



HAL
open science

Mapping Risk Judgment and Risk Taking in Mountain Hiking: An Information Integration Approach

Eric Fruchart, Patricia Rulence-Pâques

► **To cite this version:**

Eric Fruchart, Patricia Rulence-Pâques. Mapping Risk Judgment and Risk Taking in Mountain Hiking: An Information Integration Approach. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 2024, 10.1177/00315125241239119 . hal-04510217

HAL Id: hal-04510217

<https://hal.science/hal-04510217v1>

Submitted on 22 Mar 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Mapping Risk Judgment and Risk Taking in Mountain Hiking: An Information 2 Integration Approach

3 Eric Fruchart¹ and Patricia Rulence-Pâques²

4
5 University of Perpignan Via Domitia¹, LIPSEM, France
6 University of Lille², PSITEC, France

7 Abstract

8 Risk analysis is essential for promoting hiking-based tourism. Our objective in the present
9 study was to map 395 mountain hikers' positions on risk judgment and risk taking, according
10 to how they integrated three antecedents of confidence (environment, team, and self). For
11 integrating information, people can develop an additive rule whereby the same weight is
12 given to all information or interaction rules (i.e., conjunctive or disjunctive) whereby they
13 may give different weights to information. In the questionnaire our participants completed,
14 there were eight scenarios that combined the three confidence antecedents as information
15 cues. We applied cluster analysis, repeated-measures analyses of variance, chi-square tests,
16 and bivariate correlation analyses to the questionnaire results to identify three participant
17 positions on risk. In the first risk position (cluster 1), participants used a disjunctive
18 integration rule for both risk judgment and risk taking. In the second risk position (Clusters 2
19 and 4), they used an additive integration rule for risk judgment while they used a disjunctive
20 integration rule for risk taking. In the third risk position (cluster 3), they used an additive
21 integration rule for both risk judgment and risk taking. In each risk position, confidence in the
22 three antecedent factors (environment, team, and self) negatively affected risk judgment and
23 positively affected risk taking. We found the clusters' compositions to be related to the
24 participants' sex, and we discuss various advantages of applying information integration for
25 mountain hiking practitioners and promoters.

26
27 *Keywords:* mapping, risk, information integration, confidence frame, mountain hiking

1 **Introduction**

2 *Mountain Sports and Risk*

3 Mountain hiking has become increasingly popular in France. This activity is defined
4 as hiking on official trails, non-official trails, small paths or general terrain in a mountainous
5 area (Zürcher et al., 2020). This type of outdoor activity in mountain settings provides
6 psychological and physical health benefits but also exposes participants to a risk of injury
7 (Kortenkamp et al., 2017). Understanding this risk is essential for reducing the number of
8 accidents and promoting hiking-based tourism (She et al., 2019). Faulhaber et al. (2017)
9 reported an increasing number of hiking accidents over recent years, most of which occurred
10 on a marked hiking trail or small path and some of which were fatal (especially among
11 males). Zürcher et al. (2020) investigated the circumstances and causes of death among fatally
12 injured hikers in these accidents. They identified many objective risk factors that included the
13 equipment (no hiking boots, no backpack, and no adequate clothing), the type of terrain, the
14 season, the altitude, the weather, and the path's difficulty. In this study, we suspected that
15 understanding the manner in which hikers perceive these objective risk factors (making them
16 then subjective risk factors) would help prevent further accidents (Landrø et al., 2022). Thus,
17 we sought to map how individuals mentally integrate various information cues when both
18 judging and making decisions about engaging in risk situations while mountain hiking.

19 Given the complex nature of the mountain environment, risk activities in mountain
20 sports may be conceptualized and perceived in different ways (Mannberg et al., 2018). Landrø
21 et al. (2022) examined hikers' assessments and judgments about a selection of avalanche risk
22 factors, since avalanche risk assessment requires knowledge of and ability to assess the
23 relevant factors. Mannberg et al. (2018) investigated the perceived risk regarding a
24 backcountry skiing accident (e.g., due to an avalanche or a fall) as a function of information
25 about the terrain and snow conditions. The results from these studies suggested that both risk

1 perception and risk taking attitudes were keys for deciding about ski runs in that individuals
2 with avalanche training felt more confident in their decision to refuse to ski on terrain they
3 judged to be too risky.

4 ***Relationship between Risk judgment and Risk Taking***

5 To investigate risk, psychologists have examined the relationship between risk
6 judgment (i.e., risk perception) and risk taking (Mills et al., 2008). In various domains,
7 individuals' risk judgments were a key underlying factor in subsequent risk-taking behavior
8 (Schürmann et al., 2019). A typical theoretical and empirical prediction has been that risk
9 judgment is inversely correlated with risk-taking such that the greater the judged risk, the less
10 likely people are to take it (Reyna & Farley, 2006). However, some investigators have not
11 found a significant correlation between risk judgment and risk taking (Brewer et al., 2007) or
12 have found risk judgment positively correlated with risk taking (Reyna & Farley, 2006).
13 These various findings reveal that different individuals may think about risk in different ways
14 for unclear reasons. Therefore, we applied novel scientific approaches to better understand
15 and explain this relationship (Mullet et al., 2004).

16 A possible explanation for prior contradictory results regarding the relationship
17 between risk judgment and risk taking is the influence of person-specific factors (Mills et al.,
18 2008). Such inter-individual differences might be explained by the person's sex or level of
19 experience. Sex and experience have been investigated separately with regard to either risk
20 judgment or risk taking. Regarding sex, females have generally been prone toward less risk-
21 taking in various mountain sports, such as hiking, orienteering, mountain biking, rowing,
22 surfing, sailing, nordic skiing, tour skiing, snowboarding, parachuting, and cliff jumping
23 (Demirhan, 2005; She et al. 2019), and male recreational skiers and snowboarders were found
24 to take more risks than females (Willick et al., 2019). However, in a study of an experienced
25 professional mountain guide population, Walker and Latosuo (2016) found no gender effect

1 on risk tolerance. When the guides were asked to rank potential factors that might influence
2 their decision-making while guiding, male and female guides did not differ significantly in
3 their responses.

4 Furthermore, level of experience was found to positively influence risk judgment
5 when considering various avalanche factors, with increased precision ratings when
6 respondents had more avalanche education (Landro et al., 2022). Similarly, greater experience
7 among mountain hikers was associated with greater risk-taking (Kortenkamp et al., 2017), and
8 non-experienced individuals judged activities to be riskier than did experienced individuals
9 (Demirhan, 2005). However, in a contrary finding, She et al. (2019) found that *more*
10 experienced hikers judged activities to be riskier than less experienced hikers did.
11 Unfortunately, sex and experience have been investigated separately with regard to either risk
12 judgments or risk taking, but investigators have not simultaneously addressed both risk
13 judgments and risk taking.

14 Another possible explanation for disparate findings on the relationship between risk
15 judgment and risk taking relates to varied research methods across separate studies. Mullet et
16 al. (2004) highlighted the limitations of correlational techniques for modelling these two risk
17 dimensions. While identifying a correlation between risk judgment and risk taking was an
18 effective early investigative tool, such correlations provided no insights into the underlying
19 causal factors in individual judgments or behaviors (Mullet et al., 2004).

20 ***An Information Integration Approach***

21 Cognitive processes can be further probed by applying information integration theory
22 (Anderson, 2008). This approach focuses on the way in which people may integrate multiple
23 stimuli into a judgment or a decision (i.e., how people combine various information cues and
24 use a type of cognitive algebra to process information in different situations). Cognitive
25 algebra refers to the subjective values (or psychological considerations) that people give to

1 specific stimuli. Cognitive algebra includes three information integration rules (additive,
2 conjunctive, or disjunctive).

3 Statistical analysis (mainly repeated-measures analyses of variance (ANOVA)) and
4 graphical analysis (based on the response pattern, i.e. the shape of the lines) can be used to
5 identify the three integration rules in the interactions of various factors. Using ANOVAs, an
6 additive rule is characterized by a non-significant interaction effect on judgment, while and
7 the interaction rules (i.e., conjunctive and disjunctive) are characterized by a significant
8 interaction effect on judgment. From the perspective of graphical analysis, an additive rule is
9 characterized by two parallel lines, while a conjunctive rule is characterized by a fan that is
10 open to the right, and a disjunctive rule is characterised by a fan that is open to the left
11 (Anderson, 2008). This dual analysis is an informative method for understanding the weight
12 respondents give to information in their integration process (Anderson, 2008).

13 To illustrate these varied means of integrating information, Fruchart (2021) explored
14 the cognitive processes by which trail runners combined relatedness and mental vitality when
15 judging the degree of happiness derived from pleasure, engagement, and meaning.

16 Participants in this study used the three different information integration rules differently,
17 depending on the pathway to happiness being probed (see Figure 1 from Fruchart (2021)).

18 They used an additive integration rule for judgments of engagement and gave equal weight or
19 importance to underlying constructs of relatedness and mental vitality. The two lines or
20 judgment pathways from these information sources were parallel and rose from left to right.

21 An ANOVA of the raw data showed no significant interaction effect from relatedness by
22 mental vitality on *happiness* judgments. In contrast, participants developed a conjunctive
23 integration rule for judgments of *pleasure* in which pathway lines from relatedness and mental
24 vitality formed a fan that was open to the right, and an ANOVA showed a statistically
25 significant interaction effect between relatedness and mental vitality. Lastly, participants

1 developed a disjunctive integration rule for judgments of *meaning* in which the pathway lines
2 formed a fan that was open to the left, and the ANOVAs also showed a statistically significant
3 interaction effect of relatedness by mental vitality. With these disjunctive or conjunctive
4 integration rules, for judgments of *meaning* or *pleasure*, relatedness had more weight or less
5 weight, respectively, than mental vitality.

6 This approach to understanding information integration has been applied to various
7 topical domains, including participants' perceptions of health risks (Muñoz Sastre et al.,
8 1999), mountain sport generally (Fruchart & Rulence-Pâques, 2019), and risks in mountain
9 sport specifically (Chamarro et al., 2019). Muñoz Sastre et al. (1999) studied how smokers
10 integrated risk information about their daily cigarette consumption and the cigarette's nicotine
11 concentration to judge the relationship between cigarette exposure and risk of lung cancer.
12 These researchers' main finding was that the judgment of cancer risk increased as the level of
13 smoking increased, with the number of cigarettes smoked interacting with the nicotine
14 concentration in type of tobacco. The pathway lines formed a fan open to the right; the
15 integration rule was conjunctive. Fruchart and Rulence-Pâques (2019) investigated the way in
16 which non-athletes, mountain athletes, and non-mountain athletes combined five different
17 informational cues (relatedness, autonomy, competence, risk taking, and weather conditions)
18 in judgments of the degrees of arousal and satisfaction they experienced during mountain
19 hiking. There were no differences between the three groups. In all three groups, the influence
20 of relatedness and risk taking on judgments of arousal differed from the influence of
21 satisfaction judgments. In the relatedness by risk taking interaction, pathway lines were
22 parallel, and the integration rule was additive. Chamarro et al. (2019) examined how climbers
23 combined available information on environmental conditions and personal resources when
24 judging the risk to their safety. They found that all the information factors had a highly
25 significant influence on risk judgment, and participants applied different integration rules to

1 different combinations of factors. For example, in the difficulty by confidence interaction, the
2 lines were parallel; and the integration rule was additive. In the difficulty by meteorological
3 conditions interaction and in the difficulty by carrying appropriate tools interaction, the lines
4 formed a fan open to the right; and the integration rule was conjunctive.

5 The information integration approach has also been used to map research participants'
6 judgment positions (i.e., to identify qualitative, personal differences in views regarding
7 judgment). By means of cluster analysis, this approach can describe potential radically
8 different positions within raw data (in contrast to the use of an individual design) and reveal
9 individual differences in information integration processes. Recent applications of this
10 technique can be found in sport psychology (e.g., Fruchart & Rulence-Pâques, 2020) and
11 health (e.g., Muñoz Marco et al., 2017). Fruchart and Rulence-Pâques (2020) mapped how
12 adolescents, young adults, and middle-aged adults cognitively combined five elements when
13 estimating their level of well-being in sport. All five elements had a significant impact on
14 judgments of well-being, and two well-being judgment positions were identified, with each
15 characterized by different cognitive processes (an additive rule in the moderate well-being
16 position and a disjunctive rule in the high well-being position), and with both associated with
17 the participants' age. Muñoz Marco et al. (2017) mapped how children and adolescents
18 judged the risk of catching a disease from sick friends. They estimated this risk transmission
19 in scenarios that were constituted from information about type of contact, type of disease, and
20 number of contacts, and they identified six risk judgment positions.

21 ***The Present Study***

22 Our objective in this study was to map participants' positions on mountain hiking
23 according to two risk dimensions (risk judgment and risk taking), by identifying how people
24 cognitively integrated these three information factors that have often been described in the
25 literature on risk in mountain sports that correspond to antecedents of personal confidence in

1 this context (Males et al., 2015). During mountain activities, individuals may be aware of
2 immediate danger, and they may develop a confidence frame or “psychological bubble” from
3 within which they cope with risk or enjoy the sports situation (e.g., Houge Mackenzie & Kerr,
4 2014). This “bubble” might be a primary psychological construct affecting their subjective
5 judgment of risk. This confidence frame provides feelings of safety from risk, and it is often
6 operationalized as an individual’s confidence in their equipment, their own knowledge and
7 skills, and/or their knowledge and skills of others in their activity group (Apter, 2001). The
8 development of this confidence frame may generate different levels of risk in these activities
9 (Kerr & Houge Mackenzie, 2012). Within a confidence frame, risk taking can be experienced
10 as exciting, and without it, people may feel particularly anxious and scared. Thus, Males et al.
11 (2015) proposed three antecedents of the confidence frame in the sports domain: self, team,
12 and environment. Self may refer to previous experience and accomplishments in the activity
13 considered. Team may concern the support provided by social relationships. Environment
14 may reflect equipment and other circumstances that ensure a favorable situation. We then
15 mapped participants’ positions on risk judgment and risk taking in mountain hiking by
16 identifying the ways in which they cognitively combined these three antecedents of the
17 confidence frame (environment, team, and self). First, we hypothesized that we would find
18 several different positions on risk judgment and risk taking (e.g., Fruchart & Rulence-Pâques,
19 2020). Depending on their cluster position, participants might combine or integrate the three
20 antecedents of the confidence frame in different ways. They might develop different (additive,
21 disjunctive, and conjunctive) rules of integration. Risk judgment and risk taking would be
22 differently correlated across the sample, with no correlation (Brewer et al., 2007), a positive
23 correlation, or a negative correlation (Reyna & Farley, 2006). Second, we hypothesized that
24 the participants’ position would be linked to their individual characteristics (i.e., how often
25 they went mountain hiking, and their sex) (e.g., Fruchart & Rulence-Pâques, 2019) such that a

1 risk position characterized by high risk judgment and low risk taking would be linked to being
2 females and inexperienced, while a risk position characterized by low risk judgment and high
3 risk taking would be linked to being male and experienced.

4 **Method**

5 ***Participants***

6 The participants were 395 students attending a sport university located in a mountain
7 environment in France (Males = 220, $M_{age} = 21.35$, $SD = 2.25$; Females = 175, $M_{age} = 21.86$,
8 $SD = 3.04$). We only included people who reported prior experience hiking in a mountain
9 environment. Participation was voluntary and not remunerated. After obtaining the Dean's
10 approval to of the research protocol, we contacted students, explained the study's objectives
11 and procedures, and invited students to participate. When a student provided informed written
12 consent to participate, a study appointment was arranged. Each participant had to state the
13 frequency with which they went hiking in the mountains: very rarely ($n = 89$), sometimes ($n =$
14 179), and often ($n = 127$).

15 ***Materials***

16 The materials were comprised of two questionnaires we designed (one on risk
17 judgment and the other on risk taking). Each included a set of cards bearing a scenario, a
18 question, and a rating scale. Each scenario was designed to have three within-subject factors:
19 (a) Environment (with vs. without appropriate equipment), (b) Team (participation with
20 inexperienced people vs. experienced people), and (c) Self Experience (No experience or
21 knowledge vs. prior experience or knowledge). Hence, a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial design yielded 8
22 scenarios.

23 One typical scenario was as follows: "Jean Dubeut is on holiday in the mountains and
24 is thinking about going for a mountain hike: this would involve more than six hours of
25 walking, 1200 meters of climbing, steep slopes, sometimes loose terrain, and some narrow

1 paths with a sheer drop on both sides. Jean is in good physical condition. He is not very well
2 equipped for this hike (no hiking boots, no hiking clothing, and no walking sticks). He will be
3 hiking with people with experience of mountain hiking. Jean has already done difficult hikes
4 in the mountains.”

5 In the first questionnaire (risk judgment), the question below each scenario was: “If
6 you were Jean Dubeut, how risky would you perceive the planned mountain hike to be?”
7 Beneath each question was an 11-point response scale, with “Not at all risky” indicated on the
8 left and “Extremely risky” indicated on the right. In the second questionnaire (risk taking), the
9 question below each scenario was: “If you were Jean Dubeut, to what extent would you take
10 the risk of going on the mountain hike?” Again, beneath each question was an 11-point
11 response scale with “Not at all” indicated on the left and “Absolutely” indicated on the right.

12 *Procedure*

13 We performed the study in accordance with the ethical tenets of the Declaration of
14 Helsinki and the ethical standards of our local institutional review board with the university’s
15 ethical standards. Participants were tested individually in a room at the university after they
16 gave their written consent.

17 In line with Anderson (2008), we used a familiarization phase and an experimental
18 phase. In the familiarization phase, the experimenter explained the procedure to each
19 participant by informing the participant that their task was to read scenarios on a person’s
20 planned mountain hike and then indicate the degree of perceived risk (questionnaire 1) or
21 willingness to take the risk of going on a planned hike (questionnaire 2). During this
22 familiarization phase, each participant was presented with three scenarios that were selected
23 to expose them to the full range of informational stimuli related to their confidence frame. At
24 the end of this phase, the participants could review their three answers and change them if
25 they wished. In the second (experimental) phase, all eight factorial design scenarios were

1 presented to the participants. In contrast to the familiarization phase, the participants were not
2 allowed to review or change their answers during the experimental phase. Half of the
3 participants were presented with the risk judgment questionnaire first and the risk-taking
4 questionnaire second. The other half were presented with the questionnaires in the reverse
5 order.

6 ***Data Analysis***

7 Each participant's assessments of risk judgment and risk taking during the
8 experimental phase were converted into numerical values corresponding to the distance
9 between the point checked by the participant on the response scale and the left anchor (i.e.,
10 the point of origin). These numerical values were then entered into graphical and statistical
11 analyses.

12 To test our first hypothesis, we used a two-step cluster analysis (hierarchical and then
13 non-hierarchical cluster analysis) to obtain a robust solution (e.g., Martinent et al., 2013).
14 First, we used a hierarchical cluster analysis based on Ward's linkage method with a squared
15 Euclidian distance (Randriamihamison et al., 2021) measure to determine the number of
16 clusters in the data from the agglomeration schedule coefficients and the dendrogram. A fully
17 repeated-measure ANOVA with cluster membership as a between-subject factor, the three
18 factors as independent variables (Environment, Team, and Self Experience), and we then
19 estimated means as the dependent variables to check whether the cluster solution was valid
20 (Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984). Second, we performed a *k*-means non-hierarchical cluster
21 analysis by specifying the cluster solution. This clustering approach has been used to map
22 different individual positions in the process of making sports judgments (e.g., Fruchart et al.,
23 2019).

24 Several separate fully repeated-measures ANOVAs were conducted on the data from
25 each cluster. A graphical (visual) assessment was used to determine which information

1 integration rules had been applied in the various clusters. We used chi-square tests to establish
2 whether cluster groups were associated with participants' sex and/or their level of experience
3 in mountain hiking. Last, we computed bivariate correlations between the data from each risk
4 judgment cluster and the data from each risk-taking cluster using Pearson's r coefficients,
5 with statistical significance set to $p < .05$.

6 **Results**

7 *Cluster Analyses*

8 The results of the hierarchical analysis suggested a tenable four-cluster solution ($K =$
9 4). A k -means cluster analysis of a four-cluster solution was then conducted, and the four-
10 cluster solution was found to be similar for the two stages of the cluster analysis. A fully
11 repeated measures 4 Cluster x 2 Risk x 2 Environment x 2 Team x 2 Self Experience ANOVA
12 revealed that the four Cluster subgroups were significantly different ($p < .05$) (see Table 1),
13 confirming a four-cluster solution.

14 Tukey's test revealed a significant difference ($p < .001$) between Cluster 1 ($M = 4.83$;
15 $SD = 0.06$) and the three other clusters: Cluster 2 ($M = 5.68$; $SD = 0.13$), Cluster 3 ($M = 5.21$;
16 $SD = 0.05$), and Cluster 4 ($M = 5.64$; $SD = 0.08$); and it also showed significant differences
17 between Cluster 3 and Cluster 2 and between Cluster 3 and Cluster 4. The difference between
18 Cluster 2 and Cluster 4 was not significant ($p = .999$).

19 *Repeated-Measures ANOVAs and Graphical Analysis*

20 *Overall Repeated-Measures ANOVA*

21 A first set of four fully repeated-measures ANOVAs (one for each cluster) was
22 performed on the whole set of raw data. The design for each was a 2 Risk x 2 Environment x
23 2 Team x 2 Self Experience ANOVA. The main results are summarized in Table 2 and the
24 four clusters are depicted in Figure 1 and 2. Figure 1 characterizes the four clusters according
25 to judgment of risk and risk taking. Figure 2 illustrates the combined effects of the Risk,

1 Team, and Self Experience factors on the participants' estimations in each cluster. The pairs
2 of panels (a) to (d) corresponded to clusters 1 to 4, respectively. In Figure 2, for each pair of
3 graphs, one corresponds to risk judgment and the other corresponds to risk taking. The
4 estimated mean ratings are plotted on the y-axis. The two levels of the Self Experience factor
5 are plotted on the x-axis. Each line corresponds to one level of the Team factor.

6 Cluster 1 contained 117 participants (30% of the total). The mean risk judgment rating
7 ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 0.21$) for Cluster 1 was slightly lower than the risk-taking rating ($M = 5.00$,
8 $SD = 0.19$). In both panels of Figure 2, the lines formed a broad fan opening to the left,
9 indicating that the participants in this cluster used a disjunctive integration rule for risk
10 judgment and risk taking.

11 Cluster 2 contained 27 participants (7% of the total). For Cluster 2, the mean risk
12 judgment rating ($M = 5.52$, $SD = 0.69$) and mean risk taking rating ($M = 5.84$, $SD = 0.82$)
13 were not significantly different. The lines in the left panel (risk judgment) were parallel,
14 indicating that the integration rule was additive. The lines in the right panel (risk taking)
15 formed a small fan opening to the left, indicating that the integration rule was disjunctive.
16 Hence, participants in Cluster 2 used an additive integration rule for risk judgment but a
17 disjunctive integration rule for risk taking.

18 Cluster 3 contained 179 participants (45% of the total). In Cluster 3, the mean risk
19 judgment rating ($M = 6.17$, $SD = 0.14$) was markedly higher than the mean risk-taking rating
20 ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.19$). In both panels, all the lines were parallel, indicating that the
21 participants in Cluster 3 used an additive integration rule for both risk judgment and risk
22 taking.

23 Cluster 4 contained 72 participants (18% of the total). In Cluster 4, the mean risk
24 judgment rating ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 0.43$) was markedly lower than the mean risk-taking rating
25 ($M = 6.91$, $SD = 0.29$). The lines in the left panel (risk judgment) were parallel, indicating that

1 the integration rule was additive. The lines in the right panel (risk taking) formed a small fan
2 open to the left, which indicated that the integration rule was disjunctive. As was seen in
3 Cluster 2, the participants of Cluster 4 used an additive integration rule for risk judgment and
4 a disjunctive integration rule for risk taking.

5 ***Risk Judgment***

6 A second set of four fully repeated-measures ANOVAs were conducted on the risk
7 judgment data from each cluster (Table 3). All three factors were statistically significant (p
8 $<.05$) in each cluster (see Table 3). The Environment \times Team \times Self Experience interaction
9 was not significant in Cluster 1, Cluster 2 or Cluster 4 but was significant in Cluster 3. The
10 estimated mean risk judgment ratings for each variable and each cluster are shown in Table 4.

11 ***Risk Taking***

12 A third set of four fully repeated-measures ANOVAs was conducted on the risk taking
13 data. The findings of the ANOVAs performed on each cluster are presented in Table 5. The
14 three factors were all statistically significant ($p <.05$) in each cluster. The Environment \times
15 Team \times Self Experience interaction was not significant in Cluster 2 or Cluster 3 but was
16 significant in Cluster 1 and Cluster 4. Table 4 shows the estimated mean risk-taking rating for
17 each variable in each cluster.

18 ***Correlations between Risk Judgment and Risk Taking***

19 For each cluster, we computed the correlation between the mean risk judgment rating
20 and the mean risk-taking rating. In Cluster 1, the risk judgment was significantly and
21 inversely correlated with risk taking ($r = -.303, p < .001$). In Cluster 2, the risk judgment was
22 not significantly correlated with risk taking ($r = -.349, p = .075$). In Cluster 3, the risk
23 judgment was significantly and inversely correlated with risk taking ($r = -.292, p < .001$). In
24 Cluster 4, the risk judgment was significantly and inversely related to risk taking ($r = -.594, p$
25 $< .001$).

1 *Chi-Square Test for Sex Differences*

2 Table 6 shows the composition of each cluster in terms of the participants' sex. The 2
3 (male/female) \times 4 (cluster) Pearson's chi-square test was significant, $\chi^2(3) = 18.23, p < .001$.
4 The 3 (very rarely/sometimes/often) \times 4 (cluster) Pearson's chi-square test was not
5 significant, $\chi^2(6) = 8.14, p = .228$.

6 **Discussion**

7 Our objective in the present study was to map various participant positions on risk
8 judgment and risk taking according to how participants integrated information pertaining to
9 the three antecedents of the confidence frame (environment, team, and self experience). Our
10 first hypothesis was that there would be several different risk positions (i.e., different
11 participants would integrate the information pertaining to the three factors differently ways
12 (e.g., Fruchart & Rulence-Pâques, 2020). This hypothesis was confirmed because an analysis
13 of the whole set of raw data from the two questionnaires revealed three positions about risk.
14 The first position corresponded to Cluster 1, the second corresponded to Cluster 3, and the
15 third position corresponded to Clusters 2 and 4. Our second hypothesis that the clusters'
16 composition would be linked to how often the participants went mountain hiking and to the
17 participants' sex (e.g., Fruchart & Rulence-Pâques, 2019) was partially confirmed in that only
18 sex (as opposed to hiking frequency) was associated with the cluster compositions. These
19 results were not consistent with findings from Walker and Latosuo's pilot study (2016), in
20 which male and female guides did not differ significantly with regard to personal risk
21 tolerance, possibly due to differences between the study populations; participants in Walker
22 and Latosuo's study (2016) were professional guides who hiked frequently, while our
23 participants were college students with some hiking experience.

24 Our findings confirmed that the relationship between risk judgment and risk taking is
25 complex (Schürmann et al., 2019) for many reasons. Various factors (such as the antecedents

1 of confidence frame) may impact people's connections with risk, and these different factors
2 may be cognitively combined by individuals when judging/taking risks. Some individual
3 characteristics (such as sex) may influence how people integrate these factors for judging and
4 taking risks, since our first overall analysis showed that the participants varied with regard to
5 judging a risk and (hypothetically) taking a risk.

6 ***Risk Position 1 (Cluster 1): Use of a Disjunctive Integration Rule***

7 For the first risk position, people used the same disjunctive integration rule for both
8 risk judgments and risk taking. When the hiker's Self Experience factor (experience and
9 knowledge) was present, it was given considerable weight; with weight given to the Team
10 factor (participation with (in)experienced people) reduced proportionally.

11 The risk judgment level was slightly lower than the risk-taking level, and this position
12 was more frequently endorsed by males than by females. This is consistent with prior
13 literature showing that males perceive activities to be less risky and are more likely to take
14 risks than females are (Reniers et al., 2016; She et al., 2019; Willick et al., 2019). The lower
15 the judged risk, the more likely the people were to take it. This position confirms a previously
16 discovered negative correlation between risk judgment and risk taking (Reyna & Farley,
17 2006).

18 ***Risk Position 2 (Clusters 2 and 4): Use of an Additive Integration Rule for Risk Judgment*** 19 ***and a Disjunctive Integration Rule for Risk Taking***

20 In the second risk position (Clusters 2 and 4), the integration rule used for risk
21 judgment (additive) differed from the integration rule used for risk taking (disjunctive). With
22 regard to risk judgment, the Self and Team factors had the same weight, but for risk taking,
23 the Team factor was given less weight by experienced, knowledgeable hikers.

24 The participants represented in Cluster 2 judged mountain hiking to be sometimes
25 risky, and they sometimes took risks. As suggested by Brewer et al. (2007), risk judgment was

1 not linked to risk taking. The position in Cluster 2 was more frequently endorsed by males
2 than by females. This result extends previous findings of sex differences in risk judgment and
3 risk taking (e.g., Reniers et al., 2016; Willick et al., 2019), by further stipulating the absence
4 of a link between risk judgment and risk taking among males.

5 For members of Cluster 4, their risk judgment level was clearly lower than their risk-
6 taking level. The less they estimated risk, the more likely they were to take risks. This
7 position confirmed the previously reported negative correlation between risk judgment and
8 risk taking (Reyna & Farley, 2006). However, this correlation was stronger in this second
9 position than in the first position. The position in Cluster 4 was more frequently endorsed by
10 males than by females, confirming that males judged the risks to be low and therefore took
11 risks more readily (e.g., Willick et al., 2019).

12 ***Risk Position 3 (Cluster 3): Use of an Additive Integration Rule***

13 In the third risk position, people used the same (additive) integration rule for both risk
14 judgment and for risk taking. Whatever the situation, the Self Experience and Team factors
15 had the same weight in the integration process: the greater the hikers' levels of knowledge and
16 experience (the Self Experience factor) and the greater the extent of their participation with
17 experienced hikers (the Team factor), the lower their risk judgement level. Conversely, the
18 greater their levels of knowledge and experience and the greater the extent of participation
19 with experienced people, the greater the risk taking.

20 The members of this position judged mountain hiking to be very risky and so did not
21 wish to risk engaging in this activity. We observed that the higher the estimated risk, the less
22 likely people were to take it. This position was more frequently endorsed by females than
23 males, confirming that females perceive the mountains to be more risky and take fewer risks
24 than males do (Reniers et al., 2016; Willick et al., 2019)

25 ***The Relationship between Risk Judgment and Risk Taking***

1 Our results highlighted the existence of two different relationships between risk
2 judgment and risk taking: a negative relationship and no relationship (Mills et al., 2008;
3 Reyna & Farley, 2006). Our results did not reflect the positive relationship between these
4 variables highlighted by Reyna and Farley (2006), perhaps because the latter researchers
5 studied adolescents, while we studied young adults and these populations may differ in their
6 views of risk (Frühauf et al., 2020).

7 We found a negative relationship between risk judgment and risk taking. Three types
8 of negative relationships were identified: (a) low risk judgment scores and high risk-taking
9 scores (mainly male participants), (b) high risk judgment scores and low risk-taking scores
10 (mainly female participants), and (c) intermediate risk judgment scores and slightly higher
11 risk taking scores (mainly male participants).

12 Although our results highlighted differences in ways of thinking about risk, one
13 finding was consistent in all risk positions: the three confidence antecedents (i.e. self
14 experience, team, and environment (Males et al., 2015)) were negatively associated with risk
15 judgment and positively associated with risk taking. Individuals considered mountain hiking
16 to be riskier if they did not have appropriate equipment, if they were accompanied by
17 inexperienced, non-competent people, and if they had no practical personal experience or
18 knowledge. Conversely, individuals considered taking more risks in the mountains if they had
19 appropriate equipment, were accompanied by experienced, competent people, and had prior
20 experience. This finding confirms that people who participate in mountain activities may take
21 risks that align with their confidence frame (e.g., Houge Mackenzie & Kerr, 2014). Our
22 observation of several different risk positions suggests that the emergence of a confidence
23 frame produces different views of risk during mountain activities (Kerr & Houge Mackenzie,
24 2012). Our results extend earlier findings in this area by emphasizing the different ways in
25 which confidence frames may be integrated into risk judgments and risk taking.

1 *Limitations and Directions for Further Research*

2 Among our study's limitations is that we used only three kinds of confidence frame
3 antecedents (environment, team, or self experience); others should be investigated in the
4 future (Males et al., 2015). Second, our three independent variables were associated with only
5 two modalities or levels (e.g. with or without equipment for Environment). In future research,
6 all independent variables might include at least three modalities to further facilitate the
7 identification of integration rules used by the participants (Anderson, 2008). Third, a third
8 dependent variable could have usefully completed our experimental design. Just as
9 information integration theory has been used to investigate the acceptability of an act in sport
10 (Fruchart et al., 2019), the acceptability of risk could also be studied. Risk acceptability is
11 essential for understanding the complex construction of risk taking (Tchiehe & Gauthier,
12 2017). Fourth, given that adolescents and adults may differ in their approach to risk (Frühauf
13 et al., 2020), further studies should map the cognitive processes involved in risk judgment and
14 risk taking by participants of varying ages. Fifth, we did not probe other risk factors reported
15 in the literature, such as years of experience (e.g., Mannberg et al., 2018) and age (e.g.,
16 Frühauf et al., 2020), or personal temperament such as having a high level of self-belief
17 (Clough et al., 2016) and self-efficacy (Houge Mackenzie et al., 2011). Thus, the practical
18 implications of our study cannot necessarily be extrapolated to these higher-risk groups.
19 Sixth, we studied university students, rather than a more diverse population of hikers in the
20 general population, limiting our ability to generalize from these data. Last, the information
21 integration approach was not ecological because we used imagined scenarios in a laboratory
22 context and did not study these phenomena in real situations. While one might wonder
23 whether these risk-related cognitive processes operate in real situations, the information
24 integration approach has already been validated in the field of sport (Fruchart et al., 2007),
25 such that judgment patterns obtained from a questionnaire closely matched real patterns

1 obtained on the field. Furthermore, with this approach, we were able to identify the relative
2 weights of various factors when they were cognitively integrated, allowing us to reveal the
3 existence of different integration rules in standardized, controlled situations. To complete this
4 approach, a regression analysis would allow to confirm the relative weights of factors.

5 **Conclusion**

6 We mapped three different positions with regard to risk judgment and risk taking.
7 These positions were based on Anderson's integration rules and on how individuals
8 cognitively combine three informational factors in their confidence frame (environment, team,
9 and self). Our main results have implications for stakeholders in mountains sports, such as
10 managers, coaches, mountain guides, instructors, ski patrollers, etc. In a mountain
11 environment, a hiker must process several factors when making a judgment or a risk decision.
12 Applying Anderson's (2008) information integration theory might provide solutions to these
13 problems that enhance enjoyment of mountains sports and increase levels of safe
14 participation.

15 First, risk judgments and decisions in outdoor mountain recreational environments are
16 affected in complex ways by a wide range of interacting environmental and human factors.
17 Individuals can specify the factors likely to influence their own risk judgments or risk-taking
18 and communicate a rank order of importance for these factors. Second, the information
19 integration approach is simple to implement via pencil and paper measures. Third, the
20 information integration approach can answer a multitude of questions in the field of mountain
21 sports when factors other than the three we chose (self experience, team, and environment)
22 are studied as well. Fourth, our approach might have value in teaching and training. For
23 instance, scenarios dealing with problematic, potential risky situations (such as those in the
24 present study) could be incorporated into briefings before a mountain hike, making the hikers'
25 answers the starting points for training programs designed to reduce risky behaviors or

1 increase hikers' levels of confidence (Mannberg et al., 2018). Fifth, our approach might be
 2 useful for risk prevention by helping to distinguish hikers on the basis of their views of risk
 3 and then suggesting appropriate activities. Further research should focus on accident
 4 prevention and the identification of risk factors for falls in mountain hikers. Knowledge of the
 5 specific internal factors (fatigue, fitness, experience, etc.) and external factors (weather,
 6 altitude, etc.) involved in mountain hiking accidents and how these factors are cognitively
 7 integrated by mountain hikers could be of the utmost importance for developing evidence-
 8 based preventive measures (Faulhaber et al., 2017) and risk learning (Landrø et al., 2022).

10 **References**

- 11 Aldenderfer, M. S., & Blashfield, R. K. (1984). *Cluster analysis*. Sage Press.
- 12 Anderson, N. H. (2008). *Unified social cognition*. Psychology Press.
- 13 Apter, M. J. (2001). *Motivational styles in everyday life: A guide to reversal theory*. American
 14 Psychological Association.
- 15 Brewer, N. T., Chapman, G. B., Gibbons, F. X., Gerrard, M., McCaul, K. D., & Weinstein, N.
 16 D. (2007). Meta-analysis of the relationship between risk perception and health
 17 behavior: The example of vaccination. *Health Psychology, 26*(2), 136–145.
 18 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.26.2.136>
- 19 Chamarro, A., Rovira, T., Edo, S., & Fernandez-Castro, J. (2019). Risk judgments in
 20 climbers: The role of difficulty, meteorological conditions, confidence and appropriate
 21 tools. *Leisure Sciences, 41*(3), 221–235.
 22 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2018.1442266>
- 23 Clough, P., Houge Mackenzie, S., Mallabon, L., & Brymer, E. (2016). Adventurous Physical
 24 Activity Environments: A Mainstream Intervention for Mental Health. *Sports
 25 Medicine, 46*(7), 963–968. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-016-0503-3>

- 1 Demirhan, G. (2005). Mountaineers' risk perception in outdoor-adventure sports: A study of
2 sex and sports experience. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 100(3), 1155.
3 <https://doi.org/10.2466/PMS.100.3.1155-1160>
- 4 Faulhaber, M., Pocecco, E., Niedermeier, M., Ruedl, G., Walter, D., Sterr, R., Ebner, H.,
5 Schobersberger, W., & Burtscher, M. (2017). Fall-related accidents among hikers in
6 the Austrian Alps: A 9-year retrospective study. *BMJ Open Sport & Exercise*
7 *Medicine*, 3(1), e000304. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjsem-2017-000304>
- 8 Fruchart, E. (2021). Judgments of happiness during trail running: Pleasure, engagement, and
9 meaning. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 55, 101938.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2021.101938>
- 11 Fruchart, E., & Rulence-Pâques, P. (2019). Arousal and satisfaction during mountain
12 rambling: Comparing non-athletes', mountain athletes' and non-mountain athletes'
13 views. *Universitas Psychologica*, 18(2), 1–5.
14 <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.upsy18-2.asdm>
- 15 Fruchart, E., & Rulence-Pâques, P. (2020). Mapping judgment of well-being in sport.
16 *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1-16.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2020.1717577>
- 18 Fruchart, E., Rulence-Pâques, P., & Mullet, E. (2007). Ecological validity test of laboratory
19 studies of information integration. *Teorie and Modelli*, 12, 281–288.
- 20 Fruchart, E., Rulence-Pâques, P., & Mullet, E. (2019). Mapping adults' and young athletes'
21 views regarding how acceptable it is to use a nutritional supplement in sport.
22 *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17(5), 477–492.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2017.1367952>

- 1 Frühauf, A., Zenzmaier, J., & Kopp, M. (2020). Does age matter? A qualitative comparison of
2 motives and aspects of risk in adolescent and adult freeriders. *Journal of Sports
3 Science and Medicine, 19*, 112–120.
- 4 Houdge Mackenzie, S., Hodge, K., & Boyes, M. (2011). Expanding the flow model in
5 adventure activities: A reversal theory perspective. *Journal of Leisure Research,*
6 *43(4)*, 519–544. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2011.11950248>
- 7 Houge Mackenzie, S., & Kerr, J. H. (2014). The psychological experience of river guiding:
8 Exploring the protective frame and implications for guide well-being. *Journal of Sport
9 & Tourism, 19(1)*, 5–27.
- 10 Kerr, J. H., & Houge Mackenzie, S. (2012). Multiple motives for participating in adventure
11 sports. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise, 13(5)*, 649–657.
- 12 Kortenkamp, K. V., Moore, C. F., Sheridan, D. P., & Ahrens, E. S. (2017). No hiking beyond
13 this point! Hiking risk prevention recommendations in peer-reviewed literature.
14 *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism, 20*, 67–76.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2017.10.002>
- 16 Landrø, M., Engeset, R., & Pfuhl, G. (2022). The role of avalanche education in assessing and
17 judging avalanche risk factors. *Journal for Research in Arts and Sports Education,*
18 *6(2)*, 37–60. <https://doi.org/10.23865/jased.v6.2977>
- 19 Males, J. R., Kerr, J. H., & Hudson, J. (2015). Elaborating the mastery state and the
20 confidence frame. *Journal of Motivation, Emotion, and Personality: Reversal Theory
21 Studies, 4*. <https://doi.org/10.12689/jmep.2015.405>
- 22 Mannberg, A., Hendrikx, J., Landrø, M., & Ahrland Stefan, M. (2018). Who's at risk in the
23 backcountry? Effects of individual characteristics on hypothetical terrain choices.
24 *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 59*, 46–53.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2018.08.004>

- 1 Martinent, G., Nicolas, M., Gaudreau, P., & Campo, M. (2013). A cluster analysis of affective
2 states before and during competition. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*,
3 35(6), 600–611. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.35.6.600>
- 4 Mills, B., Reyna, V. F., & Estrada, S. (2008). Explaining contradictory relations between risk
5 perception and risk taking. *Psychological Science*, 19(5), 429–433.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02104.x>
- 7 Mullet, E., Ciudad, N., & Rivière-Shafiqhi, S. (2004). Cognitive processes involved in the
8 assessment of health hazards' severity. *Health, Risk & Society*, 6(3), 277–288.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369857042000275678>
- 10 Muñoz Marco, V., Cano Martil, S., Muñoz Sastre, M. T., Sorum, P. C., & Mullet, E. (2017).
11 Mapping children's and adolescents' judgment rules for assessing the risk of disease
12 transmission from sick friends: Contagion. *Infant and Child Development*, 26(5),
13 e2014. <https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.2014>
- 14 Muñoz Sastre, M. T., Mullet, E., & Sorum, P. C. (1999). Relationship between cigarette dose
15 and perceived risk of lung cancer. *Preventive Medicine*, 28(6), 566–571.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1006/pmed.1999.0482>
- 17 Randriamihamison, N., Vialaneix, N., & Neuvial, P. (2021). Applicability and interpretability
18 of hierarchical agglomerative clustering with or without contiguity constraints.
19 *Journal of Classification*, 38(2), 363–389. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00357-020-09377-y>
- 20 Reniers, R. L. E. P., Murphy, L., Lin, A., Bartolomé, S. P., & Wood, S. J. (2016). Risk
21 perception and risk-taking behaviour during adolescence: The influence of personality
22 and gender. *PLOS ONE*, 11(4), e0153842.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0153842>

- 1 Reyna, V. F., & Farley, F. (2006). Risk and rationality in adolescent decision making:
2 Implications for theory, practice, and public policy. *Psychological Science in the*
3 *Public Interest*, 7(1), 1–44.
- 4 Schürmann, O., Frey, R., & Pleskac, T. J. (2019). Mapping risk perceptions in dynamic risk-
5 taking environments. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 32(1), 94–105.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.2098>
- 7 She, S., Tian, Y., Lu, L., Eimontaite, I., Xie, T., & Sun, Y. (2019). An exploration of hiking
8 risk perception: Dimensions and antecedent factors. *International Journal of*
9 *Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(11), 1986.
10 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16111986>
- 11 Tchiehe, D. N., & Gauthier, F. (2017). Classification of risk acceptability and risk tolerability
12 factors in occupational health and safety. *Safety Science*, 92, 138–147.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2016.10.003>
- 14 Walker, E., & Latosuo, E. (2016). Gendered decision-making practices in Alaska’s dynamic
15 mountain environments? A study of professional mountain guides. *Journal of Outdoor*
16 *Recreation and Tourism*, 13, 18–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2015.11.010>
- 17 Willick, S. E., Wagner, G., Ericson, D., Josten, G., Teramoto, M., & Davis, J. (2019). Helmet
18 use and risk-taking behavior among skiers and snowboarders. *Clinical Journal of*
19 *Sport Medicine*, 29(4), 329–335. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JSM.0000000000000527>
- 20 Zürcher, S., Jackowski, C., & Schön, C. A. (2020). Circumstances and causes of death of
21 hikers at different altitudes: A retrospective analysis of hiking fatalities from 2003–
22 2018. *Forensic Science International*, 310, 110252.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2020.110252>
24

Table 1

Main Results of the ANOVA Cluster x Risk x Environment x Team x Self Experience

Factor	Effect		Error		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2_p
	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>			
CLUSTER	3	586.10	391	2686.61	28.43	<.001	.18
RISK x CLUSTER	3	4444.21	391	2283.96	253.72	<.001	.66
ENVIRONMENT x CLUSTER	3	313.50	391	1151.07	35.50	<.001	.21
TEAM x CLUSTER	3	461.04	391	987.68	79.74	<.001	.82
SELF-EXPERIENCE x CLUSTER	3	238.32	391	894.90	34.71	<.001	.76

Table 2

Main Results of the ANOVAs of Each Cluster

Factor	Effect		Error		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2_p
	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>			
CLUSTER 1							
Risk	1	59.95	116	4.20	14.28	<.001	.11
Environment	1	0.28	116	2.60	1.21	.742	.00
Team	1	2.54	116	2.11	1.20	.274	.01
Self	1	0.90	116	1.80	0.50	.481	.00
CLUSTER 2							
Risk	1	11.02	26	2.81	3.92	.058	.13
Environment	1	232.61	26	8.73	26.65	<.001	.51
Team	1	422.06	26	4.00	105.51	<.001	.80
Self	1	204.19	26	5.29	38.58	<.001	.60
CLUSTER 3							
Risk	1	2648.22	178	4.93	536.72	<.001	.75
Environment	1	58.69	178	2.16	27.11	<.001	.13
Team	1	25.83	178	2.31	11.20	<.001	.06
Self	1	14.25	178	1.82	7.85	<.001	.04
CLUSTER 4							
Risk	1	1850.35	71	11.90	155.54	<.001	.69
Environment	1	59.59	71	3.35	17.80	<.001	.20
Team	1	53.39	71	3.22	16.59	<.001	.19
Self	1	19.01	71	3.18	5.98	.017	.08

Note. Threshold for statistical significance: $p < .05$

Table 3

Risk Judgment ANOVAs for Each Cluster

Factor	Effect		Error		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2_p
	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>			
CLUSTER 1							
ENVIRONMENT (E)	1	2076.11	116	4.79	433.42	<.001	.79
TEAM (T)	1	1750.43	116	3.41	512.98	<.001	.82
SELF-EXPERIENCE (S)	1	1107.18	116	3.01	367.93	<.001	.76
E x T	1	5.24	116	2.46	2.12	.147	.02
E x S	1	0.15	116	1.97	0.08	.780	.00
T x S	1	50.77	116	1.64	30.92	<.001	.21
E x T x S	1	1.38	116	2.46	0.56	.455	.00
CLUSTER 2							
ENVIRONMENT (E)	1	86.89	26	7.36	11.80	.002	.31
TEAM (T)	1	151.67	26	3.23	46.83	<.001	.64
SELF-EXPERIENCE (S)	1	79.44	26	4.25	18.71	<.001	.41
E x T	1	8.56	26	1.80	4.75	.038	.15
E x S	1	7.78	26	2.48	3.13	.088	.11
T x S	1	0.56	26	2.55	0.22	.643	.00
E x T x S	1	0.01	26	6.32	0.01	.978	.00
CLUSTER 3							
ENVIRONMENT (E)	1	2168.05	178	3.70	586.54	<.001	.77
TEAM (T)	1	3668.48	178	5.24	699.87	<.001	.79
SELF-EXPERIENCE (S)	1	1980.35	178	2.92	678.34	<.001	.79
E x T	1	388.63	178	2.24	174.43	<.001	.49
E x S	1	62.01	178	2.21	28.02	<.001	.14
T x S	1	9.40	178	1.48	6.36	.012	.03
E x T x S	1	19.24	178	2.34	8.23	.005	.04
CLUSTER 4							
ENVIRONMENT (E)	1	610.50	71	3.08	198.04	<.001	.74
TEAM (T)	1	1136.25	71	4.33	262.25	<.001	.78
SELF-EXPERIENCE (S)	1	546.39	71	2.92	186.97	<.001	.79
E x T	1	4.52	71	1.74	2.60	.111	.04
E x S	1	1.09	71	2.11	0.51	.476	.01
T x S	1	0.14	71	1.54	0.09	.764	.00
E x T x S	1	4.88	71	1.58	3.08	.083	.04

Table 4

Participants' Risk Judgment and Risk Taking Means and SDs by Cluster for the Three Factors

Factor	RISK JUDGMENT								RISK TAKING							
	Cluster 1		Cluster 2		Cluster 3		Cluster 4		Cluster 1		Cluster 2		Cluster 3		Cluster 4	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
ENVIRONMENT																
No appropriate equipment	6.13	0.24	4.89	0.64	7.40	0.15	5.40	0.34	3.49	0.17	5.00	0.76	2.73	0.18	6.33	0.22
Appropriate equipment	3.16	0.17	6.15	0.59	4.94	0.13	3.35	0.33	6.52	0.21	6.67	0.51	5.77	0.16	7.49	0.31
TEAM																
Accompanied by non-competent people	6.01	0.23	4.69	0.62	7.77	0.14	5.78	0.38	3.57	0.18	4.70	0.75	2.46	0.15	5.93	0.25
Accompanied by competent people	3.28	0.15	6.36	0.47	4.57	0.17	2.97	0.31	6.45	0.20	6.98	0.48	6.04	0.18	7.89	0.29
SELF																
No experience or knowledge	5.74	0.20	4.91	0.63	7.35	0.12	5.35	0.37	3.88	0.17	5.07	0.68	3.21	0.13	6.19	0.24
Experience or knowledge	3.56	0.18	6.12	0.49	5.00	0.14	3.40	0.29	6.14	0.18	6.61	0.57	5.28	0.17	7.63	0.17

Table 5

Risk Taking ANOVAs for Each Cluster

Factor	Effect		Error		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2_p
	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>			
CLUSTER 1							
ENVIRONMENT (E)	1	2145.18	116	4.09	524.77	<.001	.82
TEAM (T)	1	1944.23	116	3.89	499.36	<.001	.81
SELF-EXPERIENCE (S)	1	1198.16	116	2.65	451.68	<.001	.80
E x T	1	42.31	116	2.13	19.86	<.001	.15
E x S	1	8.46	116	2.37	3.57	.061	.03
T x S	1	37.36	116	2.58	14.47	<.001	.11
E x T x S	1	14.63	116	1.62	9.03	.003	.07
CLUSTER 2							
ENVIRONMENT (E)	1	150.00	26	4.03	37.23	<.001	.59
TEAM (T)	1	280.17	26	2.96	94.50	<.001	.78
SELF-EXPERIENCE (S)	1	127.57	26	2.81	45.33	<.001	.63
E x T	1	12.51	26	2.36	5.35	.029	.17
E x S	1	1.85	26	1.44	1.28	.266	.05
T x S	1	15.57	26	2.89	5.39	.028	.17
E x T x S	1	0.67	26	1.21	0.55	.465	.02
CLUSTER 3							
ENVIRONMENT (E)	1	3194.40	178	4.81	684.57	<.001	.79
TEAM (T)	1	4590.85	178	4.44	1034.20	<.001	.85
SELF-EXPERIENCE (S)	1	1533.75	178	2.79	550.13	<.001	.76
E x T	1	332.47	178	2.40	138.26	<.001	.43
E x S	1	66.25	178	1.66	39.80	<.001	.18
T x S	1	2.51	178	1.87	1.35	.247	.01
E x T x S	1	6.71	178	2.34	2.87	.092	.02
CLUSTER 4							
ENVIRONMENT (E)	1	190.21	71	4.44	42.88	<.001	.38
TEAM (T)	1	546.39	71	4.32	126.47	<.001	.64
SELF-EXPERIENCE (S)	1	296.13	71	3.57	82.94	<.001	.54
E x T	1	2.13	71	1.29	1.65	.203	.02
E x S	1	0.04	71	1.44	0.03	.862	.00
T x S	1	35.50	71	1.74	20.39	<.001	.22
E x T x S	1	33.54	71	14.25	2.35	<.001	.16

Table 6

Sex Composition of Participants by the Four Clusters

Participants	CLUSTER 1	CLUSTER 2	CLUSTER 3	CLUSTER 4	Total
Males	70 (31.8%)	16 (7.3%)	81 (36.8%)	53 (24.1%)	220
Females	24 (26.9%)	33 (6.3%)	37 (56.0%)	19 (10.9%)	175
Total	117 (29.6%)	62 (6.8%)	63 (45.3%)	72 (18.2%)	395

Note: The difference between the percentages was statistically significant ($p < .001$) in the 2 (Sex) x 4 (Cluster) Pearson's chi-square test.




Figure 1. Graphical Characterization of the Four Clusters According to Participants' Risk Judgment and Risk Taking




Figure 2. Combined Effects of Risk, Team and Self-Experience Factors on Participants' Estimations by Cluster.

Note: Dotted lines correspond to experienced participants, and solid lines correspond to inexperienced participants.