

Measuring Leisure Attitude¹

Mounir G. Ragheb and Jacob G. Beard

ABSTRACT: *Knowledge on leisure and recreation behavior was reviewed to extract indicators relevant to the construct leisure attitudes. That created a pool of over 100 indicators which were reduced and used to develop a tentative measure of 55 items. Items were related to three components of leisure attitudes: cognitive, affective, and behavioral. The instrument was subjected to three pilot studies. The first was in face-to-face situations with about 30 subjects. After refining the instrument, it was administered to a sample of 155 subjects. Some items required modifications and some others needed to be eliminated. Then, the new version was administered to a sample of 254 subjects. This yielded an alpha reliability coefficient of .94 for the total scale. A final test and two other leisure attitude scales were administered to a sample of 1,042 subjects to test concurrent validity; Crandall and Slivken (1980), and Burdige (1961). The results showed the following alpha reliability coefficients: Total Scale = .94, Cognitive = .91, Affective = .93, and Behavioral = .89. The instrument was sent to 31 experts in the areas of leisure attitude and social psychology to be evaluated for content validity. Their responses generally confirmed the appropriateness of the items.*

KEYWORDS: *Leisure attitudes, components, measurement, reliability, validity, factor analysis, alpha reliability coefficient.*

AUTHORS: *Mounir G. Ragheb is Associate Professor, Leisure Services and Studies, and Jacob G. Beard is Professor of Tests and Measurements, Department of Educational Research, Development and Foundations, College of Education, The Florida State University, Tallahassee.*

Journal of Leisure Research, 1982 Volume 14, Number 2, pp. 155-167. Copyright © 1982 by the National Recreation and Park Association.

¹This investigation was supported by the Florida State University at Tallahassee. The authors wish to thank Mr. Gary Stein for his assistance in collecting the data. This paper was presented at the SPRE Research Symposium, National Recreation and Park Association, Phoenix, Arizona, October 1980.

A valid and reliable leisure attitude instrument is badly needed. There is a growing reliance, in leisure services, on theory derived from the behavioral and social sciences, and on the results of empirical research done in the area of leisure itself. This research oriented approach to the study of leisure requires precise measuring instruments. If we are concerned with the psychological and sociological aspects of leisure, the study of leisure attitudes becomes an imperative task (Neulinger 1974: 52). Progress in these areas would be facilitated by the availability of adequate leisure attitude instruments.

Triandis (1967) distinguished three attitude components: cognitive, affective, and behavioral. On the need to consider the three components, Triandis says, "In view of the multi-dimensional nature of attitudes, it would appear naive to attempt to predict social behavior from the measurement of attitudes, utilizing only one attitude score. In fact, it appears necessary to obtain a number of scores to describe each of the components of attitude. There is evidence (Ostrom 1966) that the behavioral component of attitudes provides the best set of attitude scores for the prediction of behavior" (pp. 266-7). Triandis also cited studies which provided information about the intercorrelations among the three components.

Three leisure attitude scales are frequently cited in the leisure literature. These scales were developed by Burdge (1961), Neulinger and Breit (1971), and Crandall and Slivken (1978). None of these instruments included separate measures of the three components. This study will help fill this void.

Background

Some authorities advocate reliance on only the affective component of attitude (Thurstone 1946; Fishbein 1967) and it is usually only the affective component which is measured and treated by researchers as the essence of attitude (Fishbein 1967). On the other hand, several studies have used the three components (Hollander 1971; Cooper and McGaugh 1963; Lindgren 1969; Katz and Stotland 1959; Cook and Sellitz 1967; Triandis 1967; Martens 1975; Katz 1960; and Neulinger 1976). Martens (1975, p. 130) summarizes the state of affairs by saying, "... the separate measurement of each of the three components of an attitude is advocated by most attitude researchers today. In the past, only the affective component usually has been measured".

The use of all three components appears to be particularly appropriate in the case of leisure attitude. Certainly our predisposition to engage in leisure activities is affected by our knowledge and beliefs about leisure activities and their effects (knowledge); our liking, disliking and other feelings about them (affective); and by our past and current patterns of behavior regarding such activities (behavioral).

Previous Efforts to Measure Leisure Attitude

Burdge (1961) developed a leisure attitude scale which consisted of eleven items contrasting work and leisure. Widely used, this scale has been adapted in various ways by researchers. Items have been modified and changed, the test's length has been altered, and items have been re-ordered. According to its author such changes have diminished its value (Yoesing and Burdge 1976).

Ten years after the Burdge scale was developed Neulinger and Breit (1971) constructed a leisure attitude scale composed of 150 items. Utilizing factor analysis, five (5) main factors were identified. Crandall and Slivken (1980) offered the following comments on Neulinger and Breit's scale. First, they acknowledge the scale as a pioneer instrument which stimulated research. Second, concerning its content validity, there is no knowledge on the importance of these five factors composing the leisure attitude domain. Third, the different items are answered in many formats and scales which are awkward to score. Last, little psychometric evidence has been provided to support the use of each scale as a separate measure.

Crandall and Slivken (1978, 1980) developed the Leisure Attitude Scale (LAS). The LAS originally had 20 items, but was reduced to 10 items with an alpha reliability coefficient of .76. The main intent of the LAS was to assess the affective component.

Need for a New Scale

The instruments previously available for measuring leisure attitudes have not differentiated among the three components of attitude, although some have included items which might compose scales of all three components. The heterogeneous nature of these scales have produced results having modest reliability. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the feasibility of a leisure attitude scale with subscales reliably measuring cognitive, affective, and behavioral components.

Method

Component Conceptualization

The conceptualization of these three components is described in the following paragraphs.

The *Cognitive* component of leisure attitude was conceptualized as including the following elements: (a) general knowledge and beliefs about leisure, (b) beliefs about leisure's relation to other concepts such as health, happiness, and work, and (c) beliefs about the qualities, virtues, characteristics, and benefits of leisure to individuals such as: developing friendship, renewing energy, helping one to relax, meeting needs, and

self-improvement. The knowledge and beliefs about leisure must be general enough to be comprehensible by most respondents. They may be related to individuals and society, but not necessarily to the leisure of the respondent himself or herself. It was considered necessary that this component reflect the basic beliefs of the respondent about the properties of leisure.

The *Affective* component of leisure attitudes was viewed as including the individuals': (a) evaluation of their leisure experiences and activities, (b) liking of those experiences and activities, and (c) immediate and direct feelings toward leisure experiences and activities. This component generally reflects the respondent's liking or disliking of leisure activities. The *Behavioral* component of leisure attitudes was to include the individuals': (a) verbalized behavioral intentions toward leisure choices and activities, and (b) reports of current and past participation such as "I do leisure activities frequently." Indirect behaviors such as "I would vote for taxes for leisure agencies" were excluded.

The following brief definitions were structured to facilitate communication about the three components.

Cognitive—The individual's general knowledge and beliefs about leisure, its characteristics, virtues, and how it relates to the quality of one's life.

Affective—The individual's feelings toward his/her own leisure, the degree of liking or disliking of leisure activities and experiences.

Behavioral—The individual's past, present, and intended actions with regard to leisure activities, and experiences.

Item Development

On the basis of the component conceptualization and definitions, and with the aid of the leisure attitude measurements available by Burdge (1961), Neulinger and Breit (1971) and Crandall and Sivken (1980), a pool of more than 100 items was formed.

The investigators, using a process of critical analysis, reduced the original pool to 61 items. The instrument was then distributed to faculty colleagues and leisure students (total 35), who were asked to evaluate each item using the following criteria:

1. How relevant are the response scales to the items?
2. Is the item too difficult or unclear for average respondents?
3. Is the item vague or ambiguous?
4. Is there any duplication between the item and another one within its component?

The responses were used to modify or omit some of the items. As a result, the number of items was reduced to 55 revised items.

Pilot Studies

Two pilot studies were conducted. The first was used to determine the workability of the scale through direct feedback from 155 graduate and undergraduate students, and to obtain data from an initial empirical analysis which facilitated revision of the instrument. A factor analysis of the data suggested that the affective component should be more clearly defined. Item analyses showed that negatively stated items, i.e., those which persons having a positive attitude would disagree with, yielded low point-biserial correlations between the item and the total subscale score. Some examples of such items which did not discriminate were: (1) I feel guilty for engaging in leisure activities, (2) I regret the time I put into my leisure activities, (3) I consider it wrong to engage in leisure activities frequently, and (4) I feel that I am wasting my time when I am engaging in leisure activities.

After the indicated modifications were made the new scale consisting of 54 items was administered in a second pilot study to a sample of 294 graduate and undergraduate students. The alpha reliability coefficient obtained was .94 for the total scale, .91 for the cognitive component, .86 for the affective component, and .91 for the behavioral component. However, item and factor analyses showed that the negative items which were modified to a positive form remained low on their factor loadings and in their item-component discrimination values. Therefore, these items were discarded and the analyses redone. The scale was then reduced to the best 36 items, 12 items for each component, shown in Table 3. An item was eliminated if: (a) it had one of the lower correlations with the factor (component) under which it was subsumed, (b) it had a small point-biserial correlation with the part score under which it was subsumed, or (c) problems in clarity of communication had been identified.

The Field Test of the Final Instrument

The field test was conducted on two levels. First, experts in the area of leisure attitudes and social psychology evaluated its content validity. Second, the leisure attitude scales were administered to a sample of 1,042 subjects and extensive statistical analyses of the resulting data were completed, including a concurrent validity study utilizing two other leisure attitude scales.

The final scale and a set of criteria to be used in evaluating it were mailed to 31 experts in the field of leisure and social psychology. The experts were identified through the Society of Park and Recreation Educators (SPRE) *Curriculum Catalog* for 1979-1980. Their academic interests included either leisure attitudes, social psychology of leisure, or social and behavioral aspects of leisure. The number of judges who evaluated the scale and responded was 15, or 47 percent.

The judges were asked to evaluate the items and overall instrument with respect to the following characteristics: (a) definitions of the three components were offered and the judges were instructed to evaluate how the items within each of the components appeared to assess such an attitude, (b) relevance of the 36 items to the general concept of leisure attitude, (c) clarity of the items, (d) reading level of the items and instructions, and (e) the likelihood of the items being objectionable to the respondents.

The responses generally indicated acceptance of the instrument. On the basis of 5-point scales, the means of the evaluation ratings ranged between 3.6 to 4.8; 3.6 for the relevancy of the items on the affective component to its definition; 4.8 was the mean of the evaluation of the reading level of the items and instructions.

Finally, the 36 items, together with the Burdige (1961) and Crandall and Sivken (1978) scales, were administered to a sample of 1,042 individuals in the Spring of 1980. The sample is described in Table 1. Approximately half of the subjects were community college or university students.

TABLE 1

Description of the Sample		
Sex	Marital Status	Income in 1979
Female—547 (52)*	Single—580 (56)	Less than \$3,000—375 (36)
Male—464 (45)	Married—386 (32)	\$3,001 to 10,000—207 (20)
Omitted—31 (03)	Divorced—77 (07)	10,001 to 20,000—218 (21)
	Separated—8 (01)	20,001 to 30,000—97 (09)
	Widow(er)—18 (02)	30,001 or more—64 (06)
	Omitted—23 (02)	Omitted—81 (08)

Age In Years	Educ. in Years	Employment
11 to 15—109 (10)	Under 6—23 (02)	Student—521 (50)
16 to 20—281 (27)	6 to 8—17 (20)	Faculty—85 (08)
21 to 25—185 (18)	9 to 11—229 (22)	University Staff—101 (10)
26 to 30—112 (11)	12—201 (19)	Full-time Non-Univ.—286 (27)
31 to 35—66 (08)	13 to 14—188 (18)	Part-time—10 (01)
36 to 40—71 (07)	15 to 16—170 (16)	Unemployed—1 (<1)
41 to 45—43 (04)	More than 16—187 (18)	Retired—3 (<1)
46 to 50—37 (04)	Omitted—27 (03)	Housewife—2 (<1)
51 to 55—47 (05)		Omitted—53 (03)
56 to 60—51 (05)		
61 to 65—20 (02)		
Omitted—0 (00)		

Note. N = 1042

*number (percentage)

Analysis of Field Test Data

The data were analyzed by conventional item and test analysis techniques and by factor analysis. The item and test analyses included the computation of variances, interitem correlations, item-total correlations, and alpha reliability coefficients for each component part and for the total scale-means. Each of the three component parts was treated as a subscale and intercorrelations among the subscale scores were also computed.

A principal component factor analysis was also done. The initial factors were rotated using orthogonal (varimax) solutions.

Results of the Field Test

The statistical characteristics of the final field test data are shown in Table 2. The means of the three parts are not directly comparable because the number of response positions was seven for the Cognitive part and nine for the Affective and Behavioral parts. However, the mean responses for all three parts reflected a positive attitude toward leisure activities. The number of response positions varied among subscales because different anchoring statements were used for different subscales. However, users may easily adapt the scales to have a consistent number of scale positions if they wish to do so.

The alpha reliabilities for each of the part and total scores were reasonably large. The Affective part was most reliable and the Behavioral part was least reliable. The lower alpha coefficient for the Behavioral part is probably caused by the relatively greater heterogeneity in the content of the items on that part. For example, the content of the items in the

TABLE 2

Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities for the Final Version of the Leisure Attitude Scale, and Burdige, and Crandall and Sivken Scales				
Component & Scales	Number of Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Alpha Reliability
Cognitive	12	58.76*	10.07	.91
Affective	12	73.70**	13.63	.93
Behavioral	12	61.55**	15.84	.89
Total—Ragheb & Beard	36	194.01	33.06	.94
Burdige	11	44.27*	7.36	.46
Crandall & Sivken	10	43.72*	8.88	.76

*Seven-point response scale.

**Nine-point response scale. N = 1042

behavioral part ranges from frequency of participation in leisure activities to willingness to spend money in support of leisure activities. On the other hand, all the items of the Affective part tap the "feelings" one has toward leisure activities. In other words, the small differences in alpha coefficients might be caused by the specificity of the particular trait measured by each part.

The reliabilities of the scales authored by Burdge (1961) and Crandall and Sivken (1978) are also shown in Table 2. The low alpha coefficient for the Burdge scale can be traced to at least two major problems revealed by item analysis data. First, two of the items yielded negative discrimination indices. One of these required the respondent to make a subtle choice between work and leisure while the second required a judgment which apparently was unrelated to the respondents' attitudes. A third non-discriminating item also required a subtle comparison between work and leisure. The problems inherent in comparing work and leisure had been raised and discussed by Crandall and Sivken (1980) and confirmed when we attempted to incorporate several of the item themes from the Burdge scale in our own. The above problems were revealed during the early field tests and the items were eliminated or changes were made to overcome the problems.

The Crandall and Sivken (1978) scale yielded an alpha reliability coefficient of .76. The scale's reliability would have been improved by the deletion of its one negatively stated item and by the revision or substitution of another item which dealt with feelings of guilt about leisure.

The item and test analyses of the Burdge and Crandall et al. scales confirmed the field test findings which led to the elimination of negatively stated items; i.e., items which require the respondent having a positive attitude to disagree with a statement that leisure has some negative qualities; and items which conceptualize leisure as being complementary to work.

Factor Structure of the Leisure Attitude Scale

The data from the field test of 1,042 individuals were analyzed using the program "Factor" from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Version 8.0, 1979). Three factors were rotated using the Varimax solution. The rotated factor matrix is shown in Table 3.

The factor structure confirms the differentiation of the three component parts. Each item correlated more highly with the intended factor than either of the other two factors. The factor structure does not prove that leisure attitudes consist of the three components included here; however, it does confirm that the three subscales have a greater degree of homogeneity within the set of items making up each subscale than between the subscales. This might be considered to be a form of "divergent validity" (Campbell and Fisk 1959).

TABLE 3

Factor Structure of the Leisure Attitude Scale*

Item	Factor I (Cognitive)	Factor II (Affective)	Factor III (Behavioral)
1. Engaging in leisure activities is a wise use of time.	.572	.120	.181
2. Leisure activities are beneficial to individuals and society.	.702	.125	.117
3. People often develop friendships in their leisure.	.574	.200	.126
4. Leisure activities contribute to one's health.	.678	.126	.131
5. Leisure activities increase one's happiness.	.693	.168	.191
6. Leisure increases one's work productivity.	.624	.098	.168
7. Leisure activities help to renew one's energy.	.667	.152	.138
8. Leisure activities can be a means for self-improvement.	.692	.113	.202
9. Leisure activities help individuals to relax.	.662	.219	.039
10. People need leisure activities.	.658	.219	.094
11. Leisure activities are good opportunities for social contacts.	.530	.239	.159
12. Leisure activities are important.	.621	.218	.177
13. When I am engaged in leisure activities, the time flies.	.185	.554	.124
14. My leisure activities give me pleasure.	.232	.726	.163
15. I value my leisure activities.	.274	.694	.229
16. I can be myself during my leisure.	.148	.662	.119
17. My leisure activities provide me with delightful experiences.	.228	.679	.212
18. I feel that leisure is good for me.	.315	.647	.248
19. I like to take any time while I am engaged in leisure activities.	.162	.602	.164
20. My leisure activities are refreshing.	.178	.716	.238
21. I consider it appropriate to engage in leisure activities frequently.	.287	.580	.385
22. I feel that the time I spend on leisure activities is not wasted.	.208	.561	.336
23. I like my leisure activities.	.170	.691	.231
24. My leisure activities absorb or get my full attention.	.054	.617	.336
25. I do leisure activities frequently.	.159	.398	.451
26. Given a choice I would increase the amount of time I spend in leisure activities.	.243	.297	.455
27. I buy goods and equipment to use in my leisure activities as my income allows.	.169	.298	.558
28. I would do more new leisure activities if I could afford the time and money.	.190	.242	.417
29. I spend considerable time and effort to be more competent in my leisure activities.	.055	.365	.591

TABLE 3 (Cont.)

Factor Structure of the Leisure Attitude Scale*

Item	Factor I (Cognitive)	Factor II (Affective)	Factor III (Behavioral)
30. Given a choice I would live in an environment or city which provides for leisure.	.222	.174	.560
31. I do some leisure activities even when they have not been planned.	.133	.353	.471
32. I would attend a seminar or a class to be able to do leisure activities better.	.117	.071	.624
33. I support the idea of increasing my free time to engage in leisure activities.	.239	.223	.631
34. I engage in leisure activities even when I am busy.	.104	.129	.593
35. I would spend time in education and preparation for leisure activities.	.084	.109	.718
36. I give my leisure high priority among other activities.	.100	.201	.659

*The 36 items included in this table constitute the final leisure attitude instrument by Raghieb and Beard.

Correlations Among the Subscales

The convergent and divergent validities of the subscales were explored further by examining the intercorrelations among the raw scores of the subscales. These correlations are shown in Table 4 along with the intercorrelations among the total, the Crandall et al., and the Burdge scales.

The intercorrelations among the cognitive, affective, and behavioral subscale scores were moderate, ranging from .47 to .63. Taking the correlation coefficient squared as the proportion of common variance and the reliability coefficient as the proportion of true variance, these data indicate that only approximately one-third of the true variance of the subscales is common among them. This is further evidence that the three subscales are measuring different traits, or different aspects of the same trait. It should be noted that the correlation between the affective and behavioral scores was larger than that between the cognitive and behavioral, indicating that behavioral intentions may be caused more by what is *felt* than by what is *known* about leisure activities.

The correlations generally indicate that scores from the Crandall et al. and Burdge scales are more closely related to the behavioral component and least related to the cognitive. This also holds true for the Total scores of the new scale.

TABLE 4

Intercorrelations Among the Scales and Subscales

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Cognitive	(.91)	.53	.47	.68	.40	.37
2. Affective		(.93)	.63	.82	.49	.48
3. Behavioral			(.89)	.82	.61	.52
4. Total—Raghieb & Beard				(.94)	.54	.50
5. Crandall & Sivken					(.76)	.66
6. Burdge						(.46)

Reliabilities on the Diagonal

Relationship Among Subscale Scores and Demographic Variables

The respondents were asked to complete an identification section which included questions about their sex, age, education, and income levels. The relationship between these four demographic variables and scores on the leisure attitude instrument were investigated by computing a Pearson product moment intercorrelation matrix. These correlations are shown in Table 5.

The correlations among the leisure attitude and demographic variables are generally small and of little practical significance. However, because of the large *n*, correlations larger than .04 would be statistically significant. It is interesting that scores on the cognitive subscale correlate positively with age, education, and income, and all remaining correlations are negative. Individuals who are in the upper age, education, and income brackets tend to have positive beliefs about leisure activities, but

TABLE 5

Correlations Among Leisure Attitude and Demographic Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Cognitive	—	.53	.47	.68	-.11	.06	.12	.06
2. Affective		—	.63	.82	-.14	-.10	-.04	-.06
3. Behavioral			—	.82	-.02	-.08	-.02	-.07
4. Total—Raghieb & Beard				—	-.11	-.07	-.06	-.03
5. Sex (Male = 1, female = 0)					—	.00	.06	.22
6. Age						—	.48	.59
7. Education							—	.51
8. Income								—

n = 928 to 1019
where *r* = .04 and higher, it is significant at .05

tend to like them less than individuals in the lower levels of those categories. It also appears that males tend to have more positive beliefs and feelings toward leisure activities than females. However, that difference is smaller for the behavioral subscale.

Conclusions

The results of this study support the widely held view that attitudes are composed of the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. The differentiation of these components appears useful in explicating the construct of "leisure attitude" and in contributing to our knowledge of the interaction of knowledge, feelings and leisure behaviors.

The three subscales developed in this study are short and easily administered. Each has acceptable internal consistency reliability, and the reliability of the overall scale is quite high. Each may be administered separately, or all together. There is considerable overlap among the subscales but also a substantial amount of unique variance. Two pre-existing instruments for assessing leisure attitudes were more highly related to the behavioral subscale and least highly related to the cognitive subscale.

The effects of sex, age, education, and income on the three subscales were found to be small but statistically significant. An investigation of the possibility of curvilinear relationship among these variables is a topic which needs further research.

References

- Burdge, R. 1961. The development of a leisure-orientation scale. Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Campbell, D. and Fiske, D. 1959. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin* 56:81-105.
- Cook, S. W. and Seitz, C. 1967. A multiple-indicator approach to attitude measurement. In: Fishbein, M. (Ed.), *Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement*, pp. 220-235. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Candall, R. and Sivken, K. 1978. The importance of measuring leisure attitudes. Presented at the SPRE Symposium, National Recreation and Park Association, Miami Beach, Florida.
- Candall, R. and Sivken, K. 1980. Leisure attitudes and their measurement. In: Iso-Ahola, S. (Ed.), *Social Psychological Perspectives on Leisure and Recreation*, pp. 261-284. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas.
- Fishbein, M. 1965. A consideration of beliefs, attitudes and their relationship. In: Steiner, I. and Fishbein, M. (Eds.), *Current Studies in Social Psychology*, pp. 107-130. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Fishbein, M. A. 1967. A consideration of beliefs, and their role in attitude measurement. In: Fishbein, M. A. (Ed.), *Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement*, pp. 257-265. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Hollander, E. 1971. *Principles and Methods of Social Psychology*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kau, D. and Scotland, E. 1959. A preliminary statement to a theory of attitude structure and change. In: Koch, S. (Ed.), *Psychology: A Study of a Science*, Vol. 3, pp. 423-475. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kau, D. 1960. The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 24:163-204.
- Lindgren, H. C. 1969. *An Introduction to Social Psychology*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Martens, R. 1975. *Social Psychology and Physical Activity*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Neulinger, J. and Breil, M. 1971. A study of leisure. In: Neulinger, J., 1976, *The Psychology of Leisure*, pp. 167-188. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas.
- Neulinger, J. 1974 and 1976. *The Psychology of Leisure*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas.
- Ostrom, T. M. 1966. A unipartite study of attitudes. Research proposal, Ohio State University.
- Rosenberg, M. J. 1965. Inconsistency arousal and reduction in attitude change. In: Steiner, I. and Fishbein, M. (Eds.), *Current Studies in Social Psychology*, pp. 121-134. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Thurstone, L. L. 1946. Comment. *American Journal of Sociology* 52:39-40.
- Triandis, H. C. 1967. Toward an analysis of the components of interpersonal attitudes. In: Shetl, C. and Shetl, M. (Eds.), *Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change*, pp. 227-270. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Triandis, H. C. 1971. *Attitude and Attitude Change*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Yosting, D. and Burdge, R. 1976. Utility of a leisure-orientation scale. *Iowa State Journal of Research* 50(5):345-356.