Est. 1841 | YORK ST JOHN UNIVERSITY

Francis, Leslie J. and Village, Andrew (2017) Psychological type and reported religious experience: An empirical enquiry among Anglican clergy and laity. Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 20 (4). pp. 367-383.

Downloaded from: https://ray.yorksj.ac.uk/id/eprint/2270/

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13674676.2017.1328404

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

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

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

Psychological type and reported religious experience: An empirical enquiry among Anglican clergy and laity

Leslie J. Francis*

University of Warwick, UK

Andrew Village

York St John University, UK

Author note:
*Corresponding author:
Leslie J Francis
Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit
Centre for Education Studies
The University of Warwick
Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539
Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638
Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

This study employs psychological type theory and tests the hypothesis that some psychological types are more likely to experience and to report religious experience than others. A total of 4,421 practising Anglican clergy and laity (2,586 men and 1,835 women) responded to the question, "Have you ever had something you would describe as a 'religious experience'?" on a four-point scale, and completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales that distinguish between two orientations (introversion and extraversion), two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving). The data confirmed that the perceiving process is fundamental to individual differences in openness to religious experiences. Among practising Anglican clergy and laity intuitive types were more likely than sensing types to report religious experiences.

Keywords: Anglican Church, psychological type, religious experience, clergy, psychology of religion

Introduction

Precision of definition is a matter of critical significance for the advance of quantitative scientific enquiry within the field of religious research. In this context, a number of attempts have been made to clarify this problem by considering the language employed to distinguish between various dimensions along which individual differences in religiosity may be identified. Such dimensions include: self-assigned religious affiliation, as assessed for example in the 2001 national census in England and Wales (Francis, 2003); frequency of worship attendance, as assessed to distinguish between churchgoers, church-leavers, and the unchurched (Francis & Richter, 2007); belief in God, as assessed to distinguish between theists, agnostics, and atheists (Francis & Robbins, 2004); and the affective dimension, or attitudinal dimension, as assessed by attitude scales (Francis, 2009a). Within many of the dimensions further clarification and greater precision has been generated by differentiation among different components. For example, in terms of worship attendance, Batson and Ventis (1982) distinguished among three motivational orientations, styled intrinsic orientation, extrinsic orientation and quest orientation. These three orientations were further clarified with the introduction of the New Indices of Religious Orientation (NIRO) by Francis (2007). In terms of religious belief, Francis (1984) distinguished between the content of religious belief (differentiating between conservative belief, liberal belief, agnosticism, and rejection of belief) and the manner in which belief is held (differentiating between dogmatic belief and open belief). It is within the context of this broader debate concerning quantitative scientific enquiry within the field of religious research that the notion of "religious experience" remains relatively unexamined.

Within a qualitative research tradition the notion of religious experience came into prominence through the initiatives of Alister Hardy and the establishment of the Religious Experience Research Unit in Oxford in 1966 (see Franklin, 2014). Hardy's vision was to

establish an archive of self-reported religious experience that could provide a resource for analysis, and for classification. Hardy generated the foundations for this archive by publishing the following invitation in the national press.

> Professor Hardy proposes, if readers will kindly co-operate, to study and compare as many personal records of such experiences as possible. He invites all who have been conscious of, and perhaps influenced by, some such power, whether they call it God or not, to write a simple and brief account of these feelings and their effects. They should include particulars of age, sex, nationality, religious upbringing and other factors thought to be relevant … They will be regarded as strictly confidential and names will be suppressed in any published accounts of the research.

An initial flurry of publications from Hardy's unit demonstrated the rich potential of such an archive (see Beardsworth, 1977; Robinson, 1977a, 1977b, 1978). The archive continues to attract new submissions and to provide the resource for ongoing investigation (see Fox, 2003, 2008, 2014). Attempts to translate concern with the notion of religious experience into a quantitative tradition have followed two main trajectories: developing single-item questions (not dissimilar to Hardy's original question) or developing multi-item scales that focus on specific well-defined categories of religious experience. Within the first of these two trajectories, five questions in particular have attracted repeated use. Glock and Stark (1965) framed their question, "Have you ever as an adult had the feeling that you were somehow in the presence of God?". Back and Bourque (1970) framed their question, "Would you say that you have ever had a 'religious or mystical experience', that is, a moment of sudden religious awakening or insight?". Greeley (1974) framed his question, "Have you ever felt as though you were close to a powerful spiritual force that seemed to lift you out of yourself?". Working specifically within the tradition of Alister Hardy, Hay and Morisy (1978) framed their question, "Have you ever been aware of or influenced by a presence or

power, whether you call it God or not, which is different from your everyday self?". Francis (2006) framed his question, "Have you ever had something you would describe as a religious experience?", and offered the choice of four responses: "no", "perhaps, but not really sure", "probably, but not certain", and "yes definitely".

Within the second of the two trajectories (developing multi-item scales), the aspect of religious experience that has attracted most attention is that of mysticism. This trajectory is illustrated by the Hood Mysticism Scale (Hood, 1975) and the Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale (Francis & Louden, 2000). While having much in common, these two instruments consciously build on different conceptualisations of mysticism, Hood building on the work of Stace (1960) and Francis and Louden building on the work of Happold (1963). Stace (1960) identified six core characteristics of mysticism as: a sense of objectivity or reality; feelings of blessedness, joy, peace, satisfaction, happiness; feeling that what is apprehended is holy, sacred, or divine; paradoxicality; ineffability; and the sense of unity. Stace also distinguishes between extrovertive and introvertive experiences of unity. Happold (1963) identified seven core characteristics of mysticism as: ineffability, noesis, transiency, passivity, consciousness of the oneness of everything, sense of timelessness, and true ego.

These two trajectories (concerned with single-item questions or with multi-item scales) have generally been employed to address somewhat different research questions. The single-item questions have tended to be located more within a sociological framework of enquiry exploring issues like the demographic predictors of the frequency of reported religious experiences. The multi-item scales have tended to be located more within a psychological framework of enquiry exploring issues like the personality correlates of reported religious experiences. Reviewing the psychological literature, especially concerning the Hood Mysticism Scale and the Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale, Hood and Francis (2013) identified two particular bodies of research that have employed these

instruments, one exploring the association between mystical experience and psychopathology and the other exploring the association between normal personality differences and mystical experience. The formulations of the precise research questions shaped by these two bodies of research look somewhat different. The first research question explores the hypothesis that mystical experience is associated with higher levels of psychopathology. The second research question explores the hypothesis that some personality profiles are more open than others to mystical experience.

Research question

The present study builds on the body of knowledge established concerning the connection between personality profile and openness to mystical experience, in order to test whether the patterns of association found in that literature also appertain when a single item measure of religious experience is substituted for the multi-item scale of mystical orientation. The ground for this extension to the research literature needs to be prepared by an introduction to the model of personality employed in the previous studies, by an examination of the theoretical framework shaping these studies, and by a discussion of the results reported by these studies. This body of research has been grounded in psychological type theory, as originally proposed by Jung (1971) and as subsequently developed and refined in conversation with a series of psychological measures, including the Myers-Biggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005).

Psychological type theory has become more visible within the empirical psychology of religion, as a growing body of evidence has established the power of type theory to predict individual differences in religious expression, experience, and belief (for recent reviews see Francis, 2009b; Ross, 2011). Particular contributions to this growing body of knowledge have been made by recent special issues of *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*

(Village, 2011a) and *Mental Health, Religion and Culture* (Lewis, 2012, 2015). Psychological type theory distinguishes between two core psychological processes, the perceiving process and the judging process. Each of these processes is expressed through two contrasting functions. The perceiving process is expressed through the sensing function and the intuitive function. The judging process is expressed through the thinking function and the feeling function. Psychological type theory also distinguishes between two orientations or directions of energy, introversion and extraversion, and between two attitudes toward the external world, judging and perceiving.

Jung (1971) considered the perceiving process as the irrational process, concerned with the ways in which people gather information. Sensing types focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They are concerned with the actual, the real and the practical. They tend to be down to earth and matter of fact. Intuitive types focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. The judging process, on the other hand, Jung considered as the rational process, based on the Latin root *ratio* meaning ordering. This ordering process is concerned with the ways in which people judge or evaluate information. Thinking types focus on the abstract, logical and systematic aspects of a situation, thereby privileging consistency. They evaluate through the mind. Feeling types focus on the interpersonal values and the relational aspects of a situation, thereby privileging consideration and sensitivity to the human consequences. They evaluate through the heart.

The two orientations are concerned with the sources of psychological energy. Introverts are energised by the inner world of ideas and can be drained by too much engagement with the outer world of people and events. Extraverts are energised by the outer world and by interaction with people and events. They can be drained or immobilised by too much solitude and isolation. The two attitudes are concerned with identifying which of the two processes (judging or perceiving) is engaged in the external world. Perceiving types

engage their preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) in the outer world and consequently present an open, flexible, spontaneous approach to the outer world. Judging types engage their preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) in the outer world and consequently present an organised, planned and disciplined approach to the outer world.

Psychological type theory and religiosity

Assessing the connection between psychological type theory and individual differences in religious expression, experience, and belief, Ross (1992) argued that the perceiving process (sensing and intuition) is of central importance. In his initial empirical examinations of this thesis, Ross began to chart the distinctive profiles of religiosity among sensing types and among intuitive types. For example, Ross, Weiss, and Jackson (1996) found intuitives contrasted to sensers in terms of greater comfort with regard to complexity of religious belief, while sensers tended to be more definite in regard to what counted as religious to them. Sensers evidenced firmer boundaries between what was secular and what was sacred. Intuitives showed a more welcoming attitude toward religious change, viewing new insights as essential for a healthy religious life and viewing narrow-minded religion as a significant problem. Sensing types, by contrast, saw religious change as a problem, and change in personal faith as an indication of weakness.

In a subsequent paper, Francis and Ross (1997, p. 95) set out to examine differences between sensing types and intuitive types with regard to preferences in Christian spirituality, and to test the following two specific hypotheses.

> As consistent with a preference for more traditional patterns of worship and more conservative forms of belief, it is hypothesised that sensers will display a greater preference for traditional expressions of Christian spirituality (like church attendance and personal prayer) in comparison with intuitives, while intuitives will display a greater openness to the experiential aspects of spirituality (like witnessing a fine

> sunset or being inspired by a star filled sky) in comparison with sensers. (Francis & Ross, 1997, p. 95)

Ross' (1992) general theory that the perceiving process (sensing or intuition) plays a central role in predicting preferred ways of being religious or expressing religiosity, together with the findings presented by Francis and Ross (1997) that intuitive types show a higher appreciation than sensing types of experiential spirituality, leads to the clear hypothesis that intuitive types will record higher scores than sensing types on indices of religious experience.

So far six studies have examined the association between psychological type and either the 21-item Mystical Orientation Scale (Francis & Louden, 2000a) or the 9-item Short Index of Mystical Orientation (Francis & Louden, 2004): Francis and Louden (2000b) among 100 students and adult churchgoers; Francis (2002) among 543 participants attending workshops concerned with personality and spirituality; Francis, Village, Robbins, and Ineson (2007) among 318 guests who had stayed at a Benedictine Abbey; Francis, Robbins, and Cargas (2012) among 580 participants from a range of religious and spiritual traditions; Francis, Litter, and Robbins (2012) among 232 Anglican clergymen serving in the Church in Wales; and Ross and Francis (2015) among 149 adolescents between 16- and 18-years of age. The two clearest findings to emerge from these six studies concern the association between mystical orientation and the two orientations and the two perceiving functions. All six studies agreed in finding no significant difference between introverts and extraverts in terms of mystical orientation scores. Five of the six studies agreed in finding significantly higher mystical orientation scores among intuitive types than among sensing types. The six studies did not generate similar consensus in terms of the two judging functions or the two attitudes toward the outer world. Three of the six studies found significantly higher mystical orientation scores among feeling types than among thinking types, but the other three studies found no significant difference between these two groups. Two of the six studies found

significantly higher mystical orientation scores among perceiving types than among judging types, but the other four studies found no significant differences between these two groups.

The opportunity to test the association between psychological type and reported religious experience was provided by the invitation to design the *Church Times* survey 2013, building on the initial successful *Church Times* survey 2001. Findings from the *Church Times* survey 2001 were published in two books, *Fragmented Faith* (Francis, Robbins, & Astley, 2005) and *The Mind of the Anglican Clergy* (Village & Francis, 2009), as well as in a series of focused papers (Village, 2011b, 2012; Village & Francis, 2008, 2010a, 2010b). In place of the abbreviated form of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Francis, Brown, & Philipchalk, 1992) included in the *Church Times* survey 2001, the *Church Times* survey 2013 included the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005) as a measure of psychological type, alongside the previously tested Francis question on religious experience (Francis, 2006).

The particular interest and strength of utilising the *Church Times* survey to test the association between psychological type and reported religious experience is that this survey accesses a religiously motivated sample (clergy and laity) who have an informed interest in detailed surveys concerned with religion, and who are likely to recognise a question concerning religious experience and respond to that question intelligently. At the same time, a range of other religious factors that may affect the reporting of religious experience are held relatively constant. The majority of participants in the survey tend to hold a broad religious tradition in common (Anglicanism), tend to live within the same culture (England and Wales), and tend to report a uniform level of worship attendance (most weeks).

Procedure

In 2013, a four-page questionnaire was published in two editions of the *Church Times*, one in July and one in October. The newspaper is published in hard copy and online, and the

questionnaire appeared in both formats. It was based on the 2001 *Church Times* survey, which was designed to assess a wide range beliefs, attitudes and practices (Francis, Robbins, & Astley, 2005). The 2013 version included many of the same items, but also some new ones, and a measure of psychological type.

The *Church Times* is the main newspaper of the Church of England, with a circulation of around 25,000. It is widely read by a cross-section of the Church of England laity and clergy who tend to be mainly, but not exclusively, broad church or Anglo-Catholic. Evangelicals are probably under-represented in the readership, partly because the alternative weekly, *The Church of England Newspaper*, is aimed at this constituency. Despite this, *Church Times* readers come from across the Church of England, and survey respondents in 2001 ranged from extremely Anglo-Catholic to extremely evangelical (Village, 2012; Village & Francis, 2009). The *Church Times* readers who responded to the current survey were likely to represent a sample of committed Anglicans spanning most of the traditions of the Church of England, with some over-sampling of those who are more Anglo-Catholic or broad church.

Participants

The total response was 4,909, of which 54% completed online and 46% completed the hardcopy. Nearly all respondents lived in England and the majority were lay people. This study is based on the results from 4,421 readers who gave sufficiently complete answers to be used in this analysis. Of the 4,421 respondents, 59% were men and 42% women; 13% were under 50, 17% in their 50s, 29% in their 60s, and 40% 70 or older; 61% were laity and 39% were clergy. Most assigned themselves to the Anglo-Catholic (42%) or broad-church (44%) categories, with fewer in the evangelical category (15%). The majority attended church at least once a week (93%), with a further 4% doing so at least twice a month.

Instruments

Religious experience was assessed using the single forced-choice question proposed by Francis (2006): “Have you ever had something you would describe as a ‘religious experience’?”. There were four possible answers: “no”; “perhaps, but not really sure”; “probably but not certain”; “yes, definitely”.

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). This is a 40-item instrument comprising four sets of 10 forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). Participants were asked for each pair of characteristics to check the “box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if you feel both characteristics apply to you. Tick the characteristics that reflect the real you, even if other people see you differently”. Recent studies have demonstrated that this instrument functions well in church-related contexts. For example, Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported alpha coefficients of .83 for the EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale. In this sample, the equivalent reliabilities were .83 for the EI scale, .74 for the SN scale, .71 for the TF scale, and .76 for the JP scale. Scores on each scale were used to assign preferences in each dimension, using the conventional practice of assigning ties to I, N, F or P. These binomial preference variables were used as independent variables in univariate and multivariate analyses.

Church tradition was assessed using a seven-point bipolar scale anchored at one end as “catholic” and at the other as “evangelical”. The scores were coded 1 (most catholic) to 7 (most evangelical). The scale was used to produce dummy variables using Randall’s (2005) classification whereby 1 and 2 are referred to as Anglo-Catholic, 3, 4 and 5 as broad church, and 6 and 7 as evangelical. In addition, respondents were asked for their sex (1 = male and 2

= female), age (four point scale with 1 = <50, 2 = 50s, 3 = 60s and 4 = >60s), and whether or not they were ordained clergy (laity = 1 clergy = 2).

Analysis

The effects of sex, age, church tradition and being ordained on reporting (or not reporting) a religious experience were tested using contingency tables. Psychological type profiles of those reporting high on religious experience (yes, and probably but not certain) were compared with those reporting low on religious experience (no, and perhaps but not really sure) using standard psychological type tables. The conventional format of 'type tables' has been employed in the present paper to allow the findings of this study to be located easily alongside other relevant studies in the literature. Multivariate logistic regression was used to test the hypotheses that preferences for intuition, feeling and perceiving independently exerted positive effects on the likelihood of reporting a religious experience. Sex, age, church tradition and ordination status were used as controls because they are known to be related to psychological type differences (Kendall, 1998; Myers & McCaulley, 1985; Village, 2013; Village, Francis, & Craig, 2009) and were also related to reporting religious experience. Logistic regression is suitable for use on categorical dependent variables, and can predict the effect of independent variables on the likelihood of individuals in the population belonging to one particular group rather than the other (Hosmer, Lemeshow, & Sturdivant, 2013).

Results

The first step in data analysis followed the established convention within the research tradition associated with psychological type theory by drawing up type tables for men and for women separately. For both sexes two type tables were compiled: one for those who responded to the question on religious experience by saying "yes definitely" or "probably but not certain", and the other for those saying "no" or "perhaps but not really sure". These two

type tables for men were then compared using the conventional self-selection ratio proposed by McCaulley (1985), an extension of chi square. The two type tables for women were compared in the same way.

- insert tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 about here -

Table 1 presents the psychological type distribution for men low on religious experience. Table 2 presents the psychological type distribution for men high on religious experience, compared with the distribution of those profiled in table 1. In terms of dichotomous type preferences these data demonstrate significantly higher levels of religious experience among intuitive types compared with sensing types, among feeling types compared with thinking types, and among perceiving types compared with judging types, but no significant differences between introverts and extraverts. In terms of dominant type preferences, the data demonstrate that the perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) are central to individual differences in openness to religious experience.

Table 3 presents the psychological type distribution for women low on religious experience. Table 4 presents the psychological type distribution for women high on religious experience, compared with the distribution of those profiled in table 3. In terms of dichotomous type preferences these data demonstrate significantly higher levels of religious experience among intuitive types, among feeling types, and among perceiving types, but no significant differences between introverts and extraverts. In terms of dominant type preferences, the data demonstrate that the perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) are central to individual differences in openness to religious experience. In other words, identical patterns emerge among women as among men from the type tables.

- insert table 5 about here -

The second step in analysing the data explored the extent to which the four demographic categories (defined as sex, age, church tradition, and ordination status)

functioned as predictors of individual differences in levels of reported religious experience. The data presented in table 5 demonstrate: that higher levels of religious experience were reported by women than by men; that higher levels of religious experience were reported by those under the age of sixty than by those aged sixty and over; that higher levels of religious experience were reported by evangelicals than by Anglo-Catholics and those from the broad church tradition; and that higher levels of religious experience were reported by clergy than by lay people. These findings suggest that it would be prudent to employ a multivariate form of analysis to interrogate whether the observation emerging from tables 2 and 4 are sustained under this form of examination.

Moreover, while tables 2 and 4 suggested that the likelihood of reporting a religious experience was greater among intuitive types than among sensing types, among feeling types than among thinking types, and among perceiving types than among judging types, the distribution of these three aspects of psychological type were not entirely independent in the sample. In the sample there was a strong association between preference for intuition and preference for perceiving, with 24% of the 1,661 intuitive types preferring perceiving over judging, compared with only 5% of the 2,760 sensing types (χ^2 =342.6, df = 1, p < .001).

- insert table 6 about here -

The third and final step in data analysis, therefore was designed to explore the incremental and cumulative effect on the likelihood of reporting religious experience of the following factors considered in the following order: sex, age, church tradition, ordination status, orientation, perceiving functions, judging functions, and attitude toward the outside world. These results of logistic regression (presented in table 6) confirmed the effects of sex, age, church tradition and ordination status and modified slightly the findings of the univariate analysis of the effects of psychological type preferences on the likelihood of reporting religious experience.

Women were 1.73 more likely than men to report a religious experience, while those in their 50s or younger were twice as likely to do so compared with older respondents. The figures for church tradition suggest that evangelicals were about 2.5 times more likely to report a religious experience than people of other Church of England traditions. The difference between ordained and lay was even more marked, with clergy being four times more likely to report a religious experience.

When psychological type preferences were tested for their independent effects, the effect of preferring to employ a perceiving function rather than a judging function in the outer world disappeared, apparently because it was entirely due to the association of perceiving with intuition and/or feeling in this sample. The latter two preferences had independent effects, with intuitive types being twice as likely to report a religious experience than sensing types, and feeling types 1.4 times more likely to do so compared with thinking types.

Discussion and conclusion

Employing data generated from the *Church Times* survey, the present study set out to draw together two relatively distinct trajectories which have developed independently in the quantitative stream of research concerned with religious experience. The first trajectory, using single-item questions and standing within the tradition pioneered by Alister Hardy, has tended to be located more within a sociological framework of enquiry exploring issues like the demographic predictors of the frequency of reported religious experience. The second trajectory, using multi-item scales, has tended to be located more within a psychological framework of enquiry exploring issues like the personality correlates of reported religious experience.

This broad research objective was sharpened and focused in two ways. First, the single-item question, borrowed from the sociological tradition, selected to access reported religious experience was the item refined and tested by Francis (2006) working within the

Alister Hardy tradition, but intentionally incorporating the words “religious experience” in order to focus attention on the way in which this construct is understood within well-defined situations. The limitation with this choice of question is that the focus is explicitly on religious experience, and fails to take into account spiritual experience or transcendental experience. Comparable research can, of course, replicate the present study with properly acknowledged changes to the wording of the single-item question. It is important to note also that the question used deliberately made no mention of God and so allows the participants to reflect their own personal construction of the concept “religion”.

Second, the theoretical framework set alongside the single-item question, borrowed from the psychological tradition, and concerned with personality, was that of psychological type theory as originally proposed by Jung (1971) and in this case extended and operationalised by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). The limitation with this choice of theory is that the focus is explicitly on normal personality differences and fails to take into account the literature connecting religious experience with areas of abnormal psychology. Comparable research can, of course, replicate the present study drawing on a model of personality and individual differences embracing aspects of abnormal psychology or psychopathology. There is, for example, a well established research literature linking mystical experience with the dimensional model of personality proposed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975, 1976) that links normal personality with the pathological constructs of neuroticism and psychoticism. This stream of research can be traced back to Caird (1987).

A sequence of earlier studies had consistently explored the link between openness to mystical experience, as accessed by multi-item scales, and psychological type theory. The main consensus from these studies concerned the connection between the perceiving process and openness to mystical experience: openness to mystical experience was significantly higher among intuitive types than among sensing types (see Francis & Louden, 2000b;

Francis, 2002; Francis, Village, Robbins, & Ineson, 2007; Francis, Robbins, & Cargas, 2012; Francis, Littler, & Robbins, 2012; Ross & Francis, 2015). What the present study adds to knowledge is that this stable finding (demonstrated by studies established within the research trajectory employing multi-item scales) remains true also in a study established within the alternative research trajectory (employing a single-item measure of religious experience). Two conclusions can be drawn from this finding, one specific and one more general.

The specific conclusion concerns the connection between reported religious experience and individual differences within the normal population. Whether religious experience is assessed by a focused single-item measure or by a scale of openness to mystical experience, some psychological types are more prone to reporting such experiences than others. This conclusion raises both psychological and theological questions about the nature and meaning of religious experience. From a psychological perspective, the key question concerns the extent to which the occurrence and reporting of religious experience can be explained by psychological processes. From a theological perspective, the key question concerns the revelatory impact of religious experience and the implications of such revelation being more accessible to some psychological types than to others.

The more general conclusion concerns the potential for wider and more systematic integration of the two research trajectories: the one using single-item measures and rooted more in a sociological tradition and the other using multi-item scales and rooted more in a psychological tradition. The point made by the present data is that it may be legitimate to transfer conclusions across the divide between these two trajectories. This being the case would add to the solidity of the growing scientific evidence concerning the nature, correlates and significance of reported religious experience.

References

Back, C. W., & Bourque, L. B. (1970). Can feelings be enumerated? *Behavioural Science, 15*, 487-496. doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830150603

Batson, C. D., & Ventis, W. L. (1982). *The religious experience: A social psychological perspective*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Beardsworth, T. (1977). *A sense of presence*. Oxford: RERU.

Caird, D. (1987). Religiosity and personality: Are mystics introverted, neurotic, or psychotic? *British Journal of Social Psychology, 26*, 345-346. doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1987.tb00798.x

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (adult and junior)*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1976). *Psychoticism as a dimension of personality*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Fox, M. (2003). *Religion, spirituality and the near-death experience.* London: Routledge.

Fox, M. (2008). *Spiritual encounters with unusual light phenomena: Lightforms.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Fox, M. (2014). *The fifth love: Explaining accounts of the extraordinary*. Kidderminster: Spirit and Sage Ltd.

Francis, L. J. (1984). Dimensions of Christian belief. *Educational Studies, 10*, 103-111. doi.org/10.1080/0305569840100203

Francis, L. J. (2002). Psychological type and mystical orientation: Anticipating individual differences within congregational life. *Pastoral Sciences, 21*, 77-93.

Francis, L. J. (2003). Religion and social capital: The flaw in the 2001 census in England and Wales. In P. Avis (Ed.), *Public faith: The state of religious belief and practice in Britain* (pp. 45-64). London: SPCK.

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

Francis, L. J. (2006). The God experience (who has it and why?): Perspectives from empirical theology. *Modern Believing, 47,* 4-21. doi.org/10.3828/MB.47.1.4

Francis, L. J. (2007). Introducing the New Indices of Religious Orientation (NIRO): Conceptualisation and measurement. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 10,* 585-602. doi.org/10.1080/13674670601035510

Francis, L. J. (2009a). Understanding the attitudinal dimensions of religion and spirituality. In M. De Souza, L. J. Francis, J. O'Higgins-Norman, & D. G. Scott (Eds.), *International Handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing* (pp. 147-167). Dordrecht: Springer. doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9018-9_9

Francis, L. J. (2009b). Psychological type theory and religious and spiritual experiences. In M. De Souza, L. J. Francis, J. O'Higgins-Norman, & D. G. Scott (Eds.), *International Handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing* (pp. 125-146). Dordrecht: Springer. doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9018-9_8

Francis, L. J., Brown, L. B., & Philipchalk, R. (1992). The development of an abbreviated form of the Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-A): Its use among students in England, Canada, the USA and Australia. *Personality and Individual Differences, 13*, 443-449. doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(92)90073-X

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

Francis, L. J., & Littler, K., & Robbins, M. (2012). Mystical orientation and the perceiving process: A study among Anglican clergymen. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 15,* 945-953. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.676257

Francis, L. J., & Louden, S. H. (2000a). The Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale (MOS): A study among Roman Catholic priests. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 11,* 99-116.

Francis, L. J., & Louden, S. H. (2000b). Mystical orientation and psychological type: A study among student and adult churchgoers. *Transpersonal Psychology Review, 4*(1), 36-42.

Francis, L. J., & Louden, S. H. (2004). A Short Index of Mystical Orientation (SIMO): A study among Roman Catholic priests. *Pastoral Psychology, 53,* 49-51. doi.org/10.1023/B:PASP.0000039325.40451.65

Francis, L. J., & Richter, P. (2007). *Gone for good? Church-leaving and returning in the twenty-first century.* Peterborough: Epworth.

Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2004). Belonging without believing: A study in the social significance of Anglican identity and implicit religion among 13- to 15-year-old males. *Implicit Religion, 7,* 37-54. doi.org/10.1558/imre.7.1.37.36037

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Astley, J. (2005). *Fragmented faith? Exposing the fault-lines in the Church of England*. Carlisle: Paternoster.

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Cargas, S. (2012). The perceiving process and mystical orientation: An empirical study in psychological type theory among participants at the Parliament of the World's Religions. *Studies in Spirituality, 22,* 341-352.

Francis, L. J., & Ross, C. F. J. (1997). The perceiving function and Christian spirituality: Distinguishing between sensing and intuition. *Pastoral Sciences, 16,* 93-103.

Francis, L. J., Village, A., Robbins, M., & Ineson, K. (2007). Mystical orientation and psychological type: An empirical study among guests staying at a Benedictine Abbey. *Studies in Spirituality, 17*, 207-223. doi.org/10.2143/SIS.17.0.2024649

Franklin, J. (2014). *Exploration into spirit: A power greater than… : A history of the Alister Hardy Religious Experience Research Centre and Society, origins, development and vision*. Lampeter: Alister Hardy Religious Experience Research Centre.

Glock, C. Y., & Stark, R. (1965). *Religion and society in tension*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Greeley, A. M. (1974). *Ecstasy: A way of knowing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Practice Hall.

Happold, F. C. (1963). *Mysticism: A study and an anthology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hay, D., & Morisy, A. (1978). Reports of ecstatic, paranormal or religious experience in Great Britain and the United States: A comparison of trends. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 17*, 255-268. doi.org/10.2307/1386320

Hood, R. W. (1975). The construction and preliminary validation of a measure of reported mystical experience. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 14*, 29-41. doi.org/10.2307/1384454

Hood, R. W. jr., & Francis, L. J. (2013). Spiritual experience: Mysticism. In K. I. Pargament (Ed.). *APA Handbook of psychology, religion, and spirituality* (Volume 1, pp. 391-405). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hosmer, Jr D. W., Lemeshow, S., & Sturdivant, R. X. (2013). *Applied logistic regression* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. doi.org/10.1002/9781118548387

Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works* (volume 6). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.

Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Lewis, C. A. (2012). Psychological type, religion, and culture: Theoretical and empirical perspectives. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 15*, 817-821. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.721534

Lewis, C. A. (2015). Psychological type, religion, and culture: Further empirical perspectives. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 531-534. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2015.1103520

McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The selection ratio type table: A research strategy for comparing type distribution. *Journal of Psychological Type, 10*, 46-56.

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

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

Robinson, E. (1977a). *The original vision*. Oxford: RERU.

Robinson, E. (1977b). *This time-bound ladder*. Oxford: RERU.

Robinson, E. (1978). *Living the questions*. Oxford: RERU.

Ross, C. F. J. (1992). The intuitive function and religious orientation. *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 37*, 83-103. doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-5922.1992.00083.x

Ross, C. F. J. (2011). Jungian typology and religion: A perspective from North America. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 22*, 165-191. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.30

Ross, C. J. F., & Francis, L. J. (2015). The perceiving process and mystical orientation: A study in psychological type theory among 16- to 18-year-old students. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 693-705. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.961353

Ross, C. F. J., Weiss, D., & Jackson, L. M. (1996). The relation of Jungian psychological type to religious attitudes and practices. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 6,* 263-279. doi.org/10.1207/s15327582ijpr0604_3

Stace, W. T. (1960). *Mysticism and philosophy*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott.

Village, A. (2011a). Introduction to special section: Psychological type and Christian ministry. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 22,* 157-164. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.28

Village, A. (2011b). Factors predicting relationship with society among Anglicans in England. In L. J. Francis & H.-G. Ziebertz (Eds.), *Public significance of religion* (pp. 215-240). Leiden: Brill. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207066.i-495.82

Village, A. (2012). English Anglicanism: Construct validity of a scale of Anglo-Catholic versus evangelical self-identification. In F.-V. Anthony & H.-G. Ziebertz (Eds.), *Religious identity and national heritage: Empirical-theological perspectives* (pp. 93-122). Leiden: Brill. doi.org/10.1163/9789004228788_007

Village, A. (2013). Traditions within the Church of England and psychological type: A study among the clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, *26*, 22-44. doi.org/10.1163/15709256-12341252

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2008). Attitude toward homosexuality among Anglicans in England: The effects of theological orientation and personality. *Journal of Empirical Theology, 21,* 68-87. doi.org/10.1163/092229308X310740

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

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2010a). All in the mind? Psychological, social and religious predictors of civic volunteerism among churchgoers in England. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 21,* 1-26. doi.org/10.1163/9789004216464_002

Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2010b). An anatomy of change: Profiling cohort-difference in beliefs and attitudes among Anglicans in England. *Journal of Anglican Studies, 8*, 59-81. doi.org/10.1017/S1740355309990027

Village, A., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2009). Church tradition and psychological type preferences among Anglicans in England. *Journal of Anglican Studies*, *7*, 93-109. doi.org/10.1017/S1740355309000187

Table 1

Psychological type distribution for men low on religious experience

The Sixteen Complete Types

ISTJ *n* = 234 (31.9%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	ISFJ *n* = 132 (18.0%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++	INFJ *n* = 26 (3.5%) ++++	INTJ *n* = 81 (11.0%) +++++ +++++ +
ISTP *n* = 3 (0.4%)	ISFP *n* = 10 (1.4%) +	INFP *n* = 13 (1.8%) ++	INTP *n* = 16 (2.2%) ++
ESTP *n* = 5 (0.7%) +	ESFP *n* = 7 (1.0%) +	ENFP *n* = 8 (1.1%) +	ENTP *n* = 1 (0.1%)
ESTJ *n* = 79 (10.8%) +++++ +++++ +	ESFJ *n* = 78 (10.6%) +++++ +++++ +	ENFJ *n* = 16 (2.2%) ++	ENTJ *n* = 25 (3.4%) +++

Dichotomous Preferences

E	*n* =	219	(29.8%)
I	*n* =	515	(70.2%)
S	*n* =	548	(74.7%)
N	*n* =	186	(25.3%)
T	*n* =	444	(60.5%)
F	*n* =	290	(39.5%)
J	*n* =	671	(91.4%)
P	*n* =	63	(8.6%)

Pairs and Temperaments

IJ	*n* =	473	(64.4%)
IP	*n* =	42	(5.7%)
EP	*n* =	21	(2.9%)
EJ	*n* =	198	(27.0%)
ST	*n* =	321	(43.7%)
SF	*n* =	227	(30.9%)
NF	*n* =	63	(8.6%)
NT	*n* =	123	(16.8%)
SJ	*n* =	523	(71.3%)
SP	*n* =	25	(3.4%)
NP	*n* =	38	(5.2%)
NJ	*n* =	148	(20.2%)
TJ	*n* =	419	(57.1%)
TP	*n* =	25	(3.4%)
FP	*n* =	38	(5.2%)
FJ	*n* =	252	(34.3%)
IN	*n* =	136	(18.5%)
EN	*n* =	50	(6.8%)
IS	*n* =	379	(51.6%)
ES	*n* =	169	(23.0%)
ET	*n* =	110	(15.0%)
EF	*n* =	109	(14.9%)
IF	*n* =	181	(24.7%)
IT	*n* =	334	(45.5%)

Jungian Types (E)			**Jungian Types (I)**			**Dominant Types**		
	n	%		*n*	%		*n*	%
E-TJ	104	14.2	I-TP	19	2.6	Dt.T	123	16.8
E-FJ	94	12.8	I-FP	23	3.1	Dt.F	117	15.9
ES-P	12	1.6	IS-J	366	49.9	Dt.S	378	51.5
EN-P	9	1.2	IN-J	107	14.6	Dt.N	116	15.8

Note: N = 734 (NB: + = 1% of N)

Table 2

Psychological type distribution for men high on religious experience compared with men low on religious experience

The Sixteen Complete Types

ISTJ *n* = 361 (19.5%) *I* = 0.61*** +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++	ISFJ *n* = 299 (16.1%) *I* = 0.90 +++++ +++++ +++++ +	INFJ *n* = 203 (11.0%) *I* = 3.09*** +++++ +++++ +	INTJ *n* = 236 (12.7%) *I* = 1.15 +++++ +++++ +++
ISTP *n* = 15 (0.8%) *I* = 1.98 +	ISFP *n* = 23 (1.2%) *I* = 0.91 +	INFP *n* = 71 (3.8%) *I* = 2.16** ++++	INTP *n* = 40 (2.2%) *I* = 0.99 ++
ESTP *n* = 5 (0.3%) *I* = 0.40	ESFP *n* = 19 (1.0%) *I* = 1.08 +	ENFP *n* = 64 (3.5%) *I* = 3.17*** ++++	ENTP *n* = 27 (1.5%) *I* = 10.70** ++
ESTJ *n* = 148 (8.0%) *I* = 0.74* +++++ +++	ESFJ *n* = 168 (9.1%) *I* = 0.85 +++++ ++++	ENFJ *n* = 89 (4.8%) *I* = 2.20** +++++	ENTJ *n* = 84 (4.5%) *I* = 1.33 +++++

Dichotomous Preferences

E	*n* = 604	(32.6%)	*I* = 1.09
I	*n* = 1248	(67.4%)	*I* = 0.96
S	*n* = 1038	(56.0%)	*I* = 0.75***
N	*n* = 814	(44.0%)	*I* = 1.73***
T	*n* = 916	(49.5%)	*I* = 0.82***
F	*n* = 936	(50.5%)	*I* = 1.28***
J	*n* = 1588	(85.7%)	*I* = 0.94***
P	*n* = 264	(14.3%)	*I* = 1.66***

Pairs and Temperaments

IJ	*n* = 1099	(59.3%)	*I* = 0.92*
IP	*n* = 149	(8.0%)	*I* = 1.41*
EP	*n* = 115	(6.2%)	*I* = 2.17***
EJ	*n* = 489	(26.4%)	*I* = 0.98
ST	*n* = 529	(28.6%)	*I* = 0.65***
SF	*n* = 509	(27.5%)	*I* = 0.89
NF	*n* = 427	(23.1%)	*I* = 2.69***
NT	*n* = 387	(20.9%)	*I* = 1.25*
SJ	*n* = 976	(52.7%)	*I* = 0.74***
SP	*n* = 62	(3.3%)	*I* = 0.98
NP	*n* = 202	(10.9%)	*I* = 2.11***
NJ	*n* = 612	(33.0%)	*I* = 1.64***
TJ	*n* = 829	(44.8%)	*I* = 0.78***
TP	*n* = 87	(4.7%)	*I* = 1.38
FP	*n* = 177	(9.6%)	*I* = 1.85***
FJ	*n* = 759	(41.0%)	*I* = 1.19**
IN	*n* = 550	(29.7%)	*I* = 1.60***
EN	*n* = 264	(14.3%)	*I* = 2.09***
IS	*n* = 698	(37.8%)	*I* = 0.73***
ES	*n* = 340	(18.4%)	*I* = 0.80**
ET	*n* = 264	(14.3%)	*I* = 0.95
EF	*n* = 340	(18.4%)	*I* = 1.24*
IF	*n* = 596	(32.2%)	*I* = 1.31***
IT	*n* = 652	(35.2%)	*I* = 0.77***

Jungian Types (E)				**Jungian Types (I)**				**Dominant Types**			
	n	%	*Index*		*n*	%	*Index*		*n*	%	*Index*
E-TJ	232	12.5	0.88	I-TP	55	3.0	1.15	Dt.T	287	15.5	0.92
E-FJ	257	13.9	1.08	I-FP	94	5.1	1.62*	Dt.F	351	19.0	1.19
ES-P	24	1.3	0.79	IS-J	660	35.6	0.71***	Dt.S	684	36.9	0.72***
EN-P	91	4.9	4.01***	IN-J	439	23.7	1.63***	Dt.N	530	28.6	1.81***

Note: N = 1,852 (NB: + = 1% of N) * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3

Psychological type distribution for women low on religious experience

The Sixteen Complete Types

ISTJ *n* = 113 (24.5%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++	ISFJ *n* = 119 (25.8%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +	INFJ *n* = 22 (4.8%) +++++	INTJ *n* = 34 (7.4%) +++++ ++
ISTP *n* = 4 (0.9%) +	ISFP *n* = 6 (1.3%) +	INFP *n* = 10 (2.2%) ++	INTP *n* = 7 (1.5%) ++
ESTP *n* = 2 (0.4%)	ESFP *n* = 2 (0.4%)	ENFP *n* = 5 (1.1%) +	ENTP *n* = 1 (0.2%)
ESTJ *n* = 53 (11.5%) +++++ +++++ ++	ESFJ *n* = 68 (14.7%) +++++ +++++ +++++	ENFJ *n* = 7 (1.5%) ++	ENTJ *n* = 9 (1.9%) ++

Dichotomous Preferences

E	*n* =	147	(31.8%)
I	*n* =	315	(68.2%)
S	*n* =	367	(79.4%)
N	*n* =	95	(20.6%)
T	*n* =	223	(48.3%)
F	*n* =	239	(51.7%)
J	*n* =	425	(92.0%)
P	*n* =	37	(8.0%)

Pairs and Temperaments

IJ	*n* =	288	(62.3%)
IP	*n* =	27	(5.8%)
EP	*n* =	10	(2.2%)
EJ	*n* =	137	(29.7%)
ST	*n* =	172	(37.2%)
SF	*n* =	195	(42.2%)
NF	*n* =	44	(9.5%)
NT	*n* =	51	(11.0%)
SJ	*n* =	353	(76.4%)
SP	*n* =	14	(3.0%)
NP	*n* =	23	(5.0%)
NJ	*n* =	72	(15.6%)
TJ	*n* =	209	(45.2%)
TP	*n* =	14	(3.0%)
FP	*n* =	23	(5.0%)
FJ	*n* =	216	(46.8%)
IN	*n* =	73	(15.8%)
EN	*n* =	22	(4.8%)
IS	*n* =	242	(52.4%)
ES	*n* =	125	(27.1%)
ET	*n* =	65	(14.1%)
EF	*n* =	82	(17.7%)
IF	*n* =	157	(34.0%)
IT	*n* =	158	(34.2%)

Jungian Types (E)			**Jungian Types (I)**			**Dominant Types**		
	n	%		*n*	%		*n*	%
E-TJ	62	13.4	I-TP	11	2.4	Dt.T	73	15.8
E-FJ	75	16.2	I-FP	16	3.5	Dt.F	91	19.7
ES-P	4	0.9	IS-J	232	50.2	Dt.S	236	51.1
EN-P	6	1.3	IN-J	56	12.1	Dt.N	62	13.4

Note: N = 462 (NB: + = 1% of N)

Table 4

Psychological type distribution for women high on religious experience compared with women low on religious experience

The Sixteen Complete Types

ISTJ *n* = 227 (16.5%) *I* = 0.68*** +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	ISFJ *n* = 289 (21.0%) *I* = 0.82* +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +	INFJ *n* = 154 (11.2%) *I* = 2.36*** +++++ +++++ +	INTJ *n* = 127 (9.2%) *I* = 1.26 +++++ ++++
ISTP *n* = 8 (0.6%) *I* = 0.67 +	ISFP *n* = 17 (1.2%) *I* = 0.95 +	INFP *n* = 54 (3.9%) *I* = 1.82 ++++	INTP *n* = 25 (1.8%) *I* = 1.20 ++
ESTP *n* = 5 (0.4%) *I* = 0.84	ESFP *n* = 18 (1.3%) *I* = 3.03 +	ENFP *n* = 48 (3.5%) *I* = 3.23** ++++	ENTP *n* = 16 (1.2%) *I* = 5.38 +
ESTJ *n* = 88 (6.4%) *I* = 0.56*** +++++ +	ESFJ *n* = 155 (11.3%) *I* = 0.77* +++++ +++++ +	ENFJ *n* = 82 (6.0%) *I* = 3.94*** +++++ +	ENTJ *n* = 60 (4.4%) *I* = 2.24* ++++

Dichotomous Preferences

E	*n* =	472	(34.4%)	*I* = 1.08
I	*n* =	901	(65.6%)	*I* = 0.96
S	*n* =	807	(58.8%)	*I* = 0.74***
N	*n* =	566	(41.2%)	*I* = 2.00***
T	*n* =	556	(40.5%)	*I* = 0.84**
F	*n* =	817	(59.5%)	*I* = 1.15**
J	*n* =	1182	(86.1%)	*I* = 0.94***
P	*n* =	191	(13.9%)	*I* = 1.74***

Pairs and Temperaments

IJ	*n* =	797	(58.0%)	*I* = 0.93
IP	*n* =	104	(7.6%)	*I* = 1.30
EP	*n* =	87	(6.3%)	*I* = 2.93***
EJ	*n* =	385	(28.0%)	*I* = 0.95
ST	*n* =	328	(23.9%)	*I* = 0.64***
SF	*n* =	479	(34.9%)	*I* = 0.83**
NF	*n* =	338	(24.6%)	*I* = 2.58***
NT	*n* =	228	(16.6%)	*I* = 1.50**
SJ	*n* =	759	(55.3%)	*I* = 0.72***
SP	*n* =	48	(3.5%)	*I* = 1.15
NP	*n* =	143	(10.4%)	*I* = 2.09***
NJ	*n* =	423	(30.8%)	*I* = 1.98***
TJ	*n* =	502	(36.6%)	*I* = 0.81***
TP	*n* =	54	(3.9%)	*I* = 1.30
FP	*n* =	137	(10.0%)	*I* = 2.00***
FJ	*n* =	680	(49.5%)	*I* = 1.06
IN	*n* =	360	(26.2%)	*I* = 1.66***
EN	*n* =	206	(15.0%)	*I* = 3.15***
IS	*n* =	541	(39.4%)	*I* = 0.75***
ES	*n* =	266	(19.4%)	*I* = 0.72***
ET	*n* =	169	(12.3%)	*I* = 0.87
EF	*n* =	303	(22.1%)	*I* = 1.24*
IF	*n* =	514	(37.4%)	*I* = 1.10
IT	*n* =	387	(28.2%)	*I* = 0.82*

Jungian Types (E)				**Jungian Types (I)**				**Dominant Types**			
	n	%	*Index*		*n*	%	*Index*		*n*	%	*Index*
E-TJ	148	10.8	0.80	I-TP	33	2.4	1.01	Dt.T	181	13.2	0.83
E-FJ	237	17.3	1.06	I-FP	71	5.2	1.49	Dt.F	308	22.4	1.14
ES-P	23	1.7	1.93	IS-J	516	37.6	0.75***	Dt.S	539	39.3	0.77***
EN-P	64	4.7	3.59***	IN-J	281	20.5	1.69***	Dt.N	345	25.1	1.87***

Note: N = 1,373 (NB: + = 1% of N) * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 5

Predictors of reported religious experience

Category	Groups	N	Religious Experience		χ^2	
			No/Perhaps %	Yes/Probably %		
Sex	male	2586	28.4	71.6		
	female	1835	25.2	74.8	5.59	*
Age	under 50	594	18.0	82.0		
	50-59	749	17.1	82.9		
	60-69	1267	25.7	74.3		
	70 and above	1811	35.1	64.9	123.24	***
Church Tradition	Anglo-Catholic	1850	29.5	70.5		
	Broad church	1932	28.8	71.2		
	Evangelical	639	14.7	85.3	57.85	***
Ordained	No	2711	36.2	63.8		
	Yes	1710	12.6	87.4	296.27	***

Note. Chi-squared values based on counts. * $p < .05$; *** $p < .001$;

Table 6

Logistic regression of reporting religious experience

							95% C.I.for Exp(B)	
Category	Groups	B	S.E.	Wald		Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
	Constant	0.43	0.15	8.62	***	1.53		
Sex	Female	0.55	0.08	49.02	***	1.73	1.48	2.01
	Male (ref)							
Age	under 50			73.46	***			
	50-59	0.85	0.13	46.12	***	2.34	1.83	2.99
	60-69	0.70	0.12	36.62	***	2.02	1.61	2.54
	70 and above	0.42	0.09	23.64	***	1.53	1.29	1.81
Tradition				52.16	***			
	Anglo-Catholic	-0.93	0.13	51.44	***	0.40	0.31	0.51
	Broad church	-0.83	0.13	40.71	***	0.44	0.34	0.57
	Evangelical (ref)							
Status	Ordained	1.43	0.09	251.42	***	4.16	3.49	4.96
	Lay (ref)							
Orientation	Introversion	-0.08	0.08	0.94		0.93	0.79	1.08
	Extraversion (ref)							
Perceiving	Intuition	0.70	0.08	69.65	***	2.02	1.71	2.38
	Sensing (ref)							
Judging	Feeling	0.34	0.07	21.49	***	1.41	1.22	1.63
	Thinking (ref)							
Attitude	Perceiving	0.07	0.13	0.31		1.08	0.83	1.39
	Judging (ref)							

Note: *** $p < .001$