DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 173 CS 210 698

AUTHOR Nowak, Glen J.; Salmon, Charles T.
TITLE Measuring Involvement with Social Issues.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (70th, San Antonio, TX, August 1-4, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Cognitive Processes; Consumer Economics; Higher Education; *Mass Media Effects; *Measurement Techniques; Media Research; Models; *Participation; Political Issues; Public Opinion; *Research Methodology; *Social Problems; *Test Validity; Theories
IDENTIFIERS Personal Involvement

ABSTRACT

A study applied research concepts from consumer product involvement to test a model for research on involvement with social issues. Issue involvement was defined as the state or level of perceived importance and/or interest evoked by a stimulus (issue) within a specific situation. Attitudes on four social issues--abortion, pornography the mandatory seat-belt law, and proposed increases in university tuition--were elicited by questionnaire from 475 undergraduates in an introductory public relations course at a large midwestern university. These issues were chosen because they reflected national, state, and local concerns, thereby offering the possibility of wide differences in the level of involvement among the students. The questions were presented as part of a public opinion poll, and students were told that the purpose of the questionnaire was to assess their opinions on various social issues. Seven weeks later, a similar questionnaire, with questions about abortion and the mandatory seat belt law, was administered to 413 members of the same class. Results indicated that the approach taken to measure involvement in consumer behavior research is applicable, with appropriate adaptation, to mass communication research on involvement with social issues as well. However, standardized, reliable, and valid measures of the construct should be developed so that the precise role of involvement in these processes will be better understood. (Tables of data are included, and footnotes, references, a sample questionnaire and an assessment scale are appended.) (NKA)

MEASURING INVOLVEMENT WITH SOCIAL ISSUES

Glen J. Nowak and Charles T. Salmon
School of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI 53706

(608) 263-6798/(608) 263-3391

Paper presented to the Theory and Methodology Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, San Antonio, TX, Aug. 1987.

MEASURING INVOLVEMENT WITH SOCIAL ISSUES

INTRODUCTION

The search for and explanation of differences in individual behavior has encompassed consumer behavior, mass communication and social psychological research for decades. As a result of this research, a number of information processing models have been advanced in an attempt to account for and explain differences in human attitudes and behavior. Some of these models view individuals as active searchers and users of information, who store and evaluate sensory inputs to make reasoned decisions (Lavidge and Steiner, 1961; Grunig, 1978; McGuire, 1978; Markin and Narayana, 1975). Other models of information processing, though, allow for the fact that a great deal of human behavior does not seem to involve extensive search or a comprehensive evaluation of choice alternatives (Preston and Thorson, 1984; Ray, 1973; Vaughn, 1980).

For both mass communication and consumer behavior researchers, a factor that has often been proposed as central to determining how an individual processes information in order to arrive at a final action or decision is the involvement construct (Antil, 1983; Houston and Rothschild,

1977; Kassarjian, 1978, 1980; Krugman, 1965, 1966; Mitchell, 1981; Ray, 1973; Salmon, 1986). Level of involvement helps determine the extent to which information seeking will take place and whether an individual will be active or passive upon exposure to communication messages.

The objective of this paper is to synthesize research done on consumer product involvement and apply it to an often-studied area in mass communication research--social issues. As with products, level of involvement with a social issue will affect, among other things, how an individual processes information on that issue and the amount of information seeking done with respect to that issue. This, in turn, has important implications for campaign designers and communication strategists. In social psychology and mass communication, where the notion of involvement was first formally introduced (Sherif and Cantril 1947), and where involvement is considered to be an important mediator of communication effects, little work has been done with regard to constructing a standardized measure of issue-involvement. Often, single-item measures with low reliability and little breadth are used to "capture" the involvement construct. Further, different researchers tend to employ idiosyncratic measures of the concept, thereby reducing comparability of various findings and conclusions (Salmon, 1986). For any construct to be truly useful to researchers involved in a cumulative, systematic research program, a standardized,

general, valid and multiple-item measure is needed (Churchill, 1979).

The present paper draws on consumer behavior research and previous conceptualizations of involvement to test an adaptation of a multi-item measure of product involvement, the Zaichkowsky (1985) Personal Involvement Inventory (PII), for use with social issues. In doing so, Churchill's (1979) suggestions were used as a guide in forming and testing the index. The steps taken to derive and test the social issue-involvement measure include: construct definition; item generation; data collection; and assessment of construct validity through tests of internal reliability, test-retest reliability, convergent validity, criterion validity, and discriminant validity.

The Involvement Construct

In the research literature, involvement is most often conceptualized as related to "importance," "interest," and/or "personal relevance" (Antil, 1983; Leavitt, Greenwald and Obermiller, 1981; Krugman, 1966; Mitchell, 1979; Rothschild, 1984). Based on these various conceptualizations, Rothschild (1984) suggested that it is useful to generically define involvement as a state of motivation, arousal or interest. This state is driven by current external variables (e.g., the situation, the issue, the communications) and past external variables (e.g., political socialization, personality, and central values). The consequences of involvement include differential levels of searching, processing and decision

making.

It is not enough, however, to say that involvement varies by individuals, situations and circumstances, and that it is somehow related to "importance" or "interest." Despite its wide acceptance as an important mediator of communication effects, the involvement construct is useful only to the extent that it is well defined and can be accurately indexed (Antil, 1983; Cohen, 1983; Rothschild, 1984). A number of methods have been used to assess or capture the nature of involvement. These include the development of multi-item measures, simple rank ordering of products (Sheth and Venkatesen, 1968) or having respondents rate how important products are in one's life (Hupfer and Gardner, 1971). Many of these approaches are not concerned, however, with developing a reliable and valid standardized measure of a specific type of involvement.

In consumer behavior, a number of researchers have developed multi-item measures that attempt to provide an accurate index of a person's involvement with consumer products (Bloch and Richins, 1983; Laurent and Kapferer, 1985; Kapferer and Laurent, 1986; Zaichkowsky, 1985). Unlike previous measures, these multi-item measures allow for more precise study, manipulation, and control of involvement. As Table 1 indicates, however, not all attempts to measure product involvement, even in the consumer behavior field, have placed importance or emphasis on developing reliable and valid measures of the construct.

TABLE 1: MEASURES OF PRODUCT INVOLVEMENT

Study	Type of Scale	No. of Items in scale	Reliability coefficient	N
Bloch (1981)	Likert	44	.82	381
	Likert	17	.79	57
Bowen & Chaffee (1974)	Likert	7	NA	97
Lastovicka (1979)	Likert	5	NA	143
Laurent & Kapferer (1985)	Likert	19	.72 to .90	414
McQuarrie & Munson (1987)	Semantic differential	14	.93	136
Oliver & Bearden (1983)	Likert	9	.84	353
Zaichkowsky (1985)	Semantic differential	20	.95	152

SOCIAL ISSUE-INVOLVEMENT

Issue-Involvement as a Stimulus Property. Issue-involvement has been conceptualized and operationalized in a number of ways in the research literature. Three principal approaches, however, have been most common. The first approach has been to treat issue-involvement as a stimulus property, where the stimulus can be considered to be an issue or political election (Reid and Soley, 1983; Rothschild, 1978; Rothschild and Ray, 1974; Swinyard and Coney, 1978). Using this approach, researchers have commonly decided, for example, that national elections are inherently more involving than state elections, thereby ignoring individual differences in perceptions of the stimulus. This approach also serves as the framework for most experimental manipulations of involvement (e.g., Petty and Cacioppo, 1979, 1981; Rhine and Severance, 1970; Watts and Holt, 1979). In these studies, experimenters employ messages about issues that are considered to be, a priori, of high or low levels of involvement to most subjects. Following the experiments, the researchers typically compare (using aggregated data) the mean levels of involvement in the high and low involvement groups as a manipulation check. Another example of treating involvement as a stimulus property is found in the work of Herbert Krugman (1965), who attempted to demonstrate that certain mass media were inherently more involving than others. In all cases, the reasoning has been the same: the level of involvement is largely a stimulus property.

Issue-Involvement as a Personal State. A second common approach has been to treat involvement, either implicitly or explicitly, as primarily a characteristic of individuals. Kassarjian (1980), for example, has argued that certain individuals consistently demonstrate high involvement in consumer affairs. Further, he contends, this involvement in consumer affairs is trans-situational; it is not restricted to a specific or narrow informational domain. A similar notion has been advanced by Hyman and Sheatsley (1947) in their classic description of "chronic know-nothings" who do not exhibit interest in news or public affairs. As Dervin (1980) has observed, it is unclear whether lack of interest on the part of this societal segment is "fault" of the victims themselves or due to systemic deficiencies.

Issue-Involvement as an Individual-Stimulus Interaction.

The approach taken in the present paper is to consider involvement as an interaction between a specific stimulus and an individual. This conceptualization of involvement is based upon the type of involvement described in social judgment theory (Sherif and Cantril, 1947; Sherif and Hovland, 1961). The Sherif group originally investigated involvement by examining individuals' self-selection in groups with a political focus. The problem with this approach, however, is that it confounded involvement with every other characteristic that differentiated the groups.

Although Sherif et al. have been criticized for their

particular operationalization of involvement, they did make a compelling case that involvement represents an interaction between stimulus and individual. Following this approach, it is entirely reasonable to conclude that a particular individual may be highly involved with one issue, e.g., a local property tax debate, but not at all involved with another issue, e.g., nuclear power, even though at the aggregate level of analysis the issue of nuclear power might be more involving to most individuals.

Using this conceptual framework, then, the inclusion of a particular issue in, for example, a "low involvement" category is not determined by the objective characteristics of the issue, but by how an individual views those characteristics. Issue-involvement, for the purposes of this study, is thus defined as the state or level of perceived importance and/or interest evoked by a stimulus (i.e., an issue) within a specific situation (Antil, 1983).

METHODOLOGY

Item Generation

Perhaps the most rigorous attempt to develop a reliable and valid measure of product involvement is that by Zaichkowsky (1985). She developed her measure by starting with 168 word pairs that represented the concept of involvement. After having the word pairs rated in terms of their representativeness of involvement, a 30-item content valid scale was tested for reliability and validity with

respect to product involvement. Her resulting Personal Involvement Inventory (PII) measure consisted of 20 seven-point semantic differential scale items. This measure was found to have high stability (average test-retest correlation of .90) and internal reliability (Chronbach alpha of .95). Given these considerations, this scale was used as the basis for developing a measure of social issue-involvement.

The original 20-item PII was evaluated and adapted for application to social issues. The intent was to maintain as much continuity with the original index as possible, while at the same time removing redundant and nonapplicable items. First, those scale items pertaining to products, and consequently lacking content validity for measuring issue-involvement, were dropped (i.e., useful-useless, valuable-worthless, beneficial-not beneficial, undesirable-desirable, wanted-not wanted, needed-not needed, essential-nonessential, mundane-fascinating, appealing-unappealing). Also dropped from the measure were items judged to be redundant (i.e., interesting-boring and interested-uninterested, items in the original scale, were collapsed into the single pair of interesting-not interesting. See appendix A). This resulted in a 10-item index of five-point items. While the use of only ten items might normally be expected to reduce the scale's internal reliability, McQuarrie and Munson (1987) argue that this is not the case with the PII; indeed, they have recommended that the PII be modified to reduce redundancy.

Given the design of the measurement scale, a person's social issue-involvement score could range from 10 to 50. A low score would be an indication of little or no involvement with the social issue, while a high score would indicate high involvement with the issue.

Data Collection

Subjects for the scale development were 475 undergraduate students in an introductory public relations class at a large midwestern university. The use of students for scale development is fairly standard, since the intent is to measure underlying dimensions of cognitions and attitudes rather than to generalize to some specific population (McQuarrie and Munson, 1987; Zaichkowsky, 1985).

Four social issues--abortion, pornography, mandatory seat-belt law, and proposed increases in university tuition--were selected for examination. These issues were chosen because they reflected national, state and local concerns, thereby probably eliciting wide differences in level of involvement among college students. The questions in this study were presented as part of a public opinion poll, and students were told that the purpose of the questionnaire was to assess their opinions on various social issues.

A second wave of data collection occurred seven weeks later, and involved administering a similar questionnaire to the same class. Questions about two of the original four issues--mandatory seat belt law and abortion--were asked of

413 student subjects.[1] This second administration allowed assessment of test-retest reliability of the involvement scale.

Reliability and Validity Assessments

Several types of reliability and validity were investigated in this analysis. First, internal reliability was assessed following principles of the domain sampling model. According to this model, the purpose of any particular measurement is to estimate the score that would be obtained if all the items in the domain were used (Nunnally, 1967). The dispersion of correlations about the average indicates the extent to which items vary in sharing a common dimension. High inter-item correlations indicate that items are drawn from the domain of a single construct, while low inter-item correlations indicate that some items were not drawn from the appropriate domain and are, as a result, producing error and unreliability. Coefficient alpha, which results directly from the domain sampling model, was used to assess internal reliabilty.

A second form of reliability, test-retest, was determined by administering the involvement scale at two timepoints (seven weeks apart).

Three forms of validity were examined. First, convergent validity, i.e., the extent to which one measure of a phenomenon is associated with other measures of the same phenomenon, was assessed by correlating the 10-item issue-

involvement measure with a measure of involvement developed by Laurent and Kapferer (1985), described below, and a one-item "thermometer" measure of involvement. Next, criterion validity, i.e., predictive validity, was assessed by correlating issue-involvement with behavioral intention measures. Finally, discriminant validity, i.e., "predictably low correlations between the measure of interest and other measures that are supposedly not measuring the same variable" (Heeler and Ray, 1972), was assessed by correlating involvement scores with two standardized measures in the social psychological literature--self-esteem and personal efficacy.

Descriptions of the variables used in these assessments are provided below.

Laurent and Kapferer's Measure of Involvement. To determine convergent validity, a standardized measure of product involvement derived by Laurent and Kapferer (1985) was adapted and employed. Laurent and Kapferer (1985) and Kapferer and Laurent (1986) have argued that product involvement is a multidimensional construct composed of four dimensions: perceived importance/risk; probability of negative consequences; sign or symbolic value; and pleasure. While the empirical data they collected on 37 product categories and from 7500 interviews supported their contention that involvement was based upon these four dimensions, the scale is problematic for use with social issues. First, it is

heavily product oriented. Secondly, the original scale was published in French, and even then all of the items were not included (McQuarries and Munson, 1987). Thus the version of the Laurent and Kapferer scale used in this examination must be considered a variant of the actual scale used in France.

Eight five-point Likert-type items adapted from Laurent and Kapferer (1985), judged to be most capable of tapping the potential dimensions of social issue involvement, were used to assess convergent validity (see Appendix B for the scale items).[2]

For additional data on convergent validity, a single-item thermometer measure was used in which subjects were simply asked, "Overall, how involved would you say you are in the issue of .....?" The use of a one-item thermometer measure has been applied in previous scale constructions in conjunction with the evaluation of multiple-item indices (Churchill, 1979).

To assess criterion or predictive validity, subjects were asked about their willingness to donate money to an organization that lobbies on behalf their opinion on the issues being considered.

To determine discriminant validity, the involvement index scores were correlated with two other measures. The first, a measure of self-esteem, was developed by Janis and Field (Hovland and Janis, 1959). This standardized measure of self-esteem has been used in a number of studies on persuasion

and has a reported internal reliability of between .72 and .88 (Robinson and Shaver, 1973). The second, efficacy, was based upon a scale developed by Olson (1969).[3] Although both constructs have been empirically demonstrated to be significantly correlated with behaviors pertaining to social issues, there is no rationale for expecting them to be significantly correlated with issue-involvement. Thus, low correlations between issue-involvement, self-esteem and efficacy would indicate high discriminant validity for the issue-involvement measure.

RESULTS

Scale Scores

The Time 1 means and standard deviations of the scales for each of the four social issues were: abortion ($\bar{x}$ = 42, s = 8); mandatory seat-belt law ($\bar{x}$ = 39, s = 7); pornography ($\bar{x}$ = 31.9, s = 8); and tuition ($\bar{x}$ = 42, s = 7).

Time 2 means and standard deviations for the two issues used in the second wave of data collection were markedly similar: abortion ($\bar{x}$ = 42, s = 7); mandatory seat-belt law ($\bar{x}$ = 38, s = 8).

Internal Reliability

The ranges of item-to-total correlations for the four issue-involvement scales are presented in Table 2. Across all four issues, at Time 1, the overall range is from .52 to .86. The average between-item correlations for each of the scales are also presented in Table 2. These correlations range from

TABLE 2: TIME 1 INTERNAL RELIABILITY RESULTS BY ISSUE

Social Issue	Range of Item-to-Total Correlations	Average Between Item Correlations	S.D.	Chronbach Alpha
Pornography	.52 to .85	.52	.11	.91
Seat Belts	.63 to .85	.58	.10	.93
Abortion	.58 to .78	.45	.10	.89
University Tuition	.59 to .86	.54	.12	.92

N=471 $p<.001$ for all correlations

used are similarly high, ranging from .67 to .84 across both issues. The average between-item correlations for these scales at Time 2 were .50 for abortion and .56 for the mandatory seat-belt law.

The computation of Chronbach's alpha for each of the four issue-involvement scales indicated the following: for abortion, alpha = .89; for the seat-belt law, alpha = .93; for pornography, alpha = .91; and for tuition, alpha = .92. In general, alpha levels of .80 or higher are considered good for widely used measurement scales (Carmines and Zeller, 1979).

Based upon the high item-to-total correlations and coefficient alpha levels for all four issues, the issue-involvement scale was considered to have high internal reliability.

Test-Retest Reliability

Pearson correlation coefficients were used to assess over-time reliability of two issue-involvement scales. The Pearson correlations were $r = .63$ ($p < .001$) for abortion and $r = .62$ ($p < .001$) for the mandatory seat-belt law.

Convergent Validity

For gauging convergent validity, the four issue-involvement scales were correlated at Time 1 with the adapted Kapferer and Laurent scales. Two issues, seat belts and abortion, were correlated at Time 2 with the adapted Kapferer and Laurent scales and also with the one-item thermometer measure. These correlations are presented in Table 3. All correlations between

TABLE 3: CONVERGENT VALIDITY CORRELATIONS

Time 1:

Social Issue Involvement	Correlation with K&L Scale
Pornography	.55*
Seat Belts	.69*
Abortion	.63*
University Tuition	.57*

N=471 *p < .001

Time 2:

Social Issue Involvement	Correlation with K&L Scale	Correlation with Thermometer Item
Seat Belts	.66*	.67*
Abortion	.63*	.63*

N=404 for seat belts
391 for abortion

*p < .001

the issue-involvement index and both indices used for the purpose of establishing convergent validity ranged from .55 to .69 and were significant at the .001 level. These correlations indicate high convergent validity.

Criterion Validity

To assess criterion validity, respondents were asked to indicate their willingness to donate money to an organization lobbying on behalf of their positions on the issues of abortion and the mandatory seat-belt law. One would expect that high involvement in either issue would be related to greater willingness to donate money for that issue. In this case, the correlations between issue-involvement and willingness to donate money were .34 ($p < .001$) for abortion and .46 ($p < .001$) for the mandatory seat-belt law.

Discriminant Validity

For the purpose of eatablishing discriminant validity, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed between the constructs of self-esteem and issue-involvement and efficacy and issue-involvement. As Table 4 indicates, issue-involvement was, with one exception, not significantly correlated with self-esteem nor efficacy. The only exception was abortion, where efficacy and issue involvement had a relatively low, but statistically significant, correlation of .15 ($p < .001$).

Factor Analysis of Scale Scores

In order to assess the dimensionality of the involvement measure, factor analyses were carried out at both Time 1 and

TABLE 4: DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY CORRELATIONS

Social Issue Involvement	Correlation with Self-Esteem	Correlation with Efficacy
Pornography	.01	.088
Seat Belts	-.002	-.036
Abortion	.148*	.074
University Tuition	.051	.075

N=455 *p < .001

Time 2. Factor analyzing both the Time 1 and Time 2 involvement indices by social issue, using maximum likelihood extraction with varimax rotation and the multiple R squared from the regression equation as the estimate of communality, consistently resulted in a one-factor solution that accounted for around 50 percent of the variance. As Table 5 illustrates, for the 10-item Time 1 measure, the one factor accounted for 53 percent of the variance for pornography, 45 percent for abortion, 59 percent of the variance for seat belts and 55 percent for tuition. At Time 2, the one factor accounted for 48 percent of the variance for abortion and 53 percent for seat belts. The results were thus consistent with the assumption of Zaichkowsky (1985) that the involvement index she developed was a simple linear combination of individual scale items.

TABLE 5: FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR SCALE ITEMS
(Time 1)

Pornography:

Variable	Communality	Eigen Value	Pct. of Var.
Importance	.546	5.299	53.0
Concern	.454		
Relevance	.640		
Meaningfulness	.580		
Trivialness	.589		
Matters	.611		
Interesting	.425		
Significant	.723		
Vital	.533		
Excitement	..195		

Seat Belts:

Variable	Communality	Eigen Value	Pct. of Var.
Importance	.575	5.878	58.8
Concern	.602		
Relevance	.588		
Meaningfulness	.655		
Trivialness	.666		
Matters	.617		
Interesting	.470		
Significant	.725		
Vital	.685		
Excitement	.295		

Abortion:

Variable	Communality	Eigen Value	Pct. of Var.
Importance	.313	4.528	45.3
Concern	.588		
Relevance	.483		
Meaningfulness	.591		
Trivialness	.348		
Matters	.614		
Interesting	.415		
Significant	.472		
Vital	.474		
Excitement	.230		

TABLE 5 continued. . .

University Tuition:

Variable	Communality	Eigen Value	Pct. of Var.
Importance	.542	5.490	54.9
Concern	.486		
Relevance	.664		
Meaningfulness	.605		
Trivialness	.503		
Matters	.652		
Interesting	.403		
Significant	.778		
Vital	.634		
Excitement	.224		

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Carmines and Zeller (1979) have described the paradoxical coexistence of ritualistic concern with, but lack of systematic attention to, issues of social science measurement. Inadequate measures, Carmines and Zeller note, can lead to incorrect inferences and misleading conclusions. The present paper represents an attempt to redress this problem, one that is endemic to the social sciences as a whole, in the specific area of social issue-involvement. The results indicate that the approach taken in the discipline of consumer behavior toward measuring involvement is applicable, with appropriate adaptation, to mass communication research as well.

The construct of involvement, operationalized in one form or another, repeatedly has been found to be a major intervening variable in the communication process. Yet progress in understanding the precise role of involvement in these processes has been impeded by the lack of development of standardized, reliable, and valid measures of the construct. As Rothschild (1984) pointed out, rather than generate more definitions and further conceptualizations of involvement, research efforts in the field need to focus on developing reliable measures.

The unidimensional issue-involvement measure described in this paper has high internal reliability (with an alpha of between .89 and .93 depending on the issue) and high test-

retest reliability. Further, tests of three forms of validity, convergent, criterion and discriminant, similarly indicate that the scale has high overall validity.

Measurement is inextricably linked with theory (Peter, 1981), and the theoretical approach used to guide this scale construction is that involvement represents a motivational state. Other, conceptualizations may posit that involvement has cognitive, affective and behavioral dimensions, and that, therefore, measures of involvement ought to be multidimensional in nature. While this is a legitimate concern, there are several advantages to developing a unidimensional measure of the construct. First, unidimensional scales are considered more useful for theory-relevant research. McIver and Carmines (1981), for example, contend that unidimensional scales are easier to interpret and apply than multidimensional models. In addition, McIver and Carmines argue that multidimensional concepts may actually hamper research because they are too ambiguous in their meaning and too difficult to measure in a precise and parsimonious manner.

Future research is needed to build a body of literature in which this measure of issue-involvement is employed. This will permit the accumulation of research findings that is critical to the scientific method. Future research should also investigate developing other unidimensional measures of involvement for other facets of the construct. The ultimate

goal of this approach is to further understanding of the role of this construct in all aspects of human information seeking and processing.

FOOTNOTES

1. Data from Time 1 were used to assess levels of involvement on four social issues, i.e., abortion, mandatory seat belt law, pornography, and tuition. Two of these four issues, pornography and tuition, were selected for experimental manipulation during the second wave of data collection. The manipulation precluded collecting data on test-retest reliability for these two issues. However, the manipulation did not prevent assessing Time 2 reliability information for the two issues not used in the manipulation, i.e., abortion and the mandatory seat belt law.

2. As previously mentioned, the Kapferer and Laurent measure of involvement is (1) designed for use with products, and (2) an adaptation of incomplete versions of the scale used in France. Thus, is was expected to have lower internal reliability than the issue-involvement scale designed in this paper. At this same time, it is a well-conceptualized and tested measure of involvement that can reasonably be used as a point of comparison when assessing convergent validity. The range of item-to-total correlations for the Kapferer and Laurent measure indicated less reliability than the issue-involvement

FOOTNOTES continued. . .

scale. The range were: for abortion, .50 to .67; for seat-belt law, .43 to .67; for pornography, .39 to .60; and for tuition, .58 to .65. Coefficient alphas for the scales were: .75 for abortion; .74 for the seat-belt law; .63 for pornography; and .71 for tuition.

3. The self-esteem measure is a standard measure developed by Janis and Field and described in the pioneering work of the Yale group, Personality and Persuability. In this study, the 20-item index was found to have a coefficient alpha of .90. The measure of efficacy was derived from the work of Olsen and consists of four items tapping political incapability. Coefficient alpha for this scale was a modest .60, probably a function of the few items comprising the scale.

REFERENCES

Antil, John H. (1983). "Conceptualization and Operationalization of Involvement," in R.P. Bagozzi and A. Tybout (eds.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 10. Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research, 203-209.

Bloch, Peter H. (1981). "An Exploration into the Scaling of Consumers' Involvement with a Product Class," in K. Monroe (ed.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 8. Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research, 61-65.

Bloch, Peter H. and M.L. Richins (1983). "A Theoretical Model for the Study of Product Importance Perceptions." Journal of Marketing, 47(Summer), 69-81.

Bowen, L. and S.H. Chaffee (1974). "Product Involvement and Pertinent Advertising Appeals," Journalism Quarterly, 51, 613-621.

Carmines, E.G. and R.A. Zeller (1979). "Reliability and Validity Assessment," in J.L. Sullivan (ed.) Quantative Applications in the Social Sciences. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Churchill, G.A., Jr. (1983). "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs." Journal of Marketing Research, 16(February), 64-73.

Cohen, Joel B. (1983). "Involvement and You: 1000 Great Ideas," in R.P. Bagozzi and A. Tybout (eds.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 10. Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research.

Dervin, Brenda (1980). "Mass Communicating: Changing Conceptions of the Audience," in R. Rice and W. Paisley (eds.) Public Communication Campaigns. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications

Grunig, J.E. (1978). "Defining Publics in Public Relations: The Case of a Suburban Hospital." Journalism Quarterly, 55, 109-118.

Heeler, R.M. and M.L. Ray (1972). "Measure Validation in Marketing." Journal of Marketing Research, 9(Nov.), 361-370.

Hovland, C. and Janis, I. (1959). Personality and Persuability. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Houston, M.J. and M.L. Rothschild (1977). "A Paradigm for Research on Consumer Involvement," Unpublished working paper, Graduate School of Business, University of Wisconsin.

Hupfer, N.T. and D.M. Gardner (1971). "Differential Involvement with Products and Issues: An Exploratory Study," in D.M. Gardner (ed.) Proceedings of the Association for Consumer Research, 2nd Conference. College Park, MD.

Hyman, H. and P. Sheatsley (1947). "Some Reasons Why Information Champaigns Fail." Public Opinion Quarterly, 11, 412-423.

Kapferer, J. and G. Laurent (1986). "Consumer Involvement Profiles: A New Practical Approach to Consumer Involvement." Journal of Advertising Research, 25(6).

Kassarjian, H.H. (1980). "Low Involvement: A Second Look," in K.B. Monroe (ed.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 8. Association for Consumer Research, 31-34.

Kassarjian, H.H. (1978). "Presidential Address: Anthrophomophism and Parsimony," in H.K. Hunt (ed.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 5. Association for Consumer Research.

Krugman, H.E. (1966). "The Measurement of Advertising Involvement." Public Opinion Quarterly, 30, 583-596.

Krugman, H.E. (1965). "The Impact of Television Advertising: Learning without Involvement." Public Opinion Quarterly, 29, 349-356.

Lastovicka, John L. (1979). "Questioning the Concept of Involvement Defined Product Classes," in W. Wilkie (ed.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 6. Association for Consumer Research, 174-179.

Lastovicka, John L. and Gardner, D. (1978). "Low Involvement Versus High Involvement Cognitive Structures," in H.K. Hunt (ed.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 5. Association for Consumer Research.

Laurent, Giles and J. Kapferer (1985). "Measuring Consumer Involvement Profiles." Journal of Marketing Research, 22(Feb.), 41-53.

Lavidge, R.J. and Steiner, G.A. (1961). "A Model for Predictive Measurements of Advertising Effectiveness." Journal of Marketing, Oct., 59-62.

Leavitt, C., A.G. Greenwald and C. Obermiller (1981). "What is Low Involvement Low In?" in K. Monroe (ed.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 8. Association for Consumer Research.

Markin, R.J. and C. Narayana (1975). "Behavior Control: Are Consumers Beyond Freedom and Dignity?" in B. Anderson (ed.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 3. Association for Consumer Research.

McGuire, W.J. (1978). "An Information-Processing Model of Advertising Effectiveness," in Davis and Silk (eds.) Behavioral and Management Science in Marketing. New York: Ronald.

McIver, J.P. and E.G. Carmines (1982). "Unidimensional Scaling," in J. Sullivan (ed.) Quantative Applications in the Social Sciences. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

McQuarrie, E.F. and J.M. Munson (1987). "The Zaichkowsky Personal Involvement Inventory: Modification and Extension," in M. Wallendorf and P. Anderson (eds.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 14. Association for Consumer Research.

Mitchell, A.A. (1981). "The Dimensions of Advertising Involvement," in K. Monroe (ed.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 8. Association for Consumer Research, 25-30.

Mitchell, A.A. (1979). "Involvement: A Potentially Important Mediator of Consumer Behavior," in W. Wilkie (ed.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 6. Association for Consumer Research, 191-196.

Nunnally, Jum C. (1978). Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Olsen, M. (1969). "Political Alienation." Social Forces, 47, 288-299.

Oliver, R.L. and W.O. Bearden (1983). "The Role of Involvement in Satisfaction Processes," in Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 10. Association for Consumer Research.

Peter, J. Paul (1981). "Construct Validity: A Review of Basic Issues and Marketing Practices." Journal of Marketing Research, 18(May), 133-145.

Petty, R.E. and J.T. Cacioppo (1981). "Issue Involvement as a Moderator of the Effects of Attitude of Advertising Content and Context," in Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 8. Association for Consumer Research.

Petty, R.E. and J.T. Cacioppo (1979). "Issue Involvement can Increase or Decrease Persuasion by Enhancing Message Relevant Cognitive Processes." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1915-1926.

Preston, Ivan L. and E. Thorson (1984). "The Expanded Association Model: Keeping the Hierarchy Concept Alive." Journal of Advertising Research, 24(1).

Ray, M.L. (1973). "Marketing Communication and the Hierarchy of Effects," in P. Clarke (ed.) New Models for Mass Communication Research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Reid, L.N. and L.C. Soley (1983). "Promotional Spending Effects in High Involvement Elections: An Examination of the Voter Involvement Explanation." Journal of Advertising, 12, 43-50.

Rhine, R.J. and L.J. Severance (1970). "Ego-Involvement, Discrepancy, Source Credibility and Attitude Change." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 175-190.

Robinson, J.P. and P.R. Shaver (1973). Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center Institute for Social Research.

Rothschild, M.L. (1984). "Perspectives on Involvement: Current Problems and Future Directions," in T. Kinnear (ed.) Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 11. Association for Consumer Research.

Rothschild, M.L. (1978). "Political Advertising: A Neglected Policy Issue in Marketing." Journal of Marketing Research, 15, 58-70.

Rothschild, M.L. and M.L. Ray (1974). "Involvement and Political Advertising Effect: An Exploratory Experiment." Communication Research, 1(July), 264-284.

Salmon, Charles T. (1986). "Perspectives on Involvement in Communication and Consumer Research," in B. Dervin and M. Voight (eds.) Progress in Communication Science, Vol. 7. New York: Ablex.

Sherif, M. and H. Cantril (1947). The Psychology of Ego-Involvement. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Sherif, M. and C.I. Hovland (1961). Social Judgment: Assimilation and Contrast Effects in Communication and Attitude Change. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sherif, C.W., M. Sherif, and R.E. Nebergall (1965). Attitude and Attitude Change. Philadephia: Saunders.

Swinyard, W.R. and K.A. Coney (1978). "Promotional Effects on a High- Versus Low-Involvement Electorate." Journal of Consumer Research, 5, 41-48.

Vaughn, R. (1980). "How Advertising Works: A Planning Model." Journal of Advertising Research, 20(Oct.), 27-33.

Watts, W.A. and L.E. Holt (1979). "Persistence of Opinion Change Induced Under Conditions of Forewarning and Distraction." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 778-789.

Zaichkowsky, J.L. (1985). "Measuring the Involvement Construct." Journal of Consumer Research, 12(Dec.), 341-352.

APPENDIX A: SOCIAL ISSUE INVOLVEMENT MEASURE

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to measure your opinions on various social issues. We will give you a series of adjectives about each issue and we would like you to indicate how you feel about each one.

EXAMPLE: If you feel that the item given is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your checkmark as follows:

IMPORTANT ____:____:____:____:__X__ UNIMPORTANT

If you feel that the item given is related to one end of the scale, you should place your checkmark as follows:

IMPORTANT ____:__X__:_ __:____:_____ UNIMPORTANT

If you feel that the item given is not related to one end of the scale or the other, you should place your checkmark as follows:

IMPORTANT ____:____:__X__:____:_____ UNIMPORTANT

IMPORTANT:

1. Be sure you check every scale for every issue; do not omit any items.
2. Never put more than one checkmark on a single scale.
3. Answer each item separately and independently. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impression that we want.
4. Be honest. All answers will be kept completely confidential.

APPENDIX A continued. . .

The issue of _____ is . . .

Important	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	Unimportant
Of no concern	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	Of concern
Irrelevant	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	Relevant
Very Meaningful to me	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	Means nothing to me
Trivial	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	Fundamental
Matters to me	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	Doesn't matter
Interesting	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	Not interesting
Significant	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	Insignificant
Vital	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	Superflous
Boring	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	Exciting

(Note: With slight modifications, this scale can be adapted for use with telephone interviews.)

APPENDIX B. MODIFIED KAPFERER AND LAURENT SCALE FOR ASSESSING ISSUE INVOLVEMENT

I have a strong interest in ___(social issue)___.

strongly agree ____:____:____:____:____ strongly disagree

I don't enjoy thinking about the issue of _____.

strongly agree ____:____:____:____:____ strongly disagree

Making the right decision about the issue of _____ is critical for society.

strongly agree ____:____:____:____:____ strongly disagree

I am not sure that my position on the issue of _____ is the most correct one.

strongly agree ____:____:____:____:____ strongly disagree

You can tell a lot about a person by knowing the position s/he holds on the issue of _____.

strongly agree ____:____:____:____:____ strongly disagree

I like thinking about the issue of _____.

strongly agree ____:____:____:____:____ strongly disagree

There are a lot of issues about which I am more concerned than the issue of _____.

strongly agree ____:____:____:____:____ strongly disagree

A person's position on ___ _____ doesn't tell you what kind of person he or she really is.

strongly agree ____:____:____:____:____ strongly disagree