

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Village, Andrew ORCID logoORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2174-8822> (2012) Biblical literalism among Anglican clergy: what is the role of psychological type? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15 (9). pp. 955-968.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/776/>

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://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.681482>

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

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

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

Biblical literalism among Anglican clergy: What is the role of psychological type?

Running head: Clergy and literalism

Andrew Village¹

York St John University, York, UK

Author Note

I thank Leslie Francis and Mandy Robbins for allowing me to use a dataset on clergy which we collected together.

¹ Author correspondence: York St John University, Lord Mayor's Walk, York YO31 7EX, UK. Email: A.Village@yorks.ac.uk

Biblical literalism among Anglican clergy: What is the role of psychological type?

ABSTRACT

The SIFT method of preaching argues that preachers should attend to the different learning styles implied by psychological type theory when preparing and delivering sermons. The evidence to date that supports the theory behind the method has mainly been based on offering readers of known psychological type a range of interpretations specifically created to appeal to particular type preferences. This paper extends these studies by looking at how a more general interpretative strategy (literalism) is related to psychological type preferences. A sample of 1039 recently ordained Anglican clergy in the UK completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales and a 10-item biblical literalism scale. There was a positive association between a preference for sensing and biblical literalism, after controlling for general biblical conservatism and church tradition. The implications for preachers are discussed.

Keywords: biblical conservatism, biblical literalism, evangelical, psychological type, sensing

Introduction

The SIFT method of preaching (Francis, 2003; Francis & Village, 2008) is based on applying psychological type theory to the delivery of biblically-based sermons (Francis & Atkins, 2000, 2001, 2002). The method implies that preachers should be aware of preferences associated with psychological type, and shape sermons so that a range of listeners, with different preferences, can be exposed to a range of emphases in sermons. In this way, preachers can give due recognition to individual differences within congregations, allowing people to interact with both their preferred and less-preferred styles of handling information. At the same time preachers can be aware of their own preferences, and avoid preaching solely in ways that match their particular psychological type. This is particularly important because there is growing evidence that the psychological make-up of clergy is often different from that of the people among whom they preach (Francis, Craig, Horsfall, & Ross, 2005; Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007; Francis, Duncan, Craig, & Luffman, 2004; Francis, Robbins, Duncan, Whinney, & Ross, 2010; Francis, Robbins, & Wulff, 2011; Village, 2011; Village, Francis, & Craig, 2009).

To date, the main research in this area has been to show that clergy or lay people tend to prefer interpretations that are matched to their psychological type preferences (Francis, Robbins, & Village, 2009; Village, 2007a, 2010b; Village & Francis, 2005). In this research, the ‘test interpretations’ are usually deliberately created in order to align with the sorts of interpretation predicted from psychological type theory. While this is a justified method for testing the theory, the interpretations are not ones that necessarily relate to wider or more general understandings of how the bible might be interpreted. This paper looks at the link between biblical literalism and psychological type among preachers in the Anglican Church in order to

demonstrate that type may predict the likely mode of preaching in ways that relate to a widely understood and important facet of biblical interpretation.

Psychological type and the SIFT method of preaching

The model of psychological type proposed by Carl Jung (1923) seeks to describe various modes of psychological functioning and how this functioning results in different personalities. In its current form, as developed by Katharine Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers (Myers, 2006; Myers & Myers, 1980), the model includes two orientations, two perceiving functions, two judging functions, and two attitudes toward the outer world.

The two orientations are concerned with where individuals prefer to function psychologically: extraverts (E) in the outer world through interaction with others, which they find stimulating and energizing; introverts (I) in their inner world, through solitude, silence, and contemplation, which they find stimulating and energizing.

The two perceiving functions allow the gathering and processing of information. Sensing types (S) prefer to process the realities of a situation as perceived by their senses, attending to specific details rather than to the wider picture. They attend to practical issues and are typically down-to-earth and matter-of-fact. Intuitive types (N) prefer to process the possibilities of a situation as perceived by their imaginations, attending to wider patterns and relationships rather than to specific details. They are stimulated by abstract theories and they are typically imaginative and innovative.

The two judging functions allow people to evaluate information and make decisions. Thinking types (T) process information objectively, using logic and principles rather than relationships and personal values. The thinking function prizes

integrity and justice, and thinking types tend to be truthful and fair, even if this risks upsetting others. Feeling types (F) process information subjectively, using their personal values and relationships rather than abstract principles. The feeling function prizes compassion and mercy, and feeling types tend to be tactful and empathetic, even at the expense of fairness and consistency.

The two attitudes toward the outer world indicate which of the two sets of functions (that is, perceiving S/N, or judging T/F) is preferred in dealings with the outer world. Judging types (J) actively judge external stimuli, so they tend to order, rationalize, and structure their outer world. They value the routine and established patterns created by schedules, lists, timetables, or diaries. Perceiving types (P) passively perceive external stimuli, so they tend to enjoy a flexible, open-ended approach to life that values change and spontaneity.

The emphasis in the SIFT method of preaching is on the two core processes of perceiving and judging. The acronym 'SIFT' refers to the four psychological functions of Sensing, Intuition², Feeling and Thinking, and the method is for preachers to exposit passages in ways that are designed to appeal to these four different functions. Using this approach, a sermon can explore a text in a manner that means it is likely to resonate at some point with the various psychological type preferences displayed among people in the audience. Using the characteristics of the four different functions, it is possible to predict what sort of preaching will appeal most readily to each.

For the preferred sensing types, interpreting a text may be largely about attending to what is actually there. They will value interpretations that highlight the details in the text, especially those that draw on sensory information. Interpretations

² The 'I' here refers to intuition rather than introversion.

that begin with a repeat of the text and draw attention to details will appeal to sensing types, who will be reluctant to speculate too widely about hidden or metaphorical meanings. The sensing function draws attention to factual details so sensing types will be likely to interpret biblical passages literally rather than symbolically or metaphorically.

For preferred intuitive types, interpreting a text may be largely about using the text as a springboard to imaginative ideas. They will be inspired by interpretations that fire the imagination and raise new possibilities and challenges. Interpretations that raise wider questions and that look for overarching or underlying concepts will appeal to intuitive types, who may find the plain or literal sense rather uninteresting. Intuitives find it natural to make links between analogous ideas and concepts, and they will be likely to interpret passages symbolically or metaphorically, rather than literally.

For preferred thinkers interpreting a text may largely be about seeing what the text means in terms evidence, moral principles or theology. They will be drawn to using rationality and logic to identify the ideas and truth-claims in a text. Interpretations that highlight the theological claims in a text will appeal to thinking types, who may be less interested in trying to understand the characters described by the text.

For preferred feeling types, interpreting a text may be largely about applying the human dimensions to present day issues of compassion, harmony and trust. They will be drawn to empathizing with the characters in a narrative, and will want to understand their thoughts, motives and emotions. Interpretations that try to understand what it was like to be there will appeal to feeling types, who may be less interested in the abstract theological ideas that might be drawn from the text.

Evidence linking psychological type and preferences in handling biblical material comes from a range of studies. A link between a preference for feeling and feeling-type interpretative passages was shown in a study of 74 college students in the United States (Bassett, Mathewson, & Gailitis, 1993), though there was some conflation of feeling and thinking learning styles, making the results difficult to interpret. More direct tests of the SIFT model on 404 Anglican lay people (Village & Francis, 2005) and 718 Anglican clergy (Village, 2010b, a subset of the present sample) has shown that in both the perceiving and judging processes, readers tend to prefer interpretations that match their preferred function. In a slightly different approach, preachers were asked to offer their interpretations of Mark 1:29-39 and these were then shown to correspond to the sorts of interpretations predicted by SIFT theory (Francis, et al., 2009). There is also evidence to suggest that preference for intuition over sensing makes it more likely that readers can imagine themselves into a narrative (Village, 2009, in press), again supporting the kind of difference between psychological types predicted by SIFT theory.

Biblical literalism and the SIFT method

Despite the changes in academic biblical studies over the last few decades, literalism remains an important issue for many in churches today (Village, 2007a). The furor surrounding the work of the Jesus Seminar in the 1990s (Funk, 2001, 1998; Funk & Hoover, 1993; Powell, 2009), and the earlier controversy over the appointment of David Jenkins as bishop of Durham in 1984 (Dyson, 1985; Harrison, 1985), indicate that whether or not certain biblical events actually happened or not is important to many clergy and lay people. If this is so, then sermons may be a context in which the exposition of a biblical text can lead to confusion or consternation if preachers do not

understand the consequences of highlighting, or avoiding, issues of literalism.

Literalism is closely tied with certain commitments to the bible, notably those associated with conservative Protestantism or Christian fundamentalism. In North America literalism has been used as an indicator of political affiliation (Jelen, 1989a, 1989b; Leege, 1989; Smidt, 1989) and a wide range of mainly ‘right wing’ attitudes and beliefs (Bader & Froese, 2005; Burn & Busso, 2005; Cottone, Drucker, & Javier, 2007; Crapanzano; Kellstedt, 1989; Marty, 1994; Wilcox, 1989; Zigerell). Biblical literalism is associated with conservative Protestant denominations, whose members are inclined to vote Republican and have conservative attitudes toward abortion, the role of women, capital or corporal punishment, and sexuality.

It seems likely that preaching from the bible is driven primarily by particular theological commitments associated with wider beliefs. Such theological commitments maybe related to psychological type preferences, so this might lead to more literal preaching among certain psychological types. For example, conservative or traditional Christian views are associated with a preference for sensing over intuition (Francis & Jones, 1998; Francis & Loudon, 2000; Francis & Ross, 1997; Village, 2005b) and biblical conservatism is linked to literalism. However, SIFT theory suggests that literalism may appeal to sensing types not just because it is linked to biblically conservative beliefs, but also because literalism involves the sort of direct attention to a text that is associated with the sensing function. Or conversely, literalism avoids the kind of symbolic or metaphorical handling of texts that is likely to be driven by the intuitive function. If this is the case, SIFT theory predicts that literalism should be more frequent among sensing types, even after allowing for their underlying beliefs about the bible.

This paper tests this idea among a sample of recently ordained Anglican clergy in the UK. The Anglican Church in England has both Anglo-catholic and evangelical wings, alongside the majority of ‘middle of the road’ or broad-church Anglicanism (Randall, 2005; Village, 2010a). These different groups have distinct and complex profiles of belief related the bible, the role of the church and the ordination of women (Village & Francis, 2010). In general, evangelicals tend to be similar to mainstream Protestants in holding to conservative beliefs about scripture, whereas Anglo-catholics and members of broad church congregations tend to be more varied and include some who hold more liberal views. In testing for a link between biblical literalism and psychological type in such a sample it is therefore necessary to allow for differences in both biblical conservatism and church tradition.

Method

Participants

Questionnaires were posted to all 2190 Anglican clergy ordained between 2004 and 2007 in the United Kingdom, mostly from the Church of England, and 1061 (48%) were returned. Of these, 1039 had valid answers to all the questions used in this analysis. Comparison of age and sex ratios of clergy in the main sample with nationally published figures indicated that respondents were a reasonably representative sample of recently ordained clergy within the Anglican Church in the UK (Village & Francis, 2011).

Instruments

Dependent variable: The biblical literalism scale

The literalism scale (Village, 2005c) consists of 10 items that refer to biblical events. Respondents are asked in each case to indicate if they think the event really happened or is a fictional story. The Likert-type, five-item response scale ranges from 'Definitely a story' (= 1) to 'Definitely happened' (= 5), and the summated scale had a high reported internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha = .92) in a sample of 404 lay Anglicans (Village, 2005c) and in the present sample of 1039 Anglican clergy (Cronbach's alpha = .92). The items range from Old Testament accounts such as Adam and Eve or Jonah to New Testament miracle stories such as the virgin birth of Jesus and the feeding of the 5000. Items were selected to reflect the range of literal belief within the Anglican Church, and most respondents scored near the mid-point of the scale.

Psychological type preference scores

The predictor variables were the scores within the psychological type dimensions measured in the Francis Psychological Types Scales, FTPS (Francis, 2005). These scales measure preference for orientation (extraversion versus introversion), perceiving (sensing versus intuition), judging (feeling versus thinking) and attitude toward the outer world (judging versus perceiving). Each scale includes ten forced-choice items related to each of the four dimensions (E/I, S/N, F/T and J/P) of the psychological type model. Items representing opposite characteristics within each of the dimensions were presented in pairs and respondents were asked to select the one in the pair that was closest to how they perceived themselves. Selecting one of a pair scored one for the function or attitude it represented, while the unselected function or

attitude scored zero. Scores with each pair were thus complementary and summed to ten. Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for the scales in this study were: E/I = .85, S/N = .77, F/T = .71, J/P = .80. To avoid loss of information, scores were used rather than the usual preference dichotomies (Cowan, 1989; DeCoster, Iselin, & Gallucci, 2009), and for each dimension only one score was used in analysis, either extraversion, sensing, feeling, or judging.

The biblical conservatism scale

This scale is based on the bible scale developed by Village (2005a) among lay Anglicans in the Church of England. The original scale consisted of 12 items related to the authority, inerrancy, exclusivity and literal interpretation of the bible. It had a high reported internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha = .92) in the sample of 404 lay Anglicans (Village, 2005a). For the present study, items related to literalism were removed to avoid collinearity. The resulting scale (Village, Submitted for review) consisted of eight items and had a high internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha = .93 in this sample). The scale was taken as a measure of biblical liberalism (low score) versus biblical conservatism (high score), and was included because it is known to be related to both literalism and some psychological type scores.

Church tradition

The seven-point, bi-polar scale reported in Randall (2005) is labeled 'Anglo-catholic' at one end and 'evangelical' at the other. Construct validity has been tested against a wide range of attitudes, beliefs and practices in a sample of 6187 Anglicans from England (Village, 2010). Those scoring 1-2 were classed as Anglo-catholic, 3-4 as broad church and 5-7 as evangelical. Dummy variables were created for use in linear

regression and these were evangelical (versus broad and Anglo-catholic) and Anglo-catholic (versus broad and evangelical). In general within the Church of England, evangelicals tend to be more biblically conservative and literalist than broad-church members, who in turn are more biblically conservative and literalist than Anglo-catholics. The dummy variables were included because there may be some relationship between church tradition and psychological type that is not explained solely by biblical conservatism (Village, et al., 2009).

Other variables

A number of studies have indicated that biblical literalism may be related to education (Samuel, 2011; Village, 2005c) and sex (Hoffmann & Bartkowski, 2008; Village, Submitted for review). Participants were asked to indicate their highest educational qualification on a scale of 0 (= No formal qualification) to 4 (= postgraduate qualification). Anglican clergy in England are normally required to reach at least undergraduate diploma level as part of their ordination training, and the question referred to education before they began that training. Respondents were also asked for their sex (scored as 1 = male and 2 = female) and age (coded by decade).

Procedures

Biblical literalism varies with educational experience and is related to general biblical conservatism (Village, 2007a), and these were both included as controls. There is a well-known relationship between sex and preference in the psychological type judging process, with a higher preference for feeling among women compared to men (Kendall, 1998; Myers, 2006; Myers & Myers, 1980). This was true in the present sample (Village, 2011), where there was also an uneven distribution of women among

the different church traditions (61% men among evangelicals versus 46% in other traditions). Sex-differences in literalism varied between traditions in this sample (Village, Submitted for review), so it was necessary to control for sex when testing the relationship of literalism to psychological type.

Literalism was treated as a normally distributed continuous variable, and analyzed using a linear response model with the Generalized Linear Models procedure of IBM SPSS Statistics version 19 (Norusis, 2011). The main effects of psychological type scales were entered into an initial model. In a second model, sex, age and education were entered as factors. In the final model, the dummy variables evangelical and Anglo-catholic were entered, along with biblical conservatism as a covariate. This procedure revealed the effects of controls on the relationships between psychological type and literalism.

Results

The distributions of sex, age and education are much as expected for recently ordained clergy in the Church of England (Table 1). The sex and age distributions match those for the Church of England as whole, with roughly equal numbers of men and women among ordinands, and most new clergy in their 40s or 50s. Educational background is an important consideration in the selection of clergy, and over 83% of the sample had at least a first degree before they entered training. The distribution in church tradition is difficult to gauge since there are no base-line figures for comparison, but just under half were broad church, with just over a quarter in the evangelical or Anglo-catholic traditions.

[Table 1 about here]

In the overall data, literalism was, as expected, strongly correlated with biblical conservatism and with church tradition (Table 2). Literalism was negatively correlated with both educational experience and (weakly) with age. There was a negative correlation with sex, suggesting that clergywomen were, on average, less literal than clergymen. The strongest correlation between literalism and psychological type preferences was in the perceiving process, with higher literalism among those with a preference for sensing over intuition. There were weak positive correlations between literalism and extraversion and between literalism and judging, but no correlation with feeling score. The type scores were themselves correlated in this sample, especially in the positive correlation between sensing and judging.

[Table 2 about here]

Multiple regression showed that the correlation between literalism and judging score disappeared after allowing for other type scores (Table 3). This suggests the uncontrolled effect of judging on literalism was due to the correlation of sensing and judging scores in this sample. The effect of extraversion on literalism remained after controlling for sex, age and education (Model 2), but disappeared when the church tradition and biblical conservatism controls were added (Model 3). Among extraverts, there seemed to be a higher proportion of biblically-conservative evangelicals, and this seems to cause the extraversion effect.

The positive correlation between sensing and literalism remained after all controls were added in Model 3, and seems to be a genuine effect. Clergy who scored high on sensing (and low on intuition) were more likely to interpret literally, and this was over

and above their church tradition or general levels of biblical conservatism.

Preferences in the other three dimensions of psychological type showed no relationship with literalism, after controlling for other individual differences, church tradition, and biblical conservatism.

[Table 3 about here]

Discussion

The results presented here were predicted from psychological type theory, and have important implications for understanding preaching and biblical interpretation. The two functions of the perceiving process seem to predispose clergy to different attitudes towards biblical literalism. The sensing function, with its emphasis on the immediate, the data gathered from the senses, the practical, and the routine, is associated with literal interpretations of biblical events. The intuitive function, with its emphasis on the future, on the linking of data through the imagination, and the creative, is associated with non-literal interpretations. The effect size is small compared with the effects of general biblical conservatism, or of being evangelical, but it remained after controlling for these factors. This suggests that type preference may heighten differences in interpretative practice linked to being evangelical and/or biblically conservative.

Preferences in the other psychological type dimensions were not predicted to influence biblical literalism, and the results confirmed that any associations in the overall data were due to the cross-sectional nature of the sample. Extraverts were slightly more literal overall than introverts, but this was because extravert orientation is associated to some extent with biblical conservatism or being evangelical. There is

some evidence that preference for extraversion is more frequent among evangelical than other ministers (Craig, Horsfall, & Francis, 2005; Francis, Craig, & Butler, 2007; Francis, et al., 2005), and this might explain the association between extraversion and literalism in this sample. There was no indication that preference within the judging process (feeling versus thinking) was associated with literalism, and no particular theoretical reason why there should be.

In terms of preaching, literalism represents an important underlying interpretative principle that may guide the way in which some sermons are constructed. The literalism scale employed a range of material that covered mythological passages such as Adam and Eve or Noah, accounts of miraculous deeds, and accounts that may be more widely accepted as historical. Even among clergy there was considerable variation in how different accounts were understood. To expound texts such as the book of Jonah or Noah and the Great Flood as history is a very different approach to starting with the assumption that these are symbolic stories or metaphors for underlying truths. For many biblical literalists, a key issue is that such accounts are expounded and believed as historical events precisely because they are scripture. They demand an act of placing oneself 'under the Authority of the Word', which can mean assent to believing the 'plain' or 'literal' sense of scripture. In some churches it is a person's willingness to do so that marks them out as belonging to a particular interpretative community (Ammerman, 1982; Bielo, 2009; Boone, 1989; Wilcox, 1992). In the Church of England there is considerable variation in stance toward the bible between congregations, or even between different members of the same congregation (Village, 2007a, 2007b). Preachers need to be aware of how assuming a literalist or non-literalist position in a sermon might be understood by

their listeners. For some, a literalist exposition on a given text might seem naïve or foolish, for others it might be seen as a test of the preacher's faithfulness.

The results of this study indicate that preachers who prefer sensing may be more likely to take a literalist approach to scripture as their 'reflex' understanding. This may partly be because of underlying conservative beliefs about the bible, but it might also reflect a wider preference for sensing rather intuition. Reading texts symbolically or metaphorically may come more easily to intuitive types, who may move quickly beyond the literal without pausing to consider the consequences. There is growing evidence that Anglican stipendiary clergy tend to have a much greater preference for intuition than their congregations (Francis, et al., 2005; Francis, Craig, Whinney, et al., 2007; Francis, et al., 2004; Francis, et al., 2010; Francis, et al., 2011; Village, 2011), implying that they may be more comfortable in moving on from literal interpretations than their listeners. The SIFT method of preaching draws attention to such disparities and cautions preachers to be aware of how their own type preferences may influence their sermons and be received by their congregations. This study suggests that such advice may be particularly important when it comes to the issue of biblical literalism.

The drawbacks of this study are that it has used a fairly simple scale for assessing literalism. Although this scale has high internal consistency reliability, and covers a range of different biblical accounts, it does not necessarily indicate how preachers of different type preferences would actually deal with particular passages in a sermon. In particular, the assumption that less literal interpretation for intuitives means more symbolic or metaphorical interpretation (rather than avoiding passages altogether) needs to be tested by more direct observation of preaching.

Conclusion

Biblical literalism is an interpretative strategy among Anglican clergy that is clearly related to their underlying beliefs about what they consider the bible to be and the church tradition to which they belong. Conservative beliefs are linked to views of the bible that stress its inspired, inerrant, exclusive authority. Such beliefs are linked to literal interpretation, a widely understood idea that has been empirically demonstrated in this study. Conservative beliefs about the bible are fostered by belonging to particular faith groups, and evangelicals within the Church of England are one such group. This study has shown empirically that clergy identifying as evangelical (rather than as broad church or Anglo-catholic) in the Church of England show heightened literalism over and above those with similar levels of biblical conservatism who do not identify as evangelical. Conservative belief and being evangelical are both important factors that promote literal biblical interpretation. What this study has importantly shown is that psychology also plays a role in shaping biblical literalism. Psychological type may promote literalism indirectly through fostering certain styles of belief about the bible and adherence to certain church traditions, but it also seems to have a direct effect because preference for sensing over intuition promotes biblical literalism after controlling for the effects of biblical conservatism and evangelicalism. Biblical literalism is not a matter of either belief or psychology, but perhaps a matter of both.

Table 1

Metrics for variables used in the analyses

| | | Frequency | % |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Sex | male | 524 | 50.4 |
| | female | 515 | 49.6 |
| Age | 20s | 47 | 4.5 |
| | 30s | 190 | 18.3 |
| | 40s | 256 | 24.6 |
| | 50s | 354 | 34.1 |
| | 60s | 192 | 18.5 |
| Education | to 16 years | 101 | 9.7 |
| | to 18 years | 71 | 6.8 |
| | undergraduate degree | 567 | 54.6 |
| | postgraduate degree | 300 | 28.9 |
| Church tradition | Anglo-catholic | 279 | 26.9 |
| | broad | 460 | 44.3 |
| | evangelical | 300 | 28.9 |
| | | Mean | <i>SD</i> |
| Literalism score | | 35.8 | 8.7 |
| Biblical conservatism | | 21.0 | 7.2 |
| Extraversion | | 4.6 | 3.2 |
| Sensing | | 5.5 | 2.6 |
| Feeling | | 6.1 | 2.5 |
| Judging | | 8.3 | 2.8 |

Note. $N = 1039$

Table 2

Correlation matrix

| | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|
| 1 Literalism | .09** | -.06 | .18*** | .07* | .76*** | -.33*** | .51*** | -.12*** | -.08* | -.17*** |
| 2 Sex | -.01 | .19*** | -.03 | .01 | -.19*** | .04 | -.14*** | -.05 | .22*** | |
| 3 Age | .02 | .19*** | .13*** | -.05 | -.17*** | .01 | -.15*** | -.16*** | | |
| 4 Education | .03 | -.14*** | -.20*** | -.06 | -.08* | .07* | .00 | | | |
| 5 Evangelical | .07* | -.12*** | .09** | .08* | .60*** | -.39*** | | | | |
| 6 Anglo-catholic | -.01 | -.01 | -.07* | -.09** | -.37*** | | | | | |
| 7 Biblical conservatism | .10** | -.12*** | .13*** | .11** | | | | | | |
| 8 Extraversion | -.19*** | .09** | -.06* | | | | | | | |
| 9 Sensing | .44*** | -.04 | | | | | | | | |
| 10 Feeling | -.29*** | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 Judging | | | | | | | | | | |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table 3

Linear regression of biblical literalism

| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Parameter | <i>B</i> | <i>B</i> | <i>B</i> |
| Intercept | 32.22 ^{***} | 27.68 ^{***} | 15.85 ^{***} |
| Extraversion | 0.24 ^{**} | 0.22 ^{**} | -0.03 |
| Sensing | 0.60 ^{***} | 0.51 ^{***} | 0.22 ^{**} |
| Feeling | -0.19 | -0.07 | 0.13 |
| Judging | 0.03 | 0.11 | -0.01 |
| Sex: (female) | | | |
| male | | 2.58 ^{***} | 0.77 [*] |
| Age: (60s) | | | |
| 20s | | 1.39 | -0.72 |
| 30s | | 2.16 [*] | -1.13 |
| 40s | | 1.09 | -0.16 |
| 50s | | 0.62 | 0.09 |
| Education: (postgraduate) | | | |
| to 16 | | 2.80 ^{**} | 0.91 |
| to 18 | | 2.82 [*] | 1.27 |
| degree | | 2.08 ^{**} | 0.38 |
| Tradition: | | | |
| evangelical | | | 1.58 ^{**} |
| Anglo-catholic | | | 0.45 |
| Biblical conservatism | | | 0.57 ^{***} |

Note. For nominal and ordinal variables, reference categories are shown in parentheses. *B* = unstandardized regression coefficients. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

References

- Ammerman, N. T. (1982). Operationalizing evangelicalism: An amendment. *Sociological Analysis*, 43(2), 170-172.
- Bader, C., & Froese, P. (2005). Images of God: The effect of personal theologies on moral attitudes, political affiliation and religious behaviour. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion*, 1(Article 11).
- Bassett, R. L., Mathewson, K., & Gailitis, A. (1993). Recognising the person in biblical interpretation: An empirical study. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 12(1), 38-46.
- Bielo, J. S. (2009). *Words upon the word: An ethnography of evangelical group bible study*. New York: New York University Press.
- Boone, K. C. (1989). *The Bible tells them so: The discourse of Protestant fundamentalism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Burn, S. M., & Busso, J. (2005). Ambivalent sexism, scriptural literalism, and religiosity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29(4), 412-418. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00241.x
- Cottone, J., Drucker, P., & Javier, R. A. (2007). Predictors of moral reasoning: Components of executive functioning and aspects of religiosity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 46(1), 37-54. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5906.2007.00339.x
- Cowan, D. A. (1989). An alternative to the dichotomous interpretation of Jung's psychological type functions: Developing more sensitive measurement technology. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 53(3), 459-471. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa5303_4
- Craig, C. L., Horsfall, T., & Francis, L. J. (2005). Psychological types of male evangelical missionary personnel training in England: A role for thinking type men? *Pastoral Psychology*, 53(5), 475-482. doi: 10.1007/s11089-005-2588-8

- Crapanzano, V. *Serving the Word: Literalism in America from the pulpit to the bench*. New York & London: The New Press.
- DeCoster, J., Iselin, A.-M. R., & Gallucci, M. (2009). A conceptual and empirical examination of justifications for dichotomization. *Psychological Methods*, *14*(4), 349-366. doi: 10.1037/a0016956
- Dyson, A. (1985). The bishop of Durham and all that. *Modern Churchman*, *27*(3), 1-2.
- Francis, L. J. (2003). Psychological type and biblical hermeneutics: SIFT method of preaching. *Rural Theology*, *1*(1), 13-23.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Francis, L. J., & Atkins, P. (2000). *Exploring Luke's Gospel: A guide to the Gospel readings in the Revised Common Lectionary*. London: Continuum / Mowbray.
- Francis, L. J., & Atkins, P. (2001). *Exploring Matthew's Gospel: A guide to the Gospel readings in the Revised Common Lectionary*. London: Continuum.
- Francis, L. J., & Atkins, P. (2002). *Exploring Mark's Gospel: An aid for readers and preachers using Year B of the Revised Common Lectionary*. London: Continuum / Mowbray.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., & Butler, A. (2007). Psychological types of male Evangelical Anglican seminarians in England. *Journal of Psychological Type*, *67*(2), 11-17.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Horsfall, T., & Ross, C. F. J. (2005). Psychological types of male and female Evangelical lay church leaders in England compared with United Kingdom population norms. *Fieldwork in Religion*, *1*(1), 69-83.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry.

International Journal of Practical Theology, 11(2), 266-284. doi:
10.1515/IJPT.2007.17

Francis, L. J., Duncan, B., Craig, C. L., & Luffman, G. (2004). Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England. *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, 1(1), 66-77. doi: 10.1558/jate.1.1.65.36058

Francis, L. J., & Jones, S. H. (1998). Personality and Christian belief among adult churchgoers. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 47, 5-11.

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

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Duncan, B., Whinney, M., & Ross, C. (2010). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in England: A ministry for intuitives. In B. Ruelas & V. Briseño (Eds.), *Psychology of intuition* (pp. 211-219). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Village, A. (2009). Psychological type and the pulpit: An empirical enquiry concerning preachers and the SIFT method of biblical hermeneutics. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, 65 Art. #161(1), 7 pages.

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Wulff, K. (2011). Psychological type profile of clergywomen and clergymen serving in the Presbyterian Church (USA): Implications for strengths and weaknesses in ministry. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 192-211.

Francis, L. J., & Ross, F. J. (1997). The perceiving function and Christian spirituality: Distinguishing between sensing and intuition. *Pastoral Sciences*, 16(1), 93-103.

Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2008). *Preaching with all our Souls*. London: Continuum.

- Funk, R. W. (2001). The Jesus Seminar and the quest. In M. W. Meyer & C. T. Hughes (Eds.), *Jesus then & now: Images of Jesus in history and christology* (pp. 130-139). Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.
- Funk, R. W. (Ed.). (1998). *The acts of Jesus: The search for the authentic deeds of Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Funk, R. W., & Hoover, R. W. (Eds.). (1993). *The five Gospels: The search for the authentic words of Jesus: A new translation and commentary*. New York: Macmillan.
- Harrison, T. (1985). *The Durham phenomenon*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Hoffmann, J. P., & Bartkowski, J. P. (2008). Gender, religious tradition and biblical literalism. *Social Forces*, 86(3), 1245-1272.
- Jelen, T. G. (1989a). Biblical literalism and inerrancy: Does the difference make a difference? *Sociological Analysis*, 49(4), 421-429.
- Jelen, T. G. (Ed.). (1989b). *Religion and political behavior in the United States*. New York: Praeger.
- Jung, C. G. (1923). *Psychological types*. London: Routledge.
- Kellstedt, L. A. (1989). The meaning and measurement of evangelicalism: Problems and prospects. In T. G. Jelen (Ed.), *Religion and political behavior in the United States* (pp. 3-22). New York: Praeger.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Leege, D. C. (1989). Toward a mental measure of religiosity in research on religion and politics. In T. G. Jelen (Ed.), *Religion and political behavior in the United States* (pp. 46-63). New York & Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Marty, M. E. (1994). Literalism versus everything else: A continuing conflict. *Bible Review*, 10(1), 38-43, 50.

- Myers, I. B. (2006). *MBTI manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I. B., & Myers, P. B. (1980). *Gifts differing*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Norusis, M. (2011). *IBM SPSS Statistics 19 statistical procedures companion*. Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.
- Powell, M. A. (2009). "Things that matter": Historical Jesus studies in the new millennium. *Word & World*, 29(2), 121-128.
- Randall, K. (2005). *Evangelicals etcetera: Conflict and conviction in the Church of England's parties*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Samuel, S. (2011). Education and religion: Individual, congregational, and cross-level interaction effects on biblical literalism. *Social Science Research*, 40(6), 1478-1493. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2011.05.001
- Smidt, C. (1989). Identifying Evangelical respondents: an analysis of "born-again" and bible questions used across different surveys. In T. Jelen (Ed.), *Religion and Political Behavior in the United States* (pp. 23-43). New York & Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Village, A. (2005a). Assessing belief about the Bible: A study among Anglican laity. *Review of Religious Research*, 46(3), 243-254.
- Village, A. (2005b). Christian belief about the Bible and the Holy Spirit in relation to psychological type. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 16(1), 1-16.
- Village, A. (2005c). Factors shaping biblical literalism: A study among Anglican laity. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 26(1), 29-38. doi: 10.1080/13617670500047566
- Village, A. (2007a). *The Bible and lay people: An empirical approach to ordinary hermeneutics*. Aldershot & Burlington VT: Ashgate.

- Village, A. (2007b). Feeling in and falling out: Sense of belonging and frequency of disagreeing among Anglican congregations. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, 29, 268-288. doi: 10.1163/008467207X188865
- Village, A. (2009). The influence of psychological type preferences on readers trying to imagine themselves in a New Testament healing story *HTS Theologese Studies/Theological Studies* 65 Art. # 162. (1), 6 pages.
- Village, A. (2010a). *English Anglicanism: Individual religious identities in an established church*. Paper presented at the a conference of the International Society for Empirical Research in Theology: 'Religious Identity and National Heritage: Empirical-Theological Perspectives', Rome.
- Village, A. (2010b). Psychological type and biblical interpretation among Anglican clergy in the UK. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 23(2), 179-200. doi: 10.1163/157092510X527349
- Village, A. (2011). Gifts differing? Psychological type among stipendiary and non-stipendiary Anglican clergy. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 230-250.
- Village, A. (in press). The Charismatic imagination: Clergy reading Mark 9: 14-29. *Biblical Interpretation*.
- Village, A. (Submitted for review). Biblical literalism: A test of the compensatory schema hypothesis among Anglicans in England. *Review of Religious Research*.
- Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2005). The relationship of psychological type preferences to biblical interpretation. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 18(1), 74-89. doi: 10.1163/1570925054048929
- Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2010). An anatomy of change: Profiling cohort-difference in beliefs and attitudes among Anglicans in England. *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 8(1), 59-81. doi: 10.1017/S1740355309990027

- Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2011). The visibility of mission agencies in general and USPG in particular among recently ordained Anglican clergy: An empirical enquiry. *Transformation*, 28(2), 129-137. doi: 10.1177/0265378810396299
- Village, A., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2009). Church tradition and psychological type preferences among Anglicans in England. *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 7(1), 93-109. doi: 10.1017/S1740355309000187
- Wilcox, C. (1989). The New Christian Right and the mobilization of the Evangelicals. In T. G. Jelen (Ed.), *Religion and political behavior in the United States* (pp. 139-156). New York & Wesport, CT: Praeger.
- Wilcox, C. (1992). *God's warriors: The Christian Right in twentieth-century America*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Zigerell, L. J. Science knowledge and biblical literalism. *Public Understanding of Science*. doi: 10.1177/0963662510391723