



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): Leslie J. Francis, Simon Mansfield, Emyr Williams and Andrew Village

Article Title: Applying Psychological Type Theory to Cathedral Visitors: A Case Study of Two Cathedrals in England and Wales

Year of publication: 2010

Link to published article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10645578.2010.509695>

Publisher statement: This is a preprint of an article whose final and definitive form has been published in Visitor Studies, 2010

© Taylor & Francis]; Visitor Studies is available online at:

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a927854195~db=all~jumptype=rss>

Applying psychological type theory to cathedral visitors: a case study of two cathedrals in
England and Wales

Leslie J Francis*,

University of Warwick, UK

Simon Mansfield,

St Mary's Centre at St Deiniol's Library, 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 employs Jungian psychological type theory to profile visitors to Chester Cathedral in England and St Davids Cathedral in Wales. Psychological type theory offers a fourfold psychographic segmentation of visitors, distinguishing between introversion and extraversion, sensing and intuition, thinking and feeling, and judging and perceiving. New data provided by 157 visitors to Chester Cathedral (considered alongside previously published data provided by 381 visitors to St Davids Cathedral) demonstrated that these two cathedrals attract more introverts than extraverts, more sensors than intuitives, and more judges than perceivers, but equal proportions of thinkers and feelers. Comparison with the population norms demonstrated that extraverts and perceivers are significantly under-represented among visitors to these two cathedrals. The implications of these findings are discussed both for maximising the visitor experiences of those already attracted to these cathedrals and for discovering ways of attracting more extraverts and more perceivers to explore these cathedrals.

Keywords: Cathedrals, tourism, psychological type, personality, religion

Introduction

Psychological type theory provides a coherent model of individual differences that has proved useful within a number of applied fields, including dentistry (Sandow, Jones, & Moody, 2000), Christian ministry (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007), the real estate industry (Cahill, 2007), social work (Chesborough, 2009) and teacher education (Francis, 2006). The utility of psychological type theory for psychographic segmentation within the tourism industry has been demonstrated in a couple of recent pioneering studies reported by Gountas and Gountas (2000) and Francis, Williams, Annis, and Robbins (2008). The first of these two studies is based on holiday air travellers, and the second on cathedral visitors.

Psychological type theory has its roots in the pioneering and original thinking of Carl Jung as set out in his classic book *Psychological Types* (Jung, 1971). The theory has been subsequently developed, modified and operationalised in a series of self-report psychological tests, the best known of which are the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) and the Kiersey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978). At its heart psychological type theory identifies and discusses four key aspects of the human psyche. The distinguishing feature of psychological type theory is that it conceptualises these four key aspects of the human psyche in terms of polar opposites. While most current personality theories work in terms of locating individuals at points along a psychological continuum, psychological type theory works in terms of locating individuals within contrasting type categories, making the model particularly attractive for psychographic segmentation purposes.

The first contrast is defined by the notion of orientation. The two orientations are concerned with where energy is drawn from and focused. On the one hand, extraverts (E) are orientated toward the outer world; they are energised by the events and people around them.

They enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and exciting environments. They tend to focus their attention on what is happening outside themselves. They are usually open people, easy to get to know, and enjoy having many friends. Introverts (I), on the other hand, are orientated toward their inner world; they are energised by their inner ideas and concepts. They enjoy solitude, silence, and contemplation, as they tend to focus their attention on what is happening in their inner life. They may prefer to have a small circle of intimate friends rather than many acquaintances.

The second contrast is defined by the notion of perceiving. The two perceiving functions are concerned with the way in which people gather information. On the one hand, sensing types (S) focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They tend to focus on specific details, rather than on the overall picture. They are concerned with the actual, the real, and the practical; they tend to be down to earth and matter of fact. On the other hand, intuitive types (N) focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. They may feel that perception by the senses is not as valuable as information gained from the unconscious mind as indirect associations and concepts impact on their perception. They focus on the overall picture, rather than on specific facts and data.

The third contrast is defined by the notion of judging. The two judging functions are concerned with the criteria which people employ to make decisions and judgements. On the one hand, thinking types (T) make decisions and judgements based on objective, impersonal logic. They value integrity and justice. They are known for their truthfulness and for their desire for fairness. They consider conforming to principles to be of more importance than cultivating harmony. For thinkers impersonal objectivity is more important than interpersonal relationships. For them the mind is more important than the heart. On the other hand, feeling types (F) make decisions and judgements based on subjective, personal values. They value compassion and mercy. They are known for their tactfulness and for their desire for peace.

They are more concerned to promote harmony, than to adhere to abstract principles. For feelers interpersonal relationships are more important than impersonal objectivity. For them the heart is more important than the mind.

The fourth contrast is defined by the notion of attitude toward the outer world. The two attitudes toward the outer world are determined by which of the two sets of functions is preferred in dealings with the outer world. The choice is between the perceiving function (sensing *or* intuition) and the judging function (thinking *or* feeling). On the one hand, judging types (J) seek to order, rationalise, and structure their outer world, as they actively judge external stimuli. They enjoy routine and established patterns. They prefer to follow schedules in order to reach an established goal and may make use of lists, timetables, or diaries. They tend to be punctual, organised, and tidy. They prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once made. On the other hand, perceiving types (P) do not seek to impose order on the outer world, but are more reflective, perceptive, and open, as they passively perceive external stimuli. They have a flexible, open-ended approach to life. They enjoy change and spontaneity. They prefer to leave projects open in order to adapt and improve them. Their behaviour may often seem impulsive and unplanned.

In the first of the two studies that have applied psychological type theory to psychographic segmentation within the tourism industry, Gountas and Gountas (2000) devised their own measure of the four functions proposed by psychological type theory (sensing, intuition, feeling and thinking) and distributed 3000 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 sensors 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 intuitives 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 civilisations, and in new and untested future possibilities. Dominant feelers 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 thinkers 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.

Gountas and Gountas' (2000) pioneering study is, however, limited in a number of important ways. They do not use a recognised measure of psychological type; they do not report on the proportions of different types encountered on the flights; they do not test the claims being offered in their conclusions. It remained, therefore, for subsequent studies to build on the foundations that Gountas and Gountas (2000) put in place.

In the second of these studies, Francis, Williams, Annis, and Robbins (2008) examined the psychological type profile of 381 visitors to St Davids Cathedral in Wales, using the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). The advantage of this instrument over the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Keirsey Temperament Sorter is that it was designed specifically for research purposes and is straightforward to complete. Their

data demonstrated that there were more introverts visiting this cathedral than extraverts (57% compared with 43%), more sensors than intuitives (72% compared with 28%), and more judgers than perceivers (81% compared with 19%), but similar numbers of thinkers and feelers (51% and 49% respectively). In their interpretation of these findings, Francis, Williams, Annis, and Robbins (2008) suggested two key implications for those managing the tourism side of St Davids Cathedral. The first implication concerns recognition of the preferences and needs of the constituency with which the cathedral already has significant contact, namely those who display preferences for introversion, sensing, and judging, alongside an equal balance of those who prefer feeling and thinking. The second implication concerns identifying ways in which the cathedral may extend its appeal to reach more of those individuals who at present are not so readily attracted to it, namely those who prefer extraversion, intuition and perceiving.

The study by Francis, Williams, Annis, and Robbins (2008) was published at a time of growing recognition of the symbiotic relationship between cathedrals and the tourism industry in England and Wales. The scene was set by the Archbishops' Commission on Cathedrals (1994), *Heritage and Renewal*, that highlighted both the importance of tourism for the wider ministry exercised by cathedrals and the importance of cathedrals for tourism within the wider economy. The commissioners wrote as follows.

Tourism is of great significance to cathedrals in terms of their mission of teaching, evangelism, and welcome, and as an important source of income. Cathedrals also play a major part in the nation's tourism. (p.135)

According to Shakley (2002) the 43 Anglican Diocesan cathedrals in England were at that time attracting in excess of 30 million tourist visitors per year.

Given that the practical significance of the findings reported by Francis, Williams, Annis, and Robbins (2008) for the work of those managing cathedral tourism, their study

deserves closer scrutiny. As it stands there are two potential weaknesses with the study that need to be addressed by further research. The first weakness concerns the way in which their findings were based on research conducted within just one cathedral, based at St Davids in rural west Wales. The first aim of the present study is to address that weakness by replicating the research in another cathedral, this time in England. Replication provides an appropriate scientific strategy for testing the generalisability of research findings. The second weakness concerns the way in which the findings from the St Davids study were not nested within a proper understanding of the psychological type profile of the wider population of the United Kingdom. The second aim of the present study is to address that weakness by comparing to the new data with the population norms published for the United Kingdom by Kendall (1998).

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' (p136), 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.

Method

Procedure

Two of the authors spent two consecutive days during mid-September 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 offered a copy of the questionnaire to all 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. The majority of participants were keen to see the cathedral before settling down to complete the questionnaire.

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 or thirties, 50 were in their forties or 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 once a month, 16% at least six times a year, and 25% 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), as in the previous study conducted in St Davids Cathedral. 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 their 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.

Analysis

The scientific literature concerned with psychological type has developed a highly distinctive way of presenting type data in the form of ‘type tables’. This convention has been adopted in the current study, in order to integrate these new data within the established literature and to provide all the detail necessary for secondary analysis and further interpretation. Statistical significance testing in the context of type tables is conducted by means of the selection ratio index, an extension of chi square.

Results

The four scales of the Francis Psychological Type Sorter achieved satisfactory internal consistency reliabilities in terms of alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951): extraversion and introversion, .75; sensing and intuition, .59; thinking and feeling .65; judging and perceiving, .71. Table 1 presents the type profile of visitors to Chester Cathedral. These data demonstrate that the psychological type profiles of cathedral visitors generated by the two separate studies reported in St Davids Cathedral by Francis, Williams, Annis, and Robbins (2008) and in the present study in Chester Cathedral are almost identical. In St Davids 57% preferred introversion and so did 60% in Chester. In St Davids 72% preferred sensing and so did 68% in Chester. In St Davids 51% preferred thinking and so did 51% in Chester. In St Davids 81% preferred judging and so did 82% in Chester.

-Insert table 1 and table 2 about here-

Since the psychological type profiles generated by the two studies are so similar, it makes good sense to combine the data from both projects in order to provide a database of substance which can be compared with the population norms for the United Kingdom published by Kendall (1998). Table 2, therefore presents the combined profile of 538 visitors to the two cathedrals tested alongside the population norms based on a sample of 1,634 individuals. The population norms are subject to copyright and, therefore, not displayed in the table. These data demonstrate that among visitors to these two cathedrals there is a clear over-

representation of introverts (58%, compared with 48%), of intuitives (29% compared with 23%), and of judgers (81%, compared with 58%), together with a smaller, but nevertheless significant over-representation of thinkers (51%, compared with 46%). In terms of dominant functions, there is a significantly higher proportion of dominant intuitives among visitors to these two cathedrals (18% compared with 12%) and a significantly lower proportion of dominant feelers among cathedral visitors (20% compared with 25%)

Discussion

The present study set out to extend the earlier research reported by Francis, Williams, Annis, and Robbins (2008) in two ways: by checking their findings against a survey conducted in a second cathedral and by examining the aggregated data provided by two cathedrals against the population psychological type norms for the UK published by Kendall (1998). Two main conclusions can be drawn from the findings: the psychological type profiles generated by visitors to two different cathedrals were highly similar; and the psychological type profile of visitors to these two cathedrals differs from the population norms in significant ways. Three main sets of implications follow from these findings of relevance to those who manage the tourism industry within these two cathedrals and for those who hold the wider brief linking tourism attractions within the local areas and the wider regions.

The first set of implications arises from an awareness of the dichotomous type preferences of those who currently visit these two cathedrals. These two cathedrals are welcoming more introverts (58%) than extraverts (42%). To continue to make introverts feel welcome, these cathedrals would not wish to be too extraverted, outgoing or engaging in the way in which they approach their visitors. These two cathedrals are welcoming more sensors (71%) than intuitives (29%). To continue to make sensors feel welcome, these cathedrals would not wish to be too imaginative, speculative or intuitive in the way in which they

project the story of their ministry and witness. These two cathedrals are welcoming more judges (81%) than perceivers (19%). To continue to make judges feel welcome, these cathedrals would not wish to lose their image of disciplined and well-regulated institutions, with clearly defined opening times and clearly delineated patterns of services. These two cathedrals are welcoming roughly equal proportions of thinkers (51%) and feelers (49%), having much to offer to both the mind (the thinking preference) and to the heart (the feeling preference) of their visitors. To continue to make thinkers and feelers equally welcome, cathedrals would not wish to compromise their ability to speak in this twofold manner.

The second set of implications arises from an awareness of the dominant type preferences of those who currently visit these two cathedrals. Two out of every five visitors to these cathedrals are dominant sensors (42%), while one in every five is dominant feeling (20%), dominant thinking (19%) or dominant intuition (18%). In other words, there are twice as many dominant sensors as there are of any other dominant type. In ordering their priorities for welcoming visitors, these cathedrals could be well advised to keep this statistic in mind. Two out of every five visitors come as dominant sensors, the practical matter-of-fact people who want to know the facts, who want to see the detail, and who want to ask the pragmatic questions about the way things are.

The third set of implications arises from an awareness of those who are currently less likely to find these two cathedrals appealing. The data demonstrate that in terms of the judging process, feelers are slightly but significantly under-represented (49%, compared with 51%), but this difference is not that great. The data also demonstrated that in terms of the perceiving process, sensors are significantly under-represented (71%, compared with 76%), but these cathedrals cannot be said to be neglecting such a large body of their visitors. On the other hand, the data regarding the orientations (introversion and extraversion) and the attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving) deserve closer scrutiny.

In terms of the orientations, extraverts are under-represented among visitors to these two cathedrals (42%) compared with their representation in society (52%). These cathedrals may wish to explore ways of engaging more proactively with extraverts who will approach visiting cathedrals with somewhat different expectations from those carried by introverts. They may wish to develop more interactive ways of engaging with extraverted visitors, including the arrangement of special 'social hours', with opportunities to congregate, to converse and to socialise. These cathedrals possess facilities ideally suited to such activities. Extraverts may welcome engaging stewards, chaplains, and other visitors in conversation, made possible by the appropriately designed coffee shops. Extraverts may welcome engaging with interactive presentations and with experience-based ways of communication.

In terms of the attitudes toward the outer world, perceivers are underrepresented among visitors to these two cathedrals (19%) compared with their representation in society (42%). These cathedrals may wish to explore ways of engaging more proactively with perceivers who will approach the cathedral with somewhat different expectations from those carried by judges. Perceivers may welcome less formal ways through which to engage with the cathedral, perhaps through displays and activities in the cathedral grounds, through attractive and stimulating ideas and possibilities about the cathedral displayed in the shopping precinct, and through opportunities to drop into and out of the cathedral without the formal requirement to pay an entry fee at each point of access.

Conclusion

Taking two cathedrals (St Davids in Wales and Chester in England) as a case study, the present analysis has explored the potential of psychological type theory for proposing a helpful psychographic segmentation profile of cathedral visitors. Further research is now needed to build on this case study in two ways. First, it would be unwise and unsafe to generalise from the situation in these two cathedrals without replicating the research in other

cathedrals in order to check the extent to which a common visitor profile emerges in different locations. Second, practical implications and recommendations have been extrapolated from psychological type theory, both for working effectively among those psychological types currently drawn to these two cathedrals and for extending the welcome of these cathedrals to those psychological types currently less likely to visit. Such extrapolations from theory now require rigorous empirical testing.

References

- Archbishops' Commission on Cathedrals (1994). *Heritage and renewal*. London: Church House Publishing.
- Cahill, D. J. (2007). Real estate agents and the MBTI: a research note. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 67, 85-88.
- Chesborough, S. (2009). Do social work students learn differently? MBTI implications for teaching strategies that address social work students' current learning styles. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 69, 23-41.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2006). Psychological types of female trainee primary school teachers in Wales: teachers in a changing educational climate. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 66, 7-13.
- 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., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 11, 266-284.
- Francis, L. J., Williams, E., Annis, J., & Robbins, M. (2008). Understanding cathedral visitors: Psychological type and individual differences in experience and appreciation. *Tourism Analysis*, 13, 71-80.

- 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.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis.
- 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.
- Pevsner, N., & Hubbard, E. (1971). *Cheshire: the buildings of England*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Sandow, P. L., Jones, A. C., & Moody, R.A. (2000). Psychological type and dentistry, *Journal of Psychological Type*, 55, 26-34.
- Shakley, M. (2002). Space, sanctity and service: The English cathedral as heterotopia. *The International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4, 345-352.

Table 1

Psychological type of cathedral visitors

N = 157 += 1% of N

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ n = 35 (22.3%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	ISFJ n = 22 (14.0%) +++++ +++++ +++++	INFJ n = 11 (7.0%) +++++ ++	INTJ n = 11 (7.0%) +++++ ++	E n = 63 (40.1%)	I n = 94 (59.9%)	
				S n = 107 (68.2%)	N n = 50 (31.8%)	
				T n = 80 (51.0%)	F n = 77 (49.0%)	
				J n = 128 (81.5%)	P n = 29 (18.5%)	
				Pairs and Temperaments		
ISTP n = 1 (0.6%) +	ISFP n = 3 (1.9%) ++	INFP n = 7 (4.5%) +++++	INTP n = 4 (2.5%) +++	IJ n = 79 (50.3%)	IP n = 15 (9.6%)	EP n = 14 (8.9%)
				EJ n = 49 (31.2%)		
				ST n = 59 (37.6%)	SF n = 48 (30.6%)	NF n = 29 (18.5%)
				NT n = 21 (13.4%)		
ESTP n = 2 (1.3%) +	ESFP n = 5 (3.2%) +++	ENFP n = 5 (3.2%) +++	ENTP n = 2 (1.3%) +	SJ n = 96 (61.1%)	SP n = 11 (7.0%)	NP n = 18 (11.5%)
				NJ n = 32 (20.4%)		
				TJ n = 71 (45.2%)	TP n = 9 (5.7%)	FP n = 20 (12.7%)
				FJ n = 57 (36.3%)		
ESTJ n = 21 (13.4%) +++++ +++++ +++	ESFJ n = 18 (11.5%) +++++ +++++ ++	ENFJ n = 6 (3.8%) ++++	ENTJ n = 4 (2.5%) +++	IN n = 33 (21.0%)	EN n = 17 (10.8%)	IS n = 61 (38.9%)
				ES n = 46 (29.3%)		
				ET n = 29 (18.5%)	EF n = 34 (21.7%)	IF n = 43 (27.4%)
				IT n = 51 (32.5%)		

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types			<i>L. J. Francis, S. Mansfield, E. Williams, and A. Village. Psychological type of cathedral visitors</i>
	n	%		n	%		n	%	
E-TJ	25	15.9	I-TP	5	3.2	Dt. T	30	19.1	
E-FJ	24	15.3	I-FP	10	6.4	Dt. F	34	21.7	
ES-P	7	4.5	IS-J	57	36.3	Dt. S	64	40.8	
EN-P	7	4.5	IN-J	22	14.0	Dt. N	29	18.5	

Table 2

Psychological type of cathedral visitors, compared with UK population norms

N = 538 += 1% of *N* *I* = Selection Ratio Index **p* < .05 ***p* < .01 ****p* < .001

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 123 (22.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.67*** +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++ +++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 79 (14.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.15 +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 36 (6.7%) <i>I</i> = 3.90*** +++++ ++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 30 (5.6%) <i>I</i> = 3.96*** +++++ +	E 226 (42.0%) I 312 (58.0%) S 380 (70.6%) N 158 (29.4%) T 274 (50.9%) F 264 (49.1%) J 437 (81.2%) P 101 (18.8%)	*** <i>I</i> = 0.80 *** <i>I</i> = 1.21 ** <i>I</i> = 0.92 ** <i>I</i> = 1.25 <i>I</i> = 1.11 <i>I</i> = 0.91 *** <i>I</i> = 1.39 *** <i>I</i> = 0.45	
ISTP <i>n</i> = 6 (1.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.17*** +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 11 (2.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.33*** ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 18 (3.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.05 +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 9 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.68 ++		Pairs and Temperaments IJ 268 (49.8%) IP 44 (8.2%) EP 57 (10.6%) EJ 169 (31.4%) ST 207 (38.5%) SF 173 (32.2%) NF 91 (16.9%) NT 67 (12.5%) SJ 337 (62.6%) SP 43 (8.0%) NP 58 (10.8%) NJ 100 (18.6%) TJ 241 (44.8%) TP 33 (6.1%) FP 68 (12.6%) FJ 196 (36.4%) IN 93 (17.3%) EN 65 (12.1%) IS 219 (40.7%) ES 161 (29.9%) ET 106 (19.7%) EF 120 (22.3%) IF 144 (26.8%) IT 168 (31.2%)	*** <i>I</i> = 1.69 *** <i>I</i> = 0.45 *** <i>I</i> = 0.45 <i>I</i> = 1.09 <i>I</i> = 1.06 *** <i>I</i> = 0.80 <i>I</i> = 1.21 <i>I</i> = 1.30 *** <i>I</i> = 1.27 *** <i>I</i> = 0.30 <i>I</i> = 0.73 *** <i>I</i> = 2.11 <i>I</i> = 1.57 *** <i>I</i> = 0.35 *** <i>I</i> = 0.52 ** <i>I</i> = 1.22 *** <i>I</i> = 1.98 <i>I</i> = 0.82 <i>I</i> = 1.04 *** <i>I</i> = 0.80 <i>I</i> = 0.90 *** <i>I</i> = 0.73 <i>I</i> = 1.13 *** <i>I</i> = 1.30
ESTP <i>n</i> = 7 (1.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.22*** +	ESFP <i>n</i> = 19 (3.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.41*** ++++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 20 (3.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.59* ++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 11 (2.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.74 ++			
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 71 (13.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.27 +++++ +++++ +++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 64 (11.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.94 +++++ +++++ ++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 17 (3.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.15 +++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 17 (3.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.08 +++			

Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types			<i>L. J. Francis, S. Mansfield, E. Williams, and A. Village. Psychological type of cathedral visitors</i>	
<i>n</i>	%	<i>index</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>index</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>index</i>			
E-TJ	88	16.4	1.23	I-TP	15	2.8	0.31***	Dt. T	103	19.1	0.86
E-FJ	81	15.1	0.98	I-FP	29	5.4	0.58***	Dt. F	110	20.4	0.83*
ES-P	26	4.8	0.33***	IS-J	202	37.5	1.42***	Dt. S	228	42.4	1.04
EN-P	31	5.8	0.64*	IN-J	66	12.3	3.93***	Dt. N	97	18.0	1.48***