

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/137238>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

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:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

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

Psychographic segmentation of cathedral visitors in England and Wales:

Introducing the Visitor Expectations Type Scales 2.0 (VETS2.0)

Leslie J. Francis*

Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research (CEDAR)

University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

Simon Mansfield

St Mary's Centre, Abergwyngregyn, Wales, UK

Ursula McKenna

Centre for Education Studies (CES)

University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J. Francis

Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research (CEDAR)

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

This study employs Jungian psychological type theory, as subsequently developed by various type measures, to interpret and to classify the expectations of cathedral visitors, as assessed by the Visitor Expectations Type Scales 2.0 (VETS 2.0). Data provided by 1,278 visitors to five cathedrals in England and Wales demonstrated the coherence and internal consistency of the eight measures of the VETS 2.0 (designed to assess introvert expectations, extravert expectations, sensing expectations, intuitive expectations, feeling expectations, thinking expectations, perceiving expectations, and judging expectations) and drew attention to the particular emphasis placed by cathedral visitors on introvert expectations, feeling expectations, and perceiving expectations. The VETS 2.0 are commended as providing a more valid assessment of the psychographic segmentation of cathedral visitors than could be provided simply by the administration of a recognised measure of psychological type. Such assessment has implications for the marketing and management of cathedrals within the tourism industry.

Keywords: visitor expectations, cathedral studies, psychological type, tourist segmentation

Introduction

Francis, Mansfield, Williams, and Village (2010a) developed and tested the Visitor Expectations Type Scales (VETS) to explore individual differences in the ways in which visitors to cathedrals in England and Wales may bring different expectations concerning their visit. The present study builds on the foundations laid by Francis, Mansfield, Williams, and Village (2010a) in order to refine the original instrument and to propose a revised instrument, the Visitor Expectations Type Scales 2.0 (VETS 2.0). This research has been grounded in four main fields of enquiry, each of which will be reviewed in turn: social scientific segmentation within the tourism industry; grounding segmentation within psychological type theory; psychological type profiling of visitors to cathedrals; and projecting psychological type theory onto patterns of behaviour.

Social scientific segmentation and the tourism industry

The tourism industry is well familiar with the utility of sociological theory and sociological segmentation for understanding patterned individual differences in the expectations and behaviour of tourists and visitors (see Aposolopoulos, Leivadi & Yiannakis, 2001; Kozak & Decrop, 2008; Kumar, 2018; Cohen & Cohen, 2019). From such research traditions there are clearly established correlates of age, sex, and socio-economic status in the expectations, needs, and consumer patterns of tourists. Although considerably less visible than these sociologically defined variables, psychologically defined variables have also been shown to function as significant predictors of the expectations, needs and consumer patterns relevant both to the leisure industry in general, and to the tourism industry in particular (Driver & Knopf, 1977; Plog, 1987; Lee-Hoxter & Lester, 1988; Nolan & Patterson, 1990; Furnham, 1990; Madrigal, 1995; Ross, 1998; Frew & Shaw, 1999; Weaver, 2012; Abbate & Di Nuovo, 2013; Tan & Tang, 2013; Kvasova, 2015).

Grounding segmentation within psychological type theory

Psychological type theory was introduced to tourism research in a seminal paper by Gountas and Gountas (2000). Psychological type theory has its roots in the pioneering work of Carl Jung (1971) and has been developed and modified by 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; Francis, Laycock, & Brewster, 2017). 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. On the other hand, intuitive types (N) focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. 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. 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. 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. 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.

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 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.

Goutnas and Gountas (2000) devised their own measure of the four functions proposed by psychological type theory (sensing, intuition, feeling and thinking) and distributed 3,000 copies of this instrument among passengers on in-bound and out-bound flights from 12 UK airports to a variety of European and long-haul destinations. Nearly 800 questionnaires were returned and from that 760 were fully completed and suitable for factor analysis. From these data Gountas and Gountas (2000) concluded that psychological type

theory provides an appropriate psychographic segmentation of the tourism industry. Their analysis focuses on the distinctive characteristics of the four dominant preferences.

According to Gountas and Gountas' analysis, dominant sensing types are described as materially oriented and pragmatic individuals. Here are people who are likely to prefer holiday and leisure activities that include the enjoyment of tangible and material attributes, and of the natural world that can be experienced particularly with the senses. Dominant intuitive types are described as perceptive individuals. Here are people who are likely to prefer holiday and leisure activities that fire their interest in the imagined past civilizations, and in new and untested future possibilities. Dominant feeling types are described as affectively oriented individuals. Here are people who are likely to prefer holiday and leisure activities where emotional and feelings-driven experiences are of primary importance. Dominant thinking types are described as individuals for whom the mind is the driving force. Here are individuals who are likely to prefer holiday and leisure activities where there are opportunities to learn about new cultures, places, and people and where there is an emphasis on the understanding of how things work.

In a subsequent study Gountas and Gountas (2007) applied this same model of psychological type to explore the association between personality orientations, customer satisfaction and intention to repurchase. They concluded that different service settings produced different responses for each personality orientation.

Psychological type profile of cathedral visitors

While the introduction of psychological type theory to research in tourism and visitor studies is relatively recent and still under-developed, psychological type theory has been more extensively applied within the fields of the psychology of religion and empirical theology, especially as relevant to two specific areas. The first area is the science of clergy studies as illustrated by studies conducted among clergy within the Church of Wales

(Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001; Francis, Littler, & Robbins, 2010; Payne & Lewis, 2015), clergy within the Church of England (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007; Francis, Robbins, Duncan, & Whinney, 2010; Village, 2011; Francis, Robbins, & Whinney, 2011; Francis & Holmes, 2011; Francis, Robbins, & Jones, 2012; Francis & Village, 2012; Village, 2013, Francis & Smith, 2018), hospital chaplains within the Church of England (Francis, Hancocks, Swift, & Robbins, 2009), bishops within the Church of England (Francis, Whinney, & Robbins, 2013), ministers within the Methodist Church (Burton, Francis, & Robbins, 2010), local preachers within the Methodist Church (Francis & Stevenson, 2018), ministers within the Free Churches (Francis, Whinney, Burton, & Robbins, 2011), priests within the Roman Catholic Church (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006; Francis, Powell, & Robbins, 2012; Burns, Francis, Village, & Robbins, 2013; Francis & Crea, 2015, 2018), lead elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches (Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009), leaders within the Apostolic Networks (Kay, Francis, & Robbins, 2011), ministers within the Presbyterian Church USA (Francis, Robbins, & Wulff, 2011), and Anglican clergy in Newfoundland (Francis, Jones, & Peddle, 2016). The second area is the science of congregation studies, as illustrated by studies conducted in North America (Gerhardt, 1983; Rehak, 1998; Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Ross, 1993, 1995), and in the United Kingdom (Craig, Francis, Bailey, & Robbins, 2003; Francis, Duncan, Craig, & Luffman, 2004; Francis, Robbins, Williams, & Williams, 2007; Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011; Francis & Robbins, 2012; Francis, 2013; Francis, Wright, & Robbins 2016).

Alongside the science of clergy studies and the science of congregation studies, psychological type theory has played a part in the emerging science of cathedral studies. In terms of cathedral congregations, studies have been published on the psychological type profile of those who attend the regular Sunday services (Lankshear & Francis, 2015) and those who attend the annual festival of lessons and carols (Walker, 2012).

It is within this context of the science of cathedral studies that research has been undertaken on the psychological type profile of cathedral visitors by Francis, Williams, Annis, and Robbins (2008), Francis, Mansfield, Williams, and Village (2010b), Francis, Annis, Robbins, ap Siôn, and Williams (2012), and Francis, Robbins, and Annis (2015). In the most recent of these four studies, Francis, Robbins, and Annis (2015) reported on the psychological type profile of 2,695 visitors to St Davids Cathedral in west Wales, and compared the profile of these cathedral visitors to the population norms published for the UK by Kendall (1998). In terms of their own type profile, these data demonstrate that the 1,058 male cathedral visitors prefer introversion (61%) over extraversion (39%), sensing (74%) over intuition (26%), thinking (67%) over feeling (33%), and judging (81%) over perceiving (19%). The two most frequently represented types among male cathedral visitors are ISTJ (30%) and ESTJ (15%), followed by ISFJ (12%). In terms of comparison with the male population norms, the significant differences occur on the orientations and on the attitudes toward the outer world. Male cathedral visitors are significantly more likely to prefer introversion than is the case among men in general (61% compared with 53%). Male cathedral visitors are significantly more likely to prefer judging than is the case among men in general (81% compared with 55%). Regarding the dominant functions, male cathedral visitors are more likely to be dominant sensing types than men in general (47% compared with 41%) and less likely to be dominant thinking types than men in general (25% compared with 31%).

In terms of their own type profile, these data demonstrate that the 1,354 female cathedral visitors prefer introversion (56%) over extraversion (45%), sensing (71%) over intuition (30%), feeling (56%) over thinking (45%), and judging (82%) over perceiving (18%). The two most frequently represented types among female cathedral visitors are ISTJ (19%) and ISFJ (17%), followed by ESFJ (15%) and ESTJ (12%). In terms of comparison with the female population norms, female cathedral visitors differ from women in general on

the orientations and on the attitudes toward the outer world in the same direction as male cathedral visitors differ from men in general. Female cathedral visitors are significantly more likely to prefer introversion than is the case among women in general (56% compared with 43%). Female cathedral visitors are significantly more likely to prefer judging than is the case among women in general (82% compared with 62%).

Female cathedral visitors also differ from women in general on the perceiving process and on the judging process. Female cathedral visitors are significantly more likely to prefer intuition than is the case among women in general (30% compared with 21%). Female cathedral visitors are significantly more likely to prefer thinking than is case among women in general (45% compared with 30%). Regarding the dominant functions, female cathedral visitors are more likely to be dominant intuitive types than women in general (17% compared with 12%) and less likely to be dominant feeling types than women in general (25% compared with 33%).

Mapping psychological type theory onto behaviour

While psychological type theory provides a coherent account of ways in which individuals differ in terms of their personal psychological predispositions or preferences (distinguishing between introversion and extraversion, sensing and intuition, thinking and feeling, judging and perceiving), it would be mistaken to imagine a simple and direct pathway from psychological predisposition to public behaviour or actions. For example, while introverts may be energised by the inner world, they nonetheless engage competently in and gain enjoyment from the outer world. While extraverts may be energised by the outer world, they nonetheless engage competently in and gain enjoyment from the inner world. Indeed Jungian theory suggests that healthy psychological development (the process of individualisation) promotes and is promoted by engagement with the individual's less preferred psychological type characteristics (see Jung, 1971). Moreover, both leisure and

religion may offer opportunities for such engagement and for personal individual development. It is for this reason that research both within the psychology of religion and the psychology of tourism has begun to model psychological type measures grounded not in the psychological type preferences of the individual, but in their preferred expectations or behaviour.

For example, within the psychology of religion three examples of such measures have been provided by Francis and Payne (2002), by Francis and Robbins (2008), and by Francis and Robbins (2015) working in the area of practical theology. In the first study, Francis and Payne (2002) created a model derived from psychological type theory to describe and to account for individual differences in the ways in which clergy express their professional vocation, and tested their model through the Payne Index of Ministry Styles. In the second study, Francis and Robbins (2008) created a model derived from psychological type theory to describe and to account for individual differences on preferred styles of personal spirituality, and tested this model through the Prayer Preference Inventory. In the third study Francis and Robbins (2015) created a model derived from psychological type theory to describe and to account for individual differences in preferred learning styles among adult Christian learners engaged in a distance-learning undergraduate-level programme, and tested this model through the Learning Preferences Inventory.

Introducing the Visitor Expectations Type Scales

It is against this background that Francis, Mansfield, Williams, and Village (2010a) developed the Visitor Expectations Type Scales to apply the theoretical framework proposed by psychological type theory to the field of cathedral visitors. This development required a two-stage project. Stage 1 was designed to produce and to validate a battery of test items reflecting the projection of psychological type theory onto visitor behaviour. Stage 2 was

designed to test these items alongside a recognised measure of psychological type among a sample of cathedral visitors.

In stage 1 a group of four professionally-trained and qualified psychological type practitioners generated eight sets of statements to reflect the characteristics of extraversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving projected onto the assumed preferences of cathedral visitors. Each set comprised between 10 and 13 statements. The complete battery of statements, thoroughly randomised, were then emailed to the 70 individuals enrolled on the memberships list of the Network for Psychological Type and Christian Faith. After introducing the project, the instructions continued as follows, 'Please read each sentence and rate it by typing the letter (E, I, S, N, T, F, J, or P) onto which you think it maps. Please do not linger for too long over any one item.' A total of 35 individuals responded to this invitation. From the original battery of statements, the aim was to select the eight items representative of each of the eight components of psychological type that achieved the highest level of agreement among the 35 assessors. The 64 items selected all achieved in excess of 77% agreement. It is these items that went forward to stage 2.

In stage 2 two members of the research group spent two days in Chester cathedral, working alongside the stewards and chaplains to welcome visitors as they entered the Cathedral, having passed through the foyer and paid the admission fee. They handed a copy of the questionnaire to visitors, explained the purpose of the survey as enabling the cathedral to understand its visitors better, and invited them to complete the instrument before leaving. Visitors were assured of confidentiality, anonymity, and the voluntary nature of their participation. The researchers remained to greet the visitors as they left the cathedral and to collect completed questionnaires from those who had participated in the research. Thoroughly completed questionnaires were submitted by 157 visitors, 51 men and 106 women.

The data generated during stage 2 was employed to examine the eight sets of eight items in order to select the best performing six items within each set to comprise the eight components of the Visitor Expectations Type Scales. This strategy was largely successful, with seven of the eight proposed scales recording an alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951) meeting the threshold of .65 proposed by DeVellis (2003). The data generated by these scales confirmed some assumptions about the preferences of cathedral visitors, but equally challenged other assumptions.

Research aims

Against this background the purpose of the present study was to build on the foundation study reported by Francis, Mansfield, Williams, and Village (2010a) in four ways. The first research aim was to try to improve on the internal consistency reliabilities of the eight scales by refining some of the items and by increasing the length of each scale to seven items. In the original study the six-item scales achieved the following alpha coefficients: extraversion, .74; introversion, .65; sensing, .69; intuition, .74; feeling, .74; thinking, .78; judging, .66; and perceiving, .59.

The second research aim was to test these new scales on a larger and more diverse sample of cathedral visitors. While the original study was conducted among 157 participants attending one cathedral, the present study set an initial target of up to 1,250 visitors attending five cathedrals.

The third research aim was to explore whether five different cathedrals attracted visitors with significantly different expectations as defined within the theoretical framework that informed the Visitor Expectations Type Scales.

The fourth research aim was to explore whether visitor expectations, as conceived within the theoretical framework that informed the Visitor Expectations Type Scales, varied significantly among visitors according to their level of church attendance.

Method

Procedure

Permission was received from five cathedrals for the second author to invite visitors to these cathedrals to complete ‘The Cathedral and You’ survey booklet following a similar procedure to that described by Francis, Mansfield, Williams, and Village (2010a) in order to ensure compatibility between the two sets of data. The booklet introduced the survey in the following way:

This survey explores the thoughts and feelings of visitors to cathedrals. Please be honest, we want to know your views. Please do not pause for too long over any one question, and try to answer every question. Everything you tell us is completely confidential and anonymous. Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Measures

Visitor expectations were assessed by a pool of 58 items, shaped in line with the 48 items that comprised the original Visitor Expectations Type Scales, and from which the longer scales could be constructed. These items were prefaced by the phrase, ‘On my visit to the cathedral I wanted to...’. Responses were located on the five-point Likert scale: agree strongly (5), agree (4), not certain (3), disagree (2), and disagree strongly (1).

Religious attendance was assessed by the question, ‘How often do you attend acts of public worship?’, rated on a five-part scale: never (1), at least once a year (2), at least six times a year (3), at least once a month (4), and nearly every week (5).

Demographic information was collected regarding sex, age, and religious affiliation, and the context for visiting the cathedral.

Participants

The 1,278 participants comprised 583 men, 688 women, and 7 who did not disclose their sex. They ranged in age from 20 to 88 years, with a mean age of 52.2 years ($SD = 14.8$).

The participants comprised both churchgoers and non-churchgoers: 25% never attended church services, while 30% attended church services nearly every week; of the remaining 45%, 28% attended at least once a year, 10% at least six times a year, and 7% at least once a month. In terms of the following five options, 35% of the participants regarded themselves as holiday-makers, 35% as occasional visitors to the city, 14% as regular visitors to the city, 4% as people who were studying or working in the city, and 13% as people who lived in the city. Over half (52%) were visiting the cathedral for the first time, 22% were visiting the cathedral for the second time, and a further 7% were visiting the cathedral for the third time; the remaining 19% were more frequent visitors to the cathedral. Some of the participants had made quite a fleeting visit, while others had been much more leisurely in their approach: 12% had spent under 15 minutes on their visit, 33% had taken 15 to 29 minutes, 19% had taken 30 to 44 minutes, 16% had taken 45 to 60 minutes, and the remaining 21% had spent over an hour in the cathedral.

Data analysis

The data were analysed by means of SPSS, using the frequency, correlation, reliability, and ANOVA routines.

Results and discussion

Scale properties

- insert tables 1 to 5 about here -

Tables 1 to 4 present the items that comprise the eight scales of the Visitor Expectations Type Scales 2.0, together with the correlations between the individual items and the sum of the other items within the scale, and with the item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly responses. Table 5 then presents the alpha coefficients, the means, and the standard deviations for the eight scales. Seven of the eight scales now comprised seven items each. The seven scales all recorded alpha coefficients in excess of .65. The scale

concerning perceiving visitor expectations, however, failed to reach that threshold. The best fit for that scale were five items that generated an alpha of .62.

Scale content

The item endorsements provide helpful insight into how the balance of visitor expectations operates across the two orientations (introversion and extraversion), the two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), the two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and the two attitudes (judging and perceiving).

In terms of the two orientations, the visitor expectations were much higher within the domain of introversion than within the domain of extraversion. Reflecting introversion preferences, 93% of visitors wanted to pause to reflect on what they were seeing, 85% wanted to look around in the quiet and stillness, and 79% wanted to explore the building on their own. Well over half of the visitors wanted to find space to be alone (64%), to keep their thoughts and feelings to themselves (64%), to be left alone by other people (63%), and to remain undisturbed by the people who work there (59%). Reflecting extraversion preferences, around a third of the visitors wanted to share their experiences with others there and then (in the cathedral) (35%), wanted to talk with other people about the experience (34%), and wanted to engage with other people around them (30%). Under a quarter of the visitors wanted to find ways to express themselves with others (22%), wanted to have many people around them (20%), wanted to join with a group of other visitors (17%), or wanted to explore the building as part of a large group (12%). This view that cathedral visitors may value more highly an introverted approach for their visit is consistent with the profile reported by Francis, Robbins, and Annis (2015) who found that 61% of male and 56% of female cathedral visitors preferred introversion.

In terms of the two perceiving functions, the visitor expectations were quite high both within the domain of sensing and within the domain of intuition. Reflecting sensing

preferences, 78% wanted to give attention to the details of the architecture, 60% wanted to address the practical question regarding how the cathedral is used today, and 52% wanted to read all the information boards. Half of the visitors wanted to do something practical like light a candle (49%), but the proportions dropped to 33% who wanted to smell the flowers, and to 27% who wanted to learn about the organ. About two fifths of the visitors wanted to have their thoughts fully engaged with the here and now (43%). Reflecting intuitive preferences, more than three fifths of the visitors wanted to have their imagination sparked (69%), wanted to speculate about how the architects designed the cathedral (68%), wanted to be fired by the rich symbolism of the cathedral (66%), and wanted to have their thoughts lifted beyond the here and now (63%). Half of the visitors wanted to explore meanings (51%), and to dream about the wonders of creation (50%), but the proportion dropped to 38% who wanted to catch the vision for future development. This view that cathedral visitors may wish in similar measure for the cathedral to stimulate both the sensing function and the intuitive function suggests that, although 74% male cathedral visitors and 71% of female cathedral visitors prefer sensing (according to Francis, Robbins, & Annis, 2015), the cathedral may invite them to draw more strongly on their less preferred intuitive function.

In terms of the two judging functions, the visitor expectations were higher within the domain of feeling than within the domain of thinking. Reflecting feeling preferences, over two thirds of the visitors wanted to appreciate the feelings of people who worship in the cathedral (75%), wanted to affirm and support what the cathedral staff are doing (73%), wanted to have a sympathetic presentation of the cathedral's work (71%), and wanted to appreciate the feelings of the people who work in the cathedral (69%). Over half of the visitors wanted to have warm-hearted and friendly guides (55%), and wanted to learn how much the cathedral works for harmony in the community, but the proportion fell to 43% of the visitors who wanted to experience the life stories of the people who worship in the

cathedral. Reflecting thinking preferences, while 68% of the visitors wanted to stand back and analyse what was going on, but the proportions fell to around one third who wanted to leave with a sense of having got to the truth (37%), who wanted to learn how the cathedral works for truth and justice (36%), who wanted to interrogate what they were learning (35%), who wanted to assess and evaluate what the cathedral staff were doing (30%), and who wanted to make a critical evaluation of the role of the cathedral (29%). The proportion dropped further to 17% who wanted to ask sharp and penetrating questions. This view that cathedral visitors may value more highly a feeling approach to their visit contrasts with the findings of Francis, Robbins, and Annis (2015) that, while 56% of female cathedral visitors prefer feeling, the proportion fell to 33% among male cathedral visitors. The cathedral may invite both men and women to draw more strongly on their feeling function.

In terms of the two attitudes, the visitor expectations were much higher within the domain of perceiving than within the domain of judging. Reflecting perceiving preferences, the majority of visitors wanted to take as much time as their visit needed (91%), and to make their visit flexible and open-ended (82%). Around three-quarters of the visitors wanted to approach their visit in a casual way (77%), wanted to avoid an over-structured experience (73%), and wanted to enjoy freedom from routines and patterns (71%). Reflecting judging preferences, about half of the visitors came wanting to find what they were looking for (54%), and wanting to have a clear idea where they were going (48%). Around a third of the visitors wanted to arrive having prepared well for their visit (35%), but fewer than a third wanted to take a planned tour through the building (28%), wanted to have a tour-guide who was well-organised (27%), wanted to have a clear idea how long the visit would take (23%), or wanted to plan how to organise the visit (17%). The view that cathedral visitors may value more highly a perceiving approach for their visit contrasts strongly with the finding of Francis, Robbins, and Annis (2015) that 81% of male cathedral visitors and 82% of female

cathedral visitors prefer judging. The cathedral may invite visitors to step outside their preference for extraverting a judging function, and allow the experience of the environment to give fuller reign to their perceiving functions.

Comparing cathedrals

- insert tables 6a and 6b about here -

Tables 6a and 6b present the mean scale scores for the eight Visitor Expectations Type Scales for each of the five participating cathedrals separately in order to explore how much variation there may be among the expectation profile of visitors to these different cathedrals. One way analyses of variance show that there were significant differences among the five cathedrals recorded on the indices of introverted expectations, extraverted expectations, sensing expectations, intuitive expectations, thinking expectations, feeling expectations, and perceiving expectations, although no significant difference was recorded on the index of judging expectations.

However, while there were statistically significant differences in the mean scale scores on seven of the Visitor Expectations Type Scales, the size of the difference was quite small and probably indicates insufficient substantive difference to impact the policy of individual cathedrals in addressing visitor expectations. The trends identified on the basis of considering visitors to all five cathedrals together may be confidently applied in each of the individual cathedrals.

Exploring the effects of church attendance

- insert table 7 about here -

Table 7 presents the mean scale scores of the eight Visitor Expectations Type Scales for three levels of church attendance expressed by the visitors: those who never attended (25%), those who attended at least six times a year (38%), and those who attended at least monthly (37%). One way analyses of variance show that there were significant differences

recorded on seven of the eight indices according to levels of church attendance, but not on the index of perceiving expectations. Compared with those who never attended church, higher scores were recorded by those who attended monthly on the indices of introverted expectations, extraverted expectations, sensing expectations, intuitive expectations, thinking expectations, feeling expectations, and judging expectations.

These findings suggest that the pattern of expectations, as conceived within the theoretical framework that informed the Visitor Expectations Type Scales, does not *vary* between frequent churchgoers and those who never attend church. The pattern remains constant, although across these styles of expectations, the expectations are higher among churchgoers. Whatever their pattern of expectations, churchgoers seem more informed about what they expect.

Conclusion

Building on the more general earlier research reported by Gountas and Gountas (2000, 2007) who introduced psychological type theory to the field of psychographic segmentation within the tourism industry, and extending the more specific earlier research reported by Francis, Mansfield, Williams, and Village (2010a) who developed the Visitor Expectations Type Scales among 157 visitors to Chester Cathedral, the present study was designed to address four research aims.

The first research aim was to try to improve on the internal consistency reliabilities of the eight six-item scales (designed to access introvert expectations, extravert expectations, sensing expectations, intuitive expectations, feeling expectations, thinking expectations, perceiving expectations, and judging expectations) proposed by Francis, Mansfield, Williams, and Village (2010a) by refining some of the items and by increasing the length of each scale to seven items. This aim was largely successful. Reliabilities were increased for the extraversion scale from .74 to .85, for the judging scale from .66 to .76, for the

introversion scale from .65 to .71, for the intuition scale from .74 to .79, for the feeling scale from .74 to .79, and for the thinking scale from .78 to .80. Reliability for the sensing scale fell from .69 to .66. The real problem, however, remained with the perceiving scale where the best fit reliability stood at .62 after dropping two poorly performing items and settling for a five-item scale. Two main conclusions emerge from these findings. First, overall the Visitor Expectations Type Scales 2.0 can be commended for further use and as an improvement on the earlier set of scales proposed by Francis, Mansfield, Williams, and Village (2010a). Second, further research and development is still clearly needed to improve the perceiving expectations scale.

The second research aim was to test these new scales on a larger and more diverse sample of cathedral visitors to complement and augment the initial study undertaken by Francis, Mansfield, Williams, and Village (2010a) among 157 visitors in one cathedral. The present study set an initial target of up to 1,250 visitors attending five cathedrals. This aim was achieved with 1,278 participants. Drawing on these data a clear profile of cathedral visitor expectations emerged from which four conclusions can be draw in respect of the four components of psychological type theory. First, visitor expectations were much higher within the domain of introversion than within the domain of extraversion. Second, visitor expectations were quite high both within the domain of sensing and within the domain of intuition. Third, visitor expectations were higher within the domain of feeling than within the domain of thinking. Fourth, visitor expectations were much higher within the domain of perceiving than within the domain of judging.

The third research aim was to explore whether the five different cathedrals attracted visitors with significantly different expectations as defined within the theoretical framework that informed the Visitor Expectations Type Scales. The data demonstrated that, while there were statistically significant differences in the mean scale scores on seven of the eight Visitor

Expectations Type Scales, the size of the difference was quite small and probably indicates insufficient substantive difference to impact the policy of individual cathedrals in addressing visitor expectations. This conclusion, however, needs further testing by replicating the present study within other cathedrals.

The fourth research aim was to explore whether visitor expectations, as conceived within the theoretical framework that informed the Visitor Expectations Type Scales, varied significantly among visitors according to their level of church attendance. The data demonstrated that, while there were statistically significant differences in the mean scale scores on seven of the eight Visitor Expectations Type Scales, the direction of the difference was the same in respect of all seven indices. In other words, the *pattern* of expectations does not vary between frequent churchgoers and those who never attend church, but the expectations across all seven indices are higher and more clearly formed among those who are more familiar with the patterns of Christian worship around which cathedrals have been built. Thus, within the conceptual framework proposed by the Visitor Expectations Type Scales, cathedrals may expect similar type characteristics to be displayed alike by churchgoers and by non-churchgoers.

From research to practice

The findings from the present study, based on the responses of over 1,250 visitors to five cathedrals should be of practical value to cathedrals concerned with developing their ministry among visitors and with maximising the visitor experience within their cathedral. Two main recommendations emerge from this research, one general and the other specific.

The general recommendation is that those making provision for cathedral visitors may benefit from some systematic immersion within psychological type theory. When public-facing practitioners are given opportunity to explore their own psychological type preferences and at the same time to gain awareness of the psychological type preference of their

colleagues, the relevance of the theory for their own professional engagement becomes more obvious (see Smith, 2015; Francis & Smith, 2015; Smith & Francis, 2015).

The specific recommendation derives from applying the four key insights generated by the findings of the present study. The first finding is that visitor expectations were much higher within the domain of introversion than within the domain of extraversion. For example, 93% of visitors wanted to pause and reflect on what they were seeing, and 85% wanted to look around in the quiet and stillness. It is, of course, far too easy for a busy and thoughtless cathedral to erode such opportunities just by carrying out their daily business. On the other hand, quiet and stillness can be encouraged by sensitive lighting and evocative music. At the same time, it is necessary to be aware that a minority of visitors would wish to engage in a more extraverted manner.

The second finding is that visitor expectations were quite high both within the domain of sensing and within the domain of intuition. These two distinctive perceiving functions are active within the cathedral in complementary ways. While 78% of the visitors wanted to give attention to the details of the architecture (sensing), 69% wanted to have their imagination sparked (intuition). Cathedral signage may tend to prioritise sensing over intuition. There is clearly room for both approaches, and both approaches will be welcomed by visitors.

The third finding is that visitor expectations were higher within the domain of feeling than within the domain of thinking. Over two thirds of the visitors wanted to appreciate the feelings of people who worship in the cathedral (75%) and wanted to affirm and support what cathedral staff are doing (73%). There may be greater opportunities for cathedrals to introduce their visitors to the human stories of the lives shaped within the cathedral, with opportunities to hear about the people who animate the cathedral community. At the same time a significant minority of visitors were seeking to explore issues of truth and justice. The teaching and the apologetic ministry of cathedrals may also be welcomed by some visitors.

The fourth finding is that visitor expectations were much higher within the domain of perceiving than within the domain of judging. The cathedral cannot anticipate that visitors have arrived well-prepared for their visit, already knowing what the cathedral has to offer. It is in this domain that cathedrals may need to become more canny in offering their visitors an induction experience *before* letting them loose to roam. It is here that carefully constructed visitor centres may add enormous value to the visitor experience. In this respect there may be much to learn from the experience of bodies like the National Trust that offer to engage the visitors' curiosity before they are given access to the heritage site itself.

In summary what psychological type theory and the findings from the Visitor Expectations Type Scales are able to offer to cathedrals is a fresh lens through which to view and to shape the visitor experience and empirical evidence on which to structure future planning and development.

ORCID

Leslie J. Francis <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2946-9980>

Ursula McKenna <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2625-7731>

References

- Abbate, C. S., & Di Nuovo, S. (2013). Motivation and personality traits for choosing religious tourism: A research on the case of Medjugorje. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 16, 501-506. doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2012.749844
- Apostolopoulos, Y., Leivadi, S., & Yiannakis, A. (Eds.) (2001). *The sociology of tourism: Theoretical and empirical investigations*. London: Routledge.
- 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. doi.org/10.1007/s11089-012-0483-7
- 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. doi.org/10.1163/157092510X503020
- Cohen, S. A., & Cohen, E. (2019). New directions in the sociology of tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22, 153-172. doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2017.1347151
- 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. doi.org/10.1080/13617670600849812
- 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. doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555
- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990). Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 20, 25-33.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage.

Driver, B., & Knopf, R. (1977). Personality, outdoor recreation, and expected consequences.

Environment and behaviour, 9, 169-193. doi.org/10.1177/001391657792002

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

Darton, Longman and Todd.

Francis, L. J. (2013). The psychological type profile of a church: A case study.

Comprehensive Psychology, 2, 6. doi.org/10.2466/01.09.CP.2.6

Francis, L. J., Annis, J., Robbins, M., ap Sion, T., & Williams, E. (2012). National heritage and spiritual awareness: A study in psychological type theory among visitors to St

David's Cathedral. In F.-V. Anthony, & H.-G. Ziebertz (Eds.), *Religious identity and national heritage: Empirical theological perspectives*. (pp. 123-147). Leiden: Brill.

doi.org/10.1163/9789004228788_008

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. doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2007.17

Francis, L. J., & Crea, G. (2015). Psychological temperament and the Catholic priesthood: An empirical enquiry among priests in Italy. *Pastoral Psychology*, 64, 827-837.

doi.org/10.1007/s11089-015-0661-5

Francis, L. J., & Crea, G. (2018). The psychological temperament of Catholic priests and

religious sisters in Italy. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 29, 22-33.

doi.org/10.1163/9789004382640_003

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. doi.org/10.1558/jate.1.1.65.36058

- 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. doi.org/10.1080/13617670902784568
- 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. doi.org/10.1558/prth.v2i2.269
- Francis, L. J., & Holmes, P. (2011). Ordained Local Ministers: The same Anglican orders, but different psychological temperaments? *Rural Theology*, 9, 151-160. doi.org/10.1558/ruth.v9i2.151
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & Peddle, G. (2016). The psychological temperament of Anglican clergy in the rural Diocese of Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador. *Rural Theology*, 14, 44-52. doi.org/10.1080/14704994.2016.1154726
- Francis, L. J., Laycock, P., & Brewster, C. (2017). Exploring the factor structure of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS) among a sample of Anglican clergy in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 20, 930-941. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2017.1375469
- 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., Mansfield, S., Williams, E., & Village, A. (2010a). The usefulness of Visitor Expectations Type Scales (VETS) for tourist segmentation: The case of cathedral visitors. *Tourism Analysis*, 15, 545-554. doi.org/10.3727/108354210X12889831783279
- Francis, L. J., Mansfield, S., Williams, E., & Village, A. (2010b). Applying psychological type theory to cathedral visitors: A case study of two cathedrals in England and

Wales, *Visitor Studies*, 13, 175-186. doi.org/10.1080/10645578.2010.509695

Francis, L. J. & Payne, V. J. (2002). The Payne Index of Ministry Styles (PIMS): Ministry styles and psychological type among male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 13, 125-141.

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. (2008). Psychological type and prayer preferences: A study among Anglican clergy in the United Kingdom. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 11, 67-84. doi.org/10.1080/13674670701619445

Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2012). Not fitting in and getting out. Psychological type and congregational satisfaction among Anglican churchgoers in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 1023-1035. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.676260

Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2015). Learning styles and psychological preferences among Christian disciples. *Rural Theology*, 13, 54-68.
doi.org/10.1179/1470499415Z.000000000041

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Annis, J. (2015). The gospel of inclusivity and cathedral visitors. In L. J. Francis (Ed.), *Anglican cathedrals in modern life: The science of cathedral studies* (pp. 189-214). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
doi.org/10.1057/9781137559319_10

- 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. doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2011.036
- 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. Briseno (Eds.), *Psychology of intuition* (pp. 211-219). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- 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 and Culture*, 15, 945-953. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.698449
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Whinney, M. (2011). Women priests in the Church of England: Psychological type profile. *Religions*, 2, 389-397. doi.org/10.3390/rel2030389
- 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. doi.org/10.1179/rut_2007_5_1_003
- 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. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.38
- Francis, L. J., & Smith, G. (2015). Exploring organised and visionary approaches to designing an Advent Fun Day in an educational setting. *International Journal of Christianity and Education*, 19, 57-72. doi.org/10.1177/2056997115575643

- Francis, L. J., & Smith, G. (2018). Changing patterns in recruitment to stipendiary ministry: A study in psychological profiling. *Theology*, 121, 268-277.
doi.org/10.1177/0040571X18765426
- Francis, L. J., & Stevenson, A. (2018). Profiling Methodist leadership. *Holiness*, 4(1), 7-26.
- 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. doi.org/10.1163/157092512X635743
- Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., Burton, L., & Robbins, M. (2011). Psychological type preferences of male and female Free Church Ministers in England. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 251-263. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.55
- Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., & Robbins, M. (2013). Who is called to be a bishop? A study in psychological type profiling of bishops in the Church of England. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 34, 135-151. doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2013.801647
- Francis, L. J., Williams, E., Annis, J., & Robbins, M. (2008). Understanding cathedral visitors: Psychological type and individual differences in experience and appreciation, *Tourism Analysis*, 13, 71-80. doi.org/10.3727/108354208784548760
- Francis, L. J., Wright, H., & Robbins, M. (2016). Temperament theory and congregation studies: Different types for different services? *Practical Theology*, 9, 29-45.
doi.org/10.1080/1756073X.2016.1149679
- Frew, E., & Shaw, R. (1999). The relationship between personality, gender and tourism behaviour. *Tourism Management*, 20, 193-202. doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(98)00081-8
- Furnham, A. (1990). Personality and demographic determinations of leisure and sport preference and performance. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 21, 218-236.

- Gerhardt, R. (1983). Liberal religion and personality type. *Research in Psychological Type*, 6, 47-53.
- Gountas, J. Y., & Gountas, S. (2000). A new psychographic segmentation method using Jungian MBTI variables in the tourism industry. *Tourism Analysis*, 5, 151-156.
- Gountas, J. Y., & Gountas, S. (2007). Personality orientations, emotional states, customer satisfaction, and intention to repurchase. *Journal of Business Research*, 60, 72-75.
doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.08.007
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kay, W. K., Francis, L. J., & Robbins M. (2011). A distinctive leadership for a distinctive network of churches? Psychological type theory and the Apostolic Networks. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 20, 306-322. doi.org/10.1163/174552511X597170
- Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Kozak, M., & Decrop, A. (Eds.) (2008). *Handbook of tourist behaviours*. London: Routledge.
doi.org/10.4324/9780203881804
- Kumar, V. (2018). Emerging trends in the sociology of tourism. *Sociology International Journal*, 2, 225-237. doi.org/10.15406/sij.2018.02.00053
- Kvasova, O. (2015). The Big Five personality traits as antecedents of eco-friendly tourist behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 83, 111-116.
doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.04.011

- Lankshear, D. W., & Francis, L. J. (2015). Inside Southwark Cathedral: A study in psychological type profiling. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 18, 664-674. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.961705
- Lee-Huxter, A., & Lester, D. (1988). Tourist behaviour and personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9, 177-178. doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(88)90045-1
- Madrigal, R. (1995). Personal values, traveller personality type, and leisure travel style. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27, 125-142. doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1995.11949738
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Nolan, L. L., & Patterson, S. J. (1990). The active audience: Personality type as an indicator of TV program preference. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 5, 697-710.
- 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 and Culture*, 18, 535-543. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.963999
- Plog, S. (1987). The uses and demands for psychographic research. In J. R. Brent-Richie & C. R. Goeldner (Eds.) *Travel, tourism and hospitality research*. New York: J Wiley and Sons.
- Rehak, M. C. (1998). Identifying the congregation's corporate personality. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 44, 39-44.
- 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.

- Ross, G. F. (1998). *The psychology of tourism* (2nd Edition). Melbourne, Victoria: Hospitality Press.
- Smith, G. (2015). Psychological type and the training relationship: An empirical study among curates and training incumbents. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 18, 556-565. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.963998
- Smith, G., & Francis, L. J. (2015). Experiencing and reflecting on thinking and feeling in pastoral care: Deploying psychological type theory in continuing ministerial formation. *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, 12, 69-78. doi.org/10.1179/1740714115Z.000000000037
- Tan, W.-K., & Tang, C.-Y. (2013). Does personality predict tourism information search and feedback behaviour? *Current Issues in Tourism*, 16, 388-406. doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2013.766155
- Village, A. (2011). Gifts differing? Psychological type among stipendiary and non-stipendiary clergy. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 230-250. doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004207271.i-360.49
- Village, A. (2013). Traditions within the Church of England and psychological type: A study among the clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 26, 22-44. doi.org/10.1163/15709256-12341252
- Walker, D. S. (2012). O come all ye thinking types: The wider appeal of the cathedral carol service. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 987-995. doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.707436
- Weaver, D. B. (2012). Psychographic insights from a South Carolina protected area. *Tourism Management*, 33, 371-379. doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.04.006

Table 1

Orientations Visitor Expectations: Scale properties

	<i>r</i>	%
<i>Introversion</i>		
Pause to reflect on what I was seeing	.34	93
Find space to be alone	.43	64
Be left alone by other people	.55	63
Keep my thoughts and feelings to myself	.39	64
Look around in the quiet and stillness	.53	85
Remain undisturbed by people who work there	.45	59
Explore the building on my own	.32	79
<i>Extraversion</i>		
Share my experiences with others there and then	.60	35
Join with a group of other visitors	.65	17
Talk with other people about the experience	.65	34
Have many people around me	.59	20
Engage with other people around me	.68	30
Explore the building as part of a large group	.56	12
Find ways to express myself with others	.56	22

Table 3

Perceiving Visitor Expectations: Scale properties

	<i>r</i>	%
<i>Sensing</i>		
Smell the flowers	.34	33
Learn all about the cathedral organ	.42	27
Know how the cathedral is used today	.44	60
Read all the information boards	.42	52
Have my thoughts fully engaged with the here and now	.42	43
Give attention to the details of the architecture	.27	78
Light a candle	.33	49
<i>Intuition</i>		
Have my thoughts lifted beyond the here and now	.57	63
Catch the vision for future developments	.50	38
Have my imagination sparked	.59	69
Be fired by the rich symbolism of the cathedral	.57	66
Explore meanings	.59	51
Dream about the wonders of creation	.60	50
Speculate about how the architects designed it	.24	68

Table 3

Judging Visitor Expectations: Scale properties

	<i>r</i>	%
<i>Thinking</i>		
Learn how the cathedral works for truth and justice	.56	36
Interrogate what I was learning	.48	35
Ask sharp and penetrating questions	.57	17
Leave with a sense of having got to the truth	.54	37
Make a critical evaluation of the role of the cathedral	.54	29
Assess and evaluate what the cathedral staff are doing	.55	30
Stand back and analyse what was going on	.47	68
<i>Feeling</i>		
Affirm and support what the cathedral staff are doing	.49	73
Have warm-hearted and friendly guides	.50	55
Appreciate the feeling of people who worship here	.57	75
Have a sympathetic presentation of the cathedral's work	.49	71
Appreciate the feelings of the people who work here	.59	69
Learn how much the cathedral works for harmony in the community	.60	54
Experience life stories of the people who worship here	.42	43

Table 4

Attitude Visitor Expectations: Scale properties

	<i>r</i>	%
<i>Judging</i>		
Arrive having prepared well for my visit	.45	35
Plan how to organise the visit	.57	17
Have a tour-guide who was well organised	.42	27
Find what I was looking for	.36	54
Have a clear idea how long it would take	.48	23
Have a clear idea where I was going	.53	48
Take a planned tour through the building	.55	28
<i>Perceiving</i>		
Make my visit flexible and open-ended	.45	82
Take as much time as it needed	.39	91
Approach the visit in a casual way	.29	77
Avoid an over-structured experience	.36	73
Enjoy freedom from routines and patterns	.41	71

Table 5

Scale properties for the Visitor Expectations Scale 2.0

	N items	alpha	Mean	SD
Extraversion	7	.85	19.39	5.19
Introversion	7	.71	26.99	3.98
Sensing	7	.66	23.20	4.22
Intuition	7	.79	24.67	4.69
Feeling	7	.79	25.66	4.33
Thinking	7	.80	21.73	4.59
Perceiving	5	.62	19.74	2.64
Judging	7	.76	21.23	4.46

Table 6a

Mean VETS 2.0 scale scores by cathedral (part one)

	Introversion		Extraversion		Sensing		Intuition	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Cathedral 1	27.6	4.0	19.2	5.5	23.9	4.3	25.1	4.8
Cathedral 2	25.8	4.5	19.3	5.2	22.2	4.4	23.4	4.9
Cathedral 3	27.5	3.5	19.3	5.4	23.0	4.5	25.0	5.0
Cathedral 4	26.9	3.6	20.9	5.2	23.9	3.9	25.4	4.1
Cathedral 5	27.0	3.7	19.0	4.8	23.1	4.0	24.5	4.5
<i>F</i>	6.7***		4.4**		5.8***		5.7***	

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

Table 6b

Mean VETS 2.0 scale scores by cathedral (part two)

	Thinking		Feeling		Judging		Perceiving	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Cathedral 1	22.0	5.1	26.0	4.2	21.5	4.5	20.2	4.2
Cathedral 2	20.5	4.6	24.6	5.0	20.8	4.5	19.2	3.1
Cathedral 3	21.9	4.8	25.7	4.3	21.2	4.8	20.0	2.3
Cathedral 4	22.5	4.3	26.8	4.0	21.8	4.9	19.8	2.7
Cathedral 5	21.8	4.2	25.5	4.1	21.1	4.1	19.6	2.6
<i>F</i>	5.2***		6.5***		1.3		5.1***	

Note: *** $p < .001$

Table 7

Mean VETS 2.0 scale scores by frequency of church attendance

	Never		6 per year		Monthly		F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Introversion	26.4	4.4	27.2	3.7	27.2	3.9	4.7**
Extraversion	17.4	5.0	19.4	4.7	20.7	5.3	40.2***
Sensing	21.8	4.2	23.6	4.0	23.8	4.3	25.1***
Intuition	22.3	4.9	24.7	4.3	26.2	4.3	71.8***
Thinking	19.9	4.8	21.9	4.2	22.8	4.5	39.2***
Feeling	24.0	4.6	25.8	4.1	26.6	4.1	37.1***
Judging	19.5	4.3	21.6	4.0	22.0	4.6	33.3***
Perceiving	19.7	3.0	19.8	3.4	19.7	2.6	0.3

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