

**Original citation:**

Francis, Leslie J. and Crea, G.. (2017) Openness to mystical experience and psychological type : a study among Italians. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 20 (4). 384-397 .

**Permanent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/88592>

**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 and Culture* on 19 September 2017, available online:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2017.1328402>

**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](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk)

Openness to mystical experience and psychological type: A study among Italians

Leslie J. Francis\*

University of Warwick, UK

Giuseppe Crea

Salesian Pontifical University, Rome, Italy

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](mailto:leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk)

**Abstract**

This study examines Ross' thesis that intuitive types are more open than sensing types to mystical experience among a sample of 1,155 Italians who completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales alongside the Mystical Orientation Scale. The data supported Ross' thesis. Intuitive types recorded a significantly higher mean score than sensing types on the index of mystical orientation. Ranking the sixteen complete types according to their mean mystical orientation scores located INFPs with the highest scores and ISTJs with the lowest scores.

*Keywords:* psychological type, mysticism, psychology, religion, Italy

## Introduction

The connection between personality and religious experience has been of interest to the empirical psychology of religion since the early days of the emerging discipline (see Argyle, 1958). The empirical investigation of this problem has been consistently hampered by lack of consensus regarding appropriate models and measures of personality and appropriate models and measures of religious experience through which the problem could be operationalised. One systematic approach to this problem has adopted the model of personality proposed by psychological type theory and the model of religious experience proposed by the investigation of mysticism. The present study stands within that tradition.

### Psychological type theory

Alongside studies employing the Big Five Factor model of personality proposed by Costa and McCrae (1985) in the USA and the Major Three Dimensions model of personality proposed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) in the UK, psychological type theory has regained visibility in the empirical psychology of religion within recent years (for reviews see Francis, 2009; Ross, 2011). A special issue of *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* (Village, 2011) and two special issues of *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* (Lewis, 2012, 2015) have played their part in stimulating this growing visibility. Psychological type theory is distinguished from the models proposed by Costa and McCrae (1985) and by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) in two important ways. Psychological type is rooted in psychological theory rather than in statistical modelling; psychological type conceives individual differences in terms of discrete categories rather than in terms of continua. Both of these characteristics remain controversial within the psychological literature (see Bayne, 1995, 2004, 2005).

The understanding of human mental functioning on which psychological type theory builds distinguishes between two core psychological processes, the irrational or perceiving process and the rational or judging process. Drawing on the Latin root *ratio*, meaning

ordering, the irrational process (perceiving) is concerned with the ways in which people gather information, while the rational process (judging) is concerned with the ways in which people evaluate information. Each of these two core psychological processes is expressed through two contrasting functions (Jung, 1971). In its current developed form psychological type theory also distinguishes between two orientations or directions of psychological energy and between two attitudes toward the external world.

In terms of the perceiving process, sensing types focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They are concerned with the actual, the real and the practical. They tend to be down to earth and matter of fact. Intuitive types focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. In terms of the judging process, thinking types focus on the abstract, logical and systematic aspects of a situation, thereby privileging consistency. They evaluate through the mind. Feeling types focus on the interpersonal values and the relational aspects of a situation, thereby privileging consideration and sensitivity to the human consequences. They evaluate through the heart. In terms of the orientations, introverts are energised by the inner world of ideas and can be drained by too much engagement with the outer world of people and events. Extraverts are energised by the outer world and by interaction with people and events. They can be drained or immobilised by too much solitude and isolation. In terms of the attitudes toward the external world, perceiving types engage their preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) in the outer world and consequently present an open, flexible, spontaneous approach to the outer world. Judging types engage their preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) in the outer world and consequently present an organised, planned and disciplined approach to the outer world.

While the two perceiving functions, the two judging functions, the two orientations, and the two attitudes toward the external world form the conceptual foundations for the developed model of psychological type theory, type dynamics builds on these foundations in

a range of useful ways including the following. The notion of dominant type preference suggests four clear main strengths in terms of dominant sensing, dominant intuition, dominant thinking, and dominant feeling. The notion of dominant type preference being complemented by auxiliary preferences (drawn from the other process) suggests eight dominant auxiliary pairings. Bringing all four components of type theory into play suggests sixteen complete types.

Psychological type theory has been made accessible for empirical research through the development of a number of psychometric instruments. Three of these instruments have become particularly visible within the empirical psychology of religion, namely the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). While each of these instruments has been designed to assess the same fundamental constructs, each has been shaped with distinctive strengths within different contexts: the Keirsey Temperament Sorter has been designed as a convenient tool for self-assessment, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator has been designed as especially useful in clinical and assessment contexts, and the Francis Psychological Type Scales have been designed especially for inclusion in survey-type research. The Francis Psychological Type Scales have been used in a range of recent empirical studies within the broad field of the psychology of religion, including work reported by Baker (2015), Baker and Robbins (2012), Francis and Crea (2015), Francis and Datto (2012), Francis, Fisher, and Annis (2015), Francis, Littler, and Robbins (2012), Francis, Robbins, and Jones (2012), Francis, Robbins, and Powell (2015), Francis, Stone, and Robbins (2015), Lankshear and Francis (2015), Lewis, Varvatsoulis, and Williams (2012), Muskett and Village (2015), Payne and Lewis (2015), Powell, Robbins, and Francis (2012), Randall (2015), Robbins and Powell (2015), Robbins, Francis, and Powell (2012a, 2012b),

Ross and Francis (2015), Village (2012a, 2012b, 2015), Village, Baker, and Howat (2012), Walker (2012, 2015), and Williams, Francis, Billington, and Robbins (2012).

### **Psychological type theory and religiosity**

Because the model of personality proposed by psychological type is grounded in theory it is reasonable to extrapolate from the basic theory potential connections between personality and individual differences in religious expression, experience, and belief. On this basis, Ross (1992) argued that the perceiving process (distinguishing between sensing and intuition) is of central importance. In an initial empirical investigation of this hypothesis, Ross, Weiss, and Jackson (1996) found that intuitive types were more comfortable than sensing types with complexity of religious beliefs, while sensing types were more definite than intuitive types regarding what counted as religious to them. Sensing types drew firmer boundaries between what they regarded as secular and what they regarded as sacred. Intuitive types were more open to religious change, seeing new insights as important for a healthy religious life, while sensing types were more likely to see changes in personal faith as a sign of religious weakness. In a second study, Francis and Ross (1997) explored the differences between sensing types and intuitive types with regard to preference in Christian spirituality. They found that intuitive types showed a higher appreciation than sensing types for experiential spirituality (like witnessing a fine sunset or being inspired by a star filled sky), while sensing types showed a higher appreciation than intuitive types for institutional expressions of spirituality (like church attendance and personal prayer).

Empirical findings like those reported by Ross, Weiss, and Jackson (1996), and Francis and Ross (1997), lead to the clear hypothesis that intuitive types may show a higher appreciation or a greater openness to mystical experience in comparison with sensing types. This is a clear hypothesis that can be tested by means of drawing on well-defined conceptualisations of mysticism and well-calibrated measures rooted in such

conceptualisations. The theoretical framework proposed by Stace (1960) formed the basis for the Hood Mysticism Scale (Hood, 1975). The theoretical framework proposed by Happold (1963) formed the basis for the Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale (Francis & Loudon, 2000a). The present study is set within the framework proposed by Happold (1963) as operationalised by the Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale (MOS), an instrument that has been used in a range of studies, including work reported by Bourke, Francis and Robbins (2004), Francis, Village, Robbins, and Ineson (2007), Edwards and Lewis (2008a, 2008b), Francis and Littler (2012), Francis, Littler, and Robbins (2012), and Francis, Robbins, and Cargas (2012). A shorter instrument derived from the MOS (Francis & Loudon, 2000a), the Short Index of Mystical Orientation (SIMO), was proposed by Francis and Loudon (2004) and has been used by Francis and Thomas (1996), Francis and Loudon (2000b), and Francis (2002).

Happold's (1963) definition of mysticism embraced seven key characteristics, the first four of which were taken directly from James (1982): ineffability, noesis, transiency, passivity, consciousness of the oneness of everything, sense of timelessness, and true ego (or self). The MOS proposes three indicators of each of these seven characteristics in order to construct a 21-item measure. Ineffability concerns the private or incommunicable quality of mystical experience. Noesis concerns the insights into knowledge and truth conveyed by mystical experience. Transiency concerns the brief, inconsistent passing, and intermittent nature of mystical experience. Passivity concerns the undeserved and gratuitous nature of mystical experience. Consciousness of the oneness of everything concerns the sense in which existence is perceived as a unity by mystical experience. Sense of timelessness concerns how mystical experience appears to have a timeless quality and to occupy an entirely different dimension from that of any known sense of time. True ego concerns how mystical experience speaks to the deep, the true inner-self. In their foundation paper, Francis and Loudon (2000a)

reported an alpha coefficient of internal consistency reliability of .94 for this instrument (Cronbach, 1951).

### **Psychological type and mystical orientation**

So far six studies, all conducted within England and Wales, have examined the association between scores recorded on the MOS or the SIMO and individual differences recorded on the Jungian perceiving process. Two of these studies employed the SIMO. Francis and Louden (2000b) administered the SIMO together with the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey, 1998) to a sample of 100 student and adult churchgoers. These data supported Ross' hypothesis with significantly higher scores of mystical orientation reported among intuitive types ( $M = 30.6, SD = 7.5$ ) than among sensing types ( $M = 25.6, SD = 8.7$ ). Francis (2002) administered the SIMO together with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) to a sample of 543 participants attending workshops concerned with personality and spirituality. These data did not support Ross' hypothesis with no significant differences reported between intuitive types ( $M = 30.2, SD = 7.6$ ) and sensing types ( $M = 29.0, SD = 7.7$ ).

The other four studies employed the MOS together with the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS; Francis, 2005). Francis, Village, Robbins, and Ineson (2007) administered the MOS and FPTS to a sample of 318 guests who had stayed at a Benedictine Abbey. These data supported Ross' (1992) hypothesis with significantly higher scores of mystical orientation reported among intuitive types ( $M = 77.9, SD = 17.4$ ) than among sensing types ( $M = 71.4, SD = 18.3$ ). Francis, Robbins, and Cargas (2012) administered the MOS and FPTS to a sample of 580 participants from a range of religious and spiritual traditions attending the Parliament of the World's Religions in Barcelona, 2004. These data supported Ross' hypothesis with significantly higher scores of mystical orientation reported among intuitive types ( $M = 78.7, SD = 18.5$ ) than among sensing types ( $M = 71.3, SD =$

15.8). Francis, Littler, and Robbins (2012) administered the MOS and the FPTs to a sample of 232 Anglican clergymen serving in the Church in Wales. These data supported Ross' hypothesis with significantly higher scores of mystical orientation among intuitive types ( $M = 65.1, SD = 15.8$ ) than among sensing types ( $M = 59.8, SD = 15.1$ ). Ross and Francis (2015) administered the MOS and the FPTs to a sample of 149 adolescents between the ages of 16 and 18 years. These data supported Ross' hypothesis with significantly higher scores of mystical orientation among intuitive types ( $M = 49.7, SD = 18.6$ ) than among sensing types ( $M = 42.7, SD = 15.3$ ).

While five of these six studies support Ross' (1992) hypothesis that intuitive types are more open to mystical orientation than sensing types, other information concerning the connection between psychological type and mystical orientation also emerges from these studies. Three of the studies found higher mystical orientation scores among feeling types than among thinking types (Francis & Loudon, 2000b; Francis, 2002; Francis, Robbins, & Cargas, 2012). Two of the studies found higher mystical orientation scores among perceiving types than among judging types (Francis, Robbins, & Cargas, 2012; Francis & Littler, 2012).

### **Research question**

A limitation with the research programme designed to test Ross' hypothesis regarding the association between psychological type and openness to mystical orientation is that all six studies have been confined to one geographical location, historically shaped by an Anglican or Reformed Christian tradition. The aim of the present study is to build on the research tradition within a very different geographical location shaped by the Catholic Christian tradition. A second limitation with the six studies is that only one of them exceeded a sample size of 500 and that makes it difficult for type-based analyses that can extend from the basis comparisons between the dichotomous pairs on which type theory is constructed to examine the implications of type dynamics within the eight dominant and auxiliary pairs and within

the sixteen complete types. The aim of the present study is to build on the research tradition with a sample of over 1,000 participants.

## Method

### Procedure

Participants were drawn from all over Italy (North, Central, and South) by a team of trainee psychologists operating under the supervision of a senior psychologist within the Institute of Psychology at the Salesian University in Rome. Participation was anonymous, and no monetary reward was offered or given. The informed consent procedure required written consent prior to participation, as agreed with the Institutional Review Board of the Salesian University. Questionnaires were administered, mainly at home, in the presence of a trainee psychologist. A total of 1,155 individuals submitted thoroughly completed questionnaires.

### Measures

*Mystical orientation* was assessed by an Italian translation of the revised form of the Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale (MOS; Francis & Loudon, 2000a). This is a 21-item measure containing three items to assess each of the seven key characteristics of mysticism identified by Happold (1963): ineffability, noesis, transiency, passivity, consciousness of the oneness of everything, sense of timelessness, and true ego. The revised form of this instrument expresses these characteristics of mysticism in ways independent of traditional 'religious' language. Respondents were asked to assess 'how important each experience is to your life', using a five-point scale anchored by: 1 = low importance; 2 = some importance; 3 = medium importance; 4 = quite high importance; 5 = high importance.

*Psychological type* was assessed by an Italian translation of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS; Francis, 2005). This 40-item instrument comprises four sets of 10 forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation

(extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). A number of studies have demonstrated this instrument to function well in church-related contexts. For example, Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported alpha coefficients of .83 for the EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale. Participants were asked for each pair of characteristics to check the 'box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if you feel both characteristics apply to you. Tick the characteristics that reflect the real you, even if other people see you differently'.

### **Participants**

The participants ( $N = 1,115$ ) comprised 538 men and 617 women ranging in age from 14 to 80 years ( $M = 30.69$ ,  $SD = 15.13$ ); 247 were in their teens, 493 in their twenties, 199 in their thirties or forties, and 216 were aged fifty or over; 878 were from Central Italy, 69 from North Italy, and 208 from South Italy. In terms of religious worship attendance, 366 never attended services, 342 attended services at least once a month (of whom 276 attended weekly), and the remaining 447 attended less frequently than once a month. In terms of personal prayer, 402 never prayed, 311 prayed occasionally, 61 prayed at least once a month, 104 prayed at least once a week, and 277 prayed almost every day.

### **Analysis**

The research literature concerning the empirical investigation of psychological type has developed a highly distinctive method for analyzing, handling, and displaying statistical data in the form of 'type tables'. This convention has been adopted in the following presentation in order to integrate these new data within the established literature and to provide all the detail necessary for secondary analysis and further interpretation within the rich theoretical framework afforded by psychological type. Type tables have been designed to provide information about the sixteen discrete psychological types, about the four

dichotomous preferences, about the six sets of pairs and temperaments, about the dominant types, and about the introverted and extraverted Jungian types. Commentary on this table will, however, be restricted to those aspects of the data strictly relevant to the research question.

### **Results**

- insert table 1 about here -

The type distribution for the sample of 1,155 Italian participants is presented in table 1 in the conventional format. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, these data identify a close balance in preferences between introversion (52%) and extraversion (48%), a close balance in preferences between thinking (52%) and feeling (48%), a preference for judging (57%) over perceiving (43%), and a strong preference for sensing (77%) over intuition (23%). In terms of dominant type preferences, the most frequently occurring type was dominant sensing (45%), followed by dominant thinking (21%), dominant feeling (20%) and dominant intuition (14%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, the most frequently occurring types were ISTJ (17%), ESTJ (13%), and ESFP (12%).

- insert table 2 about here -

The second step in the data analysis comprised an evaluation of the measure of mystical orientation. Table 2 presents the 21 items of the Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale, together with the item rest-of-test correlations and the proportions of the respondents who rated the importance of the experience for their own faith as four or as five on the five-point scale. The scale achieved the satisfactory alpha coefficient of .89. All the 21 items contributed positively to the homogeneity of the scale, with item rest-of-test correlations ranging between .32 and .61.

- insert table 3 about here -

The third step in data analysis explored the connection between psychological type and scores recorded on the Mystical Orientation Scale in terms of the four dichotomous type preferences. The data presented in table 3 supported Ross' hypothesis with significantly higher mean scores of mystical orientation reported among intuitive types ( $M = 70.6$ ,  $SD = 13.1$ ) than among sensing types ( $M = 67.1$ ,  $SD = 13.0$ ). These data also demonstrate that there are significantly higher mean scores of mystical orientation reported among feeling types ( $M = 69.4$ ,  $SD = 13.2$ ) than among thinking types ( $M = 66.5$ ,  $SD = 12.8$ ), but no significant differences in the mean scores of mystical orientation recorded by introverts and extraverts, or by perceiving types and judging types.

- insert tables 4 and 5 about here -

Table 4 explores the association between mean mystical orientation scores and the four dominant type preferences. These data show the highest mean scores among dominant feeling types and the lowest among dominant sensing types. Table 5 takes the analyses one step further by exploring the association between mean mystical orientation scores and the eight dominant auxiliary preferences. These data show the linkage between intuition and feeling with openness to mystical experience, with the two highest mean scores being recorded by dominant feeling with auxiliary intuition and by dominant intuition with auxiliary feeling.

- insert table 6 about here -

Table 6 completes the picture by rank ordering mean scores of mystical orientation against the sixteen complete types. According to this table the highest mean scores are recorded by INFPs and the lowest by ISTJs.

### **Discussion and conclusion**

The present study has built on previous research by means of careful and deliberate replication, in order to test the empirical grounds for Ross' thesis that individual differences

in mystical orientation are related to the perceiving process (sensing and intuition). Now in five studies the measures have been held constant (the Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale and the Francis Psychological Type Scales) and the samples have been varied to include 318 guests who had stayed at a Benedictine Abbey (representing Christians from a range of denominations), 580 participants attending the 2004 Parliament of the World's Religions (representing a wide range of spiritual and religious traditions), 232 Anglican clergymen (representing religious professionals within one tradition), 149 religious studies students (representing a mix of adolescents actively engaged with public worship attendance and adolescents not so engaged), and 1,155 Italians (ranging in age from 14 to 80 years). Data from all five studies confirmed Ross' (1992) thesis by demonstrating significantly higher mystical orientation scores among intuitive types than among sensing types.

As well as providing further evidence in support of the general thesis that significantly higher mystical orientation scores are recorded by intuitive types than by sensing types, the present study adds to knowledge by demonstrating for the first time that this association holds true outside the culture of England and Wales shaped by and Anglican or Reformed Christian tradition. The present study was conducted among participants in Italy, a culture shaped by the Catholic tradition.

The findings from this study also prompt some further interrogation of Ross' (1992) thesis. Of the seven studies that have set out to test Ross' thesis, using either the MOS or the SIMO, four of these studies have also reported a significant linkage between mystical orientation scores and the judging process, with higher scores being recorded by feeling types than by thinking types. The further analyses facilitated by the larger sample of participants for the present study have demonstrated: that, in terms of the four dominant types, dominant feeling types record the highest mean scores on the index of mystical orientation; that, in terms of the eight dominant and auxiliary pairs, dominant feeling with auxiliary intuition and

dominant intuition with auxiliary feeling record the highest mean scores on the index of mystical orientation; and that in terms of the sixteen complete types INFPs appear in top place for the ranking of mean scores on the index of orientation.

In other words, Ross' application of theory to explaining individual differences in openness to mystical experience may not be as simple as it at first appeared. A richer understanding of the connection between psychological type and openness to mystical experience needs to embrace both the perceiving process and the judging process, recognising that the combination between intuition and feeling may release greater openness to mystical experience.

Moreover, the location of INFPs as those most open to mystical experience draws attention to the distinctive characteristics of this type where dominant introverted feeling is complemented by auxiliary extraverted intuition. In the brief description of the sixteen complete types, Myers (1998, p. 7) characterises INFPs in the following way:

Quiet observers, idealistic, loyal. Important that outer life be congruent with inner values. Curious, quick to see possibilities, often serve as catalysts to implement ideas. Adaptable, flexible and accepting unless a value is threatened. Want to understand people and ways of fulfilling human potential. Little concern for possessions or surroundings.

The next step in progressing this body of research now needs to step entirely outside the Christian and part-Christian contexts to explore whether the same associations between psychological type and openness to mystical experience pertain in contexts shaped by other major religious traditions like Islam, Judaism, and Hinduism.

### References

- Argyle, M. (1958). *Religious behaviour*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.  
[doi.org/10.4324/9780203001271](https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203001271)
- Baker, M. J. (2015). Psychological type differences between churchgoers and church-leavers. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 622-634.  
[doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.961247](https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.961247)
- Baker, M. J., & Robbins, M. (2012). American on-line atheists and psychological type. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 14*, 1077-1084.  
[doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.707433](https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.707433)
- Bayne, R. (1995). *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: A critical review and practical guide*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Bayne, R. (2004). *Psychological types at work: An MBTI perspective*. London: Thomson.
- Bayne, R. (2005). *Ideas and evidence: Critical reflections on MBTI theory and practice*. Gainesville, FL: CAPT.
- Bourke, R., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2004). Mystical orientation among church musicians. *Transpersonal Psychology Review, 2*, 14-19.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334. [doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555)
- Edwards, A. C., & Lowis, M. J. (2008a). Construction and validation of a scale to assess attitudes to mysticism: The need for a new scale for research in the psychology of religion. *Spirituality and Health International, 9*, 16-21. [doi.org/10.1002/shi.330](https://doi.org/10.1002/shi.330)

- Edwards, A. C., & Lowis, M. J. (2008b). Attitudes to mysticism: Relationship with personality in Western and Eastern mystical traditions. *Spirituality and Health International*, 9, 145-160. doi.org/10.1002/shi.342
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (adult and junior)*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- 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 experiences. In M. De Souza, L. J. Francis, J. O'Higgins-Norman, & D. G. Scott (Eds.), *International Handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing* (pp. 125-146). Dordrecht: Springer. doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9018-9\_8
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., & Hall, G. (2008). Psychological type and attitude toward Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 23, 181-191.  
doi.org/10.1080/13537900802024543
- Francis, L. J., & Crea, G (2015). Work-related psychological health and psychological type: A study among Catholic priests in Italy. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18, 593-604. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.963996
- Francis, L. J., & Dato, F. A. (2012). Inside the mosque: A study in psychological type profiling. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15, 1037-1046.  
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.709723

- Francis, L. J., Fisher, J. W., & Annis, J. (2015). Spiritual wellbeing and psychological type: A study among visitors to a medieval cathedral in Wales. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 675-692. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.964002
- Francis, L. J., & Littler, K. (2012). Mystical orientation and psychological health: A study employing Eysenck's dimensional model of personality among clergymen in the Church in Wales. *Welsh Journal of Psychology, 1*, 4-10.
- Francis, L. J., & Littler, K., & Robbins, M. (2012). Mystical orientation and the perceiving process: A study among Anglican clergymen. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 15*, 945-953. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.676257
- Francis, L. J., & Louden, S. H. (2000a). The Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale (MOS): A study among Roman Catholic priests. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 11*, 99-116.
- Francis, L. J., & Louden, S. H. (2000b). Mystical orientation and psychological type: A study among student and adult churchgoers. *Transpersonal Psychology Review, 4* (1), 36-42.
- Francis, L. J., & Louden, S. H. (2004). A Short Index of Mystical Orientation (SIMO): A study among Roman Catholic priests. *Pastoral Psychology, 53*, 49-51. doi.org/10.1023/B:PASP.0000039325.40451.65
- Francis, L. J., 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., & Jones, S. H. (2012). The psychological type profile of clergywomen in ordained local ministry in the Church of England: Pioneers or custodians? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 15*, 945-953. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.676257

- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Powell, R. (2015). The psychological type profile of Christians participating in fellowship groups or in small groups: Insights from the Australian National Church Life Survey. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 635-640. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.964000
- Francis, L. J., & Ross, C. F. J. (1997). The perceiving function and Christian spirituality: Distinguishing between sensing and intuition. *Pastoral Sciences, 16*, 93-103.
- Francis, L. J., Stone, C., & Robbins, M. (2015). Do different psychological types look for different things in sermons? A research note. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 712-714. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.964001
- Francis, L. J., & Thomas, T. H. (1996). Mystical orientation and personality among Anglican clergy. *Pastoral Psychology, 45*, 99-105. doi.org/10.1007/BF02260016
- Francis, L. J., Village, A., Robbins, M., & Ineson, K. (2007). Mystical orientation and psychological type: An empirical study among guests staying at a Benedictine Abbey. *Studies in Spirituality, 17*, 207-223. doi.org/10.2143/SIS.17.0.2024649
- Happold, F. C. (1963). *Mysticism: A study and an anthology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hood, R. W. (1975). The construction and preliminary validation of a measure of reported mystical experience. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 14*, 29-41. doi.org/10.2307/1384454
- James, W. (1982). *The varieties of religious experience*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works* (volume 6). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Keirse, D. (1998). *Please Understand Me: 2*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.

- Lankshear, D. W., & Francis, L. J. (2015). Inside Southwark Cathedral: A study in psychological-type profiling. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 664-674. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.961705
- Lewis, C. A. (2012). Psychological type, religion, and culture: Theoretical and empirical perspectives. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 15*, 817-821. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.721534
- Lewis, C. A. (2015). Psychological type, religion, and culture: Further empirical perspectives. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 531-534. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2015.1103520
- Lewis, C. A., Varvatsoulis, G., & Williams, E. (2012). The psychological type profile of practising Greek Orthodox Christians in London. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 14*, 979-986. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.720753
- Muskett, J. A., & Village, A. (2015). Created to be guardians? Psychological type profiles of members of cathedral Friends associations in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 641-654. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.961249
- 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.
- Payne, V. J., & Lewis, C. A. (2015). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in Wales: A ministry for sensing types. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 535-543. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.963999

- Powell, R., Robbins, M., & Francis, L. J. (2012). The psychological type profile of lay church leaders in Australia. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 15*, 905-918.  
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.686478
- Randall, K. (2015). Early and late responders to questionnaires: Clues from psychological type. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 566-575.  
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.961248
- Robbins, M., Francis, L. J., & Powell, R. (2012a). Work-related psychological health among clergywomen in Australia. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 15*, 933-944.  
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.698044
- Robbins, M., Francis, L. J., & Powell, R. (2012b). Congregational bonding social capital and psychological type: An empirical enquiry among Australian churchgoers. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 15*, 1009-1022. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.676264
- Robbins, M., & Powell, R. (2015). Psychological type profile of Protestant church leaders in Australia: Are clergymen and clergywomen different? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 576-585. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.963997
- Ross, C. F. J. (1992). The intuitive function and religious orientation. *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 37*, 83-103. doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-5922.1992.00083.x
- Ross, C. F. J. (2011). Jungian typology and religion: A perspective from North America. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 22*, 165-191.  
doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.30
- Ross, C. F. J., & Francis, L. J. (2015). The perceiving process and mystical orientation: A study in psychological type theory among 16- to 18-year-old students. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 18*, 693-705. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.961353

- Ross, C. F. J., Weiss, D., & Jackson, L. M. (1996). The relation of Jungian psychological type to religious attitudes and practices. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 6, 263-279. doi.org/10.1207/s15327582ijpr0604\_3
- Stace, W. T. (1960). *Mysticism and philosophy*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott.
- Village, A. (2011). Introduction to special section: Psychological type and Christian ministry. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 157-164. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.28
- Village, A. (2012a). Biblical literalism among Anglican clergy: What is the role of psychological type? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 14, 969-978. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.686479
- Village, A. (2012b). Psychological type profiles of biblical scholars: An empirical enquiry among members of the Society of Biblical Literature. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 14, 1047-1053. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.681484
- Village, A. (2015). Psychological type functions and biblical scholarship: An empirical enquiry among members of the Society of Biblical Literature. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18, 605-621. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.961246
- Village, A., Baker, S., & Howatt, S. (2012). Psychological type profiles of churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 14, 987-995. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.686479
- Walker, D. S. (2012). O Come all ye thinking types: The wider appeal of the cathedral carol service. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15, 987-995. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.707436
- Walker, D. S. (2015). Unsettling the guardian: Quest religiosity and psychological type among Anglican churchgoers. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18, 655-663. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.963291

Williams, E., Francis, L. J., Billington, U., & Robbins, M. (2012). The psychological type profile of practising British Druids compared with Anglican churchgoers. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, *15*, 1065-1075. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.681483

Table 1

*Type distribution for Italian participants*

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 199 (17.2%) +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 104 (9.0%) +++++ ++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 34 (2.9%) +++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 55 (4.8%) +++++	E <i>n</i> = 556 (48.1%) I <i>n</i> = 599 (51.9%)  S <i>n</i> = 892 (77.2%) N <i>n</i> = 263 (22.8%)  T <i>n</i> = 599 (51.9%) F <i>n</i> = 556 (48.1%)  J <i>n</i> = 662 (57.3%) P <i>n</i> = 493 (42.7%)		
ISTP <i>n</i> = 62 (5.4%) +++++ ++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 68 (5.9%) +++++ +	INFP <i>n</i> = 52 (4.5%) +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 25 (2.2%) ++	<b>Pairs and Temperaments</b> IJ <i>n</i> = 392 (33.9%) IP <i>n</i> = 207 (17.9%) EP <i>n</i> = 286 (24.8%) EJ <i>n</i> = 270 (23.4%)  ST <i>n</i> = 484 (41.9%) SF <i>n</i> = 408 (35.3%) NF <i>n</i> = 148 (12.8%) NT <i>n</i> = 115 (10.0%)  SJ <i>n</i> = 546 (47.3%) SP <i>n</i> = 346 (30.0%) NP <i>n</i> = 147 (12.7%) NJ <i>n</i> = 116 (10.0%)  TJ <i>n</i> = 414 (35.8%) TP <i>n</i> = 185 (16.0%) FP <i>n</i> = 308 (26.7%) FJ <i>n</i> = 248 (21.5%)		
ESTP <i>n</i> = 77 (6.7%) +++++ ++	ESFP <i>n</i> = 139 (12.0%) +++++ +++++ ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 49 (4.2%) ++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 21 (1.8%) ++			
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 146 (12.6%) +++++ +++++ +++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 97 (8.4%) +++++ +++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 13 (1.1%) +	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 14 (1.2%) +			

  

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%
E-TJ	160	13.9	I-TP	87	7.5	Dt.T	247	21.4
E-FJ	110	9.5	I-FP	120	10.4	Dt.F	230	19.9
ES-P	216	18.7	IS-J	303	26.2	Dt.S	519	44.9
EN-P	70	6.1	IN-J	89	7.7	Dt.N	159	13.8

Note: *N* = 1,155 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

Table 2

*Mystical Orientation Scale: Correlation coefficients for each item with the rest of test and item endorsement*

	<i>r</i>	% high
<i>Ineffability</i>		
experience something I could not put into words	.40	68
feeling moved by a power beyond description	.47	53
being aware of more than I could ever describe	.32	63
<i>Noesis</i>		
sensing meaning in the beauty of nature	.38	77
knowing I was surrounded by a presence	.54	39
hearing an inner voice speak to me	.57	39
<i>Transiency</i>		
seeing brief glimpses into the heart of things	.54	69
having transient visions of the transcendental	.61	34
experiencing passing moments of deep insight	.51	53
<i>Passivity</i>		
being overwhelmed by a sense of wonder	.42	64
being in a state of mystery outside my body	.44	20
being grasped by a power beyond my control	.48	23
<i>Oneness</i>		
feeling at one with the universe	.54	36
feeling at one with all living beings	.50	48
sensing the unity in all things	.56	41
<i>Timelessness</i>		
losing a sense of time, place and person	.34	32
being conscious only of timelessness and eternity	.54	25
sensing the merging of past, present and future	.47	46
<i>True ego</i>		
being absorbed within a greater being	.58	44
losing my everyday self in a greater being	.59	45
feeling my everyday-self absorbed in the depths of being	.51	44

Note: *r* = correlation between individual item and sum of other items

% high = sum of high importance and quite high importance

N = 1,155

Table 3

*Mean mystical orientation scores by dichotomous type preference*

	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> <
extraversion	556	68.9	13.0		
introversion	599	67.0	13.0	2.4	NS
sensing	892	67.1	13.0		
intuition	263	70.6	13.1	3.9	.001
thinking	599	66.5	12.8		
feeling	556	69.4	13.2	3.8	.001
judging	662	67.2	12.6		
perceiving	493	68.8	13.6	2.1	NS

Note: Probability level set out at one percent

Table 4

*Mean mystical orientation scores by dominant type*

	N	Mean	SD
Dominant feeling	230	71.1	12.4
Dominant intuition	159	69.6	13.1
Dominant thinking	247	67.2	13.4
Dominant sensing	519	66.3	12.9

 $F(df\ 3, 1151) = 8.5, p < .001$

Table 5

*Mean mystical orientation scores by dominant with auxiliary type*

	N	Mean	SD
Dominant feeling with intuition	65	74.0	10.9
Dominant intuition with feeling	83	71.3	12.8
Dominant feeling with sensing	165	70.0	12.8
Dominant thinking with intuition	39	69.3	15.7
Dominant intuition with thinking	76	67.7	13.2
Dominant sensing with feeling	243	67.2	13.8
Dominant thinking with sensing	208	66.8	12.9
Dominant sensing with thinking	276	65.5	12.2

 $F(df\ 7, 1147) = 5.2, p < .001$

Table 6

*Mean mystical orientation scores by complete type*

	N	Mean	SD
INFP	52	75.0	10.7
ENTJ	14	74.4	12.9
ENTP	21	74.2	13.4
ENFP	49	73.3	11.9
ESFJ	97	70.8	12.3
ENFJ	13	69.9	11.1
ISFP	68	68.8	13.6
INFJ	34	68.3	13.7
ESTJ	146	67.4	12.6
ESFP	139	67.3	14.1
ISFJ	104	67.0	13.4
ESTP	77	66.6	12.7
INTP	25	66.4	16.6
ISTP	62	65.6	13.6
INTJ	55	65.2	12.3
ISTJ	199	65.1	11.9

 $F(df\ 15, 1139) = 3.7, p < .001$