



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

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

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

Author(s): Francis, Leslie J.; Mansfield, Simon; Williams, Emyr; Village, Andrew

Article Title: The Usefulness of Visitor Expectations Type Scales (VETS) for Tourist Segmentation: The Case of Cathedral

Year of publication: 2010

Link to published article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/108354210X12889831783279>

Publisher statement: None

The usefulness of Visitor Expectations Type Scales (VETS) for tourist segmentation: the  
case of cathedral visitors

Leslie J. Francis\*,  
University of Warwick, UK

Simon Mansfield  
St Mary's Centre, Wales, UK

Emyr Williams,  
University of Warwick, UK

Andrew Village,  
York St John University, UK

Author note:

\*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis  
Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit  
Institute of Education  
The University of Warwick  
Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539  
Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638  
Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

**Abstract**

This study applies Jungian psychological type theory to assess and to interpret the expectations of cathedral visitors. The Visitor Expectations Type Scales were developed among 35 individuals trained and qualified as type practitioners and then tested among a sample of 157 visitors who also completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales. The data demonstrated: the coherence and internal consistency reliability of the Visitor Expectations Type Scales; the particular emphases placed by cathedral visitors on introverted expectations, feeling expectations, and perceiving expectations; and the complex relationship between visitor expectations (conceptualised in psychological type categories) and their personal psychological type profile. The Visitor Expectations Type Scales 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.

### **Introduction**

The tourism industry is well familiar with the utility of the sociographic segmentation of the market. There are clearly established correlates of age, sex, and socio-economic status in the expectations, needs and consumer patterns of tourists (Kozak & Decrop, 2008).

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 the tourism industry in particular (Driver & Knopf, 1977; Frew & Shaw, 1999; Furnham, 1990; Lee-Huxter & Lester, 1988; Madrigal, 1995; Nolan & Patterson, 1990; Plog, 1987; Ross, 1998). Situated within the broad field of applying psychological type theory and assessment techniques within the tourism industry, the aim of the present paper is to describe, discuss and evaluate the Visitor Expectations Type Scales, developed within the context of English cathedrals being recognised as a significant visitor attraction. The development of the Visitor Expectations Type Scales was rooted in Jungian psychological type theory, and in a small body of previous empirical research that had extended this theoretical model to the tourism industry and to visitor studies.

### **Introducing psychological type theory**

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, 1971), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). 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.

### **Psychological type and tourism research**

In their seminal paper, Gountas and Gountas (2000) applied psychological type theory to discuss the psychographic segmentation of what they considered to be a representative sample of 760 travelling consumers flying to a wide range of popular short- and long-haul holiday destinations from 12 airports in the UK. While inspirational in its conception, this study nonetheless possesses key weaknesses. Not only does the study fail to include a recognised measure of psychological type, the specially constructed instrument employed fails to relate specifically with the tourism industry.

In a subsequent paper, Francis, Williams, Annis, and Robbins (2008) built on Gountas and Gountas' (2000) idea in two ways in order to appreciate the connection between the psychological type profile of cathedral visitors and individual differences in experience and appreciation. First, Francis, Williams, Annis, and Robbins (2008) included in their study, a recognised measure of psychological type, the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). By doing so they were able to delineate the type profile of Cathedral visitors with some precision and then contextualise their profile against the population norms provided by Kendall (1998). Their data demonstrated that cathedrals attract more introverts than extraverts, more sensors than intuitives, and more judgers than perceivers, but equal proportions of thinkers and feelers. Comparison with the population norms demonstrated that both extraverts and perceivers were under-represented among cathedral visitors.

Second, Francis, Williams, Annis, and Robbins (2008) included in their study two measures of visitor experience and appreciation, defined as the Scale of Facts and Information and the Scale of Feeling and Atmosphere. Their data demonstrated that different aspects of the visitor experience appealed to different psychological types. Sensors were more attracted than intuitives by the facts, information, and data that they encountered on their visit. Feelers were more attracted than thinkers by the atmosphere and the wider ambience of the cathedral during their visit. Both of these associations are consistent with the hypotheses generated by psychological type theory and confirm the functional utility of the theory in providing a coherent psychographic segmentation method in the tourism industry.

Although the study by Francis, Williams, Annis, & Robbins (2008) signalled a significant advance in applying psychological type theory to the tourism industry, their study leaves much of the potential of the theory untapped. In principle, each of the four

components of psychological type theory (the two orientations, the two perceiving functions, the two judging functions, and the two attitudes toward the outer world) generate hypotheses regarding individual differences in the expectations, needs and consumer patterns of tourists in general and of cathedral visitors in particular. Ways of formulating and testing theories generated by psychological type theory for other applied fields have been demonstrated in recent studies by Francis and Payne (2002), by Francis and Robbins (2008), and by Francis and Robbins (in press) 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 (in press) 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 level one programme, and tested this model through the Learning Preferences Inventory.

### **Research agenda**

Building on the model of relating psychological type theory to applied fields, established by the Payne Index of Ministry Styles (Francis & Payne, 2002), by the Prayer Preference Inventory (Francis & Robbins, 2008), and by the Learning Preferences Inventory (Francis & Robbins, in press), the Visitor Expectations Type Scales were developed to apply this theoretical framework and assessment model to the field of cathedral visitors. The

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.

### **Stage 1: Method**

*Materials* 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.

*Procedure* 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

### **Stage 1: Results**

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 decision to select eight items reflected the need to have sufficient items to sample each domain, but not too many items to overburden the respondents. The 64 items selected all achieved in excess of 77% agreement. It is these items that went forward to stage 2.

## Stage 2: Method

*Procedure* Two of the authors spent two days in Chester cathedral during early September 2008, 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.

*Context* The cathedral selected for this study is located in the ancient city of Chester, on the border between north east Wales and England. Chester Cathedral has its origins as a Benedictine Abbey founded in 1092 by Hugh Lupus, Earl of Chester. It was raised to cathedral rank in 1540 by Henry VIII, when the abbey was dissolved and the last Abbot became the first Dean. In their commentary on the building, Pevsner and Hubbard (1971) claim that ‘from some angles the church is impressive indeed’ (p.136), although it remains difficult to untangle its architectural history after a series of restorations during the nineteenth century, including work by Hussey, Scott and Blomfield.

*Sample* Thoroughly completed questionnaires were submitted by 157 visitors, 51 men and 106 women. Of these visitors, 12 were under the age of twenty, 36 were in their twenties and thirties, 50 were in their forties and fifties, 42 were aged sixty or over, and 17 failed to divulge their age. Three quarters (74%) were visiting from within the UK, 15% from Europe, and the remaining 11% from the rest of the world. One quarter (26%) attended church

services most weeks, 9% attended at least twice a month, 16% attended at least six times a year, and 25% attended at least once a year, leaving 23% who never attended church services.

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

Visitor expectations were assessed by the battery of 64 items selected by the procedure described in stage 1. In the questionnaire the items were prefaced by the phrase, 'On my visit to the cathedral I wanted to...'. Responses were located on a five-point Likert scale: agree strongly, agree, not certain, disagree, and disagree strongly.

*Data analysis* The data were analysed by means of the SPSS statistical package, using the correlation, factor, and reliability routines.

### **Stage 2: Results**

The first step in data analysis examined the performance of the 64 visitor expectation items. Explorative factor analysis and item rest-of scale Pearson correlation analyses were employed to select the six items from each set of eight that achieved the most satisfactory scaling properties. These resulting six-item summated scales are presented in tables 1, 2, 3 and 4, together with the item rest-of-scale correlations and percentage endorsements, where

the agree strongly and agree responses have been collapsed as ‘yes’, the disagree and disagree strongly responses have been collapsed as ‘No’ and the uncertain response has presented as ‘?’

-Insert tables 1,2,3,4, and 5 about here-

Table 5 presents the alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951) for the eight scales of visitor expectations, together with the means and standard deviation. These data demonstrate that seven of the eight VETS generated alpha coefficients in excess of DeVellis’ (2003) threshold of .65, but that the perceiving scale fell below this threshold.

The second step in data analysis examined the performance of the Francis Psychological Type Scales. Table 6 presents the alpha coefficients for these eight scales, together with the means and standard deviations. The data demonstrate that six of the eight scales generated alpha coefficients in excess of DeVellis’ threshold of .65, but that the sensing and intuition scales fell below this threshold.

-Insert tables 6 and 7 about here-

The third step in data analysis examined the association between the measures of visitor expectations and the measures of psychological type. Table 7 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients between the eight scales of the Visitor Expectation Type Scales and the four scales of the Francis Psychological Type Scales treated as continuous variables, with the high scoring poles defined as introversion, sensing, feeling and judging. These data demonstrate that the correlations between personal psychological type preferences and visitor expectations account for little of the variance.

### Discussion

The statistics presented in tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 provide important insights into the preferences of cathedral visitors conceptualised within the framework of psychological type. These are two orientations, two perceiving functions, two judging functions, and two attitudes toward the outer world.

In terms of the two orientations, among cathedral visitors there is much higher emphasis placed on introverted than on extraverted expectations. Over two thirds of the visitors want to pause to reflect on what they are seeing (89%) and to look around in the quiet and stillness (70%). Over half want to remain undisturbed by the people who work there (66%), to keep their thoughts and feelings to themselves (63%), to be left alone by other people (58%), and to find space to be alone (54%). By way of contrast, only a minority of cathedral visitors come seeking an extraverted experience. Around one third of the visitors want to talk with other people about the experience (37%), to share their experiences with others there and then (33%), or to engage with other people around them (29%). Around one quarter of the visitors want to explore the building as part of a large group (26%), to have many people around them (25%), or to join with a group of other visitors (18%).

In terms of the two perceiving functions, among cathedral visitors there is emphasis placed both on aspects of the intuitive function and on aspects of the sensing function. On the one hand, over half of the visitors want to have their imagination sparked (61%), to be fired by the rich symbolism of the cathedral (61%), to have their thoughts lifted beyond the here and now (54%), and to explore meanings (51%). On the other hand, over half of the visitors want to give attention to the details of the architecture (68%) and to know how the cathedral is used today (54%). At the same time, there are other aspects of both the sensing function

and the intuitive function that are less appealing to Cathedral visitors. On the one hand, under half of the visitors want to contemplate the big issues of life (39%) and to catch the vision for the future (30%). On the other hand, under half of the visitors want to read all the information boards (40%), to have their thoughts fully engaged with the here and now (37%), to smell the flowers (32%), and to learn about the cathedral organ (32%).

In terms of the two judging functions, among cathedral visitors there is a much higher emphasis placed on the feeling function than on the thinking function. Over half of the visitors want to appreciate the feelings of the people who worship there (71%), have a sympathetic presentation of the cathedral's work (63%), affirm and support what the cathedral staff are doing (62%), and appreciate the feelings of the people who work there (58%); 50% want to learn how much the cathedral works for harmony in the community, and 41% want to have warm-hearted and friendly guides. By way of contrast, under two-fifths of the visitors want to leave with a sense of having got to the truth (39%), to learn how much the cathedral works for truth and justice (39%), to make a critical evaluation of the role of the cathedral (37%), to interrogate what they were learning (36%), to assess and evaluate what the cathedral staff were doing (32%), and to ask sharp and penetrating questions (17%).

In terms of the two attitudes toward the outer world, among cathedral visitors there is more emphasis placed on a perceiving approach than on a judging approach. Over two thirds of the visitors wanted to make their visit flexible and open ended (76%), to take as much time as it needed (74%), and to enjoy freedom from routines and patterns (67%). Almost two thirds of the visitors wanted to avoid an over-structured experience (63%) and to approach the visit in a casual way (61%); 48% wanted to enjoy seeing others milling round here and there. By way of contrast, around half of the visitors wanted to take a planned tour of the

cathedral (49%) and to find what they were looking for (48%); and around a third wanted to have a tour-guide who was well organized (35%), to arrive having prepared well for their visit (33%) and to plan how to organize the visit (30%); but 63% wanted to see other visitors being orderly and disciplined.

### **Conclusion**

The present project set out to explore the psychographic segmentation of cathedral visitors, drawing on psychological type theory as originally proposed by Carl Jung and as developed and modified in a series of psychometric tests. Three main conclusions emerge from this study.

The first conclusion confirms the coherence and utility of psychological type theory for distinguishing between recognisable patterns in visitor expectations and behaviours. The alpha coefficients (table 5) generated by the eight six-item indices proposed by the Visitor Expectations Type Scale (VETS) confirmed that there are clusters of visitor expectations that map well onto the eight principle constructs defined by psychological type theory. It makes complete sense, therefore, to talk of visitor expectations in terms of introvert expectations, extravert expectations, sensing expectations, intuitive expectations, thinking expectations, feeling expectations, judging expectations and perceiving expectations.

The second conclusion is that the percentage responses to the individual items within the Visitor Expectations Type Scales provide good insight into the ways in which cathedral visitors conceptualise their approach to the cathedral. This approach (documented in tables 1, 2, 3 and 4) makes it clear that: in terms of the two orientations, cathedral visitors place higher emphasis on introverted than extraverted expectation; in terms of the two perceiving functions, cathedral visitors place similar emphasis on sensing expectations and on intuitive

expectations; in terms of the judging functions, cathedral visitors place higher emphasis on feeling expectations than on thinking expectations; and in terms of the two attitudes toward the outer world, cathedral visitors place higher emphasis on perceiving expectations than on judging expectations. Such findings should have implications for the marketing and management of cathedrals within the tourism industry.

The third conclusion (documented in table 7) is that the association between personal psychological type preferences and visitor expectations expressed in psychological type categories is trivial. Within the context of psychological type theory this finding suggests that it would be a mistake to imagine that all cathedral visitors approach the cathedral with expectations shaped by their strongest psychological type preferences. While for some this is the case, for others it is clearly not the case. For some the opportunity of visiting the cathedral allows them to exercise and to develop their less preferred psychological tendencies. For example, given its overall ambiance, the cathedral may well appeal as an introverted environment. For introverted visitors such an environment may speak to their personal preferred orientation, while for extraverted visitors such an environment may provide them with a refreshing opportunity to explore a less well developed side of their personality.

This third conclusion has profound implications for ways in which psychological type theory may be applied to psychographic segmentation relevant to the tourism industry. In this context the assessment and measurement of the psychological type preferences of cathedral visitors in particular and tourists in general may be more appropriately assessed not by general measures of psychological type, like the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, the Keirsey Temperament Sorter or the Francis Psychological Type Scales, but by specifically tailored

Visitor Expectations Type Scales suited for well-defined contexts and as exemplified in the present study by the case of cathedral visitors.

Taken together these three conclusions point to the potential benefits of psychological type theory in the sense of providing a coherent lens through which visitor responses to heritage attractions can be viewed and in the sense of providing a conceptual framework within which the management and marketing of such attractions can be assessed. On the one hand, the theoretical framework provides a basis for examining the extent to which different psychological preferences are being recognised and promoted by particular heritage attractions. On the other hand, the psychometric assessment tools provide information about the range of individuals currently accessing particular heritage attractions. Knowledge of this nature may allow those responsible for managing and marketing specific heritage attractions to make conscious decisions between concentrating on specific psychological preferences (niche marketing) or concentrating on widening the appeal across diverse psychological preferences.

There are three major limitations with the present study. First, the component scales of the Visitor Expectations Type Scales are relatively short and comprise only six items each. Future research could build on this fruitful start in order to develop longer scales capable of providing richer description and of achieving stronger internal consistency reliability. Second, these scales have been developed and tested on the basis of the responses of a sample of 157 visitors during the month of September. Future research could build on this initial study by returning to the same cathedral at other times of year, both to extend the size of the sample and to test for seasonal effects. Third, the present data have been restricted to

just one cathedral. Future research could test whether these findings established in Chester cathedral hold true for other cathedrals in England, Wales, and elsewhere.

### References

- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*, 297-334.
- 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.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- 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 Christianity*, *23*, 181-191.
- 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., & 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.
- Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (in press). Learning preferences and psychological type profile: An empirical enquiry among mature candidates pursuing a part-time level-one programme in Christian theology.
- 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.

- Frew, E., & Shaw, R. (1999). The relationship between personality, gender and tourism behaviour. *Tourism Management, 20*, 193-202.
- Furnham, A. (1990). Personality and demographic determinations of leisure and sport preference and performance. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 21*, 218-236.
- Gountas, J.Y., & Gountas, S. (2000). A new psychographic segmentation method using Jungian MBTI variables in the tourism industry. *Tourism Analysis, 5*, 151-156.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- 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, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Kozak M., & Decrop, A. (Eds.) (2008). *Handbook of tourist behaviours*. London: Routledge.
- Lee-Huxter, A., & Lester, D. (1988). Tourist behaviour and personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 9*, 177-178.
- Madrigal, R., (1995). Personal values, traveller personality type, and leisure travel style. *Journal of Leisure Research, 27*, 125-142.
- 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.
- Pevsner, N., & Hubbard, E. (1971). *Cheshire: The buildings of England*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

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.

Ross, G.F. (1998). *The psychology of tourism* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). Melbourne, Victoria: Hospitality Press.

Table 1

Orientation visitor expectations: item-rest-of-scale correlations and percentage endorsements

	r	Yes %	? %	No %
<i>Extraversion</i>				
Share my experiences with others there and then	.44	33	30	37
Join with a group of other visitors	.55	18	29	53
Talk with other people about the experience	.46	37	32	31
Have many people around me	.57	25	30	45
Engage with other people around me	.45	29	38	33
Explore the building as part of a large group	.41	26	29	46
<i>Introversion</i>				
Pause to reflect on what I was seeing	.28	89	6	4
Find space to be alone	.48	54	20	26
Be left alone by other people	.51	58	27	15
Keep my thoughts and feelings to myself	.30	63	25	13
Look around in the quiet and stillness	.41	70	20	10
Remain undisturbed by the people who work there	.31	66	25	9

Table 2

*Perceiving visitor expectations: item-rest-of-scale correlations and percentage endorsements*

	r	Yes %	? %	No %
<i>Sensing</i>				
Smell the flowers	.22	32	25	44
Learn all about the cathedral organ	.34	32	41	27
Know how the cathedral is used today	.60	54	32	15
Read all the information boards	.54	40	40	20
Have my thoughts fully engaged with the here and now	.44	37	37	26
Give attention to the details of the architecture	.44	68	23	10
<i>Intuition</i>				
Contemplate the big issues of life	.49	39	32	30
Have my thoughts lifted beyond the here and now	.59	54	28	18
Catch the vision for future developments	.52	30	40	30
Have my imagination sparked	.43	61	26	13
Be fired by the rich symbolism of the cathedral	.37	61	27	12
Explore meanings	.44	51	34	15

Table 3

*Judging visitor expectations: item-rest-of-scale correlations and percentage endorsements*

	r	Yes %	? %	No %
<i>Feeling</i>				
Affirm and support what the cathedral staff are doing	.39	62	25	13
Have warm-hearted and friendly guides	.33	41	34	25
Appreciate the feelings of the people who worship there	.52	71	21	8
Have a sympathetic presentation of the cathedral's work	.47	63	29	8
Appreciate the feelings of the people who work there	.61	58	30	12
Learn how much the cathedral works for harmony in the community	.57	50	34	17
<i>Thinking</i>				
Learn how much the cathedral works for truth and justice	.50	39	35	26
Interrogate what I was learning	.53	36	41	23
Ask sharp and penetrating questions	.56	17	37	46
Leave with a sense of having got to the truth	.42	39	41	20
Make a critical evaluation of the role of the cathedral	.53	37	39	23
Assess and evaluate what the cathedral staff are doing	.60	32	42	27

Table 4

*Attitude visitor experience: item-rest-of-scale correlations and percentage endorsements*

	r	Yes %	? %	No %
<i>Perceiving</i>				
Enjoy seeing others milling round here and there	.20	48	25	28
Make my visit flexible and open-ended	.28	76	18	6
Take as much time as it needed	.33	74	16	10
Approach the visit in a casual way	.38	61	23	17
Avoid an over-structured experience	.39	63	27	11
Enjoy freedom from routines and patterns	.43	67	24	10
<i>Judging</i>				
Arrive having prepared well for my visit	.28	33	37	30
See other visitors being orderly and disciplined	.32	63	20	17
Find what I was looking for	.14	48	39	13
Take a planned tour of the cathedral	.45	49	32	20
Plan how to organise the visit	.45	30	41	30
Have a tour-guide who was well organised	.54	35	39	27

Table 5

*Alpha coefficients, means and standard deviations for the Visitor Expectation Type Scales (VETS)*

	Alpha	Mean	SD
Extraversion	.74	16.89	4.12
Introversion	.65	22.26	3.43
Sensing	.69	19.34	3.85
Intuition	.74	20.28	3.98
Feeling	.74	21.27	3.77
Thinking	.78	18.35	4.10
Perceiving	.59	21.81	3.38
Judging	.66	19.15	3.77

Table 6

*Alpha coefficients, means and standard deviations for the FPTs*

	Alpha	Mean	SD
Extraversion	.75	4.85	2.75
Introversion	.75	5.15	2.75
Sensing	.59	5.52	2.23
Intuition	.59	4.48	2.23
Feeling	.65	5.42	2.44
Thinking	.65	4.58	2.44
Perceiving	.71	4.27	2.54
Judging	.71	5.73	2.54

Table 7

*Correlations between visitor expectations and psychological type*

	Francis Psychological Type Scales			
	I	S	F	J
Extraverted Expectations	-.13	-.01	.01	-.10
Introverted Expectations	.10	.07	.15	.03
Sensing Expectations	.04	.04	-.04	.11
Intuitive Expectations	.05	-.03	.11	.03
Feeling Expectations	.10	.02	.07	.15
Thinking Expectations	-.10	.11	-.03	.10
Judging Expectations	.00	.09	-.14	.16*
Perceiving Expectations	.09	.00	.14	-.06

Note:

In the above analysis the FPTS indices have been scored in the direction of I, S, F, and J.

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$