Articles

Leisure Involvement Revisited: Conceptual Conundrums and Measurement Advances

Mark E. Havitz

Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, University of Waterloo

Frédéric Dimanche

School of Hotel, Restaurant and Tourism Administration, University of New Orleans

This paper revisits and critiques two propositions originally posited by Havitz and Dimanche (1990) with respect to leisure involvement on the basis of evidence from 50 leisure involvement data sets: (1) Multifaceted scales are more appropriate than single faceted scales for measuring leisure and tourism involvement; and (2) Leisure and touristic experiences should be highly involving on all facets. Despite general support for both propositions, recent research has suggested that leisure involvement is a more complex construct than originally suggested. Much of the complexity stems from the challenges inherent in interpreting multifaceted data.

KEYWORDS: Leisure involvement, social judgement theory, methodology, measurement

Introduction

Selin and Howard's (1988) conceptual piece on ego involvement spurred considerable interest among leisure researchers. Shortly thereafter, Havitz and Dimanche (1990) posited 15 propositions to guide leisure involvement research. Many of those propositions have subsequently been tested in independently conducted studies. Indeed, at least 50 leisure involvement data sets have been collected and five additional conceptual pieces have been written since Selin and Howard's work appeared. Because propositions papers are developed for the expressed purpose of guiding future research efforts, it is appropriate to occasionally examine the extent to which stated propositions have withstood further scrutiny. The purpose of this paper is to critique and extend existing involvement research by synthesizing existing knowledge and discussing issues related to Havitz and Dimanche's two measurement-related propositions: (1) Multifaceted scales are more appropriate than single faceted scales for measuring leisure and tourism in-

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Mark E. Havitz, Department of Recreation & Leisure Studies, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2T 1H3. email: mhavitz@healthy.uwaterloo.ca

volvement; and (2) Leisure and touristic experiences should be highly involving on all facets.

Involvement has been defined as an unobservable state of motivation. arousal or interest toward a recreational activity or associated product. It is evoked by a particular stimulus or situation and has drive properties (adapted from Rothschild, 1984). In other words, leisure involvement refers to how we think about our leisure and recreation, and it affects our behavior as well. Although situational components are evident in this definition the focus of most leisure research, consistent with Sherif and Cantril's (1947) original conceptual work, has been on the enduring properties of leisure and recreational activities and their relationships to ego or self. The terms "leisure involvement" and "involvement" will be used interchangeably throughout this paper in reference to those enduring properties unless otherwise qualified. The term leisure involvement, though technically imprecise because involvement is normally ascribed to a more specific attitude object (e.g., golf, golf clubs, or golf courses), is used in reference to people's involvement with various recreation activities and associated products, leisure service agencies, or settings.

Table 1 summarizes empirical leisure involvement research conducted in the past 10 years. The research is prolific and relatively diverse with respect to research questions and hypotheses. Though activity contexts in which it was conducted are numerous, they lack diversity in that they reflect predominantly middle- to upper middle-class leisure pursuits. Leisure researchers have been vigilant with respect to examining underlying facets of involvement; validity and reliability issues have remained a concern. The remainder of this paper is devoted to those issues, captured in part by Havitz and Dimanche's (1990) two measurement-related propositions. A subsequent paper, drawing from the hypothesis tests and research questions outlined in Table 1, will address new knowledge regarding their remaining propositions.

Proposition I: Multifaceted Scales are More Appropriate than Single Faceted Scales for Measuring Leisure and Tourism Involvement.

General support has been found for this proposition. It is apparent that leisure involvement researchers have gravitated toward multifaceted scales. Involvement was conceptualized on a unidimensional basis by most researchers until the mid-1980s. Laurent and Kapferer's (1985) paper opened the debate in earnest by proposing that involvement was composed of five components. Although their conceptual arguments were appealing, the authors' interchangeable use of the terms facet, indicator, antecedent, dimension, types, and elements exacerbated rather than clarified the issue. We will use "facet" in this paper as we believe there is adequate support for this conceptualization in the literature. Dimanche, Havitz, and Howard's (1991) translation of the multifaceted Consumer Involvement Profile (CIP) represents a benchmark with respect to the dimensionality issue as this has been the most commonly used instrument. Six of the nine leisure involvement data sets published through 1990 used single faceted scales. Whereas, excluding scale

Author(s)/Year/Scale ^a / Leisure Context(s)/Sample Size & Characteristics	Para	phrased Hypotheses, Research Questions, and Objectives ^{b c}	Statistical Tests
Celsi & Olson/1988/PII/Tennis, Tennis Equipment/101	H1	Felt involvement positively related to information attention (+)	Total and Partial Sums of Squares, ANCOVA
undergraduate and graduate students, 20 adults, 15 college	H2	Felt involvement positively related to number of product thoughts (+)	
tennis players	H3	Enduring involvement positively related to proportion of thoughts about the product (+)	
	H4	Enduring involvement positively related to number of product related inferences (+)	
Mittal & Lee/1988/CIP/Beer/100 undergraduate and graduate	H1	Perceived importance differs across product and brand choice (+)	Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, correlations
students	H5	Product importance is distinct from perceived product risk (+)	
	H6	Brand importance is distinct from perceived brand risk $(+/-)$	
	H7	Product importance is distinct from perceived brand risk (+)	
Venkatraman/1988/UNI/Movies/ 317 undergraduate students	H1	As compared to instrumental involvement, enduring involvement has stronger positive relationships with opinion leadership (+), innovative behavior (+), information seeking (+), information sharing (-), influence (+), expertise (+), and usage rate (+)	Alpha coefficients, multiple regression, cluster analysis, ANOVA
Backman & Crompton/1989/PII/ Tennis, Golf/264 golfers, 134	H1	Involvement levels discriminate continuers from discontinuers of golf (+)	Discriminant analysis
tennis players; 46 former golfers, 41 former tennis players	H2	Involvement levels discriminate continuers from discontinuers of tennis (+)	

 TABLE 1

 Chronological Summary of Involvement Research Conducted in Leisure Contexts Since 1988

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Author(s)/Year/Scale ^a / Leisure Context(s)/Sample Size & Characteristics	Para	phrased Hypotheses, Research Questions, and Objectives ^{b c}	Statistical Tests
Bloch, Black & Lichtenstein/1989/ PII/Sports Activities and	H1	Equipment importance positively related to equip. knowledge $(-)$	LISREL VI
Equipment/452 recreational runners	H2	Commitment to sport positively related to equip. importance (+)	
	H3	Commitment to sport positively related to equipment knowledge (+)	
	H4	Equipment importance positively related to spending (+)	
	H5	Equipment knowledge not related to spending (+)	
	H6	Equipment importance positively related to opinion leadership (+)	
	H7	Equipment knowledge positively related to opinion leadership (+)	
Higie & Feick/1989/PII, RPII/Golf, Needlework, Personal Computers/ 258 undergraduate students	Obj.	Development and refinement of involvement instrumentation	Factor analysis, correlations
McCarville/1989/RPII/Jazzercise/ 196 jazzercise participants	Obj.	Involvement used as a covariate in hypothesis testing related to the provision of price information and willingness to pay for recreation services	Factor analysis, ANCOVA
McIntyre/1989/WAT/Beach Camping/347 campers	RQ1	Involvement Profile (WAT) scale provides multifaceted picture of involvement (+)	Factor analysis, discriminant analysis
	H1	Involvement levels discriminate choice of camping setting $(+/-)$	
Chan & Misra/1990/PII/Wine/262 undergraduate students	H1	Opinion leadership positively related to personal involvement (+)	Alpha coefficients, T-tests, discriminant analysis, correlations
	H2	Opinion leadership positively related to risk preference (+)	
Havitz & Crompton/1990/PII/ Aerobics, Camping/60 undergraduate students	Obj.	Involvement used as a screening variable in a study of promotional videos	ANCOVA

Jain & Srinivasan/1990/CIP, PII, RPII/Chocolate, Cologne-Perfume, Haircuts, Music Tapes-Records, Newspapers, Radio/375 undergraduate students	Obj.	Development and refinement of involvement instrumentation through scale comparisons	Factor analysis, correlations, regression analysis
Roehrich & Valette-Florence/1990/ CIP, RPII/Hi-Fi (Stereo) Equipment/405 consumers	Obj.	Development and refinement of involvement instrumentation through scale comparisons	Confirmatory factor analysis, correlations
Venkatraman/1990/UNI/Same sample as Venkatraman, 1988	H1	Enduring involvement moderates the relationship between opinion leadership and its characteristics (influence, knowledge, information sharing, innovative behavior) (-)	Alpha coefficients, confirmatory factor analysis, correlations, multiple regression
	H2	Enduring involvement mediates opinion leadership:A) Enduring involvement has a significant effect on opinion leadership (+)	
		B) Enduring involvement has a significant effect on influence (+)	
		 C) Opinion leadership has a significant effect on influence over and above the effect of enduring involvement (+) The effect of enduring involvement on influence will be diminished as compared to condition B (+) 	
Backman & Crompton/1991/PII/ Same sample as Backman & Crompton, 1989	H1	Participants with high levels of activity loyalty will report high levels of enduring involvement (+)	Correlations, multiple regression
Bright & Larson/1991/UNI (inferred)/Wildlife Viewing	Obj.	To test the relationship between enduring involvement and behavioral intentions (+)	Path analysis, ANOVA
Dimanche, Havitz & Howard/1991/ CIP/Downhill Skiing, Golf,	RQ1	Involvement Profile (CIP) scale provides multifaceted picture of involvement. (+)	Exploratory factor analyses, alpha coefficients
Competitive Running, Amusement Parks, National Parks, Dining	RQ2	Subscales comprising the CIP scale internally consistent (+)	
Out/144 adult competitive runners	RQ3	Pleasure and sign items particularly salient to leisure $(+/-)$	

Author(s)/Year/Scale ^a / Leisure Context(s)/Sample Size & Characteristics	Para	phrased Hypotheses, Research Questions, and Objectives ^{b c}	Statistical Tests
McCarville/1991/RPII/Public Aerobics Classes/75 undergraduate students	Obj.	Involvement used as a covariate in hypothesis testing related to the provision of price information and willingness to pay for recreation services	Coefficient theta, T-tests
Norman/1991/PII/Summer Vacations/544 tourists	H1	Involvement levels discriminate vacationers from non- vacationers (+)	Discriminant analysis
Madrigal, Havitz & Howard/1992/ CIP/Family Vacations/70 married couples	RQ1	What are underlying dimensions of involvement as perceived by married couples? Consistent with previous research (+)	Factor analyses, stepwise regression
	RQ2	Is the variance in involvement dimensions related to selected personal variables? (+)	
McIntyre/1992/UNI (Global Item)/ Rock climbing/148 rock climbers	RQ1	To examine the effect of change in engagement level, based on three criteria (expertise, self-perceived experience, and commitment/involvement), on motivations for participation (+)	Factor analysis, regression, discriminant analysis
McIntyre & Pigram/1992/WAT/ Vehicle-Based Camping/682 campers	RQ1	To examine the underlying dimensions of involvement and derive involvement profiles Consistent with previous research (+)	Factor analysis, cluster analysis, Kruskal Wallis tests
·	RQ2	To determine whether meaningful clusters (activity groups) of participants can be identified using the CIP (+)	
	RQ3	To determine whether clusters differ based on management policy preferences (+)	
Norman, 1992/PII/Summer vacations/Same sample as Norman, 1991	H2	There is a significant association between participants' levels of involvement and leisure constraints (-)	Multiple regression
Pritchard/1992/CIP/Golf, Hotels, Airlines/419 airline travellers; 150 airline travellers, 147 hotel guests, 142 golfers	RQ2	Can the uniqueness of loyalty segments be substantiated by theoretically associated psychological constructs? Importance (+), Pleasure (+), Sign (+), Risk Probability (+/-), Risk Consequence (+/-)	Alpha coefficients, MANOVA, canonical correlation

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Reid/1992/PII/Leisure Programs ^d / 96 high involved and 126 low	H1	High involved participants will report greater ability to differentiate service attributes (-)	ANOVA, T-tests, Chi square analyses
involved first-time participants	H2	High involved participants will report more pre-purchase attitude development (+)	
	H3	High involved participants will report higher pre- purchase attitude certainty (-)	
	H4	High involved participants will report a greater number of choice alternatives (-)	
	H5	Lower percentage of high involved participants will rate their purchase as trials (-)	
	H6	High involved participants will acquire information from different sources than will low involved participants $(+/-)$	
	H7	High involved participants will rate importance of information from various sources differently than will low involved participants $(+/-)$	
Siegenthaler & Lam/1992/WAT/ Tennis/255 tennis players	H2	Ego involvement in tennis is indicated by self-image, interest, and a combination of enjoyment, interest, centrality, and importance (-)	Factor analysis, correlations, multiple regression
	H3	Commitment and ego involvement are independent but correlated constructs (+)	
	H4	Age (+), sex (-), skill level (+), past experience (-), and activity expenditures (+) are significantly related to commitment and ego involvement	
Bloch/1993/Clothing, shopping, makeup, fashion/364 female	Obj1	To develop a measure of adornment related recreation (ARR)	Alpha coefficients, correlations, multiple regression
students	Ођ2	To determine the extent to which social influences predict levels of ARR (+)	
	Obj3	To determine the extent and valence of the relationship between ARR and self- perceptions including self- perceived attractiveness $(+/-)$	

Author(s)/Year/Scale ^a / Leisure Context(s)/Sample Size & Characteristics	Para	phrased Hypotheses, Research Questions, and Objectives ^{b c}	Statistical Tests
Dimanche, Havitz & Howard/1993/ CIP/Same sample as Dimanche et al., 1991	RQ1	To examine the underlying dimensions of involvement with touristic activities Consistent with previous research (+)	Factor analysis, cluster analysis
	RQ2	Can meaningful clusters of travellers be identified using the CIP (+)	
Havitz, Dimanche & Howard/1993a/ CIP, PII/Golf, Downhill Skiing,	RQ1	Factor structure of the CIP consistent with previous research $(+/-)$	Factor analysis, MANOVA, alpha coefficients, correlations
Competitive Running/54 middle aged-older adult athletes, 54	RQ2	Factor structure of the PII consistent with previous research $(+/-)$	
undergraduate students	RQ3	Subscales comprising the CIP and PII internally consistent (+)	
	RQ4	Subscales comprising the CIP and PII exhibit predicted convergent validity [known group method] (+)	
	RQ5	Subscales comprising the CIP and PII exhibit predicted convergent validity (+)	
	RQ6	Subscales comprising the CIP and PII exhibit predicted discriminant validity (+)	
Havitz, Green, & McCarville/1993b/	H1	Scores on the PII are not subject to order effects (+)	Factor analysis, MANOVA, T-tests
CIP, PII, RPII/Downhill Skiing,	H2	Scores on the CIP are not subject to order effects (+)	
Solitaire/240 undergraduate students	H3	Scores on the RPII are not subject to order effects (+/ -)	
McCarville, Crompton, & Sell/1993/ RPII/Aerobics Programs/224	H1	Level of involvement will influence behavioral intentions to participate (+)	Factor analysis, ANCOVA, T-tests
undergraduate students	H2	Level of involvement will influence price expectations (+)	
Perdue/1993/UNI (Global Item)/ Marine Recreational Angling/517	H1	Importance of information positively related to information search (+)	Correlations, path analysis
anglers	H3	Level of experience positively related to importance of information (-)	
	H6	Level of involvement positively related to importance of information (+)	
	H7a	If involvement positively related to knowledge (+) then importance of information seeking will be U-shaped, negative relationship at low knowledge levels and positive relationship at high levels (-)	

Schuett/1993/WAT/Kayaking/301 kayakers	Obj.	Development of a comprehensive measure of engagement	Factor analysis (risk items only), multiple regression
Twynam/1993/CIP/Hotels, Airlines/ 150 hotel guests, 150 airline	RQ1	What factors contribute to involvement with travel services? $(+/-)$	Factor analysis, regression
travellers	Hl	Effect of involvement on voice complaints $(+/-)$	
	H2	Effect of involvement on private complaints $(+/-)$	
	H3	Effect of involvement on third party complaints $(+/-)$	
Ap, Dimanche, & Havitz/1994/CIP/ Tourism Industry/738 residents of tourism dependent communities	RQ1	To examine the underlying dimensions of host residents' involvement with tourism Consistent with previous research (+)	Factor analysis, alpha coefficients, correlations, multiple regression
-	H1	Level of involvement positively related to positive perceptions of tourism (+)	
	H2	Involvement, independent of seven other independent variables, will influence tourism impact perceptions (+)	
Ewert & Hollenhorst/1994/WAT/ Rock Climbing, Whitewater	H4	As specialization increases, so will levels of (activity) involvement (+)	Alpha coefficients, correlations, canonical correlations
Boating/329 rock climbers, 257 white water boaters	H7	As specialization increases, so will equipment importance (+)	
	H8	As participants become more involved and experienced, they will seek out more difficult and risky endeavors (-)	
Havitz, Dimanche & Bogle/1994/ CIP/Aerobic Dance Classes,	RQ1	To examine the underlying dimensions of fitness activity involvement Consistent with previous research (+)	Factor analysis, cluster analysis, ANOVA, Chi square analysis
Weight Training/197 aerobic dancers, 149 weight trainers	RQ2	Can meaningful clusters of participants be identified using the CIP (+)	
-	RQ3	Clusters will differ on the basis of behavioral variables (+)	
	RQ4	Clusters will differ on the basis of sociodemographic variables (-)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Author(s)/Year/Scale ^a / Leisure Context(s)/Sample Size & Characteristics	Paraj	phrased Hypotheses, Research Questions, and Objectives ^{b c}	Statistical Tests
Havitz & Howard/1994/CIP/Golf, Golf Clubs, Downhill Skiing, Skis, Windsurfing, Sail Boards/132 downhill skiers, 91 golfers, 59 wind surfers	H1	Sample members with high activity involvement scores will be more likely to respond to repeated mailings in a panel survey study than will sample members with low activity involvement scores (-)	Factor analysis, alpha coefficients, MANOVA
Norman, Fieber, & Clements/1994b/ CIP/Tourism Industry/148 park & recreation directors	H1	Park & recreation directors' level of involvement with tourism planning and perception of tourism impacts is related to agencies' level of interaction with community tourism industries (+)	Factor analysis, multiple regression, correlations
Norman, Fieber, & Larkin/1994a/ CIP/Tourism Industry/Same sample as Norman et al., 1994b	Obj.	To measure park and recreation directors' level of involvement with community tourism planning	Descriptive statistics, alpha coefficients
Vogt, 1994/PII/Midwest vacations/ 313 travel information seekers	H1	Information needs are more influential in predicting information sources than involvement with vacations or attitude toward information search $(+/-)$	Alpha coefficients, path analysis
Dimanche & Havitz/1995/CIP/ Aerobic Dance Classes, Weight Training/Same sample as Havitz et	H1	Involvement facet scores will predict global service quality perceptions: Attraction (+), sign (-), risk probability (+), risk consequence (+)	Factor analysis, alpha coefficients, stepwise regression
al., 1994	H2	Involvement facet scores will predict empathy/ responsiveness perceptions: Attraction (+), sign (-), risk probability (+), risk consequence (-)	
	H3	Involvement facet scores will predict reliability perceptions: Attraction (+), sign (-), risk probability (-), risk consequence (-)	
	H4	Involvement facet scores will predict assurance perceptions: Attraction (-), sign (-), risk probability (-), risk consequence (-)	
	H5	Involvement facet scores will predict perceptions of tangibles: Attraction (-), sign (-), risk probability (-), risk consequence (-)	
Gahwiler/1995/CIP/Leisure Programs ^e /100 long term members, 84 short term members	RQ4	Does enduring involvement vary according to social world orientation? Attraction (+), sign (+), Centrality (+), risk probability (-), risk consequence (-)	Factor analysis, alpha coefficients, ANOVA

Mittal/1995/PII, CIPf/Beer, cameras,
VCRs/samples of 90 consumers,
136 consumers
Norman, 1995/PII/Summer
Vacations/Same sample as
Norman, 1991
Obenour & Backman/1995/CIP,
PII/Touristic Activities/118
African-American tourists

Havitz & Howard/1995/CIP/Same sample as Havitz & Howard, 1994	H1/2	(Multiple sub-hypotheses) Stability of activity and product involvement profiles across seasons $(+/-)$	Factor analysis, cluster analysis, MANOVA, discriminant analysis
	H3/4	(Multiple sub-hypotheses) Stability of activity and product involvement profiles based on length of participation (+/-)	
	H5	CIP-based market segments will remain stable across seasons (+)	
Mittal/1995/PII, CIP ^f /Beer, cameras, VCRs/samples of 90 consumers, 136 consumers	Ођ	To assess construct, covergent, and nomological validity of four involvement scales	Content analysis, alpha coefficients, correlations
Norman, 1995/PII/Summer Vacations/Same sample as Norman, 1991	RQ1	Constraint-based travel market segments will differ based on level of involvement (-)	Cluster analysis, ANOVA
Obenour & Backman/1995/CIP, PII/Touristic Activities/118	RQ1	Factor structure of the CIP consistent with previous research $(+/-)$	Factor analysis, alpha coefficients, correlations
African-American tourists	RQ2	Factor structure of the PII consistent with previous research $(+/-)$	
	RQ3	Subscales comprising the CIP internally consistent (+)	
	RQ4	Subscales comprising the PII internally consistent (+)	
	RQ5	Subscales comprising the CIP and PII exhibit predicted convergent validity (+)	
	RQ6	Subscales comprising the CIP and PII exhibit predicted discriminant validity (+)	
Schuett/1995/WAT/Kayaking/Same sample as Schuett, 1993	RQ1	Facets of involvement will predict social group participation: Importance (-), enjoyment (-), self- expression (-), centrality (+)	Multiple regression

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Author(s)/Year/Scaleª/ Leisure Context(s)/Sample Size & Characteristics		phrased Hypotheses, Research Questions, and Objectives ^{b c}	Statistical Tests
Wiley/1995/WAT/78 figure skaters (54 female, 24 male), 127 ice	H 1	Men will report higher levels of enduring involvement with sport (-)	Factor analysis, alpha coefficients, t- tests, MANCOVA, correlations
hockey players (76 female, 51 male)	H2	Male hockey players will report higher levels of involvement than will female hockey players $(+/-)$	
, ,	H3	Female figure skaters will report higher levels of involvement than will male figure skaters (-)	
	H4	Traditional males will report more involvement with hockey than will egalitarian males $(+/-)$	
	H 5	Traditional females will report more involvement with figure skating than will egalitarian females $(+/-)$	
Hammer/1996/RPII/Public recreation and culture programs/ 295 public recreation program	Hl	Highly involved participants will be more aware of promotional brochures related to their program than will less involved participants (+)	Factor analysis, cluster analysis ANOVA, Chi square analysis
purchasers	H2	CIP-based market segments will have distinct socio- demographic(-) and behavioral (+) characteristics	
	H3	Highly involved participants will exhibit greater search behavior; read program brochures more often (-), refer more times to the brochure (-), and keep it longer than will less involved participants (+)	
	H4	Highly involved participants will exhibit greater agreement with brochure content (-), use it more in decision-making (+) than will less involved participants	
Havitz, Samdahl, & Whyte/1996/ CIP/Leisure and Non-Leisure Activities/60 unemployed adults	H1	Respondents remaining unemployed for the duration of the research will report lower situational involvement scores for self-described leisure activities than will part- time employed $(+/-)$ and full-time employed respondents $(+)$	MANOVA
	H2	Respondents remaining unemployed for the duration of the research will report lower situational involvement scores for self-described non-leisure activities than will part-time employed $(+/-)$ and full-time employed respondents $(+/-)$	

Jamrozy, Backman, & Backman/ 1996/CIP, PII/Nature-Based Tourism/323 frequent travellers	RQ1 RO2	Scores on various facets of the CIP scale will predict opinion leadership $(+/-)$ PU scores will predict opinion leadership $(+)$	Factor analysis, t-tests, alpha coefficients, multiple regression
Lankford, Hetzler, & Kitajima/1996/ CIP/Wave surfing/60 Japanese tourists	RQ1	Relationship of involvement and satisfaction with wave surfing among Japanese tourists $(+/-)$	Factor analysis, alpha coefficients, correlations, stepwise regression
Park/1996/CIP/Weight training, aerobic dance/208 adult fitness participants	RQ1	Attitudinal loyalty and involvement contribute independently to predicting different measures of behavioral loyalty (+)	Canonical correlation, alpha coefficients, multiple regression
	H1	Attitudinal loyalty profiles will be positively and significantly correlated with involvement profiles(+)	
Ragheb/1996/LRI/Leisure activities/299 university students, 218 university employees and students	Obj.	Conceptual clarification and development of involvement instrumentation	Factor analysis, alpha coefficients, correlations
Green & Chalip/1997/EII/Soccer/ 153 participants (children) and	Hl	Parents' program satisfaction will affect parents' involvement with soccer (-)	LISREL
153 parents	H3	Level of organizational commitment will affect parents' involvement with soccer (+)	
	H4	Higher parental expectations will heighten involvement (-)	
	H5	Parental encouragement will enhance children's involvement with soccer (+)	
	H6	Higher skill levels will foster children's involvement with soccer (-)	
	H7	Children's program satisfaction will affect children's involvement with soccer (+)	
	H8	Reciprocal relationship between children's and parents' involvement with soccer (-)	
	H9	Parents' with high involvement will encourage their children's soccer (+)	
Kerstetter & Kovich/1997/CIP/Penn State women's basketball/349	ОЪј1	Refinement and application of involvement instrumentation in spectator sport settings	Factor analysis, alpha coefficients, MANOVA, ANOVA
sport spectators	Obj2	Relationship between involvement and socio- demographic (-) and behavioral (+) characteristics	

Author(s)/Year/Scaleª/ Leisure Context(s)/Sample Size & Characteristics	Parap	phrased Hypotheses, Research Questions, and Objectives ^{b c}	Statistical Tests
Kim, Scott, & Crompton/In Press/ PII, CIP/Birding/517 visitors to a birding festival	Obj1	To identify the relationship among selected measures of social psychological involvement, behavioral commitment, and commitment $(+/-)$	Factor analysis, alpha coefficients, correlations, stepwise regression
	Obj2	To ascertain how well different measures of social psychological involvement $(+/-)$, behavioral involvement $(+)$, and commitment $(+)$ explain behavioral intentions.	
Havitz & Samdahl/1997/CIP/Same sample as Havitz, Samdahl, & Whyte, 1996	H1	Situational and enduring involvement scores will be highly correlated (+)	Factor analysis, alpha coefficients, correlations
	H2	Involvement with self-described leisure activities will be conceptualized differently from in self-described non- leisure activities (-)	
Reid, Crompton, & Havitz/1997/PII, Open Ended Questions/Leisure Programs ^g /15 first time participants	H1	Overall levels of involvement will be high among first- time purchasers of fitness services (+)	Typological analysis
	H2	Positive relationship between involvement and perceived differences in fitness services (+)	
	H3	Highly involved participants will have larger awareness sets regarding services (-), service attributes (-), spend more time and effort in search (-)	
	H4	Both high and low involved participants with low ability to differentiate between services will utilize service trials for evaluative purposes (+)	
	RQ1	Test content validity of PII $(+/-)$	

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Warnick, Sutton, & McDonald/ 1997/EII/Golf apparel/417 female golfers	RQ1	Do female golfers at different levels of involvement vary in their use of dress to communicate level of competence? (+)	Factor analysis, correlations, ANOVA
	RQ2	Do female golfers at different levels of involvement vary in expression of individuality through their golf dress apparel? $(-)$	
	RQ4	Do female golfers at different levels of involvement vary in terms of brand consciousness and attention getting apparel? (+)	

Note. Papers utilizing the same data sets as previously reviewed papers are identified in the first column. Conceptual studies and "involvement" studies measuring only behavioral manifestations of involvement are not included in this list.

^aWhere: CIP refers to Laurent and Kapferer's (1985) Consumer Involvement Profile, PII refers to Zaichkowsky's (1985) Personal Involvement Inventory, RPII refers to McQuarrie and Munson's (1987) Revised Personal Involvement Inventory, WAT refers to Watkin's (1986) modified CIP, EII refers to Bloch, Sherrell & Ridgeway's Enduring Involvement Index, , LRI refers to Ragheb's (1996) Leisure and Recreation Involvement scale, and UNI refers to unnamed scales unique to the study in question.

^bOnly involvement related hypotheses are listed in this table.

c(+) Indicates supported hypotheses, (-) indicates non-supported hypotheses, (+/-) indicates mixed support usually resulting from tests of multiple sub-hypotheses not reported in detail here.

^dRespondents selected the specific context from the universe of program options offered by a YMCA/YWCA or a public recreation centre.

*Respondents selected the specific context from the universe of program options offered by a not-for-profit recreation centre.

^fOnly selected items related to the importance facet were selected. Two other scales were tested as well.

^gRespondents selected the specific context from the universe of program options offered by a public recreation centre.

comparison research, only nine of thirty-three studies reported during or since 1991 used single faceted scales (Table 1).

The facet debate. Opinions, however, are mixed. The most conservative position remains that perceived interest/importance of the product or activity alone represents involvement proper (Bloch, Sherrell, & Ridgeway, 1986; Mittal, 1989, 1995). Indeed, every current conceptualization of involvement reported in the leisure literature includes this facet. Though purists also might argue that interest and importance are distinct, for example a person might be interested in aerobic exercise because it is challenging and exhilarating but find it important because of cardiovascular benefits, these items usually factor-load together (Table 2). Other unidimensional proponents have conceded that, at least for some products and activities, a pleasure or hedonic facet may be present (Zaichkowsky, 1987). This hedonic facet has obvious intuitive appeal, perhaps to the point of being trite, in leisure contexts (Havitz & Dimanche, 1990). In addition, leisure researchers have almost universally embraced conceptualizations which include sign or symbolic value on the basis that this facet is part of the leisure experiences of many people (Dimanche & Samdahl, 1994). Building on Watkins' (1987) early work, McIntyre (1989), Schuett (1993), Wiley (1995) and others have argued that these three facets (i.e., importance, pleasure, and sign) along with a centrality to lifestyle facet best represent enduring leisure involvement. A more liberal, in an inclusive sense, position has been taken by Howard and colleagues (e.g., Dimanche et al., 1991; Selin & Howard, 1988) who have consistently included the three above facets plus Laurent and Kapferer's proposed risk facets in their work. Citing Cheron and Ritchie (1982), Havitz and Dimanche (1990) argued that many recreational activities carry with them inherent and therefore enduring components of physical (e.g., skydiving), social (e.g., aerobic dance), or financial (e.g., extended vacations) risk. Other research supports this contention (e.g., Brannan, Condello, Stuckum, Vissers, & Priest, 1992; Mitchell & Greatorex, 1993). Brannan et al.'s (1992) data suggested that physical and psychological risk contributed most to overall perceptions of risk in a study of 24 recreational activities, but that financial, functional, satisfactional, time, and social risk were also present in most activity contexts.

Involvement instrumentation. Nearly all recent leisure involvement research has been conducted using one of four scales. The two most common, Zaichkowsky's (1985) single faceted Personal Involvement Inventory (PII) and Laurent and Kapferer's (1985) CIP were developed independently. Watkins' (1987) scale represents a derivation of the CIP wherein a centrality facet was added and the risk facets were dropped. McQuarrie and Munson's (1987) Revised Personal Involvement Inventory (RPII) was proposed as a multifaceted compromise between the PII and the CIP. Each of these instruments have documented strengths and weaknesses (e.g., Mittal, 1995), though multifaceted scales appear to have stronger content and face validity for studying leisure, recreational, and touristic experiences (Havitz, Dimanche, & Howard, 1993a). They argued that components such as sign,

Scale and Data Set	Factors (Numbers in parentheses are Cronbach's alpha unless otherwise noted)
UNI	
Venkatraman, 1990	Single facet (.80)
PII	
Higie & Feick, 1989	Hedonic (.88), Self-Expression ^b (.71). This analysis combined items from both the PII and RPII
Jain & Srinivasan, 1990	Relevance/Importance, Pleasure. Alpha for the total scale was (.94), subscale alphas were not reported.
Backman & Crompton, 1991	Single facet (.95)
Havitz et al., 1993a	Importance (.90), Pleasure (.83), Affect (.78)
Havitz et al., 1993b	Single facet (.95)
Backman et al., 1995	Pleasure (.96), Importance (.84), Affect (.79)
Jamrozy et al., 1995	Single facet (.97)
Kim et al., In Press	Single facet (.96)
RPII	
Higie & Feick, 1989	See PII above.
McCarville, 1989	Importance ($\theta = .92$), Pleasure ($\theta = .35$), Sign ($\theta = .05$)
Jain & Srinivasan, 1990	Pleasure (.88), Importance (.87), Risk (.67)
Roehrich & Valette-Florence, 1990	Attraction ^a (.87), Risk Probability (.71), Sign ^b (.60) Numbers in parenthesis are latent variable reliabilities.
McCarville, 1991 (used just 9 of 14 item pairs)	Single facet ($\theta = .97$)
Havitz et al., 1993	Importance/Sign (.88), Pleasure (.82), Risk (.55)
Hammer, 1996 Watkins	Attraction ^a (.86), Pleasure (.79), Sign (.53), Risk (.52)
McIntyre, 1989	Attraction ^a , Self-Expression ^b , Centrality. Subscale alpha coefficients ranged from (.82) to (.64) but were not keyed to specific facets.
McIntyre & Pigram, 1992	Attraction ^a (.82), Self-Expression ^b (.66), Centrality (.70)
Siegenthaler & Lam, 1992	Self-Image ^b (.86), Interest (.79)
Wiley, 1995	Sport Attraction ^a (.87), Sport Self-Expression ^b (.82), Sport Centrality (.51)
	Activity Attraction ^a (.89), Activity Self-Expression ^b (.90), Activity Centrality (.61)
CIP	
Mittal & Lee, 1988	Importance (.84, .88), Perceived Risk (.68, .66), Sign ^b (.86, .71), Hedonic (.78). Alpha coefficients were reported at both the product and brand levels for the first three facets.
Jain & Srinivasan, 1990	Attraction ^a [Alphas were reported separately for Importance (.76) and Pleasure (.72)], Sign ^b (.82), Risk Probability (.57), Risk Consequence (.78)

TABLE 2 Factor Structure and Internal Consistency of Involvement Instruments

TABLE 2 (Continued)

	Factors (Numbers in parentheses are Cronbach's alpha
Scale and Data Set	unless otherwise noted)
Roehrich & Valette-Florence, 1990	Attraction ^a (.84), Sign ^b (.93), Risk Probability (.83), Risk Consequence (.71)
Dimanche et al., 1991	Attraction ^a [Alphas were reported separately for Importance (.80) and Pleasure (.89)], Sign ^b (.96), Risk Probability (.90), Risk Consequence (.89)
Madrigal et al., 1992	Attraction ^a (.83), Sign ^b (.67). A risk factor appeared in the analysis, but had a substandard eigenvalue of .82.
Pritchard, 1992	Importance (.69), Pleasure (.80), Sign (.86), Risk Probability (.58), Risk Consequence (.65)
Havitz et al., 1993a	Attraction ^a (.72), Sign ^b (.89), Risk Probability (.80), Risk Consequence (.60)
Havitz et al., 1993b	Attraction ^a (.81), Sign ^b (.85), Risk (.84)
Twynam, 1993	Attraction ^a /Risk Consequence (.79), Sign ^b (.85), Risk Probability (.57)
Ap et al., 1994	Attraction ^a (.90), Sign ^b (.76), Risk (.76)
Havitz et al., 1994	Attraction ^a (.82), Sign ^b (.60), Risk Probability (.62), Risk Consequence (.47)
Norman et al., 1994a	Attraction ^a /Risk, Sign (Alpha coefficients were produced for the five theorized facets: Importance, .80; Pleasure, .63; Sign, .72; Risk Probability, .64; Risk Consequence, .62)
Gahwiler, 1995	,
Attraction ^a (.82), Sign ^b (.79), Risk F analyzed: Centrality (.72)	Probability (.67), Risk Consequence (.55). Not factor
Havitz & Howard, 1995	Attraction ^a (.82), Sign ^b (.85), Risk Probability (.50), Risk Consequence (.70)
Obenour & Backman, 1995	Attraction ^a /Sign (.94), Risk (.79)
Jamrozy et al., 1996	Attraction ^a (.83), Sign ^b (.77), Risk Probability (.67), Risk Importance (Consequence) (.59)
Kerstetter & Kovich, 1997	Enjoyment ^c (.89), Sign ^b (.88)
Park, 1997	Attraction ^a (.83), Self Expression ^b (.83), Risk Probability (.65), Risk Consequence (.47)
Havitz & Samdahl, 1997	Leisure Activities Attraction ^a (.86), Sign ^b (.83), Risk Probability (.74), Risk Consequence (.84)
	Non-Leisure Activities Attraction ^a (.85), Sign ^b (.66), Risk Consequence (.77)
Kim et al., In Press	Attraction ^a (.91), Sign ^b (.79), Risk (.75)

Scale and Data Set	Factors (Numbers in parentheses are Cronbach's alpha unless otherwise noted)	
LRI		
Ragheb, 1996	Long version (37 items): Importance (.90), Pleasure (.88), Interest (.79), Intensity (.82), Centrality (.78), Meaning (.80)	
	Short version (24 items): Importance (.84), Pleasure (.82), Interest (.74), Intensity (.81), Centrality (.78), Meaning (.78)	

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Note. Only one paper per data set (see Table 1) is referenced in Table 2. Factor analyses were not reported in the following studies (scale used in parentheses): Bloch et al., 1989 (PII); Bright & Larson, 1991 (inferred measure); Celsi & Olson, 1988 (PII); Chan & Misra, 1990 (PII, $\alpha =$.97); Ewert & Hollenhorst, 1994 (Watkins); Havitz & Crompton, 1990 (PII); Lankford, Hetzler, & Kitajima, 1996 (CIP, $\alpha =$ importance .75, pleasure .82, sign .81, risk probability .51, risk consequence .80); McCarville et al., 1993 (RPII, factor analysis done, but factors not reported); McIntyre, 1992 (global item); Norman, 1991 (PII, $\alpha =$.98); Perdue, 1993 (global item); Reid, 1992 (PII); Schuett, 1993 (Watkins); Vogt, 1994 (PII, $\alpha =$.95); Green & Chalip, 1997 (EII, 2 items only); Reid et al., 1997 (qualitative data); Warnick et al., 1997 (EII).

^aAttraction represents a combination of importance/interest and pleasure items. Many authors referred to this combination as importance/pleasure or interest/pleasure.

^bSign, self-expression, and self-image represent various ways of describing the same facet. Enjoyment represents a combination of attraction and risk probability item.

centrality, and risk provide important information regardless of whether they are facets or antecedents of involvement.

A fifth scale that has received multiple use in leisure research is Bloch et al.'s (1986) unidimensional Enduring Involvement Index (EII) which focuses on interest and importance. Finally, Ragheb's (1996) recently introduced six-faceted Leisure and Recreation Involvement (LRI) scale is the longest, even in its 24-item short-form, of the above instruments. This scale has not been used in published research to date, but is purported to be the first leisure-specific involvement scale. In addition to common facets of importance, interest, pleasure, and centrality, LRI includes new facets labeled as meaning and intensity. The latter facet shares elements of self expression as found in other scales. It should also be noted that centrality, as defined in the LRI, differs substantially from centrality items used in published leisure research featuring Watkins' scale. Watkins' centrality items measure primarily social aspects of involvement (e.g., "I enjoy discussing _____ with my friends") whereas LRI centrality items seem more akin to measures of volition and side bets as presented in loyalty and commitment research (e.g., Backman & Crompton, 1991; Buchanan, 1985; Pritchard, 1992).

Conclusive answers to the dimensionality debate cannot be provided with empirical evidence alone. Zaichkowsky (1990) aptly noted that, "Basi-

cally, you will get out what you put in. If you put five dimensions in, you should get five dimensions out" (p. 616). Accumulated empirical evidence must be weighed against conceptual and theoretical arguments over time. Multifaceted scales definitely provide more information than do unidimensional scales. Whether all facets are central to understanding and conceptualizing leisure involvement remains a contentious issue. The degree to which various components are situational antecedents or enduring facets remains key. Leisure involvement researchers have relied almost exclusively on survey research and standardized scales (45 of 50 data sets reviewed), and this lack of methodological diversity has limited insights into the facet versus antecedent and construct validity debate. Nevertheless, open-ended interviews of first-time fitness participants regarding their decision processes have produced statements reflecting importance, pleasure, sign, and risk (Reid, Crompton, & Havitz, 1997). Kapferer and Laurent (1993) recently confirmed their multidimensional conceptualization with new data-based evidence, a position also supported independently by Rogers and Schneider (1993). Many consumer researchers have tired of the dimensionality debate (Rothschild, 1984; Zaichkowsky, 1990) in part because at least 14 distinct consumer involvement scales were developed in the 1980s alone (Muehling, Laczniak, & Andrews, 1993). Many of those scales have been used sparingly, if at all, in subsequent research. However, dimensionality issues have remained topical among leisure researchers, who have devoted most efforts to date toward conceptually exploring and refining existing measures (e.g., Obenour & Backman, 1995; Dimanche et al., 1991; Schuett, 1993; Watkins, 1987) rather than on developing new scales (Ragheb, 1996).

Specificity of attitude objects. Another important question complicating leisure involvement research and analysis of Proposition I is: Involvement with what? Mainline consumer research has focused on involvement with products. In leisure research, this focus generally switches to involvement with activities (e.g., travel, golf) or associated services and products (e.g., airlines, golf clubs). Although less often examined, brand level involvement may be equally salient (e.g., destination, site, course). More often than not brand level involvement has been conceptualized in terms of commitment and loyalty. Although recent conceptualizations imply that involvement, loyalty, and commitment are conceptually distinct constructs (e.g., Iwasaki & Havitz, 1996; Park, 1996; Pritchard, Howard, & Havitz, 1992), there is also evidence suggesting that the two constructs are closely related (Buchanan, 1985). Conceptual relationships between leisure involvement, commitment, and loyalty must be clarified in future research.

The loyalty/commitment/involvement issue becomes especially complex in settings such as annual membership organizations and facilities where people often participate in multiple activities. For example, researchers might measure involvement with (or commitment to) the organization (e.g., YMCA), the favorite or most common activity for a given individual (e.g., aerobics), or one (e.g., swimming or jogging) which supplements her/his regular routine (Gahwiler, 1995). Involvement with the situational contexts such as purchase processes represents another potential direction for research (Reid & Crompton, 1993; Vogt, 1994). For example, Muehling et al. (1993) identified 50 studies in the consumer literature alone which have examined relationships between involvement and promotional efforts. To date, leisure researchers have devoted little effort to examining these relationships. Though Havitz and Dimanche (1990) and Reid and Crompton (1993) developed numerous propositions related to promotion and decisionmaking, few have been empirically tested.

Sport management researchers have also begun to study involvement (e.g., Kerstetter & Kovich, 1997). This research is interesting with respect to its potential to provide insight into involvement among team sport participants, spectators (e.g., fan behavior), and other contexts little examined in the leisure literature to date. Kerstetter and Kovich modified the CIP to measure involvement with Penn State University Lady Lions basketball, perhaps akin to brand commitment as opposed to a more traditional use such as involvement with basketball or women's basketball. Spectator involvement is particularly intriguing because it is passive rather than participatory as is the case with most highly involving recreation activities, yet engenders high levels of personal and social identity among many participants. Another interesting line of exploratory research focuses on involvement with adornments, equipment, and clothing (Bloch, 1993; Bloch, Black, & Lichtenstein, 1989; Warnick, Sutton, & McDonald, 1997).

Level of measurement. The original version of the CIP measured importance and pleasure at the product level, sign at both the product and brand levels, and risk primarily at the brand level. The EII, LRI, and Watkins' scale measure all facets at the product level. The PII and RPII can be modified to measure either product level or brand level involvement depending on the heading selected by the researcher. On the basis of Mittal and Lee's (1988) empirical evidence and Havitz and Dimanche's (1990) conceptual argument that risk may be enduring, some leisure researchers have rewritten the sign and risk items in the CIP scale to represent exclusively product level involvement (Gahwiler, 1995; Havitz, Green, & McCarville, 1993b) whereas others have done likewise at the brand level (Kerstetter & Kovich, 1997). These efforts have met with mixed success. For example, Gahwiler reported that item non-response was unacceptably high (21%) for one risk item, primarily because respondents appeared confused by statements written at the product or activity rather than at the brand or site level.

Involvement research to date can legitimately be criticized for conceptualizing leisure solely in activity terms. Although such conceptualizations are often deemed necessary in order to delineate as specific as possible an attitude object (e.g., downhill skiing as opposed to skiing or winter sports), leisure as activity conceptualizations have been criticized in the literature (Ragheb, 1996; Samdahl, 1992). Ragheb's LRI, which measures involvement with "leisure, recreation and tourist activities" in a generic sense (defined on the instrument as "nonobligatory pursuits chosen freely during your free time") may be useful when general conceptualizations are required. How-

ever, such generalizations may be of little use in most managerial and academic contexts. For example, an individual's involvement with golf may be primarily hedonic; with running, utilitarian (e.g., fitness-related); with live theater, symbolic; and with travel, social. Such differences may also occur within leisure participation categories. That is, few people have equal involvement levels with various sports activities. Therefore his or her LRI score would likely not accurately reflect any facet for any particular circumstance. In addition, several leisure attitude scales have been established in the literature. Taking a different tact, Havitz, Samdahl, and Whyte (1996) have initiated exploratory research which goes beyond activity involvement to studying involvement with subjectively defined leisure and non-leisure experiences. They modified CIP items to conform to the myriad of possibilities inherent in daily activity studies such as those using experiential sampling. Their sampling booklets also included subjective "I would call that leisure" items which allowed the researchers to, post hoc, distinguish leisure from non-leisure experiences but the data were collected in the context of very specific attitude objects. One challenge to be overcome with respect to motive- and experience-based research is that involvement is, by definition, enduring in nature whereas motives may be transient in nature.

The strongest support in leisure contexts, then, remains with the attraction (importance/interest and pleasure) facets. With few exceptions they factor load together, are reliable (Table 2), and though not shown here, generally produce the highest mean scores among respondents in activity contexts. Sign items, present in all scales other than the PII and EII, have consistently loaded as an independent and reliable facet (Table 2), although respondents have often ascribed low scores to sign related items relative to the scores generally given to items from other facets. Centrality items have performed well in adventure and risk recreation settings producing strong factor loadings and reliability scores (e.g., McIntyre, 1989), but have rarely held together as an independent facet in other contexts (e.g., Havitz, Dimanche, & Bogle, 1994). Items measuring risk have been plagued by reliability problems, achieving the suggested .70 minimum, for exploratory research, alpha level barely 40% of the time (Table 2). That leisure researchers have posed risk items in both brand and product/activity level contexts complicates possible generalizations. Independently developed risk scales have also produced low reliability scores (e.g., Schuett, 1993).

Measuring risk-related involvement. Recently, leisure journals have published numerous papers focusing on adventure and risk-based recreation (Ewert & Hollenhorst, 1989, 1994; McIntyre, 1992; Robinson 1992; Schuett, 1993). A reoccurring theme in this genre has been the inadequacy of behavioral risk measures relative to their attitudinal counterparts. Paradoxically, however, though components of the CIP and Watkins scales have been commonly used in leisure involvement research, items comprising the risk facets have not been used by adventure recreation researchers. Although the complete CIP scale was introduced into the leisure literature in 1991 (Dimanche et al.), adventure recreation research has built involvement conceptualizations primarily around Watkins' (1987) interpretation of the CIP scale which did not consider risk to be enduring in nature. Indeed this interpretation is consistent with arguments advanced in Laurent and Kapferer's (1985) original writing (also see McIntyre, 1989). However, this interpretation is inconsistent with arguments that risk is inherent to adventure recreation: "Central to most definitions of adventure recreation is the deliberate seeking of recreation situations that contain elements of risk or danger . . ." (Ewert & Hollenhorst, 1994, p. 177).

One reason for their poor performance is that risk items may be overly simplistic even as measured by the CIP, which is arguably the most comprehensive standardized involvement scale. Risk itself is multifaceted. The CIP's two facets of risk probability and risk consequence do not adequately address important differences between the various types of risk (e.g., physical, social, psychological) identified in the literature (Brannan et al., 1992; Cheron & Ritchie, 1982; Mitchell & Greatorex, 1993). Nor does the CIP scale have the capacity to deal with concepts such as fear, eustress, distress, abilities, and attitudes, offered by Priest (1992) as important risk-related concepts associated with adventure recreation. Further complicating the issue, Robinson (1992) argued that models of risk recreation must consider both enduring (e.g., need for stimulation and autonomy) and situation-specific (e.g., challenging terrain or weather) risk components.

In summary, refined measures of (especially) enduring risk are needed. Nor should the study of risk should not be limited to adventure recreation contexts with their implied high levels of physical risk because other settings may provide equally interesting data. Mitchell and Greatorex (1993) found that, relative to purchases of products, purchases of services (including recreation-related amenities) were perceived as being risky. Social risk, in particular, has been the subject of recent leisure research (Wiley, 1995; Frederick, Havitz, & Shaw, 1994). Most useful would be a multifaceted scale composed of sub-scales measuring each risk type identified to date (e.g., Brannan et al., 1992) that is also worded iteratively to capture the risk probability and risk consequence facets identified by Laurent and Kapferer (1985). Individual researchers could then select appropriate sub-scales based on screening questions or based on content validity as established in existing literature. Assertions regarding the construct validity of risk as it relates to leisure involvement remain contentious given our current inability to agree on conceptual definitions or to accurately measure this complex facet. There is also evidence that Likert-type involvement items may be sensitive to reverse coding problems because of double-negatives created with respect to the agree-disagree response items. These problems, taken together, suggest that risk may be best studied from qualitative rather than quantitative perspectives.

Proposition II: Leisure and Touristic Experiences Should be Highly Involving on all Facets.

General support is evident for Proposition II although it now seems clear that the wording of this proposition has overly simplified the high involvement-low involvement issue. Bloch (1990) argued against the proposition when he cautioned that involvement levels are better conceptualized on an individual-specific rather than on a product-specific level. Others, however (e.g., McIntyre, 1989; Zaichkowsky, 1990), have argued that involvement levels may also be product-specific. Zaichkowsky summarized these issues as follows:

Given that (1) there is great variation among products on average level of involvement, (2) people vary widely on their level of product involvement, and (3) there seems to be different types of involvement, a three-mode factor analysis may shed light on the product/person/facet of involvement structure. This would allow us to investigate the different relationships between products, involvement and people. In other words, what kind of people view what kind of products in what view of involvement? Some products may be mainly pleasure products and some mainly risk products. What kind of people view haircuts as hedonic and what kind of people view haircuts as mainly risk? (p. 616)

Leisure research has provided some insight with respect to her three points. Involvement levels vary based on the nature of the product (activity) in ques-Regarding Zaichkowsky's first point, McCarville (1989), Backman and tion. Crompton (1991), Reid (1992), and Reid et al. (1997) have reported data sets in which participants' leisure involvement was almost universally high. It should be noted that all but the McCarville data sets measured involvement on a unidimensional basis with the PII, and that both times McCarville reported RPII data using collapsed unidimensional mean scores. Higie and Feick (1989, p. 690) noted that several earlier studies have reported extreme "enduring involvement (fanaticism) with activities, including jazz music (Holbrook, 1987), weight lifting (Lehmann, 1987), and horseback riding (Scammon, 1987)." In Havitz et al.'s (1993b) experiment conducted to test the contextual stability of involvement measures, the authors reported that involvement with downhill skiing was consistently high and involvement with the card game solitaire was consistently low with little regard to frequency of respondents' participation. Indeed, as a group, non-skiers levels of involvement with skiing were higher than were regular solitaire players' levels of involvement with solitaire.

Multidimensional interpretations complicate the issue. For example, McIntyre (1989) found consistently high attraction scores among campers. Havitz and Howard (1995) found that attraction scores were consistently highest for participants in three recreational activities (golf, ski, windsurfing), but that risk consequence scores were consistently highest with respect to associated products (golf clubs, skis, sailboards). Involvement profiles have often been used in market segmentation and the majority of individual market segments identified using the CIP, RPII, and Watkins scales score high on some facets and low on others (e.g., Havitz et al., 1994; McIntyre & Pigram, 1992). Norman, Fieber, and Larkin (1994a) for example, reported that public park and recreation directors viewed tourism-related programming as quite important and risky, but only moderately symbolic and pleasurable. Such combinations have not been created to show that nearly every individual is "involved" with some aspect of any given leisure activity or associated product. Rather, high/low involvement combinations are interesting because they provide detailed insight into reasons underlying participation and due to their subsequent usefulness as management and marketing tools. In fact, universally high levels of involvement among participants may not be positive in that they complicate decisions for managers seeking to differentiate between participant groups based on involvement levels.

As noted above, when responding to multifaceted scales, most recreation participants score high on at least one facet of involvement, but not necessarily with all facets. This seemingly mundane conclusion is noteworthy because the research provides evidence that recreation activities differ from many consumer goods in that participation and purchase is rarely habitual. By contrast, many consumer goods generate low involvement scores on all facets (e.g., Kapferer & Laurent, 1985), a phenomenon responsible, in part, for the tepid interest in involvement research among some consumer researchers.

Measuring sign and symbolic involvement. The sign facet is particularly interesting with respect to the high/low involvement issue. Sign items have consistently scored low in several studies (e.g., Dimanche et al., 1991; Havitz & Howard, 1995) despite conceptual arguments that the symbolic value of recreational activity is important to many participants, if not integral to many leisure experiences (Dimanche & Samdahl, 1994; Frederick et al., 1994). Consistently high sign scores have been found in some data sets (e.g., Havitz et al.'s 1993b exploration of involvement with downhill skiing), but more often high sign scores are associated with specific markets (e.g., Havitz et al., 1994; McIntyre & Pigram, 1992). Indeed, Havitz et al. (1994) found that the largest single market, over 40% of respondents, in a sample of fitness participants had below average attraction scores but reported well-above average sign scores. That is, in comparison to other groups, the largest single group of respondents appeared to participate more for symbolic reasons than for enjoyment.

As is the case with risk measurements, currently used items developed to measure sign value are quite simplistic. Unlike items related to attraction or centrality where high involvement is portrayed for the most part in positive terms, sign items may be interpreted by respondents as being either positive or negative. For example, a respondent agreeing with the statement "You can tell a lot about a person by whether or not they play golf" may believe, among other things, that golf is a relaxing way to spend an afternoon, that it is a good setting for socializing with friends or business clients, or that golf is a pretentious activity for the economically privileged and golf courses dumping grounds for environmentally dangerous lawn chemicals. In addition, recent conceptual advances have illuminated the possible multifaceted nature of sign. Dimanche & Samdahl (1994) argued that components of both personal identity (self-expression) and social identity (presentation of self to others) are apparent. Indeed, the CIP, RPII, and Watkins scales all include items measuring both personal identity and social identity. The small number of such items, once a facet is split, however, preclude researchers

from enjoying the psychometric benefits accruing from the use of multipleitem scaling.

Finally, it seems possible that many respondents may exhibit a social undesirability bias with respect to reporting their perceptions of personal and social identity. Some people may be hesitant to admit that they derive social or personal identity from leisure. Many others may not consciously consider symbolic factors unless prompted. Havitz and Samdahl (1997) found that when interviewed about symbolic issues, many respondents were able to articulate lengthy descriptions of the personal and social identity accruing from leisure participation. Research into the sign facet may benefit from the development of more comprehensive, two-dimensional (personal identity and social identity) instrumentation similar to that suggested for risk. However, at present and, perhaps, over the long term, sign may best be discussed qualitatively, rather than scored quantitatively.

Inverse relationships between facets. Inverse relationships have sometimes been found between involvement facets. Several studies have suggested that risk probability scores decrease as scores on other facets escalate, or vice versa (Brannan et al., 1992; Dimanche, Havitz, & Howard, 1993; Ewert & Hollenhorst, 1994; Jamrozy, Backman, & Backman, 1996; Kim, Scott, & Crompton, 1977). This phenomenon may be at least partially attributed to increased levels of comfort, perceived skill, and knowledge that are commonly associated with higher levels of involvement. For example, Ewert and Hollenhorst (1994) noted that although highly involved adventure recreators tend to seek increasingly challenging venues in an objective sense, "they paradoxically do not necessarily seek higher levels of risk." And that, "adventure recreators appear to have an implicit belief that they are in control of the experience, that they are not exposing themselves to risk and danger because they can control the situation" (pp. 188-189). Optimal arousal theory seems a logical guide for future research with respect to this component of involvement. The theory posits that participants seek optimal arousal by matching their skills to the challenge presented by an activity. Although risk may be present in absolute terms, participants' perceptions of risk may decrease because of matching skills that lead to higher enjoyment (attraction involvement) and symbolic attainment.

Involvement is person-specific. Nearly all of the dozens of studies conducted in leisure contexts have supported Zaichkowsky's (1990, p. 616) second point, that there is wide variation in individual respondent's levels of product involvement, which makes involvement particularly intriguing as an independent variable in market segmentation. This issue will be discussed in greater depth in the follow-up paper.

Involvement structure may be product- or activity-specific. Leisure researchers have also accumulated considerable evidence in support of Zaichkowsky's third point, that different products (or activities) elicit different types of involvement. Importance and pleasure usually merge into one facet, more elegantly termed attraction (McIntyre, 1989), in leisure settings. This phenomenon has occurred in 26 of 33 leisure-related data sets which reported factor analyses for the CIP, Watkins, RPII, or LRI scales (Table 2), but this combination rarely occurs in more "habitual" product contexts except with hedonic products such as chocolates, champagne, or recreation equipment (Havitz & Howard, 1995; Jain & Srinivasan, 1990; Kapferer & Laurent, 1993). An exception was provided by Rodgers and Schneider (1993) who found that importance and pleasure items merged into a single factor for several habitually purchased consumer products and who suggested that the importance and pleasure facets are indistinguishable from one another. This position is extreme because importance and pleasure are conceptually distinct and because circumstances under which the two facets merge are relatively predictable and somewhat limited. For example, even in leisure contexts the importance facet has generally remained independent or merged with the risk consequence facet when economic considerations become paramount. An interesting tourism-based example of the attraction (importance)—risk combination was provided by Twynam (1993) who studied involvement with airlines and hotels using samples which included a large proportion of business travelers. Likewise, Norman, Fieber, & Clements (1994b) found that municipal park and recreation professionals also conceptualized attraction and risk as a single facet in the context of community tourism development. This combination makes sense in that context because the literature suggests that municipal parks and recreation departments often participate in tourism planning as much from an economic development perspective as from a leisure opportunity perspective (e.g., Blank, 1989; Gavlik, 1995).

Implications for Future Research and Practice

Havitz and Dimanche's (1990) two measurement-related propositions have been generally supported in subsequent years, but many problems remain and several new questions have been raised. The quest for construct validity remains elusive. Additional theory-based modeling exercises are necessary to build on existing knowledge. Though leisure involvement research has been characterized by a reasonable level of statistical sophistication, future empirical efforts should place more emphasis on structural equations, path analysis, and LISREL in order to provide deeper insights into the nature of leisure involvement and its alleged antecedents and facets. Leisure involvement research lags behind both traditional consumer involvement research and other leisure research in this regard. Additional nomonological comparisons must be conducted in order to clarify theoretical relationships between leisure involvement and commitment, loyalty, self-esteem, self-assessed competence, satisfaction, service quality, and serious leisure. These relationships have been discussed at varying levels of depth, but solid empirical evidence is limited (e.g., Green & Chalip, 1997; Venkatraman, 1990). Venkatraman, for example, found that involvement was a mediating variable with respect to opinion leadership and movies, but that it was not a moderating variable in that context. Leisure involvement researchers have not adequately explored such questions, perhaps because leisure involvement research to date has focused largely on micro-level instrumentation concerns. Future research must devote more effort to macro- and mid-level theory building and construct validity issues. Relationships between enduring involvement as discussed here and more transitional states, often termed experiential (Wild, Kuiken, & Schopflocher, 1995) or psychological (Mannell, 1993) involvement must also be explored.

Many practical issues remain to be addressed. Contrary to Reid and Crompton's (1993, p. 196) assertion that in comparison to unidimensional interpretations "the multi dimensionality of the involvement construct appears unlikely to affect" leisure participants' decision making processes, evidence related to these two propositions suggests that involvement profiles provide vastly different managerial and marketing information for leisure professionals than do unidimensional scales and global items. Rather than examining entire participant populations as single units, the best way to take full advantage of involvement profiling may be to segment respondents based on profiles prior to conducting follow-up analyses. This issue warrants indepth discussion in subsequent critiques of Havitz and Dimanche's (1990) remaining 13 propositions.

Forty-five of the 50 reviewed data sets were collected in North America, three in Australia and one each in Europe and Hawaii suggesting that little cultural diversity is evident in the research. Only one of the North American data sets specifically surveyed a visible minority population; Obenour & Backman's (1995) research involving African-American tourists. Lankford, Hetzler, and Kitajima (1996) surveyed Japanese tourists visiting Hawaii. Calls for more population-diverse involvement research (e.g. Samli, Wills, & Jacobs, 1993) should not, however, be limited to traditional comparisons across nations and between various ethnic groups. Henderson (1994) outlined the benefits of sometimes studying homogenous groups (e.g., women) in their own right, without necessarily comparing them to other groups. Her suggestion may be appropriate for some leisure involvement research as well. For example, consider the possibilities of studying leisure involvement of unemployed, gay men, or lesbian participants; especially with respect to attraction, sign (i.e., personal identity and social identity), and risk components in a society where some other recreation participants and some recreation professionals may question their very rights to participate (Grossman, 1992; Henderson, 1995; Spigner & Havitz, 1993).

The methodological homogeneity of involvement research (e.g., survey research using standardized scales) must be challenged for at least two reasons. First, there is evidence of weakness in all instruments proposed and used to date. Inductive qualitative research, especially, is needed to complement the current wave of deductive quantitative research. Construct validity concerns will never be adequately answered simply by accumulating numeric survey data. Second, qualitative techniques may also lead to improvements in our understanding of some of the relatively "elusive" facets (e.g., sign and risk). Ultimately, if not ironically, such research may lead to improved scaling and instrumentation.

Finally, involvement as constraint has not been adequately explored by leisure researchers. Using the single-faceted PII, Backman and Crompton (1989) and Norman (1992, 1995) have explored possible relationships between level of involvement, perceived constraints, and leisure behavior. Backman and Crompton's work suggested that low involvement may act as a constraint to participation, but Norman's data showed no relationship. This line of research should be expanded to include multifaceted instrumentation and to incorporate a broader variety of leisure settings. High involvement as a constraining variable has not been examined to date. Although Bloch (1990) argued that high involvement may have both positive and negative consequences for an individual, leisure involvement researchers have concentrated almost exclusively on positive consequences. Yet involvement-related constraints are intuitively, if not readily apparent. For example, social judgement theory suggests that high involvement with one leisure activity may lead a participant to reject other less involving activities, thus limiting the leisure repertoire of highly involved individuals. Likewise, high involvement with a particular activity may limit the range of acceptable social situations and program options for certain individuals (Bryan, 1977; Frederick et al., 1994; Gahwiler, 1995; Stebbins, 1992). These potential relationships and their implications for both leisure participants and recreation professionals should be studied within the framework of emerging leisure constraints research (e.g., Crawford, Jackson, & Godbey, 1991). Likewise, an individual's high involvement may not be entirely positive if it consequently limits interaction with family members and opportunities for meeting new people, or other potentially beneficial consequences associated with leisure participation. Indeed, intense identity may lead some sport spectators to forsake active leisure pursuits; a source of consternation among many leisure and health professionals alike. Bloch and colleagues have suggested that high involvement with recreation-related adornments and equipment may also contribute to the commodification of leisure if these materials and tools originally developed to facilitate participation become seen as ends in themselves.

In conclusion, the general support for the two propositions suggests that leisure involvement is multifaceted; though conclusive statements regarding construct validity are obviously premature. There is only partial agreement to date as to which facets are essential to determining leisure involvement. Leisure involvement research methods must be diversified if meaningful progress toward consensus on construct validity and reliable measurement is to be achieved.

References

- Ap, J., Dimanche, F., & Havitz, M. E. (1994). Involvement and residents' perceptions of tourism impacts. In A. Watson & V. J. Freysinger (Eds.), Abstracts from the 1994 Symposium on Leisure Research (p. 85). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Backman, S. J., & Crompton, J. L. (1989). Discriminating between continuers and discontinuers of two public leisure services. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 7(4), 56-71.

- Backman, S. J., & Crompton, J. L. (1991). The usefulness of selected variables for predicting activity loyalty. *Leisure Sciences*, 13, 205-220.
- Blank, U. (1989). The community tourism industry imperative. State College, PA: Venture.
- Bloch, P. H. (1990, October). Involvement, enthusiasm, fanaticism: An interdisciplinary perspective on commitment to recreational pursuits. Paper presented at the National Park and Recreation Association, 1990 Symposium on Leisure Research, Phoenix, AZ.
- Bloch, P. H. (1993). Involvement with adornments as leisure behavior: An exploratory study. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25, 245-262.
- Bloch, P. H., Black, W. C., & Lichtenstein, D. (1989). Involvement with the equipment component of sport: Links to recreational commitment. *Leisure Sciences*, 11, 187-200.
- Bloch, P. H., Sherrell, D. L., & Ridgeway, N. M. (1986). Consumer search: An extended framework. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13, 119-126.
- Brannan, L., Condello, C., Stuckum, N., Vissers, N., & Priest, S. (1992). Public perceptions of risk in recreational activities. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 17, 144-157.
- Bright, A. D., & Larson, R. (1991). The influence of enduring involvement on attitude accessibility and the attitude-behavior relationship: A case study of wildlife viewing. In C. Sylvester & L. L. Caldwell (Eds.), Abstracts from the 1991 Symposium on Leisure Research (p. 41). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Bryan, H. (1977). Leisure value systems and recreation specialization: The case of trout fishermen. Journal of Leisure Research, 9, 174-187.
- Buchanan, T. (1985). Commitment and leisure behavior: A theoretical perspective. Leisure Sciences, 7, 401-420.
- Celsi, R. L., & Olson, J. C. (1988). The role of involvement in attention and comprehension processes. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 210-224.
- Chan, K. K., & Misra, S. (1990). Characteristics of the opinion leader: A new dimension. Journal of Advertising, 19(3), 53-60.
- Cheron, E. J., & Ritchie, B. J. (1982). Leisure activities and perceived risk. Journal of Leisure Research, 14, 139-154.
- Crawford, D. W., Jackson, E. L., & Godbey, G. (1991). A hierarchical model of leisure constraints. Leisure Sciences, 13, 309-320.
- Dimanche, F., & Havitz, M. E. (1995). Exploring the importance of involvement and other selected variables in predicting perceptions of service quality. In V. J. Freysinger & P. A. Stokowski (Eds.), Abstracts from the 1995 Symposium on Leisure Research (p. 48). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Dimanche, F., Havitz, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1991). Testing the involvement profile scale in the context of selected recreational and touristic activities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23(1), 51-66.
- Dimanche, F., Havitz, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1993). Segmenting recreationists and tourists using involvement profiles. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 1(4), 33-52.
- Dimanche, F., & Samdahl, D. M. (1994). Leisure as symbolic consumption: A conceptualization and prospectus for future research. *Leisure Sciences*, 16, 119-129.
- Ewert, A., & Hollenhorst, S. (1989). Testing the adventure model: Empirical support for a model of risk recreation participation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 21, 124-139.
- Ewert, A., & Hollenhorst, S. (1994). Individual and setting attributes of the adventure recreation experience. *Leisure Sciences, 16,* 177-191.
- Frederick, C. J., Havitz, M. E., & Shaw, S. M. (1994). Social comparisons in aerobic exercise classes: Propositions for analyzing motives and participation. *Leisure Sciences*, 16, 161-176.
- Gahwiler, P. (1995). Consumer loyalty in membership-reliant leisure organizations: A social world perspective. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada.

- Gavlik, S. (1995). Reinventing recreation programming: Waco Leisure Services Department. In M. E. Havitz (Ed.), Models of change in municipal parks and recreation (pp. 108-118). State College, PA: Venture.
- Green, B. C., & Chalip, L. (1997). Enduring involvement in youth soccer: The socialization of parent and child. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29, 61-77.
- Grossman, A. H. (1992). Inclusion, not exclusion: Recreation service delivery to lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 63(4), 45-47.
- Hammer, K. R. (1996). An analysis of the use and effectiveness of public recreation marketing communications. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Havitz, M. E., & Crompton, J. L. (1990). The influence of persuasive messages on propensity to purchase selected recreational services from public or from commercial suppliers. *Journal* of Leisure Research, 22, 71-88.
- Havitz, M. E., & Dimanche, F. (1990). Propositions for guiding the empirical testing of the involvement construct in recreational and tourist contexts. *Leisure Sciences*, 12(2), 179-196.
- Havitz, M. E., Dimanche, F., & Bogle, T. (1994). Segmenting the adult fitness market using involvement profiles. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 12(3), 38-56.
- Havitz, M. E., Dimanche, F., & Howard, D. R. (1993a). A two-sample comparison of the Personal Involvement Inventory (PII) and Involvement Profile (IP) scales using selected recreation activities. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 17, 331-364.
- Havitz, M. E., Green, T. R., & McCarville, R. E. (1993b). Order effects and the measurement of enduring involvement. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 18, 181-195.
- Havitz, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1994). The effect of level of involvement on mail panel survey response rates. In G. VanderStoep (Ed.), Proceeding of the 1994 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium (pp. 169-171). Radnor, PA: United States Department of Agriculture, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station. (General Technical Report #NE-198)
- Havitz, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1995). How enduring is enduring involvement? A seasonal examination of three recreational activities. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 4, 255-276.
- Havitz, M. E., & Samdahl, D. M. (1997). Daily activities of unemployed and employed Ontarian adults: Leisure and non-leisure involvement, social networks, moods, self esteem, and life satisfaction. Unpublished manuscript.
- Havitz, M. E., Samdahl, D. M., & Whyte, L. B. (1996). Employment status and daily activities: Involvement and moods associated with leisure and non-leisure situations. In Don Dawson (Ed.), Proceedings of the Eighth Canadian Congress on Leisure Research (pp. 103-106). Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa.
- Henderson, K. A. (1994). Perspective on analyzing gender, women, and leisure. Journal of Leisure Research, 26, 119-137.
- Henderson, K. A. (1995). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual employees in the workplace: Ethical implications for leisure service organizations. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 20, 141-156.
- Higie, R. A., & Feick, L. F. (1989). Enduring involvement: Conceptual and measurement issues. Advances in Consumer Research, 16, 690-696.
- Holbrook, M. B. (1987). An audiovisual inventory of some fanatic consumer behavior: The 25cent tour of a jazz collector's home. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 14, 144-149.
- Iwasaki, Y., & Havitz, M. E. (1996). A conceptual model of the relationship between involvement and loyalty: A path analytic perspective. In P. A. Stokowski & J. Hultsman (Eds.), Abstracts from the 1996 NRPA Symposium on Leisure Research (p.34). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Jain, K., & Srinivasan, N. (1990). An empirical assessment of multiple operationalizations of involvement. Advances in Consumer Research, 17, 594-602.
- Jamrozy, U., Backman, S. J., & Backman, K. F. (1996). Involvement and opinion leadership in tourism. Annals of Tourism Research, 23, 908-924.

- Kapferer, J. N., & Laurent, G. (1993). Further evidence on the Consumer Involvement Profile: Five antecedents of involvement. Psychology and Marketing, 10, 347-355.
- Kapferer, J. N., & Laurent, G. (1985). Consumer involvement profiles: A new practical approach to consumer involvement. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 25(6), 48-56.
- Kerstetter, D., & Kovich, G. M. (1997). The involvement profiles of Division I women's basketball spectators. Journal of Sport Management, 11, 234-249.
- Kim, S. S., Scott, D., & Crompton, J. L. (1997). An exploration of the relationships among social psychological involvement, behavioral involvement, commitment, and future intentions in the context of birdwatching. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 00, 000-000.
- Lankford, S. L., Hetzler, R., & Kitajima, T. (1996, July). Crowding and satisfaction with ocean recreation: A cross-cultural perspective. Paper presented at the 4th World Congress of the World Leisure and Recreation Association, Cardiff, Wales, UK.
- Laurent, G., & Kapferer, J. N. (1985). Measuring consumer involvement profiles. Journal of Marketing Research, 22, 41-53.
- Lehmann, D. R. (1987). Pumping iron III: An examination of compulsive lifting. Advances in Consumer Research, 14, 129-131.
- Madrigal, R., Havitz, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1992). Married couples' involvement with family vacations. *Leisure Sciences*, 14, 285-299.
- Mannell, R. C. (1993). High-investment activity and life satisfaction among older adults: Committed, serious leisure and flow activities. In J. Kelly (Ed.), Activity and Aging (pp. 125-145). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McCarville, R. E. (1989). The influence of cost-of-service-provision, program and subsidy-related information on reference price levels (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 1802A.
- McCarville, R. E. (1991). An empirical investigation of the influence of cost information on willingness to pay for public aerobics classes. *Leisure Sciences*, 13, 85-96.
- McCarville, R. E., Crompton, J. L., & Sell, J. A. (1993). The influence of outcome messages on reference prices. *Leisure Sciences*, 15, 115-130.
- McIntyre, N. (1989). The personal meaning of participation: Enduring involvement. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 21, 167-179.
- McIntyre, N. (1992). Involvement in risk recreation: A comparison of objective and subjective measures of engagement. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 24, 64-71.
- McIntyre, N., & Pigram, J. J. (1992). Recreation specialization reexamined: The case of vehiclebased campers. *Leisure Sciences*, 14, 3-15.
- McQuarrie, E., & Munson, J. (1987). The Zaichkowsky involvement inventory: Modification and extension. Advances in Consumer Research, 14, 36-40.
- Mittal, B. (1989). A theoretical analysis of two recent measures of involvement. Advances in Consumer Research, 16, 697-702.
- Mittal, B. (1995). A comparative analysis of four scales of consumer involvement. Psychology & Marketing, 12, 663-682.
- Mittal, B., & Lee, M. S. (1988). Separating brand-choice involvement from product involvement via consumer involvement profiles. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 15, 43-49.
- Muehling, D. D., Laczniak, R. N., & Andrews, J. C. (1993). Defining, operationalizing, and using involvement in advertising research: A review. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 15, 21-57.
- Norman, W. C. (1991). The influence of perceived constraints on the generic decision of whether of not to take a summer vacation. In C. Sylvester & L. L. Caldwell (Eds.), Abstracts from the 1991 Symposium on Leisure Research (p. 59). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.

- Norman, W. C. (1992). An investigation of the relationship between leisure constraints and the recreation specialization of current participants. In L. L. Caldwell & C. C. Riddick (Eds.), *Abstracts from the 1991 Symposium on Leisure Research* (p. 43). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Norman, W. C. (1995). Perceived constraints: A new approach to segmenting the vacation travel market. In V. J. Freysinger & P. A. Stokowski (Eds.), *Abstracts from the 1995 Symposium on Leisure Research* (p. 113). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Norman, W. C., Fieber, P. C., & Clements, C. J. (1994b). The involvement of parks and recreation in the community tourism system: The case of Wisconsin municipal public park and recreation providers. In A. Watson & V. J. Freysinger (Eds.), Abstracts from the 1994 Symposium on Leisure Research (p. 90). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Norman, W. C., Fieber, P. C., & Larkin, K. W. (1994a). The role of tourism in local public park and recreation agencies. In *Tourism: The economy's silver lining* (pp. 124-126). Wheat Ridge, CO: Travel and Tourism Research Association.
- Obenour, W. L., & Backman, K. F. (1995). Testing the Involvement Profile (IP) and Personal Involvement Inventory (PII) scales with an African-American sample and touristic activities. In V. J. Freysinger & P. A. Stokowski (Eds.), Abstracts from the 1995 Symposium on Leisure Research (p. 116). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Park, S. H. (1996). Relationships between involvement and attitudinal loyalty constructs in adult fitness programs. *Journal of Leisure Research, 28, 233-250.*
- Perdue, R. R. (1993). External information search in marine recreational fishing. *Leisure Sciences*, 15, 169-187.
- Priest, S. (1992). Factor exploration and confirmation for the dimensions of an adventure experience. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 24, 127-139.
- Pritchard, M. (1992). Development of the psychological commitment instrument for measuring travel service loyalty (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 4408A.
- Pritchard, M. P., Howard, D. R., & Havitz, M. E. (1992). Loyalty measurement: A critical examination and theoretical extension. *Leisure Sciences*, 14, 155-164.
- Ragheb, M. G. (1996, October). Measuring leisure and recreation involvement. In P. A. Stokowski & J. Hultsman (Eds.), *Abstracts from the 1996 Symposium on Leisure Research* (p. 82). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Reid, I. S. (1992). An investigation of the decision making process in the initial purchase of selected high and low involved leisure services (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 680A.
- Reid, I. S., & Crompton, J. L. (1993). A taxonomy of leisure purchase decision paradigms based on level of involvement. *Journal of Leisure Research, 25,* 182-202.
- Reid, I. S., Crompton, J. L., & Havitz, M. E. (1997). Involvement levels and decision-making processes of first-time purchasers of recreation services. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Robinson, D. W. (1992). A descriptive model of enduring risk recreation involvement. Journal of Leisure Research, 24, 52-63.
- Rochrich, G., & Valette-Florence, P. (1990). Comparing two involvement scales: An application of structural and confirmatory analysis. In B. J. Dunlap (Ed.), Developments in marketing science. Academy of Marketing Science Conference, 8, 92-96.
- Rogers, W., & Schneider, K. (1993). An empirical evaluation of the Kapferer-Laurent Consumer Involvement Profile scale. *Psychology and Marketing*, 10, 333-345.
- Rothschild, M. (1984). Perspectives on involvement: Current problems and future directions. Advances in Consumer Research, 11, 216-217.
- Samdahl, D. M. (1992). Leisure in our lives: Exploring the common leisure occasion. Journal of Leisure Research, 24, 19-32.

- Samli, A., Wills, J., & Jacobs, L. (1993). Developing global products and marketing strategies: A rejoinder. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 21(1), 79-83.
- Scammon, D. L. (1987). Breeding, training and riding: The serious side of horsing around. Advances in Consumer Research, 14, 125-128.
- Schuett, M. A. (1993). Refining measures of adventure recreation involvement. Leisure Sciences, 15, 205-216.
- Schuett, M. A. (1995). Predictors of social group participation in whitewater kayaking. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 13(2), 42-54.
- Selin, S., & Howard, D. (1988). Ego involvement and leisure behavior: A conceptual specification. Journal of Leisure Research, 20, 237-244.
- Sherif, M., & Cantril, H. (1947). The psychology of ego involvements, social attitudes and identifications. New York: Wiley.
- Sherif, C. W., Sherif, M., & Nebergall, R. E. (1965). Attitude and attitude change: The social judgement-involvement approach. Philadelphia: W. G. Saunders.
- Siegenthaler, K. L., & Lam, T. C. M. (1992). Commitment and ego-involvement in recreational tennis. *Leisure Sciences*, 14, 303-315.
- Spigner, C., & Havitz, M. E. (1993). Social marketing or social justice: A dialogue on access to recreation for the unemployed. *Parks and Recreation*, 28(11), 51-57.
- Stebbins, R. A. (1992). Amateurs, professionals and serious leisure. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Twynam, G. D. (1993). An analysis of the extent and response forms of complaint behavior and those factors which influence consumers to complain within travel contexts (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 2983A.
- Venkatraman, M. P. (1988). Investigating differences in the roles of enduring and instrumentally involved consumers in the diffusion process. Advances in Consumer Research, 15, 299-303.
- Venkatraman, M. P. (1990). Opinion leadership, enduring involvement and characteristics of opinion leaders: A moderating or mediating relationship? *Advances in Consumer Research*, 17, 60-67.
- Vogt, C. A. (1994). Information needs as predictors of information preferences. In A. Watson & V. J. Freysinger (Eds.), Abstracts from the 1994 Symposium on Leisure Research (p. 87). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Warnick, R. B., Sutton, W. A., & McDonald, M. (1997). Female golfers and clothing interests: An examination of involvement theory. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Watkins, M. (1987). The influence of involvement and information search on consumers' choice of recreation activities (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 3560A.
- Wild, T. C., Kuiken, D., & Schopflocher, D. (1995). The role of absorption in experiential involvement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69 569-579.
- Wiley, C. G. E. (1995). The relationship between gender and enduring involvement when examined within the context of sport participation. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada.
- Zaichkowsky, J. L. (1985). Measuring the involvement construct. Journal of Consumer Research, 12, 341-352.
- Zaichkowsky, J. L. (1987). The emotional aspect of product involvement. Advances in Consumer Research, 14, 32-35.
- Zaichkowsky, J. L. (1990). Issues in measuring abstract constructs. Advances in Consumer Research, 17, 616-618.