



University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Christopher F. J. Ross and Leslie J. Francis

Article Title: The relationship of intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest religious orientations to Jungian psychological type among churchgoers in England and Wales

Year of publication: 2010

Link to published article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13674670802207462>

Publisher statement: 'This is an electronic version of an article published in Ross, C. F. J. and Francis, L. J. (2010). Francis, L. J. et al. (2010). The relationship of intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest religious orientations to Jungian psychological type among churchgoers in England and Wales *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, Vol. 13(7-8), pp 805-819. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* is available online at:

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a930548248~db=all~jumptype=rss>

Running head: Religious orientation and psychological type

The relationship of intrinsic, extrinsic and quest religious orientations to
Jungian psychological type among churchgoers in England and Wales

Dr Christopher F. J. Ross

Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada

and

The Revd Canon Professor Leslie J. Francis*

University of Warwick, UK

* Corresponding author. Tel: 024 7652 2539

e-mail: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

st\c\articles\cr\quest orientation

C:\Users\Leslie\Desktop\SusanThomas\Articles\Ross_CFJ\quest orientations APA.doc 19/01/2011

Abstract

Employing the New Indices of Religious Orientation (NIRO), this study examines the theory that different religious orientations are related to individual differences in psychological type as developed by Carl Jung and operationalised by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). Data provided by 481 weekly churchgoing Christians who completed the MBTI and the NIRO demonstrated that quest religious orientation scores were higher among intuitives than among sensors, but were unrelated to introversion and extraversion, thinking and feeling, or judging and perceiving; that intrinsic religious orientation scores were higher among extraverts than introverts, higher among sensors than intuitives and higher among feelers than thinkers, but unrelated to judging and perceiving; and that extrinsic religious orientation scores were unrelated to any of the four components of psychological type. The findings relating to Jungian psychological type differences are applied in order to elucidate the psychological significance of extrinsic, intrinsic and quest orientations to religion.

The relationship of intrinsic, extrinsic and quest religious orientations to Jungian psychological type among churchgoers in England and Wales

The social scientific study of religion is a highly complex activity presenting challenges to exact conceptualisation and to precise measurement. Three methodological stages seem required for scales and instruments to become useful in empirical studies of religion. The first stage concerns *identifying* the various aspects of religiosity. The second stage concerns *specifying* the dimensions of these aspects. The third stage concerns establishing the empirical correlation of these aspects and *clarifying* the operational form of the construct. The first stage might distinguish, for example, between the two aspects of religious belief and religious practice. While belief and practice are likely to go hand in hand, it is neither conceptually nor empirically inevitable that they should do so. An individual might believe in the Christian God, but never attend church. The second stage might distinguish, for example, between different dimensions of practice, say the private practice of personal prayer and the public practice of church attendance. The third stage might explore, for example, whether individual differences in personal prayer and public church attendance are related in the same way or in different ways to specified personality factors, say introversion and extraversion.

It is against this kind of background that the notion of religious orientation was introduced to the social scientific study of religion by the pioneering work of Gordon Allport (Allport, 1966; Allport & Ross, 1967). In the subsequent decades, the notion of religious orientation played an important part in empirically-based research, but the notion also became problematic. In their influential review of the notion of religious orientation, Kirkpatrick and Hood (1990) question whether this has in fact been the “boon or bane” in the psychology of religion. In many ways the jury may still be out in formulating a verdict.

The main problem with research using the notion of religious orientation has been the failure to delineate clearly the aspect of religion being assessed. Compared with measures of religious belief, religious practice, or attitude toward religion, all of which may *distinguish between who is religious and who is not religious*, the notion of religious orientations and their measurement is of a different conceptual order and salience. The methodological implications have only been recently recognised (Francis, 2007). The notion of religious orientation is concerned with distinguishing between different *ways in which the religious may express their religiosity*. Once this is understood, the notion of religious orientation may become highly useful in empirically-based research.

In his pioneering work, Allport distinguished between two religious orientations which he characterised as intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity. According to Allport (1966, p. 454) the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity separated “churchgoers whose communal type of membership supports and serves other, non religious ends, from those for whom religion is an end in itself - a final, not instrumental good.” Allport (1966, p. 455) proceeded to argue as follows about the nature of extrinsic orientation.

While there are several varieties of extrinsic religious orientation, we may say they all point to a type of religion that is strictly utilitarian: useful for the self in granting safety, social standing, solace, and endorsement for one’s chosen way of life.

Regarding the nature of intrinsic orientation, Allport (1966, p. 455) made the following case.

The intrinsic form of the religious sentiment regards faith as a supreme value in its own right A religious sentiment of this sort floods the whole life with motivations and meaning. Religion is no longer limited to single segments of self-interest.

Allport and Ross (1967) proposed two scales to measure their dimensions of intrinsic and extrinsic orientation. The intrinsic measure contained nine items, the first two of which

were: “It is important for me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation”; “If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church”. The extrinsic measure contained eleven items, the first two of which were: “Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in my life”; “It doesn’t matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life”.

Critiquing Allport’s model of religious orientation, Batson (1976) and Batson and Ventis (1982) argued the case for a third dimension alongside the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations, which they styled the quest orientation. The quest orientation gave recognition to a form of religiosity which embraces characteristics of complexity, doubt, tentativeness, and honesty in facing existential questions. Batson and Ventis (1982, p.150) provided the following description of the quest orientation.

An individual who approaches religion in this way recognizes that he or she does not know, and probably never will know, the final truth about such matters. But still the questions are deemed important, and, however tentative and subject to change, answers are sought. There may not be a clear belief in a transcendent reality, but there is a transcendent, religious dimension to the individual’s life.

Batson and Ventis (1982, p. 145) also provided a six-item instrument to measure the quest orientation, which they originally identified by the name “interactional scale”. Two items were: “It might be said that I value my religious doubts and uncertainties”; “Questions are far more central to my religious experience than are answers”. Subsequently Batson and Schoenrade (1991a, 1991b) developed a longer twelve-item quest scale.

Although the scales originally developed by Allport and Ross (1967), by Batson and Ventis (1982) and by Batson and Schoenrade (1991a, 1991b) have been used in a large number of studies, Francis (2007) concluded from an extensive review of the literature that there are sufficient conceptual and empirical problems with these instruments to warrant

developing a new set of scales. In furtherance of the first two steps of the three-stage methodology advocated at the outset (clear *identification* of aspects of religiosity and *specification* of the dimensions of these aspects) Francis (2007) proposed the New Indices of Religious Orientation (NIRO).

The NIRO defines the three constructs of extrinsic, intrinsic and quest religious orientation by giving equal weight to the three conceptual components identified within each construct by Batson and Schoenrade (1991b). The three components of quest orientation are: readiness to face existential questions without reducing their complexity; self-criticism and perception of religious doubt as positive; openness to change. The three conceptual components of extrinsic orientation are: compartmentalisation, or the separation of religion from the rest of life; social support, or the use of religion to achieve social ends; personal support, or the use of religion to gain personal comfort. The three conceptual components of intrinsic orientation are: integration, or the close relationship between religion and the rest of life; public religion, or the importance given to church for religious ends; personal religion, or the importance given to personal prayer and reading for religious ends. Drawing on these definitions, the NIRO re-operationalised the three orientations in terms of nine-item scales, each of which gives equal balance to the three constituent component parts identified within that construct. Care was taken to formulate the items in clear, direct, and accessible language. In respect of each scale, the three components cohere to produce high alpha coefficients. The scales possess good internal consistency reliability (Francis, 2007).

Regarding stage three of the three-stage methodology (scale and variable *clarification*) one powerful way of clarifying the psychological significance of the differences between the three religious orientations as operationalised by the NIRO may be through an examination of the relationships between these scales and recognised models of personality. For example, Francis (in press) examined the relationship between the NIRO indices of extrinsic, intrinsic

and quest religiosity and the three major dimensions of personality proposed by the short-form Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck, Eysenck, & Barrett, 1985) among a sample of 517 first-year undergraduate students. Eysenck's model maintains that individual differences in personality can be most adequately and most economically summarised in terms of three orthogonal dimensions of extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism. The data from this study demonstrated that intrinsic religious orientation was associated with low psychoticism scores, but independent of extraversion scores and neuroticism scores; that extrinsic religious orientation was associated with low psychoticism scores and high neuroticism scores, but independent of extraversion scores; and that quest religious orientation was associated with high neuroticism scores and low extraversion scores, but independent of psychoticism scores. These data clearly supported the view that the three religious orientations relate to personality in somewhat different ways.

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to examine the relationship between the NIRO indices of religious orientation and the model of personality proposed by Jung (1971) and developed by instruments like the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978) and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). This Jungian-based model of psychological type is concerned with classifying individuals within discrete categories rather than locating individuals on a set of continua. Type indicators distinguish between four bipolar constructs: two orientations (introversion and extraversion), two perceiving processes (sensing and intuition), two judging processes (thinking and feeling), and two attitudes toward the outerworld (judging and perceiving).

The two orientations are concerned with where energy is drawn from and focused. On the one hand, extraverts (E) are orientated toward the outer world; they are energised by the events and people around them. They enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and

exciting environments. They tend to focus their attention upon what is happening outside themselves. On the other hand, introverts (I) are orientated toward their inner world; they are energised by their inner ideas and concepts. They enjoy solitude, silence, and contemplation, as they tend to focus their attention on what is happening in their inner life. They may prefer to have a small circle of intimate friends rather than many acquaintances.

The two perceiving functions are concerned with the way in which people attend to and perceive information. On the one hand, sensing types (S) attend to specific details and *content*, focusing on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. Sensors attend to what is, tending to be down to earth and oriented to practical matters. On the other hand, intuitive types (N) attend to patterns and context, focusing on the possibilities of a situation. They may feel that perception by the senses is not as valuable as information gained from the unconscious mind as indirect associations and concepts impact their perception. They focus on the overall picture, rather than on specific facts and data.

The two judging functions are concerned with the criteria which people employ to make decisions and judgements. On the one hand, thinking types (T) make decisions and judgements based on objective, impersonal logic. They value consistency and justice. They are known for their truthfulness and for their desire for fairness. On the other hand, feeling types (F) make decisions and judgements based on subjective, personal values. They value compassion and mercy. They are known for their tactfulness and for their desire for peace. They are more concerned to promote harmony, than to adhere to abstract principles.

The two attitudes toward the outer world are determined by which of the two processes that is, perceiving (sensing or intuition) or judging (thinking or feeling) is preferred in dealings with the outer world. On the one hand, judging types (J) seek to order, rationalise, and structure their outer world, as they actively judge external stimuli. They enjoy routine and established patterns. They prefer to follow schedules in order to reach an established goal

and may make use of lists, timetables, or diaries. They prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once made. On the other hand, perceiving types (P) do not seek to impose order on the outer world, but are more adaptive, perceptive, and open, as they receive external stimuli. They have a flexible, open-ended approach to life. They enjoy change and spontaneity. They prefer to leave projects open in order to adapt and improve them.

According to Jungian theory, each individual needs access to all four functions (sensing, intuition, thinking and feeling) for normal and healthy living. The two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) are needed to gather information about the inner and outer worlds inhabited by the individual. These are the irrational functions concerned with collecting information, with seeing reality and possibility. The two judging functions (thinking and feeling) are needed to organise and evaluate information. These are the rational functions concerned with making decisions, including determining courses of action. Although each individual needs access to all four functions, Jungian theory posits the view that the relative strengths of these four functions vary from one individual to another. The analogy is drawn with handedness. Although equipped with two hands, the majority of individuals prefer one and tend to develop skills with that hand to the neglect of the other hand. Similarly, empirical evidence suggests that individuals will develop preference for one of the perceiving functions (sensing or intuition) and neglect the other, and that they will develop preference for one of the judging functions (thinking or feeling) and neglect the other.

Moreover, according to Jungian theory, for each individual either the preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) or the preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) takes preference over the other, leading to the emergence of one dominant function which shapes the individual's dominant approach to life. Dominant sensing shapes the practical person; dominant intuition shapes the imaginative person; dominant feeling shapes the humane person; and dominant thinking shapes the analytic person. According to Jungian

theory, it is the function opposite to the dominant function which is least well developed in the individual (the inferior function). Thus, the dominant sensor experiences most difficulty with the intuitive function; the dominant intuitive experiences most difficulty with the sensing function; the dominant thinker experiences most difficulty with the feeling function; and the dominant feeler experiences most difficulty with the thinking function.

A sequence of recent studies has established the usefulness of psychological type theory in exploring the relationship between personality and different aspects of religion. One strand of this research has examined the connection between psychological type and attitude toward Christianity (Jones & Francis, 1999; Fearn, Francis, & Wilcox, 2001; Francis, Robbins, Boxer, Lewis, McGuckin, & McDaid, 2003; Francis, Jones, & Craig, 2004). A second strand has examined the connection between psychological type and mystical orientation (Francis & Loudon, 2000; Francis, 2002; Francis, Village, Robbins, & Ineson, 2007). A third strand has examined the connection between psychological type and charismatic experience (Francis & Jones, 1997; Jones, Francis, & Craig, 2005). A fourth strand has examined the connection between psychological type and different styles of believing (Francis & Jones, 1998, 1999a; Village, 2005). Other studies have examined the relationship between psychological type and dogmatism (Ross, Francis, & Craig, 2005), preferred ways of interpreting scripture (Village & Francis, 2005), religious affiliation (Ross & Francis, 2006), Celtic Christianity (Francis, Craig, & Hall, in press), and the experience and appreciation of cathedral visitors (Francis, Williams, Annis, & Robbins, in press).

Little as yet is known, however, about the empirical relationship between psychological type theory and the three dimensions of religious orientation. In an exploratory study Francis and Ross (2000) invited a sample of 64 active adult Catholic churchgoers to complete the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) together with the six-item measure of the quest orientation of religiosity (Batson & Ventis, 1982). These data were

employed to test the following four hypotheses. First, drawing on the discussion advanced by Ross (1992), it was argued that intuitives are intrigued by complexity and are likely to endorse the view that doubt only strengthens faith, whereas sensors are more likely to avoid doubt and questioning. In other words, intuitives might be likely to record higher scores than sensors on the quest scale. Second, it was argued that thinkers are more likely to be stimulated than feelers by the questions and challenges of faith. In other words, thinkers might be likely to record higher scores than feelers on the quest scale. Third, it was argued that judgers are more likely than perceivers to respond to a faith that is settled and decided. Therefore, perceivers were predicted to record higher scores than judgers on the quest scale. Fourth, it was argued that the distinction between introversion and extraversion does not provide a clear theoretical basis for predicting a relationship with the quest orientation of religiosity. In other words, extraverts might be likely to record neither higher scores nor lower scores than introverts on the quest scale. The data, however, found no significant differences in the quest scores recorded by sensors or intuitives, by thinkers or feelers, by judgers or perceivers, and by introverts and extraverts.

There are, however, three significant limitations with the study reported by Francis and Ross (2000). That study reported on only one of the three religious orientations, employed an early and short operationalisation of the quest orientation, and gathered data from only 64 individuals. The present study is able to build on the foundations laid by Francis and Ross (2000) by recruiting a much larger sample and by employing the New Indices of Religious orientation. Following the view that the notion of religious orientation is intended to distinguish between different ways of being religious only among those who are religious (Francis 2007), the sample is restricted to weekly churchgoers in a Christian context.

Method

Sample

Over a period of five years data were provided, in the context of courses operated in England and Wales concerned with personality and spirituality, by 280 male and 201 female Christians who attended church on a weekly basis. Of the total sample, 6% were under the age of 20, 21% were in their twenties, 14% in their thirties, 19% in their forties, 28% in their fifties, 10% in their sixties, and 2% were aged 70 or over. The two largest denomination groups were Anglican (68%) and Pentecostal (20%). Other groups reported were Baptist (5%), Methodist (3%), Catholic (3%) and Presbyterian (1%).

Measures

Psychological type was assessed by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form G (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). The instrument proposes eight scales to measure preference for introversion or extraversion, sensing or intuition, thinking or feeling, and judging or perceiving. Each item requires a response within a forced-choice format. In a critical examination of the scale properties of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form G among adult churchgoers in the United Kingdom, Francis and Jones (1999b) reported the following alpha coefficients; extraversion, .80; introversion, .79; sensing, .87; intuition, .82; thinking, .79; feeling, .72; judging, .85; perceiving, .86.

Religious orientation was assessed by the New Indices of Religious Orientation (Francis, 2007). This instrument proposes three nine-item scales to measure intrinsic religious orientation, extrinsic religious orientation, and quest religious orientation. Each item requires a response on a five-point Likert scale: agree strongly, agree, not certain, disagree, and disagree strongly. In the foundation paper for this instrument, Francis (2007) reported the following alpha coefficients: intrinsic, .91; extrinsic, .84; quest, .85.

Data analysis

The data were analysed by means of the SPSS statistical package using the reliability and breakdown routines.

Results

Table 1 examines the properties of the three scales of the New Indices of Religious

- insert table 1 about here -

Orientation. The data demonstrated that all three scales function with satisfactory levels of internal consistency reliability with alpha coefficients in excess of the threshold of 0.65 proposed by DeVellis (1991).

The data generated by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator demonstrated in the sample a preference for introversion (56%) over extraversion (44%), a preference for sensing (61%) over intuition (39%), a preference for feeling (63%) over thinking (37%), and a preference for judging (73%) over perceiving (27%). The most frequently represented psychological types in the sample were ISFJ (17%), ESFJ (13%) and ISTJ (12%). In terms of dominant function, 34% reported sensing, 29% feeling, 22% intuition, and 16% thinking.

Table 2 shows the means scores on the quest, intrinsic, and extrinsic scales of religious

- insert tables 2 and 3 about here -

orientation as measured by the NIRO for the four basic preferences sets of the MBTI. Table 3 shows the mean scores on NIRO intrinsic, extrinsic and quest scales of religious orientation for each of 16 discrete personality types, together with the rank order of these means within each religious orientation scale. Both tables will be examined as each of these three religious orientations are discussed in turn.

First, according to table 2, quest religious orientation is associated with preferences for intuition ($F= 41.7, p< .001$). All eight Jungian types with an intuitive preference were above

the median for quest, with all eight Jungian types with a sensing preference ranking below the median. Table 3 suggests that higher scores on the quest scale may be especially associated with introverted intuition, inasmuch as three of the four particular types with introverted intuition, as based on Jungian type theory, occupied the three top ranks in terms of mean quest scale scores: the two introverted dominant intuitive types, the INTJ with auxiliary extraverted thinking and INFJ with auxiliary extraverted feeling, and also the ENTJ, the extraverted thinking dominant type with auxiliary introverted intuition. Thus a quest orientation toward religion may be particularly associated with the exercise of introverted intuition.

Second, according to table 2, intrinsic religious orientation is associated with a preference for feeling ($F= 9.8, p<.01$), and with significant though less strong relationships with sensing ($F= 3.8, p<.05$) and with extraversion ($F= 5.0, p<.05$). In table 3 the association between a feeling preference and higher intrinsic scores is reflected also in the rank order of the 16 Jungian personality types with all of the eight feeling types ranked above the median, except for the introverted feeling type with extraverted intuition (INFP). The extraverted thinking type with auxiliary sensing, the ESTJ, was the only thinking type ranked above the median regarding intrinsic religiosity. The ESTJ group is of interest also because ESTJs tend to score *high* on intrinsic religiosity (ranking third out of sixteen personality) but *low* on quest religiosity (ranked sixteenth), which is in direct contrast to the two types with extraverted thinking combined with intuition: ENTJs ranking sixteenth, and INTJs ranking thirteenth, score *low* on intrinsic orientation to religion, and *high* on a quest orientation to religious ranking third and first respectively.

Clear contrasts in the mean scores of different religious orientations within a specific Jungian type as noted above, and between specific Jungian types based on combined function preferences - for example thinking combined with intuition, in contrast to thinking combined with feeling (table 3) - validates the Jungian approach to the interpretation of the Myers

Briggs Type Indicator that includes analysis of the effects of *combined* preferences, in addition to the more traditional psychometric approach of dimensional personality factors (McCrea and Costa, 1989). Moreover with specific regard to Jungian personality type and religious orientation, between the two kinds extraverted thinking types - those with auxiliary introverted intuition (ENTJs) and those with auxiliary introverted sensing (ESTJs) - there is a marked contrast with regard to the two religious orientations. The fact that ENTJs score high on quest religiosity (with its concern for existential striving and acceptance of doubt) and low on intrinsic religiosity (with its concern for devout religious practice) may explain the low frequency of this group among church attenders (Ross, 2008). In contrast, ESTJs who are high on intrinsic religion are more numerous in Christian churches (Francis, Butler, Jones, & Craig, 2007; Ross, 1995).

Third, there were no statistically significant relationships between extrinsic religious orientation and any of the Jungian personality preferences and type.

Discussion

The association between quest religious orientation and intuition is understandable in view of the conceptualisation of quest scores as a measure of a religious orientation where doubt along with self-criticism is accepted and in view of the findings of Francis and Jones (1999a) that intuitives were more comfortable with doubt in a religious context compared with sensing types. While the direction of causality has not been demonstrated empirically in the present study, Jungian conceptualisations of intuition as a cognitive function that cognises “wholes”, patterns, and contexts would suggest that doubts about a particular religious issue would be cognised and “held” in a wider context, and be accepted as a natural and even inevitable element of religious life. Furthermore, Ross, Weiss, and Jackson (1996) also found intuitive types more open than sensing types to change in a religious context. Such openness

to change characterises a quest orientation to religion (Batson 1976; Batson & Ventis, 1982). Moreover, openness to change is one of the three defining features of quest as operationalised by the New Indices of Religious Orientation used in the present study. It is also likely that intuitives may be more open to the second defining feature of quest religiosity as concerned with the existential character of quest: because intuitives see things in context, including viewing and processing their religious beliefs in the context of their life experience. In fact the item with the highest factor loading in the study reported by Francis (2007) was, “My life experiences have led me to rethink my religious beliefs”.

The association between quest religious orientation and *introverted* intuition in particular is in keeping with descriptions of both constructs. Type development theorist and clinical psychologist, Naomi Quenk (1993) describes those with dominant introverted intuition in *Besides Ourselves: Our Hidden personality in everyday life* in this way:

Introverted intuitives are the most intellectually independent of the types They are . . . adept at honing in on the essential meaning of complex confusing situations. The spiritual, sometimes mystical bent of introverted intuitives has been frequently noticed. At the very least, they seem to be aware of subtle cues or nuances long before others notice them. (p. 158).

Hirsh and Kise (1998) in *Soul types: Finding the spiritual path that is right for you* discuss the development of introverted intuition in terms of “concentrating on what is unseen, inexplicable and mystical about spirituality” (p.71). Regarding quest religiosity Batson and Ventis (1982, p. 152) summarises its orientation as “an open ended responsive dialogue with existential questions raised by the contradictions of life”. It would be expected then that those with well developed introverted intuition with its facility to hone in “on the essential meaning of complex confusing situations” (Quenck 1993, p. 158) would be more inclined, if religious, toward an approach to religion that was open to engaging actively with life’s

contradictions.

The association between intuition and quest religious orientation may also shed light on issues surrounding the meaning of the quest scale. While not decisively refuting Donahue's (1985) criticism that the quest scale does not relate to religious variables, the finding of higher quest scores for intuitives, who have also been found to predominate in liberal Christian groups such as Unitarians in the United State of America (Gerhardt, 1983) and Anglicans in Canada (Ross, 1993), does fit a wider pattern of findings in the psychology of religion, and supports Wulff's (1997, p. 242) more sanguine conclusion to his comprehensive review of Quest measures: "Whatever the present conceptual and psychometric shortcomings, these measures are finally creating space in the correlational literature for the liberal religious outlook". Furthermore, significant findings in the present study from a sample that includes older as well as young adults counters the reformulation of quest and intrinsic scales as *only* temporary stages by Hood and Morris (1985), whereby quest is deemed as only a state characteristic of adolescence and of those in their irreligious twenties, and merely preparatory to the later commitments characteristic of intrinsic religiosity.

Intrinsic religious orientation

The relationships that intrinsic religiosity has with three of the four preference sets foundational to Jungian personality typology may reflect the complexity of the what has been measured by the scales of intrinsic religiosity, and may in turn account for the sometimes conflicting findings noted by reviewers of this scale (Kirkpatrick & Hood, 1990; Wulff, 1997).

The association between intrinsic religiosity and a preference for feeling over thinking is in keeping with Francis (in press) finding that intrinsic religiosity is associated with *low*

psychoticism on the Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (psychoticism correlates with tough-mindedness that would be related to a thinking rather than a feeling preference).

Moreover, the intrinsic scale's association with feeling may be attributable to a common concern for relationship and the public expression of religious commitment. In respect of relationship, several items that comprise the intrinsic scale refer to "relationship", either explicitly ("My religious beliefs really shape *the way I treat other people*", "I pray because it deepens my *relationship* with God") or implicitly ("The church is most important to me as a place to share fellowship with other Christians"). In respect of public expression of religious commitment, intrinsic religiosity is clearly concerned with factors such as regular church attendance. By the same token, feeling types have been found to be over-represented among those with a Christian affiliation (Ross & Francis, 2006) and among those who are active members of Christian denominations, including Catholics (Ross, 1995) and Anglicans (Craig, Francis, Bailey, & Robbins, 2003; Francis, Duncan, Craig, & Luffman, 2004; Francis, Robbins, Williams, & Williams, 2007). A preference for feeling has also been associated with higher scores on a measure of mystical experiences (Francis, 2002), using the Francis-Loudon Mysticism Scale (Francis & Loudon, 2000).

The association between intrinsic religiosity and a preference for sensing may be due to a shared concern for attentional "focus". The components of intrinsic religiosity (devout observance of prayer, and church attendance, and spiritual reading) require a life that is focused. The cognitive function of sensing, for its part, is understood in Jungian type theory as a focused concern with content, in contrast to the wider ranging sweep of intuition. Carl Jung indeed maintained that the eye movement patterns of sensors and intuitives differed: the sensing types in *staccato* fashion darts from one intense object of attention to the next and then fixes on that, in contrast to the diffuse "taking in" of a whole scene by an intuitive.

The association between intrinsic religiosity and extraversion may be partly accounted

for by the concern of the intrinsically religious person with public religion and worship which features in three of the nine items of the new scale used in the present study (for example, “The church is most important to me as a place to share fellowship with other Christians”, and “I allow almost nothing to prevent me from going to church on Sundays”).

Extrinsic religious orientation

The lack of association between extrinsic religiosity and Jungian personality type as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator may be an informative finding and help clarify the nature of an extrinsic approach to religion. A number of points are relevant here. Jung’s personality typology is a cognitive theory of personality, according to which individuals develop certain personal characteristics based on how they process information and make judgements. As such, Jung’s typology and its elaboration by Kathleen Myers and Isabel Briggs Myers is both theoretically and empirically unrelated to trauma and psychological maladjustment (Myers & Myers, 1980). The absence of a relationship between these cognitive preferences regarding judging and perceiving and extrinsic religiosity may redirect attention back to the emotional trauma and possibly defensive dynamics that were suggested by the early formulations of Allport (1950) as he attempted to make sense of early findings associating prejudice and early undifferentiated measures of religiosity. Whereas Piedmont (1999), in his study of the five factor measure (the NEO-PI), found no relationship between the four personality scales that map onto Jungian categories of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (McCrae & Costa, 1989) and extrinsic religiosity, he did establish a significant positive relationship between the fifth factor, neuroticism, and an extrinsic religious orientation. The tendency toward compartmentalisation that is an important component of extrinsic religiosity may then be understood as a defensive way to manage the anxiety associated with higher levels of neuroticism. This should be investigated in future research. In

view of the association of extrinsic religiosity with anxiety, it would also be interesting to see if, among individuals selected for high levels of stress, an extrinsic religious orientation then becomes associated with Jungian personality type. Khalsa (1992) found different Jungian types experienced stress in different ways. There are grounds from type theory to predict that among the sensing-judging (SJ) traditionalist temperament (Keirsey & Bates, 1978) with high levels of anxiety, there may be an association with extrinsic religiosity. Furthermore there may be a disposition among sensing judging types toward religious fundamentalism as a way of managing their anxiety. Further research is required.

Conclusion

A number of conclusions may be drawn from the findings of this study. First, there is a relationship between Jungian psychological typology as measured by the MBTI and two of the three best-established and empirically-based dimensions of religious orientation. This offers additional evidence of the salience and utility of the MBTI for the psychological study of religion. Furthermore, the specific relationships that intrinsic and quest religiosity have to Jungian typology may be used to clarify the nature of these orientations that have been the subject of debate. Second, in this regard, the finding of a connection with intuition seems to add validity to quest religiosity as a measure of religious orientation whose dynamism is based on openness to adaptation and as a psychometric of liberal religion in the context of Christian groups. More specifically, a questing approach to religion seems to be more attractive to people with introverted intuition with its propensity for discerning meaning in complex situations. The dynamics of the relationship between these two variables might be further investigated using qualitative methods, with a view to developing hypotheses about the direction of causality and possible intervening variables that could then be tested using quantitative methods. Third, intrinsic religiosity is associated with Jungian type preferences

for feeling rather than thinking, sensing rather than intuition, and judging rather than perceiving. Fourth, extrinsic religiosity seems unrelated to Jungian personality type preferences. Fifth, the fact religious individuals' perceiving preference is related to both quest (intuition) and intrinsic (sensing) scales supports the conclusion of a recent review of empirical Jungian type studies of religion (Ross, 2008), that of the four Jungian preference sets (direction of energy, perceiving process, judging process, external interface) it is the preferred way of perceiving that has the widest range of implications for the domain of religion. Sixth, large-sample replicating studies, particularly those that include measures of anxiety, would allow for more reliable analysis of combined preferences and select comparisons between the sixteen specific Jungian types, and responses to some of the issues raised by this study of personality and religious orientations.

Acknowledgement

The data collection and analyses underpinning this paper were supported by the Jack Shand Research Award of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, awarded to Leslie Francis. The authors acknowledge this support with gratitude.

References

- Allport, G. (1950). *The individual and his religion*. New York: Macmillan.
- Allport, G. W. (1966). Religious context of prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 5, 447-457.
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432-443.
- Batson, C. D. (1976). Religion as prosocial: Agent or double agent? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 15, 29-45.
- Batson, C. D., & Schoenrade, P. A. (1991a). Measuring religion as quest: Reliability concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30, 430-447.
- Batson, C. D., & Schoenrade, P. A. (1991b). Measuring religion as quest: Validity concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30, 416-429.
- Batson, C. D., & Ventis, W. L. (1982). *The religious experience: A social psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Craig, C. L., Francis, L. J., Bailey, J., & Robbins, M. (2003). Psychological types in Church in Wales congregations. *The Psychologist in Wales*, 15, 18-21.
- DeVellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage.
- Donahue, M. J. (1985). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 400-419.
- Eysenck, S. B. G., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 21-29.
- Fearn, M., Francis, L. J., & Wilcox, C. (2001). Attitude toward Christianity and psychological type: A survey among religious studies students. *Pastoral Psychology*, 49, 341-348.
- Francis, L. J. (2002). Psychological type and mystical orientation: Anticipating individual differences within congregational life. *Pastoral Sciences*, 21, 77-93.

- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2007). Introducing the New Indices of Religious Orientation (NIRO): Conceptualisation and measurement. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 10, 585-602.
- Francis, L. J. (in press). Personality and religious orientation: Shifting sands or firm foundations?
- Francis, L. J., Butler, A., Jones, S. H. and Craig, C. L. (2007). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church: A perspective from England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 10, 435-443.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., & Hall, G. (in press). Psychological type and attitude toward Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*.
- Francis, L. J., Duncan, B., Craig, C. L., & Luffman, G. (2004). Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England. *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, 1, 66-77.
- Francis, L. J., & Jones, S.H. (1997). Personality and charismatic experience among adult Christians. *Pastoral Psychology*, 45, 421-428.
- Francis, L. J., & Jones, S. H. (1998). Personality and Christian belief among adult churchgoers. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 47, 5-11.
- Francis, L. J., & Jones, S. H. (1999a). Psychological type and tolerance for religious uncertainty. *Pastoral Psychology*, 47, 253-259.
- Francis, L. J., & Jones, S. H. (1999b). The scale properties of the MBTI Form G (Anglicised) among adult churchgoers. *Pastoral Sciences*, 18, 107-126.
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & Craig, C. L. (2004). Personality and religion: The relationship between psychological type and attitude toward Christianity. *Archiv Für*

Religionspsychologie, 26, 15-33.

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

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Boxer, A., Lewis, C. A., McGuckin, C., & McDaid, C. J. (2003). Psychological type and attitude toward Christianity: A replication. *Psychological Reports*, 92, 89-90.

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Williams, A., & Williams, R. (2007). All types are called, but some are more likely to respond: The psychological profile of rural Anglican churchgoers in Wales, *Rural Theology*, 5, 23-30.

Francis, L. J., & Ross, C. F. J. (2000). Personality type and quest orientation of religiosity. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 55, 22-25.

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.

Francis, L. J., Williams, E., Annis, J., & Robbins, M. (in press). Understanding Cathedral visitors: Psychological type and individual differences in experience and appreciation. *Tourism Analysis*.

Gerhardt, R. (1983). Liberal religion and personality type. *Research in Psychological Type*, 6, 47-53.

Hirsh, S. K., & Kise, J. A. G. (1998). *Soul types: Finding the spiritual path that is right for you*. New York: Hyperion.

Hood, R. W., & Morris, R. J. (1985). Conceptualisation of quest: A critical rejoinder to Batson. *Review of Religious Research*. 26, 391-397.

Jones, S. H., & Francis, L. J. (1999). Personality type and attitude toward Christianity among student churchgoers. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 20, 105-109.

- Jones, S. H., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2005). Charismatic experience and psychological type: An empirical enquiry. *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association, 25*, 39-53.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Khalsa, K. (1992). *The experience of stress by Jungian psychological type*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada.
- Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Hood, R. W. (1990). Intrinsic-extrinsic religious orientation: The boon or bane of contemporary psychology of religion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 29*, 442-462.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1989). Reinterpreting the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator from the perspective of the Five-Factor Model of Personality. *Journal of Personality, 57*, 17- 40.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I. B., & Myers, P. B. (1980). *Gifts differing*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Piedmont, R. L. (1999). Strategies for using the five-factor model of personality in religious research. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 27*, 338-350.
- Quenck, N. (1993). *Besides ourselves: Our hidden personality in everyday life*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologist Press.

- Ross, C. F. J. (1992). The intuitive function and religious orientation. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 37, 83-103.
- Ross, C. F. J. (1993). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican Church: Comparisons with Catholics, evangelicals, and clergy. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 26, 28-36.
- Ross, C. F. J. (1995). Type patterns among Catholics: Four Anglophone congregations compared with Protestants, Francophone Catholics, and priests. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 33, 33-42.
- Ross, C. F. J. (2008). Jungian typology and religion. In D.M. Wulff (Ed.), *Handbook for the psychology of religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (forthcoming).
- Ross, C. F. J., & Francis, L. J. (2006). Psychological type and Christian religious affiliation among female undergraduates in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 66, 69-78.
- Ross, C. F. J., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2005). Dogmatism, religion and psychological type. *Pastoral Psychology*, 53, 483-497.
- Ross, C. F. J., Weiss, D., & Jackson, L. (1996). The relation of Jungian psychological type to religious attitudes and practices. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 6, 263-279.
- Village, A. (2005). Christian belief about the Bible and the Holy Spirit in relation to psychological type. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 16, 1-16.
- Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2005). The relationship of psychological type preferences to biblical interpretation. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 18 (1), 74-89.
- Wulff, D. M. (1997). *Psychology of religion: Classic and contemporary views* (second edition). Rexdale, Ontario: John Wiley.

Table 1 New Indices of Religious Orientation: Scale properties

| orientation | alpha | mean | SD |
|-----------------------|-------|------|-----|
| intrinsic religiosity | 0.72 | 37.1 | 4.6 |
| extrinsic religiosity | 0.67 | 20.3 | 4.7 |
| quest religiosity | 0.81 | 28.7 | 6.8 |

Table 2 Religious orientation scores by psychological type preferences

| | Mean | SD | N | F | P< |
|------------------------------|------|-----|-----|------|------|
| <i>Quest orientation</i> | | | | | |
| Extraversion | 28.3 | 6.8 | 211 | | |
| Introversion | 29.1 | 6.7 | 270 | 1.8 | NS |
| Sensing | 27.2 | 6.6 | 293 | | |
| Intuition | 31.1 | 6.2 | 188 | 41.7 | .001 |
| Thinking | 28.9 | 7.1 | 176 | | |
| Feeling | 28.6 | 6.6 | 305 | 0.2 | NS |
| Judging | 28.6 | 6.8 | 350 | | |
| Perceiving | 29.2 | 6.7 | 131 | 0.8 | NS |
| <i>Intrinsic orientation</i> | | | | | |
| Extraversion | 37.6 | 4.7 | 211 | | |
| Introversion | 36.7 | 4.4 | 270 | 5.0 | .05 |
| Sensing | 37.4 | 4.5 | 293 | | |
| Intuition | 36.6 | 4.6 | 188 | 3.8 | .05 |
| Thinking | 36.2 | 4.4 | 176 | | |
| Feeling | 37.6 | 4.6 | 305 | 9.8 | .01 |
| Judging | 37.0 | 4.6 | 350 | | |
| Perceiving | 37.2 | 4.6 | 131 | 0.6 | NS |
| <i>Extrinsic orientation</i> | | | | | |
| Extraversion | 20.3 | 4.5 | 211 | | |
| Introversion | 20.3 | 5.0 | 270 | 0.0 | NS |
| Sensing | 20.3 | 4.9 | 293 | | |
| Intuition | 20.4 | 4.5 | 188 | 0.3 | NS |
| Thinking | 20.3 | 4.7 | 176 | | |
| Feeling | 20.5 | 4.6 | 305 | 0.0 | NS |
| Judging | 20.3 | 4.7 | 350 | | |
| Perceiving | 20.5 | 4.9 | 131 | 0.2 | NS |

Table 3 Religious orientation scores by the 16 psychological types

| type | N | extrinsic | | | intrinsic | | | quest | | |
|------|----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-------|------|-----|
| | | rank | mean | sd | rank | mean | sd | rank | mean | sd |
| ESTJ | 37 | 5 | 20.8 | 4.1 | 3 | 38.2 | 3.9 | 16 | 25.3 | 7.1 |
| ISTJ | 58 | 11 | 20.0 | 4.9 | 12 | 36.0 | 4.8 | 9 | 28.3 | 6.6 |
| ENTJ | 20 | 3 | 21.1 | 3.9 | 16 | 34.8 | 4.1 | 3 | 32.3 | 5.3 |
| INTJ | 28 | 15 | 19.6 | 4.5 | 13 | 35.5 | 3.3 | 1 | 32.5 | 6.3 |
| ESFJ | 63 | 14 | 19.7 | 4.7 | 4 | 38.1 | 4.3 | 12 | 27.3 | 6.2 |
| ISFJ | 82 | 6 | 20.7 | 5.4 | 7 | 37.2 | 4.5 | 14 | 27.0 | 6.7 |
| ENFJ | 27 | 13 | 19.7 | 4.5 | 2 | 38.6 | 5.7 | 7 | 29.4 | 7.1 |
| INFJ | 35 | 7 | 20.5 | 4.2 | 8 | 36.5 | 4.6 | 1 | 32.5 | 5.0 |
| ESTP | 5 | 1 | 21.8 | 5.8 | 14 | 35.4 | 6.3 | 15 | 26.0 | 8.0 |
| ISTP | 8 | 16 | 18.9 | 2.6 | 15 | 35.0 | 5.3 | 11 | 28.1 | 7.4 |
| ENTP | 8 | 10 | 20.0 | 3.2 | 8 | 36.5 | 3.0 | 4 | 32.3 | 4.2 |
| INTP | 12 | 2 | 21.2 | 5.6 | 10 | 36.4 | 4.8 | 8 | 28.6 | 8.5 |
| ESFP | 18 | 9 | 20.2 | 5.1 | 5 | 37.7 | 4.7 | 13 | 27.1 | 7.5 |
| ISFP | 22 | 8 | 20.5 | 5.4 | 1 | 39.4 | 3.0 | 10 | 28.1 | 6.0 |
| ENFP | 33 | 4 | 21.0 | 4.8 | 6 | 37.4 | 5.5 | 6 | 30.0 | 6.5 |
| INFP | 25 | 12 | 19.9 | 5.1 | 11 | 36.2 | 3.7 | 5 | 30.8 | 6.0 |