

Original citation:

Francis, Leslie J., Fisher, John W. and Annis, Jennie. (2015) Spiritual well-being and psychological type : a study among visitors to a medieval cathedral in Wales. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18 (8). pp. 675-692.

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/81860>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* on 27 November 2015, available online:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.964002>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

Spiritual wellbeing and psychological type: a study among
visitors to a medieval cathedral in Wales

Leslie J. Francis*

University of Warwick, England, UK

John W. Fisher

University of Ballarat, Australia

Jennie Annis

St Mary's Centre, Wales, UK

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Centre for Education Studies

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

This study explores the theoretical and empirical connections between spiritual wellbeing and psychological type by drawing on Fisher's model of spiritual wellbeing as assessed by the Spiritual Health And Life Orientation Measure (SHALOM) and Francis' classification of psychological type as generated by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS). Data provided by 2,339 visitors to St Davids Cathedral in rural west Wales demonstrated that, when the four components of psychological type were considered independently, higher levels of spiritual wellbeing were associated with extraversion rather than introversion, with intuition rather than sensing, with feeling rather than thinking, and with perceiving rather than judging. Further examination of these data suggested that the judging process (distinguishing between the feeling function and the thinking function) was of greatest importance in shaping individual differences in spiritual health.

Key words: psychology, religion, spirituality, spiritual wellbeing, psychological type

Introduction

Spiritual wellbeing

Spiritual wellbeing is an established, but nonetheless contested construct (Hill & Pargament, 2003). Current empirical research has been informed by many different measures of spiritual wellbeing, each of which operationalises a distinctive perspective on this contested construct. The instruments generally reflect the worldview of their authors (Berry, 2005). These range from a traditional theistic view that considers religion as the over-arching concept, which embraces spirituality as one of its expressions (Pargament, 1997; Idler *et al.*, 2003), through views that posit similarities but also differences between the two constructs (King & Benson, 2006), to contemporary views that see religion as one potential expression of spirituality (Polanski, 2002) or contend that it is possible to have spirituality without religion (du Toit, 2006; van Dierendonck, & Mohan, 2006). For example, the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (Hall & Edwards, 1996) and the Spiritual History Scale in Four Dimensions (Hays, Meador, Branch, & George, 2001) mainly comprise questions on transcendental issues and religion. Ellison's Spiritual Well-Being Survey presents ten items for each of two factors, labelled Existential Well-Being and Religious Well-Being (Ellison, 1983) and the Search Institute Inventory of Youth Spiritual Development has 156 items related to self, to others, to the environment, to the transcendent and to religion (Center for Spiritual Development, 2007). Daaleman's Spirituality Index of Well-Being contains 12 items solely relating with self (Daaleman & Frey, 2004). According to Fisher (2009) the composition of 25 extant spiritual health and well-being measures reveals their authors' dominant emphases on relating with self (100%) and with God (72%), with lesser concern for relating with other people (56%) and the environment (44%).

One clear conceptualisation of spiritual wellbeing has been advanced by John W. Fisher (1998, 2011). In this work, spiritual wellbeing is perceived as the lived expression

revealing the underlying state of a person's spiritual health. Spiritual health is posited as a, if not the, fundamental dimension of health which undergirds and integrates the other dimensions of health (namely the physical, mental, emotional, social and vocational).

Spiritual wellbeing is reflected in the quality of relationships that each person has in four domains, namely: with the self (the personal domain, assessed in terms of meaning, purpose and values); with other people (the communal domain, assessed in terms of morality, culture and religion); with the environment (the environmental domain, assessed in terms of connectedness beyond care, nurture and stewardship); and with a (personal or impersonal) Transcendent Other (the transcendental domain, assessed in relation to something or someone beyond the human and natural world).

In his foundation study, Fisher (1998) develops his understanding of these four domains of spiritual wellbeing in the following ways. The personal domain concerns the ways in which individuals relate to and evaluate their inner selves. It is concerned with meaning, purpose and values in life. In the personal domain, the human spirit creates self-awareness, relating to self-worth and identity. The communal domain concerns the quality and depth of inter-personal relationships, between self and others, relating to morality and culture. In the communal domain, the human spirit generates love, justice, hope, and faith in humanity. The environmental domain concerns not only care and nurture for the physical and biological aspects of the world around us, but also a sense of awe and wonder. In the environmental domain, the human spirit nurtures, at least for some, the experience of unity or connectedness with the environment. The transcendental domain concerns the relationship of the self with something or someone beyond the human level, with a transcendent other, whether this be known as ultimate concern, cosmic force, transcendent reality, or God. In the transcendent domain, the human spirit nurtures a sense of trust and faith in, and a sense of adoration and worship for, the source of mystery at the heart of the universe.

Fisher's conceptualisation of spiritual wellbeing has been operationalised through several instruments: the Spiritual Health in Four Domains Index (SH4DI: Fisher, Francis, & Johnson, 2000), the Spiritual Health And Life-Orientation Measure (SHALOM: Fisher, 1999, 2010), and Feeling Good, Living Life (Fisher, 2004). Gomez and Fisher (2003) demonstrated that SHALOM showed good reliability (Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability and variance extracted), and validity (construct, concurrent, discriminant, predictive and factorial independence from personality). Subsequent studies have examined the psychometric properties of SHALOM from a range of perspectives. For example, SHALOM is one of only two spiritual wellbeing questionnaires that have reported item response theory (IRT) analysis on them (Hall, Reise, & Haviland, 2007). There was general support for the psychometric properties of this spiritual wellbeing questionnaire from an IRT perspective (Gomez & Fisher, 2005a). Multi-group confirmatory factor analysis showed the statistical fit results supported the invariance of the measurement model, and of both the measurement and structural models. The results also showed little gender differences. Together, these findings support gender equivalencies for this spiritual wellbeing questionnaire (Gomez & Fisher, 2005b).

A series of studies employing Fisher's instruments has begun to build up a coherent body of knowledge about the correlates, antecedents and consequences of individual differences in spiritual wellbeing. An early study investigated the relationship of spiritual wellbeing to other measures of subjective wellbeing among psychology students at the University of Ballarat (Stott, 2002). Another project with similar students investigated how the domains of spiritual wellbeing predict current quality of life and general wellbeing (Hall, 2005).

The relationship between ethical orientation in decision-making and spiritual wellbeing was examined via a survey of business executives in Australia. Each of the four

domains of spiritual wellbeing in SHALOM was examined in relation to idealism and relativism. Spiritual wellbeing, especially in the communal domain, was shown to be predictive of idealism amongst these executives (Fernando & Chowdhury, 2010).

SHALOM was also used to help assess the impact of an Interim Protection Order on victims of domestic violence in South Africa, in English, Afrikaans and Xhosa (Vogt, 2007). A study amongst adolescents in South Africa reported that a high valuing of religion and spirituality, more frequent church attendance or spiritual activity, and more frequent prayer, all related to higher levels of transcendental spiritual wellbeing. Spiritual salience and more frequent prayer are also related to higher levels of personal spiritual wellbeing and to higher levels of global spiritual health (van Rooyen, 2007). This and the following study also used the Sesotho language. Further study with these adolescents showed that seeking spiritual support for coping was highly correlated with transcendental spiritual wellbeing and moderately so with communal spiritual well-being (Moodley, 2008).

A study with Canadian primary school children found that their personal and communal spiritual wellbeing, as measured by SHALOM, was strongly linked to their happiness, although their religious practices were not. Spirituality remained a significant predictor of happiness even after removing the variance associated with temperament (Holder, Coleman, & Wallace, 2010). Three independent studies were undertaken to show the factorial validity of the German translation of SHALOM (Rowold, 2011). They also showed that each of the four scales on SHALOM was discriminant to mental, physical, and emotional wellbeing. In addition, SHALOM-G predicted levels of subsequent happiness, and was related positively with psychological wellbeing and negatively with stress.

The underlying theme of 'connectedness', or building relationships, undergirds research in spiritual wellbeing and resiliency. Studies were reported with 9- to 19-year-old students in Australia using SHALOM and an instrument to gauge the strength of relationships

(in terms of connectedness) of each student with family, friends, school and/or church, areas which have been shown to provide support for resiliency (Fisher, 2012). How well students connected, especially with themselves and God, was shown to influence their spiritual wellbeing and resilience. The students, who showed marked differences between their ideals and lived experience on SHALOM, reported lower levels of support from themselves, parents, school teachers, principals, female friends and God, in building relationships with self, others, environment and/or God. These students also showed higher levels of psychoticism and lower levels of happiness.

As yet, however, little research has focused specifically on the connection between personality and Fisher's model of spiritual wellbeing. One important pioneering study in this area by Gomez and Fisher (2003) revealed the factorial independence of the spiritual wellbeing domains on SHALOM from the personality domains operationalised in the short-form of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire Revised (EPQR-S: Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991). Another study using Eysenck's dimensional model of personality employed the SH4DI, a precursor of SHALOM, to investigate personal and social correlates of spiritual wellbeing among primary school teachers (Fisher, Francis, & Johnson, 2002). These data demonstrated that higher levels of spiritual health were found among older teachers who recorded low scores on the psychoticism scale and who practised religious faith through church attendance and personal prayer.

Using the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (FFI: Costa & McCrae, 1992) with SHALOM, among employees in the general Australian workforce, Becker (2002) found that neuroticism correlated negatively with personal and communal spiritual wellbeing, whereas extraversion correlated positively with these two as well as with environmental spiritual wellbeing. Openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness correlated positively with the four domains of spiritual wellbeing on SHALOM.

Streukens (2009) used the Clinical Analysis Questionnaire (CAQ: Krug & Cattell, 1980) together with SHALOM to examine what relationship existed between personality and spiritual wellbeing among alcoholics in Canada. This study concluded that neuroticism correlated negatively with all four domains of spiritual wellbeing, whereas extraversion correlated positively with all four. Psychoticism was shown to correlate negatively with only communal and environmental spiritual wellbeing.

The aim of the present study is to build on the earlier work reported by Becker (2002) using the NEO Five-Factor Inventory, by Fisher, Francis, and Johnson (2002) and Gomez and Fisher (2003) using the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised, and by Streukens (2009) using the Clinical Analysis Questionnaire, and to do so by drawing on the model of personality proposed by psychological type theory. In this way the present study proposes to link research on Fisher's model of spiritual wellbeing with a broader and growing body of research exploring the connection between psychological type and spirituality (see review by Francis, 2009).

Psychological type

Like spiritual wellbeing, psychological type is an established, but nonetheless contested construct. Psychological type theory has its roots in the pioneering work of Carl Jung (1971). Subsequently Jung's theory has been developed and extended in association with a series of psychometric instruments, including the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). Psychological type theory is contested because it conceives of individual differences in personality in terms of discrete type categories, in contrast with the way in which other personality theories conceive of individual differences in terms of location on continua. It is continua, not typology, that characterise the 16 personality factors proposed by Cattell, Cattell, and Cattell (1993), the big five factors

proposed by Costa and McCrae (1985), and the three major dimensions proposed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1991).

It is this attachment to typology that makes psychological type theory so distinctive in the field of personality assessment. The core of psychological type theory distinguishes between two fundamental psychological processes, styled the perceiving process and the judging process. Both processes are experienced in two opposing functions.

The perceiving process was styled by Jung as the irrational process, since it is concerned wholly with the gathering of information and not with the evaluation of that information. The two opposing functions of the perceiving process are known as sensing and as intuition. On the one hand, sensing types (S) focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They tend to focus on specific details, rather than on the overall picture. They are concerned with the actual, the real, and the practical; they tend to be down to earth and matter of fact. On the other hand, intuitive types (N) focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. They may feel that perception by the senses is not as valuable as information gained from the unconscious mind as indirect associations and concepts impact on their perception. They focus on the overall picture, rather than on specific facts and data.

The judging process was styled by Jung as the rational process, since it is concerned wholly with the evaluation of information. The two opposing functions of the judging process are known as thinking and as feeling. On the one hand, thinking types (T) make decisions and judgements based on objective, impersonal logic. They value integrity and justice. They are known for their truthfulness and for their desire for fairness. They consider conforming to principles to be of more importance than cultivating harmony. For thinkers impersonal objectivity is more important than interpersonal relationships. For them the mind is more important than the heart. 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. For feelers interpersonal relationships are more important than impersonal objectivity. For them the heart is more important than the mind.

In psychological type theory these two fundamental psychological processes (perceiving and judging) are situated within the context of two opposing orientations and two opposing attitudes. The orientations are concerned with identifying the source and focus of psychological energy, and distinguish between introversion and extraversion. 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 on what is happening outside themselves. They are usually open people, easy to get to know, and enjoy having many friends. Introverts (I), on the other hand, 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 attitudes, better styled as the 'attitudes toward the outer world', are concerned with identifying which psychological process (perceiving or judging) is exercised in the outer world. On the one hand, judging types (J) exercise their preferred judging function (either thinking or feeling) in the outer world. They 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 tend to be punctual, organised, and tidy. They prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once made. On the other hand, perceiving types (P) exercise their preferred perceiving function (either sensing or intuition)

in the outer world. They do not seek to impose order on the outer world, but are more reflective, perceptive, and open, as they passively perceive external stimuli. They have a flexible, open-ended approach to life. They enjoy change and spontaneity. They prefer to leave projects open in order to adapt and improve them. Their behaviour may often seem impulsive and unplanned.

These four constructs provide the building blocks of psychological type theory, distinguishing between two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), two judging functions (thinking and feeling), two orientations (introversion and extraversion), and two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving). The first research question to be raised by the present study concerns the connection between these four constructs, considered separately, and spiritual wellbeing.

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 and 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.

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. The definitions of these four dominant types pose the second research question addressed by the present study. This question concerns the connection between dominant type preferences and spiritual wellbeing.

According to Jungian theory, for each individual the dominant type preference is complemented and supported by the auxiliary function. The auxiliary function is defined as the preferred function from the other process. The dominant sensing types and dominant intuitive types are supported by auxiliary thinking or by auxiliary feeling; dominant feeling types and dominant thinking types are supported by auxiliary sensing or by auxiliary intuition. It is the auxiliary function that adds depth, tone and perspective to the dominant function. The third research question to be raised by the present study concerns the connection between spiritual wellbeing and the eight-fold typology proposed by the dominant and auxiliary pairs.

The four basic building blocks of psychological type theory (the two perceiving functions, the two judging functions, the two orientations, and the two attitudes) are employed to construct the four dominant types and the eight dominant and auxiliary pairs. The full richness of psychological type theory is achieved in the definition of the 16 complete types. The fourth research question to be raised by the present study concerns the connection between spiritual wellbeing and the 16 complete types.

Psychological type and spiritual wellbeing

Hypotheses regarding the link between psychological type and spiritual wellbeing can be guided by two existing bodies of knowledge shaped by previous research exploring the connection between psychological type and spirituality and the connection between psychological type and wellbeing. Currently less is known about the connection between psychological type and wellbeing than is known about the connection between psychological type and spirituality.

Two main and relevant strands of research within the psychology of religion have investigated the connection between psychological type and spirituality. The first strand has explored the connection between psychological type and the profile of individuals attracted to the Christian Church, either as members of congregations or as clergy. For example, the psychological type profiles of church congregations and church members have been explored in studies in North America by Gerhardt (1983), Delis-Bulhøes (1990), Ross (1993, 1995), and Rehak (1998), in Australia by Robbins and Francis (2011, 2012), and in the UK by Craig, Francis, Bailey, and Robbins (2003), Francis, Duncan, Craig, and Luffman (2004), Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007), and Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2011). The general consensus of these findings is that, compared with the general population norms, a higher proportion of feeling types are attracted to church participation in comparison with thinking types.

The psychological type profiles of clergy have been explored in studies in North America by Cabral (1984), Harbaugh (1984), Holsworth (1984), Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault, and Avis (1988), Francis, Robbins, and Wulff (2011), and Burns, Francis, Village, and Robbins (2013), in Australia by Francis, Powell, and Robbins (2012), and in the UK by Francis, Payne, and Jones (2001), Francis and Robbins (2002), Craig, Duncan, and Francis (2006), Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007), Francis, Gubb, and Robbins (2009), Francis, Hancocks, Swift, and Robbins (2009), Burton, Francis, and Robbins (2010),

Francis, Littler, and Robbins (2010), Francis, Robbins, Duncan, and Whinney (2010), Village (2011), Francis and Holmes (2011), and Francis and Village (2012). The general consensus of the findings from these studies is that, compared with the general population norms, among male clergy in particular, higher proportions of feeling types are attracted to the clerical profession in comparison with thinking types.

On the basis of this strand of research, if spiritual wellbeing follows the same trajectory as attraction to church membership or religious vocation, the hypothesis can be advanced that feeling types will record higher levels of spiritual wellbeing compared with thinking types.

The second strand of relevant research within the psychology of religion has explored the connection between psychological type and spiritual experience, with special reference to mystical experience. Studies employing either the Mystical Orientation Scale (Francis & Louden, 2000a), or the Short Index of Mystical Orientation (Francis & Louden, 2004) alongside measures of psychological type have been reported by Francis and Louden (2000b), Francis (2002), Francis, Village, Robbins, and Ineson (2007), Francis, Robbins, and Cargas (2012), and Francis, Littler, and Robbins (2012). Testing a thesis first developed by Ross (1992) regarding the centrality of the perceiving process (the sensing function and the intuitive function) in shaping individual differences in religious experience, expression and belief, the general consensus of the findings from these studies, is that, intuitive types record higher scores of mystical orientation in comparison with sensing types.

On the basis of this strand of research, if spiritual wellbeing follows the same trajectory as spiritual or mystical experience, the hypothesis can be advanced that intuitive types will record higher levels of spiritual wellbeing compared with sensing types.

Two main and relevant strands of research within positive psychology have investigated the connection between psychological type and aspects of wellbeing. The first

strand has explored the connection between psychological type and general happiness. For example, Francis and Jones (2000) reported on the responses of 284 adults who had completed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), and the Oxford Happiness Inventory (Argle, Martin, and Crossland, 1989). These data found that extraverts recorded significantly higher happiness scores than introverts. On the other hand, happiness scores were unrelated to preferences for sensing or intuition, for thinking or feeling, or for judging or perceiving.

The second strand of relevant research within positive psychology has explored the connection between psychological type and work-related positive psychological health. For example, a series of five studies by Francis, Wulff, and Robbins (2008), Francis, Robbins, Kaldor, and Castle (2009), Robbins and Francis (2010), Brewster, Francis, and Robbins (2011), and Robbins, Francis, and Powell (2012) administered the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005) alongside the Satisfaction in Ministry Scale (Francis, Kaldor, Shevlin, & Lewis, 2004) to samples of clergy in Australia, the UK and the USA. All five of these studies have agreed that the distinction between introversion and extraversion functions as a stable predictor of individual differences in work-related psychological health.

On the basis of these two strands of research, if spiritual wellbeing functions in the same way as psychological wellbeing, the hypothesis can be advanced that extraverts will record higher levels of spiritual wellbeing compared with introverts.

Research question

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to explore the association between psychological type (employing the Francis Psychological Type Scales) and spiritual wellbeing (employing the Fisher measure of spiritual health) among a broad sample of adults (aged 18-years or above) who were invited to complete both measures during their visit to St Davids Cathedral in west Wales. Cathedral visitors provided an appropriate constituency

among whom to test the association between psychological type and spiritual health for two reasons. Previous research among visitors to the cathedral reported by Williams, Francis, Robbins, and Annis (2007) has demonstrated that this constituency comprises a good mix of religious pilgrims and secular tourists. Many of these visitors come as holiday-makers and are well-disposed to being invited to participate in research on spirituality-related issues.

The review of relevant related research has advanced three specific hypotheses concerning the connection between psychological type and spiritual wellbeing:

- in terms of orientations, it is hypothesised that extraverts will record higher scores of spiritual wellbeing in comparison with introverts;
- in terms of the perceiving process, it is hypothesised that intuitive types will record higher scores of spiritual wellbeing in comparison with sensing types;
- in terms of the judging process, it is hypothesised that feeling types will record higher scores of spiritual wellbeing in comparison with thinking types.

There is no evidence from relevant related research to link individual differences in spiritual wellbeing with attitudes toward the outer world. The fourth hypothesis is therefore:

- in terms of the attitudes toward the outer world, it is hypothesised that there will be no significant difference between judging types and perceiving types on scores of spiritual wellbeing.

Method

During July, August and September 2006 one member of the research team invited visitors to St Davids Cathedral who were at least 18 years of age to complete a copy of the questionnaire. A total of 2,697 visitors accepted the invitation to do so and returned the questionnaire completed. The researcher first welcomed the visitors when they entered the cathedral by the west door and ensured that they received the visitor information leaflet about the cathedral. Then as the visitors were about to leave the building they were invited to

complete a questionnaire reflecting on their visit. Visitors were assured of confidentiality, anonymity and the voluntary nature of their participation. Completed questionnaires were left in the cathedral.

Participants

Of the 2,697 questionnaires returned, 2,339 were suitable for analysis in the present study. The remaining 358 were excluded because of missing data. The 2,339 participants comprised 1,026 men and 1,313 women; 359 individuals under the age of twenty, 214 in their twenties, 263 in their thirties, 497 in their forties, 529 in their fifties, 352 in their sixties, and 125 aged seventy or over. The majority of the visitors had travelled over 20 miles to visit St Davids Cathedral (94%), although comparatively few of these had travelled from overseas. The majority of the visitors identified their religious affiliation as Christian (76%), with most of the others claiming no religious affiliation (21%), leaving only 3% of the visitors affiliated with other religions. In terms of religious practice, St Davids Cathedral attracted almost equal proportions of weekly churchgoers (23%) and of people who never attended church (24%), with 9% attending at least monthly, 10% at least six times a year, 34% attending less than six times a year, and 1% declining to answer the question.

Measures

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). This instrument proposes four ten-item scales designed to distinguish preferences between introversion and extraversion, sensing and intuition, feeling and thinking, and judging and perceiving. Recent studies have reported good qualities of internal consistency reliability for these scales. For example, Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported the following alpha coefficients: .83 for the extraversion and introversion scales; .76 for the sensing and intuition scales; .73 for the thinking and feeling scales; and .79 for the judging and perceiving scales. The participants were asked to choose between each of the 40 pairs of

characteristics ‘which is closer to the real you, even if you feel both characteristics apply to you. Tick the characteristic that reflects the real you, even if other people see you differently’.

Spiritual wellbeing was assessed by the Spiritual Health And Life-Orientation Measure (SHALOM: Fisher, 1999, 2010). This instrument comprises four five-item scales designed to assess the quality of relationships reflecting a person’s spiritual well-being in four domains: the personal domain (relationship with self), the communal domain (relationship with others), the environmental domain (relationship with the natural world), and the transcendental domain (relationship with transcendent matters of ultimate concern or with God). The four domains of SHALOM have also been shown to cohere into a single higher-order factor, called spiritual well-being (Gomez & Fisher, 2003). The participants were asked to rate on a five-point scale, from low (1) to high (5), how much in their ‘normal day to day life’ they experience each of the 20 issues itemised in the measure.

Analysis

The scientific literature concerned with psychological type has developed a highly distinctive way of presenting type data in the form of ‘type tables’. This convention has been adopted in the current study, in order to integrate these new data within the established literature and to provide all the detail necessary for secondary analysis and further interpretation.

Results and discussion

The four scales of the Francis Psychological Type Scales achieved satisfactory consistency reliabilities in terms of the alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951): extraversion and introversion, .75; sensing and intuition, .64; thinking and feeling, .60; judging and perceiving, .70.

- insert table 1 about here -

Table 1 presents the type profile of the 2,339 visitors to St Davids Cathedral. These data show that among the visitors there were preferences for introversion (58%) over extraversion (42%), for sensing (72%) over intuition (28%), for thinking (54%) over feeling (46%), and for judging (82%) over perceiving (18%). Considering these indicators together, four of the 16 Jungian complete types accounted for almost two-thirds of the visitors (63%): ISTJ (24%), ISFJ (15%), ESTJ (13%) and ESFJ (11%). In terms of dominant types, dominant sensing accounted for 43% of the visitors, dominant thinking for 21%, dominant feeling for 20% and dominant intuition for 16%.

- insert table 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the mean scores recorded on the measure of spiritual wellbeing according to the four component parts of psychological type theory. The data are consistent with the first three hypotheses proposed by the present study: extraverts recorded significantly higher scores of spiritual wellbeing compared with introverts; intuitive types recorded significantly higher scores of spiritual wellbeing compared with sensing types; and feeling types recorded significantly higher scores of spiritual wellbeing compared with thinking types. At the same time, these data question the fourth hypothesis, namely that the attitudes toward the outer world were not related to individual differences in spiritual wellbeing; perceiving types recorded significantly higher scores of spiritual wellbeing compared with judging types.

- insert table 3 about here -

Table 3 takes the analysis one stage further by analysing spiritual wellbeing scores by dominant type preference. The highest level of spiritual wellbeing is reported by dominant feeling types, followed by dominant intuitive types, with lower levels of spiritual wellbeing reported by dominant thinking types and dominant sensing types.

- insert table 4 about here -

Table 4 examines the additional insights generated when the auxiliary function is taken into account alongside the dominant function. This analysis makes clear the primary role of the judging process (distinguishing between thinking and feeling) in shaping individual differences in spiritual wellbeing. The four highest scoring dominant-auxiliary pairs all involve the preference for feeling, either as the dominant function or as the auxiliary function. The four lowest scoring dominant-auxiliary pairs all involve the preference for thinking, either as the dominant function or as the auxiliary function.

- insert table 5 about here -

Table 5 completes the analysis by examining the association between spiritual wellbeing and the 16 complete types. These data confirm the centrality of the judging process (distinguishing between thinking and feeling) in shaping individual differences in spiritual wellbeing. The eight highest scoring psychological types all prefer feeling, while the eight lowest scoring psychological types all prefer thinking. After the judging process has been taken into account, the other components of type theory occupy no consistent location within the rank ordering the mean scores of spiritual wellbeing. Among the four highest scoring psychological types there were two sensing types (ISFP and ESFJ) and two intuitive types (INFJ and INFP); and among the four lowest scoring psychological types there were two sensing types (ESTP and ISTJ) and two intuitive types (INTP and INTJ). Among the four highest scoring psychological types there were two judging types (INFJ and ESJF) and two perceiving types (ISFP and INFP); and among the four lowest scoring psychological types there were two judging types (INTJ and ISTJ) and two perceiving types (INTP and ESTP). Among the four highest scoring psychological types there were three introverted types (INFJ, ISFP, and INFP) and one extraverted type (ESFJ); and among the four lowest scoring psychological types there were three introverted types (INTP, INTJ and ISTJ) and one extraverted type (ESTP).

Table 5 draws attention to INFJ as the psychological type that records the highest level of spiritual wellbeing. Myers (1998, p. 7) describes the INFJ in the following terms

Succeed by perseverance, originality and desire to do whatever is needed or wanted. Put their best efforts into their work. Quietly forceful, conscientious, concerned for others. Respected for their firm principles. Likely to be honoured and followed for their clear visions as to how to serve the common good.

Table 5 draws attention to ISTJ as the psychological type that records the lowest level of spiritual wellbeing. Myers (1998, p. 7) describes the ISTJ in the following terms

Serious, quiet, earn success by concentration and thoroughness. Practical, orderly, matter-of-fact, logical realistic and dependable. See to it that everything is well organised. Take responsibility. Make up their own minds about what should be accomplished and work towards it steadily, regardless of protests or distractions.

Conclusion

This paper set out to draw together two well-established research traditions, one concerned with the definition and measurement of spiritual wellbeing and one concerned with the definition and classification of psychological types, in order to assess whether psychological type theory can help to explain individual differences in spiritual wellbeing. In order to explore this research question data were gathered from 2,339 visitors to St Davids Cathedral in west Wales who completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS) alongside Fisher's measure of spiritual wellbeing (SHALOM). The data were analysed through four distinctive levels offered by psychological type theory, drawing on: the four preferences (defined by the two orientation, the two perceiving functions, the two judging functions, and the two attitudes), each considered separately; the four dominant type preferences (dominant sensing, dominant intuition, dominant thinking and dominant feeling),

considered together; the eight dominant-auxiliary pairs; and the sixteen complete types. Five main conclusions emerge from these analyses.

First, considered independently, the two orientations have a part to play in shaping spiritual wellbeing. Extraverts enjoy a higher level of spiritual wellbeing than introverts. This finding is consistent with the broader research tradition reviewed in the introduction to this paper that found higher levels of psychological wellbeing among extraverts than among introverts, as defined in terms of the positive affect associated with personal happiness and with work-related satisfaction. In this sense, there seems to be some continuity between spiritual wellbeing (as defined by Fisher) and a broader understanding of psychological wellbeing.

Second, considered independently, the two perceiving factors have a part to play in shaping spiritual wellbeing. Intuitive types enjoy a higher level of spiritual wellbeing than sensing types. This finding is consistent with the broader research tradition reviewed in the introduction to this paper that found higher levels of spiritual experience among intuitive types than among sensing types, as defined in terms of mystical orientation. In this sense, there seems to be some continuity between spiritual wellbeing (as defined by Fisher) and a broader understanding of spiritual experience.

Third, considered independently, the two judging functions have a part to play in shaping spiritual wellbeing. Feeling types enjoy a higher level of spiritual wellbeing than thinking types. This finding is consistent with the broader research tradition reviewed in the introduction to this paper that found a higher proportion of feeling types than thinking types associated with conventional religious participation, as defined in church membership, church attendance, and religious vocations. In this sense, there seems to be some continuity between spiritual wellbeing (as defined by Fisher) and a broader engagement with an interest in religious and spiritual practices.

Fourth, considered independently, the two attitudes toward the outer world have a (small) part to play in shaping spiritual wellbeing. Perceiving types enjoy a (slightly) higher level of spiritual wellbeing than judging types. At present there is no body of research with which to link and by which to interpret this (small) association.

Fifth, when the components of psychological type theory are considered in combination to generate the four dominant type preferences, the eight dominant-auxiliary pairs, or the 16 complete types, the judging process (distinguishing between the feeling function and the thinking function) emerges as the strongest, and clearest factor in predicting individual differences in spiritual wellbeing (as defined by Fisher). This finding is consistent with the theoretical connection between the way in which Fisher originally construed spiritual wellbeing theory and the way in which Jung originally construed psychological type theory. For Fisher, at the heart of good spiritual wellbeing resides a concern for a valuing of relationships. On Fisher's account, good spiritual wellbeing is reflected in good relationships with self (the personal domain), good relationships with others (the communal domain), good relationships with the environment (the environmental domain), and good relationships with the transcendent (the transcendental domain). Good relationships of this nature are a consequence of a rational process of evaluation and prioritisation. For Jung, at the heart of the feeling function is a rational process of evaluation and prioritisation shaped by personal values and by concern for interpersonal relationships. The finding, then, that *the key* connection between spiritual wellbeing (as defined by Fisher) and psychological type (as defined by Jung) resides in the feeling function provides support for the internal coherence of these two separate and distant theories, and support for the construct validity of the two measures through which these theories have been operationalised, namely the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS, Francis, 2005) and the Fisher measure of spiritual wellbeing (SHALOM: Fisher, 1999, 2010).

A clear limitation with the present study concerns the distinctive nature of the population from which the sample was drawn, namely visitors to a cathedral in rural west Wales. While this aspect of the study facilitated the generation of a large dataset (2,339 men and women across a wide range of ages), it nonetheless remains difficult to claim that cathedral visitors are representative of the wider general population. For this reason the study now needs replication among other groups.

References

- Argyle, M., Martin, M., & Crossland, J. (1989). Happiness as a function of personality and social encounters. In J. P. Forgas & J. M. Innes (Eds.), *Recent advances in social psychology: An international perspective* (pp. 189-203). Amsterdam, North Holland: Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Becker, P.L. (2002). *Spirituality in Australian organizations employee attitudes and impact on wellbeing*. D Psychol. dissertation, Swinburne University of technology, Victoria, Australia.
- Berry, D. (2005). Methodological pitfalls in the study of religiosity and spirituality. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 27(5), 628-647.
- Bigelow, E. D., Fitzgerald, R., Busk, P., Girault, E., & Avis, J. (1988). Psychological characteristics of Catholic sisters: Relationships between the MBTI and other measures. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 14, 32-36.
- Brewster, C. E., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2011). Maintaining a public ministry in rural England: Work-related psychological health and psychological type among Anglican clergy serving in multi-church benefices. In H-G. Ziebertz, & L. J. Francis (Eds.) *The public significance of religion* (pp. 241-265). Leiden: Brill.
- Burns, J., Francis, L. J., Village, A., & Robbins, M. (2013). Psychological type profile of Roman Catholic priests: An empirical enquiry in the USA. *Pastoral Psychology*, 62, 239-246.
- Burton, L., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type profile of Methodist circuit minister in Britain: similarities with and differences from Anglican clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 23, 64-81.
- Cabral, G. (1984). Psychological types in a Catholic convent: applications to community

- living and congregational data. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 16-22.
- Cattell, R. B., Cattell, A. K. S., & Cattell, H. E. P. (1993). *Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire: fifth edition (16PF5)*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.
- Center for Spiritual Development (2007). *Spirituality measures*. Retrieved 29 August, 2008, from: <http://www.spiritualdevelopmentcenter.org/CMS/FrontEnd/pop>
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R and NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI): Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Craig, C. L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L. J. (2006). Psychological type preferences of Roman Catholic priests in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 27, 157-164.
- 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.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- Daaleman, T.P., & Frey, B.B. (2004). The Spirituality Index of Well-Being: A new instrument for health-related quality of life research. *Annals of Family Medicine*, 2(5), 499-503.
- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990). Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 20, 25-33.
- Du Toit, C. W. (2006). Secular spirituality versus secular dualism: Towards postsecular holism as a model for a natural theology. *Theological Studies*, 62, 1251-1268.
- Ellison, C. (1983). Spiritual well-being: conceptualization and measurement, *Journal of*

Psychology and Theology, 11, 330-340.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1991). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scales*.

London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Fernando, M., & Chowdhury, R.M. (2010). The relationship between spiritual well-being and ethical orientations in decision making: An empirical study with business executives in Australia. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95, 211-225.

Fisher, J.W. (1998). *Spiritual health: its nature, and place in the school curriculum*.

Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Melbourne. Available from:

<http://eprints.unimelb.edu.au/achieve/00002994/>

Fisher, J.W. (1999). Developing a Spiritual Health And Life-Orientation Measure for secondary school students. In J. Ryan, V. Wittwer & P. Baird (Eds.), *Research with a regional/rural focus: Proceedings of the University of Ballarat inaugural annual research conference, 15 October, 1999* (pp.57-63). Ballarat: University of Ballarat, Research and Graduate Studies Office.

Fisher, J. W. (2004). Feeling good, living life: A spiritual health measure for young children. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 25, 307-315.

Fisher, J.W. (2009). *Reaching the heart: Assessing and nurturing spiritual well-being via education*. EdD dissertation, University of Ballarat, Victoria, Australia. Available

from <http://archimedes.ballarat.edu.au:8080/vital/access/>

[HandleResolver/1959.17/13481](http://archimedes.ballarat.edu.au:8080/vital/access/HandleResolver/1959.17/13481)

Fisher, J. (2010). Development and application of a spiritual well-being questionnaire called SHALOM. *Religions*, 1, 105-121.

Fisher, J. (2011). The Four Domains Model: Connecting spirituality, health and well-being. *Religions*, 2, 17-28.

Fisher, J.W. (2012). Connectedness: At the heart of resiliency and spiritual well-being.

- In C.A. Stark & D.C. Bonner (Eds.), *Handbook on spirituality: Belief systems, societal impact and roles in coping* (pp. 265-277). New York: Nova Science Publishers Inc.
- Fisher, J.W., Francis, L.J., & Johnson, P. (2000). Assessing spiritual health via four domains of spiritual wellbeing: the SH4DI. *Pastoral Psychology*, 49, 133-145.
- Fisher, J.W., Francis, L. J., & Johnson, P. (2002). The personal and social correlates of spiritual well-being among primary school teachers. *Pastoral Psychology*, 51, 3-11.
- Francis, L. J. (2002). Psychological type and mystical orientation: Anticipating individual differences within congregational life. *Pastoral Sciences*, 21, 77-99.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2009). Psychological type theory and religious and spiritual experience. In M. De Souza, L. J. Francis, J. O'Higgins-Norman, & D. G. Scott (Eds.), *International Handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing* (pp. 125-146). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., & Hall, G. (2008). Psychological type and attitude toward Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 23, 181-191.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 11, 266-284.
- 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., Gubb, S., & Robbins, M. (2009). Psychological type profile of Lead Elders

within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Belief and Values*, 30, 61-69.

Francis, L. J., Hancocks, G., Swift, C., & Robbins, M. (2009). Distinctive call, distinctive profile: The psychological type profile of Church of England full-time hospital chaplains. *Practical Theology* 2, 269-284.

Francis, L. J., & Holmes, P. (2011). Ordained Local Ministers: The same Anglican orders, but of different psychological temperaments? *Rural Theology*, 9, 151-160.

Francis L. J., & Jones, S. H. (2000). Psychological type and happiness: A study among adult churchgoers. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 54, 36-41.

Francis, L. J., Kaldor, P., Shevlin, M., & Lewis, C. A. (2004). Assessing emotional exhaustion among the Australian clergy: Internal reliability and construct validity of the Scale of Emotional Exhaustion in Ministry (SEEM). *Review of Religious Research*, 45, 269-277.

Francis, L. J., Littler, K., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type and Offa's Dyke: Exploring differences in the psychological type profile of Anglican clergy serving in England and Wales. *Contemporary Wales*, 23, 240-251.

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

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

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

- Francis, L. J., & Loudon, S. H. (2004). A short index of mystical orientation (SIMO): A study among Roman Catholic priests. *Pastoral Psychology, 53*, 49-51.
- Francis, L. J., Payne, V. J., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type, 56*, 19-23.
- Francis, L.J., Powell, R., & Robbins, M. (2012). Profiling Catholic priests in Australia: An empirical study applying psychological type theory. In A. W. Ata (Ed.), *Catholics and Catholicism in contemporary Australia: Challenges and achievements* (pp. 282-298). Melbourne, Victoria: David Lovell Publishing.
- Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2002). Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders. *Journal of Belief and Values, 23*, 217-220.
- Francis, L.J., Robbins, M., & Cargas, S. (2012). The perceiving process and mystical orientation: An empirical study in psychological type theory among participants at the Parliament of the World's Religions, *Studies in Spirituality, 22*, 341-352.
- Francis, L.J., Robbins, M., & Craig, C.L. (2011). The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: Compatible or incompatible with their clergy? *International Journal of Practical Theology, 15*, 243-259.
- Francis, L.J., Robbins, M., Duncan, B., & Whinney, M. (2010). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in England: A ministry for intuitives. In B. Ruelas and V. Brisero (Eds.), *Psychology of intuition* (pp. 211-219). New York: Nova Science.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Kaldor, K., & Castle, K. (2009). Psychological type and work-related psychological health among clergy in Australia, England and New Zealand. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 28*, 200-212.
- 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., Robbins, M., & Wulff, K. (2011). Psychological type profile of male and female clergy 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., & Village, A. (2012). The psychological temperament of Anglican clergy in ordained local ministry (OLM): The conserving, serving pastor? *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 25, 57-76.
- 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., Wulff, K., & Robbins, M. (2008). The relationship between work-related psychological health and psychological type among clergy serving in The Presbyterian Church (USA). *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 21, 166-182.
- Gerhardt, R. (1983). Liberal religion and personality type. *Research in Psychological Type*, 6, 47-53.
- Gomez, R., & Fisher, J. W. (2003). Domains of spiritual well-being and development and validation of the Spiritual Well-Being Questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 1975-1991.
- Gomez, R., & Fisher, J. W. (2005a). Item response theory analysis of the spiritual well-being questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 1107-1121.
- Gomez, R., & Fisher, J.W. (2005b). The Spiritual Well-Being Questionnaire: Testing for model applicability, measurement and structural equivalencies and latent mean differences across gender. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 1383-1393.
- Hall, H.J. (2005). *How the domains of spiritual well being predict current quality of*

- life and general well being*. Postgraduate Diploma of Psychology Research Report, University of Ballarat.
- Hall, T.W., & Edwards, K.J. (1996). The initial development and factor analysis of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 24*, 233-246.
- Hall, T.W., Reise, S.P., & Haviland, M.G. (2007). An item response theory analysis of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 17*, 157-178.
- Harbaugh, G. L. (1984). The person in ministry: Psychological type and the seminary. *Journal of Psychological Type, 8*, 23-32.
- Hays, J.C., Meador, K.G., Branch, P.S., & George, L.K. (2001). The Spiritual History Scale in Four Dimensions (SHS-4): Validity and reliability. *The Gerontologist, 41*, 239-249.
- Hill, P.C., & Pargament, K.I. (2003). Advances in the conceptualization and measurement of religion and spirituality. *American Psychologist, 58*(1), 64-74.
- Holder, M.D., Coleman, B., & Wallace, J.M. (2010). Spirituality, religiousness, and happiness in children aged 8-12 years. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 11*, 131-150.
- Holsworth, T. E. (1984). Type preferences among Roman Catholic seminarians. *Journal of Psychological Type, 8*, 33-35.
- Idler, E. L., Musick, M. A., Ellison, C. G., George, L. K., Krause, N., Ory, M. G., Pargament, K. I., Powell, L. H., Underwood, L. G., & Williams, D. R. (2003). Measuring multiple dimensions of religion and spirituality for health research. *Research on Aging, 25*, 327-365.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.

- King, P. E., & Benson, P. L. (2006). Spiritual development and adolescent well-being and thriving. In E. C. Roehlkepartain, P. E. King, L. M. Wagener, & P. L. Benson (Eds.), *The handbook of spiritual development in childhood and adolescence* (pp. 384-398). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krug, S., & Cattell, R. (1980). *Clinical Analysis Questionnaire Manual*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality & Ability Testing.
- Moodley, T. (2008). *The relationship between coping and spiritual well-being during adolescence*. PhD dissertation, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.
- Myers, I. B. (1998). *Introduction to type: A guide to understanding your results on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (fifth edition, European English version). Oxford: Oxford Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Pargament, K. I. (1997). *The psychology of religion and coping: Theory, research and practice*. London: Guilford Press.
- Polanski, P. J. (2002). Exploring spiritual beliefs in relation to Adlerian theory. *Counselling and Values, 46*, 127-136.
- Rehak, M.C. (1998). Identifying the congregation's corporate personality. *Journal of Psychological Type, 44*, 39-44.
- Robbins, M., & Francis, L. J. (2010). Work-related psychological health among Church of England clergywomen: Individual differences and psychological type. *Review of Religious Research, 52*, 57-71.
- Robbins, M., & Francis, L. J. (2011). All are called, but some psychological types are more likely to respond: Profiling churchgoers in Australia. *Research in the Social Scientific*

Study of Religion, 22, 213-229.

- Robbins, M., & Francis, L.J. (2012). The psychological type profile of Australian Catholic congregations: Psychological theory and congregational studies. In A. W. Ata (Ed.), *Catholics and Catholicism in contemporary Australia: Challenges and achievements* (pp. 262-281). Melbourne, Victoria: David Lovell Publishing.
- Robbins, M., Francis, L. J., & Powell, R. (2012). Work-related psychological health among clergywomen in Australia. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 933-944.
- 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, 28-35.
- Ross, C. F. J. (1995). Type patterns among Catholics: four Anglophone congregations compared with Protestants, Francophone Catholics and priests. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 33, 33-41.
- Rowold, J. (2011). Effects of spiritual well-being on subsequent happiness, psychological well-being, and stress. *Journal of Religion & Health*, 50, 950-963.
- Streukens, J.P. (2009). *Alcoholism: Spirituality and personality dynamics*. PhD dissertation, University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada.
- Stott, A. (2002). *The relationship of spiritual well-being to other measures of subjective well-being*. Post-grad. Dip Psych. dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Ballarat, Australia.
- Van Dierendonck, D., & Mohan, K. (2006). Some thoughts on spirituality and eudaimonic wellbeing. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 9, 227-238.
- Van Rooyen, B.M. (2007). *Spiritual well-being in a group of South African*

adolescents. PhD dissertation, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.

Village, A., (2011). Gifts differing? Psychological type among stipendiary and non-stipendiary clergy. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 230-250.

Vogt, T. (2007). *The impact of an Interim Protection Order (Domestic Violence Act 116 of 1998) on the victims of domestic violence*. D Pyschol. Dissertation, University of Stellenbosch, South Africa.

Williams, E., Francis L. J., Robbins M., & Annis, J. (2007). Visitor experiences of St Davids Cathedral: The two worlds of pilgrims and secular tourists. *Rural Theology*, 5, 111-123.

Table 1

Type distribution for cathedral visitors

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences	
ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ	E	I
<i>n</i> = 557 (23.8%)	<i>n</i> = 350 (15.0%)	<i>n</i> = 107 (4.6%)	<i>n</i> = 149 (6.4%)	<i>n</i> = 974 (41.6%)	<i>n</i> = 1365 (58.4%)
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	S	<i>n</i> = 1688 (72.2%)
++++	++++		+	N	<i>n</i> = 651 (27.8%)
+++++	+++++			T	<i>n</i> = 1267 (54.2%)
++++				F	<i>n</i> = 1072 (45.8%)
++++				J	<i>n</i> = 1921 (82.1%)
				P	<i>n</i> = 418 (17.9%)
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP	Pairs and Temperaments	
<i>n</i> = 62 (2.7%)	<i>n</i> = 53 (2.3%)	<i>n</i> = 53 (2.3%)	<i>n</i> = 34 (1.5%)	IJ	<i>n</i> = 1163 (49.7%)
+++	++	++	++	IP	<i>n</i> = 202 (8.6%)
				EP	<i>n</i> = 216 (9.2%)
				EJ	<i>n</i> = 758 (32.4%)
				ST	<i>n</i> = 966 (41.3%)
				SF	<i>n</i> = 722 (30.9%)
				NF	<i>n</i> = 350 (15.0%)
				NT	<i>n</i> = 301 (12.9%)
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP	SJ	<i>n</i> = 1472 (62.9%)
<i>n</i> = 40 (1.7%)	<i>n</i> = 61 (2.6%)	<i>n</i> = 84 (3.6%)	<i>n</i> = 31 (1.3%)	SP	<i>n</i> = 216 (9.2%)
++	+++	++++	+	NP	<i>n</i> = 202 (8.6%)
				NJ	<i>n</i> = 449 (19.2%)
				TJ	<i>n</i> = 1100 (47.0%)
				TP	<i>n</i> = 167 (7.1%)
				FP	<i>n</i> = 251 (10.7%)
				FJ	<i>n</i> = 821 (35.1%)
ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ	IN	<i>n</i> = 343 (14.7%)
<i>n</i> = 307 (13.1%)	<i>n</i> = 258 (11.0%)	<i>n</i> = 106 (4.5%)	<i>n</i> = 87 (3.7%)	EN	<i>n</i> = 308 (13.2%)
+++++	+++++	+++++	++++	IS	<i>n</i> = 1022 (43.7%)
++++	++++			ES	<i>n</i> = 666 (28.5%)
++++				ET	<i>n</i> = 465 (19.9%)
+++	+			EF	<i>n</i> = 509 (21.8%)
				IF	<i>n</i> = 563 (24.1%)
				IT	<i>n</i> = 802 (34.3%)

Jungian Types (E)		Jungian Types (I)		Dominant Types				
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
E-TJ	394	16.8	I-TP	96	4.1	Dt.T	490	20.9
E-FJ	364	15.6	I-FP	106	4.5	Dt.F	470	20.1
ES-P	101	4.3	IS-J	907	38.8	Dt.S	1008	43.1
EN-P	115	4.9	IN-J	256	10.9	Dt.N	371	15.9

Note: N = 2,339

(NB: + = 1% of N)

Table 2

Spiritual wellbeing scores by dichotomous type preferences

Comparisons	N	mean	SD	F	<i>p</i> <
Extraversion	974	3.42	.66		
Introversion	1365	3.32	.65	3.4	.001
Sensing	1688	3.33	.65		
Intuition	651	3.44	.66	-3.4	.001
Thinking	1267	3.22	.64		
Feeling	1072	3.53	.64	-11.5	.001
Judging	1921	3.35	.65		
Perceiving	418	3.43	.68	-2.4	.05

Table 3

Spiritual wellbeing scores by dominant type preferences

Dominant types	N	mean	SD	F	<i>p</i> <
Dominant feeling	470	3.56	.64		
Dominant intuition	371	3.43	.66		
Dominant thinking	490	3.29	.65		
Dominant sensing	1008	3.28	.64	23.1	.001

Table 4

Spiritual wellbeing scores by dominant and auxiliary type preferences

Dominant and auxiliary types	N	mean	SD	F	<i>p</i> <
Dominant intuition with feeling	191	3.61	.64		
Dominant feeling with sensing	311	3.58	.63		
Dominant feeling with intuition	159	3.50	.64		
Dominant sensing with feeling	411	3.45	.63		
Dominant thinking with intuition	121	3.35	.66		
Dominant thinking with sensing	369	3.27	.65		
Dominant intuition with thinking	180	3.25	.64		
Dominant sensing with thinking	597	3.16	.63	22.4	.001

Table 5

Spiritual wellbeing scores by 16 complete types

Type	N	mean	SD	F	<i>p</i> <
INFJ	107	3.67	.59		
ISFP	53	3.60	.68		
ESFJ	258	3.58	.62		
INFP	53	3.57	.64		
ENFP	84	3.54	.70		
ENFJ	106	3.47	.64		
ISFJ	350	3.46	.62		
ESFP	61	3.44	.70		
ENTJ	87	3.39	.66		
ENTP	31	3.34	.72		
ISTP	62	3.29	.67		
ESTJ	307	3.26	.64		
INTP	34	3.26	.65		
ESTP	40	3.24	.56		
INTJ	149	3.23	.62		
ISTJ	557	3.16	.63	10.8	.001