test-retest reliabilities of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as a function of mood changes, *Research in Psychological Type*, 2, 67-72.

Innes, R. (1996), *Personality Indicators and the Spiritual Life*, Cambridge, Grove Books.

Irvine, A.L. (1989), Isolation and the parish ministry, Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of St Andrews.

Jacoby, P.F. (1981), Psychological types and career success in the accounting profession, *Research in Psychological Type*, 4, 24-37.

James, W. (1982), *The Variety of Religious Experience: a study in human nature*, New York, Penguin Books.

Johnson, D.A. (1992), Test-retest reliabilities of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the type differentiation indicator over a 30-month period, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 24, 54-58.

Johnson, R. (1995), *Your Personality and the Spiritual Life*, Crowborough, Monarch.

Jones, S.H. and Francis, L.J. (1999), Personality type and attitude toward Christianity among student churchgoers, *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 20, 105-109.

Jones, W.P. (1991), Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: a psychological tool for approaching theology and spirituality, *Weavings*, 6, 32-43.

Jung, C.G. (1971), *Psychological Types: the collected works, volume 6*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Jung, C.G. (1973), *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Karesh, D.M., Pieper, W.A. and Holland, C.L. (1994), Comparing the MBTI, the Jungian Type Survey, and the Singer-Loomis Inventory of Personality, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 30, 30-38.
- Kay, W.K. (2000), *Pentecostals in Britain*, Carlisle, Paternoster Press.
- Kay, W.K. (2004), Introduction, in W.K. Kay and A.E. Dyer (eds), *Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies: a reader*, pp xvii-xxxii, London, SCM.
- Keating, C.J. (1987), *Who We Are Is How We Pray*, Mystic, Connecticut, Twenty-Third.
- Keirsey, D. (1998), *Please Understand Me II: temperament, character, intelligence*, Del Mar, California, Prometheus Nemesis Book Co.
- Keirsey, D. and Bates, M.B. (1978), *Please Understand Me: character and temperament types*, Del Mar, California, Prometheus Nemesis Book Co.
- Kelsey, M.T. (1978), Personality types and meditation, *Transcend*, 13 (2), 1-6.
- Kendall, E. (1998), *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*, Palo Alto, California, Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Kier, F.J., Melancon, J.G. and Thompson, B. (1998), Reliability and validity of scores on the Personal Preferences Self-Description Questionnaire (PPSDQ), *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 58, 4, 612-622.
- Kline, P. (2000), *Handbook of Psychological Testing*, London, Routledge.
- Kroeger, O. and Thuesen, J.M. (1988), *Type Talk: the sixteen personality types that determine how we live, love and work*, New York, Dell.
- Landrum, R.E. (1992), College students' use of caffeine and its relationship to personality, *College Student Journal*, 26, 151-155.
- Lawrence, G. (1993), *People Types and Tiger Stripes*, Gainesville, Florida, Center for Applications of Psychological Type.
- Likert, R. (1932), A technique for the measurement of attitudes, *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 1-55.
- Loewenthal, K.M. (1995), *Religion and Mental Health*, London, Chapman and Hall.
- Loewenthal, K.M. (2000), *The Psychology of Religion: a short introduction*, Oxford, Oneworld.
- Loomis, M. (1982), A new perspective for Jung's typology: the Singer-Loomis Inventory of Personality, *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 27, 59-69.

- Lundberg, D.J., Osborne, W.L. and Miner, C.U. (1997), Career maturity and personality preferences of Mexican-American and Anglo-American adolescents, *Journal of Career Development*, 23 (3), 203-213.
- McCarley, N.G. and Carskadon, T.G. (1983), Test-retest reliabilities of scales and subscales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and of criteria for clinical interpretive hypotheses involving them, *Research in Psychological Type*, 6, 24-36.
- McCaulley, M.H. (2000), Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: a bridge between counseling and consulting, *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 52 (2), 117-132.
- McCaulley, M.H. and Martin, C.H. (1995), Career assessment and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, *Journal of Career Assessment*, 3 (2), 219-239.
- McCrae, R.R. and Costa, P.T. (1989), Reinterpreting the Myers-Briggs type indicator from the perspective of the five-factor model of personality, *Journal of Personality*, 57, 17-40.
- McGrath, A.E. (2001), *Christian Theology: an introduction*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- MacDaid, G.P., McCaulley, M.H. and Kainz, R.I. (1986), *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: atlas of type tables*, Gainesville, Florida, Center for Applications of Psychological Type.
- Marcic D., Aiuppa, T.A. and Watson, J.G. (1989), Personality type, organizational norms and self-esteem, *Psychological Reports*, 65, 915-919.
- Martínez, P. (2001), *Prayer Life: how your personality affects the way you pray*, Carlisle, Paternoster.
- Methodist Publishing House (2000), *A Catechism for the Use of the People Called Methodists*, London, Methodist Publishing House.
- Miller, A. (1991), Personality types, learning styles and educational goals, *Educational Psychology*, 11 (3), 217-238.
- Michael, C.P. and Norrisey, M.C. (1984), *Prayer and Temperament: different prayer forms for different personality types*, Charlottesville, Virginia, The Open Door.
- Mitchell, W.D. (1991), A test of type theory using the TDI, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 22, 15-26.
- Myers, I.B. (2000), *Introduction to Type*, Oxford, Oxford Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I.B. and McCaulley, M.H. (1985), *Manual: a guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*, Palo Alto, California, Consulting Psychologists Press.

Myers, I.B., McCaulley, M.H., Quenk, N.L. and Hammer, A.L. (1998), *Manual: a guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*, Palo Alto, California, Consulting Psychologists Press.

Myers, I.B. and Myers, P.B. (1995), *Gifts Differing: understanding personality type*, Palo Alto, California, Davies-Black.

Nordvik, H. (1996), Similarity between partners in real and perceived personality traits as measured by the Myers-Briggs type indicator, *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 37, 444-450.

Nyland, J.L., Ybarra, K.M., Sammut, K.L., Rienecker, E.M. and Kameda, D.M. (2000), Interaction of psychological type and anxiety sensitivity on academic achievement, *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 90, 731-739.

Osborn, L. and Osborn, D. (1991), *God's Diverse People: personality and the Christian life*, London, Daybreak.

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

Otto, R. (1917), *The Idea of the Holy*, London, Oxford University Press.

Payne, V.J. (2001), Personality type and ministry, Unpublished MPhil dissertation, University of Wales, Bangor.

Price, D.T.W. (1990), *A History of the Church in Wales*, Penarth, Church in Wales Publications.

Quinn, M.T., Lewis, R.J. and Fischer, K.L. (1992), A cross-correlation of the Myers-Briggs and the Keirsey instruments, *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 279-280.

Rahim, A. (1981), Job satisfaction as a function of personality-job congruence: a study with Jungian personality types, *Psychological Reports*, 49, 496-498.

Randall, K.J. (2001), Churchmanship, Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Wales, Bangor.

Randall, K.J. (2002), *The Effects of Churchmanship on the Choice of Version of the Bible*, Report of the Anglican Charismatic Theologians Symposium, St John's Nottingham, (2002).

Rawling, K. (1992), *Preliminary Manual: The Cambridge Type Indicator; research edition*, Cambridge, Rawling Associates.

Rehak, M.C. (1998), Identifying the congregation's corporate personality, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 44, 39-44.

Repicky, R.A. (1981), Jungian typology and Christian spirituality, *Review for Religious*, 40 (3), 422-435.

- Reponen, T., Pärnistö J. and Viitanen, J. (1996), Personality impact on information management strategy formulation, *European Journal of Information Systems*, 5, 161-171.
- Richter, P. and Francis, L.J. (1998), *Gone But Not Forgotten: church leaving and returning*, London, Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Ross, C.F.J. (1986), Respect for differences, *Practice of Ministry in Canada*, 3 (4), 4-6.
- Ross, C.F.J. (1993), Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church: comparisons with Catholics, Evangelicals, and clergy, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 26, 28-36.
- Ross, C.F.J. (1995), Type patterns among Catholics: four Anglophone congregations compared with Protestants, Francophone Catholics, and priests, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 33, 33-42.
- Ross, C.F.J., Weiss, D. and Jackson, L. (1996), The relation of Jungian psychological type to religious attitudes and practices, *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 6 (4), 263-279.
- Sanford, J.A. (1987), *The Kingdom Within: the inner meaning of Jesus' sayings*, San Francisco, California, Harper.
- Silberman, S.L., Freeman, I. and Lester, G.R. (1992), A longitudinal study of dental students' personality type preferences, *Journal of Dental Education*, 56 (6), 384-388.
- Sipps, G.J. and DiCaudo, J. (1988), Convergent and discriminant validity of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as a measure of sociability and impulsivity, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48, 445-451.
- Skovington Wood, A. (1990), The Methodists, in Dowley, T. (ed.), pp 453-461, *The History of Christianity*, Oxford, Lion Publishing.
- Spoto, A. (1995), *Jung's Typology in Perspective*, Champaign, Illinois, Chrion.
- SPSS Inc. (1988), *SPSSX User's Guide*, New York, McGraw Hill.
- Steele, R.S. and Kelly, T.J. (1976), Eysenck Personality Questionnaire and Jungian Myers-Briggs Type Indicator correlations of extraversion-introversion, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 44 (4), 690-691.
- Stricker, L.J. and Ross, J. (1963), Intercorrelations and reliability of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator scales, *Psychological Reports*, 12, 287-293.
- Stricker, L.J. and Ross, J. (1964), Some correlates of a Jungian Personality Inventory, *Psychological Reports*, 14, 623-643.
- Thomson, L. (1998), *Personality Type: an owner's manual*, Boston, Massachusetts, Shambhala.

Tieger, P.D. and Barron-Tieger, B. (1993), Personality typing: a first step to a satisfying career, *Journal of Career Planning and Employment*, 52, 50-56.

Tobacyk, J., Cryson, E., and Tobacyk, Z. (2000), Cross-national evidence for compatibility of psychological type in Polish and American samples, *Journal of Career Assessment*, 8, 2, 189-204.

Towler, R. and Coxon, A.P.M. (1979), *The Fate of the Anglican Clergy*, London, Macmillan.

Tsuzuki, Y. and Matsui, T. (1997), Test-retest reliabilities of a Japanese translation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, *Psychological Reports*, 81, 349-350.

Vacha-Haase, T. and Thompson, B. (2002), Alternative ways of measuring counselees' Jungian psychological-type preferences, *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 80 (2), 173-179.

Wakefield, J.A., Sasek, J., Brubaker, M.L and Friedman, A.F. (1976), Validity study of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, *Psychological Reports*, 39, 115-120.

Walker, W., Norris, R.A., Lotz, D.W. and Handy, R.T. (eds), *A History of the Christian Church*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark.

Ware, R., Knapp, C.R. and Schwarzin, H. (1989), Prayer form preferences of Keirseley temperaments and psychological types, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 17, 39-42.

Ware, R., Yokomoto, C. and Morris, B.B. (1985), A preliminary study to assess validity of the personal style inventory, *Psychological Reports*, 56, 903-910.

Warr, P., Miles, A. and Platts, C. (2001), Age and personality in the British population between 16 and 64 years, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 165-199.

Williams, I. (1987), *Prayer and My Personality*, Nottingham, Grove Books.

Wulff, D.M. (1997), *Psychology of Religion: classic and contemporary*, New York, John Wiley.

Wyman, P. (1998), Integrating the MBTI and the Enneagram in psychotherapy: the core self and the defence system, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 46, 28-39.

APPENDIX 1

'FINDING FAITH' PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE

Finding Faith



This booklet allows individuals to reflect prayerfully on their own journey to faith and enables the church to understand better how people come to faith. Your help would be greatly appreciated. You are **not** asked to write your name on the booklet, so replies are completely confidential and anonymous.

Thank you for your help

Charlotte Craig
Project Officer

© First published in 2001
on behalf of
Angela Butler, Leslie J Francis and Charlotte Craig
Centre for Ministry Studies
University of Wales, Bangor
LL57 2PX

Part one explores your Christian faith. How much do the following statements reflect your own experience? Please circle one number against **every** statement

1= very little

3= medium

5= very much

How your faith began...

always believed	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
made a clear decision	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
had a sudden conversion	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
had a gradual conversion	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
drifted into faith	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
still searching	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
never believed.	little	1	2	3	4	5	much

How have the following influenced your faith?

I consider **prayer** to have influenced me Very little 1 2 3 4 5 Very greatly

In my prayer life I have been influenced most by...

Solitary prayer	1	2	3	4	3	2	1	Praying as part of a group
Finding answers	1	2	3	4	3	2	1	Asking questions
Understanding God better	1	2	3	4	3	2	1	Feeling more of God's love
Adopting a set pattern	1	2	3	4	3	2	1	Praying in a way that reflected my mood

I consider studying **scripture** to have influenced me Very little 1 2 3 4 5 Very greatly

In my study of scripture I have been influenced most by...

Contemplating passages alone	1	2	3	4	3	2	1	Discussing passages with a group
Investigating details	1	2	3	4	3	2	1	Exploring themes
Analysing passages logically	1	2	3	4	3	2	1	Sympathising with biblical characters
Reading scripture methodically	1	2	3	4	3	2	1	Reading passages which happen to catch my interest

*I consider **my view of God** to have influenced me* Very little 1 2 3 4 5 Very greatly

*I have been influenced most by **my view of God** as...*

- | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| At work in my inner life | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | At work in the world around me |
| Evident in traditional religion | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Evident in the beauty of nature |
| Concerned with justice | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Concerned with mercy |
| One who provides answers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | One who encourages me to explore my spirituality |

*I consider **church services** to have influenced me* Very little 1 2 3 4 5 Very greatly

*I have been influenced most by **church services** that...*

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Allowed time for reflection | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Presented lots of information and stimulation |
| Examined one theme thoroughly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Generated lots of different ideas |
| Focused on teaching | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Focused on encouragement |
| Follow a regular set pattern | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Try out different service structures |

*I consider **worship** to have influenced me* Very little 1 2 3 4 5 Very greatly

*I have been influenced most by **worship** that...*

- | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Involved stillness and quietness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Used noise and energy |
| Occurred in church | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Occurred under a starry sky |
| Renewed my sense of justice | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Filled me with compassion |
| Used familiar hymns or prayers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Tried out new methods of worship |

*I consider my **view of Christianity** to have influenced me* Very little 1 2 3 4 5 Very greatly

I have been influenced most by...

- | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Reflecting on my Christian faith | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Acting on my Christian faith |
| Applying my faith here and now | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Considering the possibilities of my faith |
| Finding meaning through faith | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Discovering emotional fulfilment through faith |
| Accepting Christianity as true | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Trying out Christianity to see if it worked for me |

Part two contains pairs of characteristics. For each pair tick (✓) the box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if other people see you differently.

PLEASE COMPLETE EVERY QUESTION

Do you tend to be more...

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Active | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Reflective |
| Interested in facts | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Interested in theories |
| Concerned for harmony | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Concerned for justice |
| Happy with routine | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unhappy with routine |

Are you more...

- | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Private | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sociable |
| Inspirational | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Practical |
| Analytic | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sympathetic |
| Structured | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Open-ended |

Do you prefer...

- | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Having many friends | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | A few deep friendships |
| The concrete | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | The abstract |
| Feeling | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Thinking |
| To act on impulse | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | To act on decisions |

Do you...

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Dislike parties | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Like parties |
| Prefer to design | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Prefer to make |
| Tend to be firm | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Tend to be gentle |
| Like to be in control | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Like to be adaptable |

Are you...

Energised by others	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Drained by too many people
Conventional	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Inventive
Critical	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Affirming
Happier working alone	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Happier working in groups

Do you tend to be more...

Socially detached	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Socially involved
Concerned for meaning	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Concerned about detail
Logical	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Humane
Orderly	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Easygoing

Are you more...

Talkative	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reserved
Sensible	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Imaginative
Tactful	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Truthful
Spontaneous	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Organised

Are you mostly...

An introvert	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	An extravert
Focused on present realities	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Focused on future possibilities
Trusting	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sceptical
Leisurely	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Punctual

Do you...

Speak before thinking	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Think before speaking
Prefer to improve things	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Prefer to keep things as they are
Seek for truth	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seek for peace
Dislike detailed planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Like detailed planning

Are you...

Happy with uncertainty	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Happier with certainty
Up in the air	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Down to earth
Warm-hearted	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair-minded
Systematic	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Casual

Part three contains questions referring to how you feel about the church you are now attending, and about your own faith. Please indicate how strongly you feel about the statements by drawing a circle round one number on each line.

For example - In this congregation I feel...

unwelcome 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 welcome

- 4 means very much
- 3 means quite a lot
- 2 means a little
- 1 means neutral

So if in your congregation you feel very welcome please answer like this

unwelcome 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 welcome

In this congregation I feel...

unwelcome	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	welcome
comfortable	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	uncomfortable
content	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	discontent
unhappy	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	happy
valued	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	not valued
uneasy	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	at ease
satisfied	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	dissatisfied
I do not fit in	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	I fit in
I belong	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	I do not belong

Do you consider yourself to be...

low church 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 high church

Please judge how Catholic/Evangelical and how Liberal/Conservative you are now by drawing a circle round one number on each of these two lines.

catholic	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	evangelical
liberal	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	conservative

Have you been influenced by the Charismatic movement...

positively 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 negatively

Part four asks for some background information. Please tick (✓) the appropriate boxes.

What is your sex?

male	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
female	2	<input type="checkbox"/>

What is your age?

under 15	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
15 - 19	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 - 29	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
30 - 39	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
40 - 49	5	<input type="checkbox"/>
50 - 59	6	<input type="checkbox"/>
60 - 69	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
70 - 79	8	<input type="checkbox"/>
80 or over	9	<input type="checkbox"/>

What is your current marital status?

single	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
living with a partner	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
married	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
widowed	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
separated	5	<input type="checkbox"/>
divorced	6	<input type="checkbox"/>

In what type of environment is your church?

scattered rural	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
village	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
market town	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
small town	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
large town	5	<input type="checkbox"/>
suburban	6	<input type="checkbox"/>
inner city	7	<input type="checkbox"/>

How often do you normally come to a church service?

more than one day a week	7	
weekly	6	
at least twice a month	5	
at least once a month	4	
at least six times a year	3	
at least once a year	2	
less than once a year	1	

How often do you pray by yourself?

nearly every day	5	
at least once a week	4	
at least once a month	3	
occasionally	2	
never	1	

How often do you read the Bible by yourself?

nearly every day	5	
at least once a week	4	
at least once a month	3	
occasionally	2	
never	1	

Have you ever had something you would describe as a 'religious experience'?

no	1	
perhaps	2	
probably	3	
yes	4	

Are you in ordained ministry recognised by your church?

no	1	
yes, stipendiary (paid) ministry	2	
yes, non-stipendiary (unpaid) ministry	3	
yes, but not active at present	4	
yes, retired	5	

Part six. These are verses from the book of Psalms, given in pairs. How much have the ideas they express influenced your faith? In each case please tick the **one** verse that you feel influenced your faith the most.

'I will tell of your name to my brothers and sisters; in the midst of the congregation I will praise you.'(22:22)

or

'He leads me beside still waters, he restores my soul.' (23:2-3)

'Clap your hands, all you peoples; shout to God with loud songs of joy.'(47:1)

or

'For God alone my soul waits in silence; from him comes my salvation.'(62:1)

'The LORD is in his holy temple; the LORD'S throne is in heaven.'(11:4)

or

'The heavens are telling the glory of God; the firmament proclaims his handiwork.' (19:1)

'Come and see what God has done, he is awesome in his deeds among mortals.'(66:5)

or

'May all nations be blessed in him, may they pronounce him happy.' (72:17)

'their delight is in the law of the LORD, and on his law they meditate day and night.' (1:2)

or

'I love the LORD, for he heard my voice; he heard my cry for mercy.' (116:1)

'Mighty King, lover of justice, you have established equity.' (99:4)

or

'You have put gladness in my heart more than when their grain and wine abound.' (4:7)

'The LORD sits enthroned forever; he has established his throne for judgement.' (9:7)

or

'I lift up my eyes to the hills - from where will my help come?' (121:1)

- 'The law of the LORD is perfect, reviving the soul.' (19:7)
- or
- 'O LORD what are human beings that you regard them, or mortals that you think of them?' (144:3)
- 'Seven times a day I praise you for your righteous ordinances.' (119:164)
- or
- 'My soul waits for the LORD, my soul waits, and in his word I hope.' (130:6)
- 'Declare your steadfast love in the morning, and your faithfulness by night.' (92:2)
- or
- 'I will sing a new song to you, O God.' (144:9)

If you wish to make any comments about this booklet please use this page.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

APPENDIX 2

'FINDING FAITH' QUESTIONNAIRE

Finding Faith



This booklet allows individuals to reflect prayerfully on their own journey to faith and enables the church to understand better how people come to faith. Your help would be greatly appreciated. You are **not** asked to write your name on the booklet, so replies are completely confidential and anonymous.

Thank you for your help

Charlotte Craig
Project Officer

© First published in 2001
on behalf of
Angela Butler, Leslie J Francis and Charlotte Craig
Centre for Ministry Studies
University of Wales, Bangor
LL57 2PX

Part one explores your Christian faith. How much do the following statements reflect your own experience? Please circle one number against **every** statement

1= very little

3= medium

5= very much

How your faith began...

I always believed	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
I made a clear decision	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
I had a sudden conversion	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
I had a gradual conversion	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
I drifted into faith	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
I am still searching	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
I have never believed	little	1	2	3	4	5	much

How much do you feel the following have helped your faith to grow?

reading the Bible at a set time every day	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
being challenged by God's justice	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
asking questions in prayer	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
hearing sermons that examined one theme thoroughly .	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
praying in a way that reflected my mood	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
worshipping with enthusiasm and energy	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
quietly contemplating my faith	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
reading scripture that catches my interest	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
encountering the Christ of faith	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
thinking of God as a judge	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
examining Bible passages in detail	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
exploring different ways of praying	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
being still in God's presence	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
enjoying the sights and sounds of church services	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
worshipping with familiar hymns or prayers	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
being accepted and forgiven by God	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
attending traditional religious services	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
attending church services that focused on teaching	little	1	2	3	4	5	much

How much do you feel the following have helped your faith to grow?							
	1= very little	3= medium	5= very much				

viewing God as one who is concerned with mercy	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
contemplating passages of scripture alone	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
trying out different forms of faith	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
applying my Christian faith in the here and now	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
considering the future possibilities of my faith	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
appreciating the fairness of Christian morality	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
evaluating the truth of the Gospel	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
relating to God as a father	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
attending church services that encouraged reflection . .	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
questioning my religious beliefs	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
feeling compassion for Christ's suffering	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
appreciating the church building	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
exploring themes in the Bible	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
finding answers through prayer	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
examining the evidence for the resurrection	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
feeling forgiven by God's mercy	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
seeing God in the beauty of nature	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
taking part in spontaneous worship	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
discovering meaning through faith	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
studying what Jesus said and did	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
adopting the discipline of regular church attendance . . .	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
attending active and exciting church services	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
understanding God better through prayer	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
reading the Bible systematically	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
exploring my spirituality	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
seeing God at work in my inner life	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
worshipping in church	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
finding God in other Christians	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
recognising God's love for me	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
attending closely structured church services	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
pursuing ideas in the Bible	little	1	2	3	4	5	much

How much do you feel the following have helped your faith to grow?							
	1= very little	3= medium	5= very much				

practising solitary prayer	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
feeling more of God's love through prayer	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
praying at a set time every day	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
attending innovative and inventive church services	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
analysing passages of the Bible logically	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
worshipping in the beauty of nature	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
meeting God in Christian fellowship	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
seeing God as one who provides answers	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
discovering personal peace through faith	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
acting on my Christian faith	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
relying on my unchanging faith	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
seeing God as concerned with justice	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
sympathising with characters from the Bible	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
taking part in worship that renews my sense of justice . .	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
seeing God at work in the world around me	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
taking part in worship that fills me with compassion	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
worshipping in quietness and stillness	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
sharing my beliefs with others	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
speculating about the meaning of Easter	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
participating in familiar church services	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
finding God in my solitude	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
reading the Bible as the mood takes me	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
praying as part of a group	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
trying different ways of worshipping God	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
adopting a strict pattern of prayer	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
discussing passages of scripture with a group	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
experiencing different sorts of churches	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
meeting God in the depth of my being	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
trying out new methods of worship	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
engaging in discussion of Christianity with others	little	1	2	3	4	5	much
reflecting on Christian teaching	little	1	2	3	4	5	much

Part two contains pairs of characteristics. For each pair tick (✓) the box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if other people see you differently.

PLEASE COMPLETE EVERY QUESTION

Do you tend to be more...

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Active | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Reflective |
| Interested in facts | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Interested in theories |
| Concerned for harmony | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Concerned for justice |
| Happy with routine | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unhappy with routine |

Are you more...

- | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Private | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sociable |
| Inspirational | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Practical |
| Analytic | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sympathetic |
| Structured | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Open-ended |

Do you prefer...

- | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Having many friends | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | A few deep friendships |
| The concrete | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | The abstract |
| Feeling | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Thinking |
| To act on impulse | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | To act on decisions |

Do you...

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Dislike parties | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Like parties |
| Prefer to design | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Prefer to make |
| Tend to be firm | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Tend to be gentle |
| Like to be in control | <input type="checkbox"/> | or | <input type="checkbox"/> | Like to be adaptable |

Are you...

Energised by others	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Drained by too many people
Conventional	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Inventive
Critical	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Affirming
Happier working alone	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Happier working in groups

Do you tend to be more...

Socially detached	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Socially involved
Concerned for meaning	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Concerned about detail
Logical	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Humane
Orderly	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Easygoing

Are you more...

Talkative	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reserved
Sensible	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Imaginative
Tactful	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Truthful
Spontaneous	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Organised

Are you mostly...

An introvert	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	An extravert
Focused on present realities	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Focused on future possibilities
Trusting	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sceptical
Leisurely	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Punctual

Do you...

Speak before thinking	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Think before speaking
Prefer to improve things	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Prefer to keep things as they are
Seek for truth	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seek for peace
Dislike detailed planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Like detailed planning

Are you...

Happy with uncertainty	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Happier with certainty
Up in the air	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Down to earth
Warm-hearted	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair-minded
Systematic	<input type="checkbox"/>	or	<input type="checkbox"/>	Casual

Part three contains questions referring to how you feel about the church you are now attending, and about your own faith. Please indicate how strongly you feel about the statements by drawing a circle round one number on each line.

For example - In this congregation I feel...

unwelcome 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 welcome

- 4 means very much
- 3 means quite a lot
- 2 means a little
- 1 means neutral

So if in your congregation you feel very welcome please answer like this

unwelcome 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 welcome

In this congregation I feel...

unwelcome	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	welcome
comfortable	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	uncomfortable
content	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	discontent
unhappy	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	happy
valued	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	not valued
uneasy	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	at ease
satisfied	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	dissatisfied
I do not fit in	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	I fit in
I belong	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	I do not belong

Do you consider yourself to be...

low church 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 high church

Please judge how Catholic/Evangelical and how Liberal/Conservative you are now by drawing a circle round one number on each of these two lines.

catholic	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	evangelical
liberal	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	conservative

Have you been influenced by the Charismatic movement...

positively 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 negatively

Part four asks for some background information. Please tick (✓) the appropriate boxes.

What is your sex?

male	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
female	2	<input type="checkbox"/>

What is your age?

under 15	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
15 - 19	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 - 29	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
30 - 39	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
40 - 49	5	<input type="checkbox"/>
50 - 59	6	<input type="checkbox"/>
60 - 69	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
70 - 79	8	<input type="checkbox"/>
80 or over	9	<input type="checkbox"/>

What is your current marital status?

single	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
living with a partner	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
married	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
widowed	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
separated	5	<input type="checkbox"/>
divorced	6	<input type="checkbox"/>

In what type of environment is your church?

scattered rural	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
village	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
market town	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
small town	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
large town	5	<input type="checkbox"/>
suburban	6	<input type="checkbox"/>
inner city	7	<input type="checkbox"/>

How often do you normally come to a church service?

more than one day a week	7	
weekly	6	
at least twice a month	5	
at least once a month	4	
at least six times a year	3	
at least once a year	2	
less than once a year	1	

How often do you pray by yourself?

nearly every day	5	
at least once a week	4	
at least once a month	3	
occasionally	2	
never	1	

How often do you read the Bible by yourself?

nearly every day	5	
at least once a week	4	
at least once a month	3	
occasionally	2	
never	1	

Have you ever had something you would describe as a 'religious experience'?

no	1	
perhaps	2	
probably	3	
yes	4	

Are you in ordained ministry recognised by your church?

no	1	
yes, stipendiary (paid) ministry	2	
yes, non-stipendiary (unpaid) ministry	3	
yes, but not active at present	4	
yes, retired	5	

If you wish to make any comments about this booklet please use this page.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

APPENDIX 3

'FINDING FAITH' PROJECT STATEMENT

FINDING FAITH - PROJECT STATEMENT

Invitation

You are invited to help with a new study designed to explore the personality type of different churches and different congregations. The *Finding Faith* booklet aims to look at some of the difficult issues raised in church congregations such as

- Why do some services inspire some churchgoers, yet leave others unmoved?
- Why do some people seek variety in the church, whilst others resist change?
- Why do people pray in different ways?
- Why do some churchgoers find it hard to communicate with each other?
- Why are some types of people drawn to the church?
- Why are other types of people unwilling to attend church?
- How can the church recognise each individual's needs?
- How can the church help people to see the gospel as relevant to their own life experience?

Research suggests that one of the ways of dealing with these questions is to address the issue of **personality type**. This project is based on the view that every person has individual personality preferences that influence them throughout their life: in the workplace, in relationships, and in church life. This is why people act and react in different ways.

This project will provide information and ideas about personality type with a view to increasing understanding of individual church members and congregations, and to enhance how churches and their members communicate with each other.

Accordingly, in the *Finding Faith* booklets there is a short type indicator, that provides a summary of the pivotal aspects of personality. Church congregations throughout the UK respond to questions about their own likes and dislikes, aversions and preferences.

Personality Type and Spirituality

It is important to know more about personality theory in order to help nurture congregation strengths and to address congregation weaknesses. Here we will be using a type indicator as a spiritual tool. The results will be used to help the Church as a whole understand how best to bring others to faith in today's world. Type theory also has far reaching implications for cooperation between different churches, between different congregations, and between different denominations. There are also implications for the way in which clergy minister and relate to individual churches.

Type theory helps us to be Christians who have life in all its fulness (John 10:10) by accepting ourselves, by accepting others and, by learning to live with both our blessings and failings. Moreover, it offers ideas to help us better express our individual spiritual preferences within the church.

What's in it for you

We are offering the opportunity to receive feedback about the booklets. This feedback will provide your church with a profile of each congregation as a whole and will include information about the strengths and gifts of your congregation. On a wider level, the results will be used to help the Church as a whole, in matters of evangelism and mission.

Identifying personality type is usually an expensive process. However, the *Finding Faith* project is offering you this opportunity free of charge.

How it works

We are asking Church leaders to hand out the booklets to their congregations, during each service held at their church on a Sunday. The best way to administer the *Finding Faith* booklet is to take a fifteen minute slot during the service, say after a short sermon. It is important that everyone in the congregation fills in a booklet.

We would like you to select as many churches as you wish and gain the help of these churches for the project. You would need to be at each of the services which you decide to include in the study. You, or one of the ministers, would need to explain to the congregation what the project is about. We will provide a set of guidelines to help with this. You will need a set of pencils for people who do not have their own pens or pencils with them. Let us know the number of booklets needed and we will send them to you. The booklet should take about fifteen minutes to complete. We will then ask you to keep each congregation's responses separate (eg to keep the 8.00 o'clock service separate from the 10.00 o'clock service). Then we will ask you to send the packets of booklets back to us, with a covering form telling us about the type of church and service from which they were derived. We will be happy to refund any costs for postage and packaging if a receipt for these expenses is enclosed.

Once all the booklets have been returned we will process them and assess the results. If you have asked for feedback we will provide you with a personality type profile and suggestions about how to challenge and encourage this type of congregation.

What happens next

Please let us know if you are interested in helping with this project by returning a request form to Charlotte Craig:

phone : 01248382829
e-mail : c.craig@bangor.ac.uk
letter : Centre for Ministry Studies, University of Wales, Bangor, Normal Site (Meirion),
Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2PX

Personnel

The project will be jointly supervised by Angela Butler, Susan Jones and Leslie J Francis. All three have written in the area of personality and faith and, are personally concerned with the work of evangelism.

The Revd Angela Butler is priest in charge of St Paul's, Chipperfield, and until recently Springboard Consultant. She is author of *Personality and Communicating the Gospel* (1999).

The Revd Susan H Jones is team vicar with responsibility for St Peter's and St David's, within the Bangor team ministry, and Director of Pastoral Studies of the Ministry Course at Bangor. She is co-editor of *Psychological Perspectives on Christian Ministry* (1996).

The Revd Professor Leslie J Francis is Director of the Welsh National Centre for Religious Education, and Professor of Practical Theology at the University of Wales, Bangor. He is author of *Personality Type and Scripture: exploring Mark's gospel* (1997) and *Exploring Luke's Gospel* (2000).

The project will be co-ordinated by Charlotte Craig within the Centre for Ministry Studies, University of Wales, Bangor.