

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Product involvement: an application in clothing

Journal Item

How to cite:

Michaelidou, Nina and Dibb, Sally (2006). Product involvement: an application in clothing. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 5(5) pp. 442–453.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2006 John Wiley Sons, Ltd.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1002/cb.192>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

PRODUCT INVOLVEMENT: AN APPLICATION IN CLOTHING

Nina Michaelidou
Birmingham University
n.michaelidou@bham.ac.uk

Sally Dibb
Open University Business School
S.Dibb@open.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

The paper examines the dimensionality of involvement with clothing. The extant literature is reviewed to show the origins, application and classification of involvement. The discussion focuses on enduring, situational and response involvement, emphasizing the dimensionality of the construct. The research examines enduring involvement with clothing, using a scale of fifteen Likert-type statements to operationalise the concept. The findings suggest that involvement with clothing stems from: 1) pleasure and enjoyment derived from shopping, and 2) the importance consumers attach to the product, which relates to the symbolic nature of clothing as a means of self-expression.

Key words: Enduring involvement, situational involvement, response involvement

INTRODUCTION

Understanding consumers' attachments to products, ideas or situations is of interest to consumer researchers and practitioners alike. Researchers use the concept of 'involvement' to understand how and why consumers form particular attachments with product classes, such as cars, music and books and football teams (Kapferer and Laurent,

1985a; Zaichkowsky, 1985; Slama and Taschian, 1985; Richins and Bloch 1986). This kind of knowledge is particularly valuable for manufacturers and advertising agencies.

Researchers generally agree that involvement is a product category-specific phenomenon, with different products arouses different levels of involvement (Bloch 1981). For example, an individual may be highly involved with their clothes and less involved with the music to which they listen. The facets (or antecedents) of product involvement also seem to vary across products classes. For example, an individual whose interest in fashion (interest facet) means he is involved with his clothes, may be involved with music because it helps him to express himself (self-expression facet). In other words, involvement for different products may be affected by different factors. Despite this, researchers have persistently tried to capture involvement across multiple product classes using generalized measures, contradicting the product- and situation-specific character of involvement. Involvement research focusing on a single product category can be justified on theoretical and empirical grounds because it enables these specific facets of involvement to be determined. This paper addresses this issue by examining involvement dimensions in the clothing context. We are particularly interested in the dimensions that motivate individuals to develop an enduring attachment with their clothes.

There is a clear rationale for basing our research on clothing. The importance of involvement in clothing purchases is highlighted by the meaning consumers attach to their clothes and by the role of fashion in today's society (O'Cass, 2000). Fashion and clothing is a high profile and economically important sector, attracting considerable marketing spend. The sector draws attention from opinion leaders and innovators (Verneet, 2004) who are critical to the adoption process (Goldsmith et al, 1999). The

many studies examining involvement with fashion (see Auty and Elliott, 1998; Fairhurst et al. 1989; Gronow, 1993) or clothing (see Flynn and Goldsmith, 1993; Goldsmith and Emmert, 1991) profoundly illustrate the sector's importance. The research we present examines the dimensions of involvement within this context, generating recommendations for researchers and practitioners working in the area.

The paper begins by reviewing the involvement concept. The literature review considers the nature of the concept and its empirical application in the consumer context, enabling the basis for advancing and test new propositions to be considered. The dimensionality of involvement with clothing is then examined using a scale of 15 Likert-type statements. The findings, which highlight the dimensions of involvement with clothing, both complement and confirm previous research.

THE CONCEPT OF INVOLVEMENT: ORIGIN AND APPLICATION

Involvement originates from social psychology and the notion of 'ego-involvement', which refers to the relationship between an individual, an issue, or object (Sherif and Sherif, 1967). This conceptualisation has been the basis for applying involvement in consumer behaviour. However, the many and varied definitions and treatments of involvement in social psychology mean that its application in this domain remains complicated. The involvement construct became linked to marketing and consumer behaviour following Krugman's (1967) measurement of involvement with advertising. Since then, and specifically through a period of increasing consumer research activity in the 1980s, attention has focused on the conceptualisation and measurement of involvement in relation to 'objects' such as a product, message, purchase task,

advertising or activity. At the heart of these conceptualisations is the notion of ‘personal relevance’: there is general agreement that a consumer’s level of involvement with an object is determined by the extent to which the product is seen as personally relevant (Zaichkowsky, 1985; Celsi and Olso, 1988). Involvement has also been examined in relation to other concepts such as perceived risk, information search, attribute comparison, brand loyalty, retail context, diffusion and opinion leadership.

Classification of Involvement into Types

The most rigorous attempt to categorise definitions of involvement is made by Laaksonen (1997) in a three category classification: *cognitively-based approach*, *individual-state approach* and *response-based approach*. These categories embrace ideas of Rothschild (1979) who suggests three forms or types of involvement: *enduring*, *situational* and *response*. This distinction provides the foundations on which other research has developed (e.g. Costly, 1988; Pucely et al. 1988; Richins and Bloch, 1986).

Enduring involvement (EI): is intrinsically motivated, purchase independent and adopts the social psychological perspective, falling into Laaksonen’s cognitively-based approach. This conceptualisation stems from the notion of ‘ego-involvement’ in social psychology, where involvement is treated as the intensity of an attitude (Sherif and Sherif, 1967). In the consumer domain, most researchers conceptualise involvement as the degree of psychological connection between an individual and the stimulus object (Hupfer and Gardner, 1971; Lastovicka and Gardner, 1979; Rothschild, 1979; Zaichkowsky, 1985). For example, Celsi and Olson (1988) argue that: “..a consumer’s

level of involvement with an object, situation, or action is determined by the degree to which s/he perceives that concept to be personally relevant...[and] the personal relevance of a product is represented by the perceived linkage between an individual's needs, goals, and values and their product knowledge” (p211). This conceptualisation reflects all definitions from the cognitively-based category proposed by Laaksonen (1997). The only difference between these definitions is that they consider the level of involvement to be determined by different cognitive elements. For example, Celsi and Olson (1988) refer to ‘self-knowledge’, Zaichkowsky (1985) focuses on ‘interests, needs or values’, Bloch (1981) uses ‘needs and values’ and Lastovicka and Gardner (1979) refer to ‘values’. Involvement is thus seen as a characteristic (or property) of an attitude, enduring or ‘stable’ over time. In summary, EI indicates the perceived personal relevance of an object to an individual (Laaksonen, 1997). It is motivated by the degree to which the product (or object) relates to the self and/or pleasure received from it (Richins and Bloch, 1986). This confirms the existence of hedonic and self-expression components as conceptualised by Kapferer and Laurent (1985) and Higie and Feick (1989).

Situational involvement (SI): corresponds to the ‘individual-state’ category of definitions suggested by Laaksonen (1997). The basic characteristic of this involvement type is that it represents a ‘mental state’ and has nothing to do with cognitive elements such as values and needs. Unlike enduring involvement, SI represents a temporary interest or concern with an object, which has been triggered by a particular cause such as perceived risk. Kapferer and Laurent (1985a) refer to SI as ‘purchase-of-the-product’ involvement, emphasising its transitory (or situational) nature. Similarly, Laaksonen (1997) uses

duration as the basis for a series of 'temporal-state' definitions within this involvement category. Such definitions represent the most common view, where involvement is treated as a matter of intensity. In this case, as *the degree of, the amount of, or the level of, interest, motivation or arousal*. For example, Rothschild (1984) sees involvement as "*a state of interest, motivation or arousal*"(p217). Mitchell's (1979) definition suggests that situational involvement represents the intensity of an internal state: "*I view involvement as an individual level, internal state variable that indicates the amount of arousal, interest or drive*" (p194). Additional definitions in this category focus on involvement being governed by the characteristics of the object or situation. In other words, certain stimuli (e.g. price, time, or elapsed time of consumption) determine both the level and type of involvement. Similarly, Beatty and Smith (1983) state that: "*situation involvement relates to the degree to which the situation engenders involvement*" (p45). Antil (1984) takes a contrary stance, suggesting: "*It is not the product per se that is involving, but the personal meaning or significance the individual attributes to the characteristics of that product that results in involvement*" (p204), while Park and Mittal (1985) have a different view. They describe situational involvement as a "*goal-directed arousal capacity*" (p202) governed by two groups of motives: a) utilitarian (cognitive) and b) value expressive (affective). This view suggests that arousal is directed towards a particular object or situation (Park and Mittal, 1985). There is then a relationship between two 'parties' because the individual is involved with *something* (i.e. object, product, message). Furthermore, arousal reflects the activation of the information processing mechanisms (Leavitt et al. 1981) which relate to the notion of response involvement.

Response involvement (RI): The term ‘response’ denotes a behavioural orientation of involvement reflecting “*time and/or intensity of effort expended in the undertaking of behaviours*” (Stone 1984, p210). Stone (1984) presents a dichotomy of involvement as a) a mental state and b) a behavioural process. The mental state view, which comes from social psychology, corresponds with enduring and situational notions of involvement. In contrast, ‘behavioural’ definitions centre on information acquisition and decision processes (see Leavitt et al. 1981). Although such variables have been used to conceptualize and measure involvement, they are widely regarded to be consequences of involvement, rather than involvement per se (Dholakia, 1997). Defining involvement as a behavioral process might therefore be misleading (Mitchell 1979). Antil (1984) states “*I see involvement and information processing activities to be two very different and separate concepts, though they can be related.....cognitive processing should be considered a possible result of involvement, not the cause of it*”(p205). In this context, involvement is seen as behaviour its own right rather than a means to mediate information search (Laaksonen, 1997). This conceptualisation debate is ongoing, although many researchers now favour the enduring and situational perspectives.

Dimensionality and Direction of Involvement

The dimensionality of involvement in consumer behaviour has been widely debated. In some instances, uni-dimensional measures of the concept have been developed (e.g. Zaichkowsky, 1985; Traylor and Joseph 1984). In others, up to six dimensions have been identified (e.g. Bloch 1981) (see table 1). However, most researchers see involvement as multi-dimensional (e.g. Kapferer and Laurent 1985a). Dimensions commonly reported

include importance (Lastovicka and Gardner, 1979; Jensen et al. 1989), pleasure (Kapferer and Laurent, 1985a), interest (Van Trijp et al. 1996), sign value (Kapferer and Laurent, 1985a, 1985c), perceived risk (Kapferer and Laurent, 1985a) and self expression (Higie and Feick, 1988).

TABLE 1 STUDIES OF INVOLVEMENT

Empirical Studies	Type of Involvement Studied	Number of Factors Identified
Tiger et al (1976)	Fashion involvement	5
Lastovicka and Gardner (1979)	Product involvement	3
Tyebjee (1979)	Product/Task involvement	3
Bloch (1981)	Product class involvement	6
Shimp and Sharma (1983)	Based on Bloch (1981)	2
Traylor and Joseph (1984)	Product involvement	1
Zaichkowsky (1985)	Product involvement (PII ¹)	1
Kapferer and Laurent (1985a)	Product involvement (IP ²)	5
Slama and Tashchian (1985)	Purchase involvement	1
McQuarrie and Munson (1986)	Involvement (based on PII)	3
Bloch et al (1986)	Enduring involvement	3
Ratchford (1987)	Involvement	1
Venkatraman (1988)	Enduring/Instrumental involvement	2
Celsi and Olson (1988)	Felt involvement	2
Higie and Feick (1988/9)	Enduring involvement	2
Mittal (1989)	Purchase decision involvement	4
Mittal and Lee (1989)	Product/Brand Decision involvement	6
Jensen et al (1989)	Involvement (based on Lastovicka and Gardner 1979)	4
Jain and Srinivasan (1990)	Involvement (based on PII and IP)	5
McQuarrie and Munson (1991)	Involvement (based on RPII ³)	2
Goldsmith et al (1991)	Product/Brand Decision involvement	6
Edgett and Cullen (1993)	Choice involvement	2
Knox et al (1994)	Enduring/Situational involvement	7
Beharrel and Denison (1995)	Purchase involvement (based on Mittal 1989)	7
Broderick et al (1995)	Involvement	4
Van Trijp et al (1996)	Product involvement	3

The direction of involvement, which relates to the stimulus object and its context, has also been debated (Laaksonen, 1997). Examples include product involvement (Bloch,

¹ Refers to Zaichkowsky's personal involvement inventory scale.

² Refers to Kapferer and Laurents' involvement profile scale.

³ Refers to the revised personal involvement inventory by McQuarrie and Munson (1991).

1981; Brisoux and Chéron, 1990), personal involvement (Zaichkowsky, 1985), purchasing involvement (Slama and Tashchian, 1985), purchasing-decision involvement (Mittal, 1989), task involvement (Tyejee, 1979), issue involvement (Petty and Cacioppo, 1981) and advertising involvement (Zaichkowsky, 1985).

MEASURING INVOLVEMENT

How involvement is measured depends on whether it is conceptualised as a single or multi-dimensional construct. As Rothschild (1979) explains, most research considers involvement to be multi-dimensional: *“no single construct can individually [and] satisfactorily describe, explain or predict involvement”* (p78). Similarly, Kapferer and Laurent (1985c: p41) suggest that marketing researchers should, *“stop thinking in terms of single indicators of the involvement level and instead use an ‘involvement profile’...”*.

The debate about operationalising involvement is dominated by interest in developing a generalised measure. Some authors believe that a single measure can capture all involvement types across many product categories (Zaichkowsky, 1985). Others argue that different measures are needed for different involvement types and product categories (Antil, 1984; Bloch, 1981; Richins and Bloch, 1986; Shimp and Sharma, 1983).

AN EXAMINATION OF INVOLVEMENT WITH CLOTHES

The scale used here measures involvement with clothes using items derived from various sources. To ensure the face validity of the scale, a multidimensional view of involvement was adopted. Items were employed that captured five of the six involvement dimensions commonly identified in the literature: importance, pleasure, interest, self-expression and

sign value. The sixth dimension, which relates to perceived risk, was excluded. Since Kapferer and Laurent's work, perceived risk has generally been seen as an individual concept, which should be measured separately (McQuarrie and Munson, 1992). Involvement is measured using an instrument that is specific to the product category. Items derived from previous scales have been employed to synthesise a scale of fifteen Likert-type items⁴, measured on a 5-point scale of 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. Thirty-two items were derived from the literature (Bloch et al. 1986; Higie and Feick, 1989; Jain and Srinivasan, 1990; Kapferer and Laurent, 1985a, 1985b; Lastovicka and Gardner, 1979; Rodgers and Schneider, 1993; Van Trijp et al. 1996). These items correspond to the five dimensions of involvement reported above (importance [10 items], interest [6 items], sign value/symbolic [6 items], self-expression [2 items] and hedonic/pleasure aspect [8 items]). Evidence of significant overlap between items emerged from this process. Indeed, much of the research on dimensionality involves replicating and validating existing scales. Such practice has generated numerous versions of relatively few original scales. These new versions include many items which are either similar or the same as those in earlier work. Consequently, it was necessary to 'clean up' the scales by eliminating unnecessary items. In most instances, priority was given to items derived from the original sources. This helped ensure face validity, which had been established for the original items derived from social psychology.

From the original thirty-two items, seventeen were eliminated. The remaining fifteen items, which corresponded to the five dimensions, were then adapted for the clothing context (Appendix 1). All of the scales from which these items were drawn support the

⁴ The use of Likert-type items is consistent with previous research conceptualising involvement as a multi-dimensional variable (Slama and Tashchian, 1985).

multi-dimensionality of involvement. All except the scale of Higie and Feick (1989) used Likert statements. The inclusion of all items derived from Higie and Feick was necessary, given these authors' measurement of the 'self expression' component of involvement is the only source of this dimension.

METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

An online questionnaire was sent to a sample of three thousand individuals. The sample was derived from the customer database of NEXT Plc, one of the largest and best-known UK clothing retailers. Privacy concerns and the Data Protection Act 1998 meant that the retailer was not allowed to provide third parties with direct access. Instead, the company used agreed principles to derive the sample randomly from their database and to make contact with targeted respondents. Potential respondents received a URL address in the form of a Hypertext link included in an e-mail message sent by the retailer. The e-mail invited recipients to visit a web page to complete the questionnaire. A pilot test preceding the main launch received a response rate of 20%. An incentive in the form of a competition for vouchers was offered by the retailer. Three weeks were allocated for the return of questionnaires. An overwhelming 41.3% of received responses arrived on the day of transmission. A steady and consistent rate of response was then received for the remainder of the first week. By the end of this time, 90% of the responses had been received. Overall, 557 usable questionnaires were returned (a 19% response rate).

Sample Gender, Age Range and Education Levels Statistics

The sample comprised a mix of individuals, some of whom already had an on-line shopping record with Next PLC and some who did not. As table 2 shows, the sample comprised of 85.8% of females and 14.2% males, of which 46.5% are aged 25 to 34. The Next brand seems to appeal to the middle-upper socio-economic shopper group (C1-39%) who are largely married with children (36%). In terms of age ranges, 31% of male Next shoppers are aged 25-34, while only 29% of female shoppers are aged 25-34. Here there is a discrepancy with our sample, which had a larger than expected percentage of female shoppers. It is possible that this discrepancy reflects the profile of Internet users who tend to be of younger ages.

TABLE 2 SAMPLE DISCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Gender % N=537		Age % N=540				Education % N=530			
Female	Male	15-24	25-34	35-44	45+	High school	GCSE	College	University
85.8	14.2	5.4	46.5	38.9	9.3	.9	40.8	24.3	34

Analysis

Respondents indicated their degree of agreement with the 15-item involvement scale using a five-point scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree). As explained above, the scale is designed to capture five dimensions of involvement: importance, pleasure, interest, self-expression and sign value. Prior to examining the dimensionality of involvement, the internal consistency of the scale was examined. An alpha value of .83 was reported, indicating a relatively high reliability level contributing to the overall validity of the scale (Peter, 1981).

Factor analysis using oblique rotation was applied to address the dimensionality of the scale. The use of oblique rotation is preferred to varimax because it allows factor inter-correlation. This is necessary, since the overall reliability of the scale has shown that all items contribute equally to the internal consistency of the scale, thereby indicating a theoretically sound and empirically possible inter-relationship. This approach is consistent with other research into the dimensionality of involvement (e.g. Kapferer and Laurent, 1985c). The factor analysis reveals a two-factor solution of nine items capturing 60% of the explained variance (see table 3). Reliability analysis of the factor items indicates acceptable alpha values of .80 for factor 1 and .79 for factor 2 (Nunnally, 1978).

TABLE 3 PATTERN MATRIX OF CLOTHES' INVOLVEMENT (oblique rotation)

	Factor	
	1	2
Interest- Clothing is a topic which I am indifferent	-.854	
Interest- I am not at all interested in clothes	-.730	
Self-expression- Clothing is not part of my self image	-.726	
Pleasure- It gives me pleasure to shop for clothes	.599	
Pleasure- I enjoy buying clothes for my self	.570	
Importance- Because of my personal values, I feel that clothing ought to be important to me		.811
Importance- I attach great importance to the way people are dressed		.803
Self-expression- Clothes help me express who I am		.734
Importance- I rate my dress sense as being of high importance to me		.719

DISCUSSION

Factor analysis has identified two dimensions of involvement. The first, described by five variables measuring interest, self-expression and pleasure, relates to respondents' interest in clothing (table 3). The second factor highlights the importance of clothes in terms of four variables describing the relationship between clothing and the individual's values and opinions about clothing's role in self-image. Each factor will now be considered.

Factor 1 suggests that consumer interest in clothing stems from the fact that it 1) gives them pleasure and enjoyment, and 2) helps shape their image (is a means of self-expression). The pleasure and enjoyment aspects of interest highlight the experiential aspect of clothing and confirm that hedonism is closely related to the involvement concept (Kapferer and Laurent, 1985b; Rodgers and Schneider, 1993). Although *interest* and *pleasure* have been hypothesised as separate dimensions of involvement, their merging together is consistent with other research. Closeness between these dimensions has been observed by Kapferer and Laurent (1985a) and Rogers and Schneider (1993) using various products including television sets, perfumes, detergents and mattresses. The implication is that individuals consider it antithetical to be interested in a product unless the product itself is inherently pleasurable.

The self-expression aspect of the first factor suggests that individuals are interested in clothes not only because they are pleasurable, but also because of their symbolic properties. Consumers are known to consume products in order to develop their self-image and identity (Elliott and Wattanasuwan, 1998). Clothing is a symbolic consumption product, allowing consumers to express themselves (Piacentini and Mailer, 2004) and to connect with society (Elliott, 1999). It serves as an expressive device by which an individual identifies his/her self image to others (Schenk and Holman, 1980). In this way clothing use is seen as communicative and helps to overcome the distance between an individual and his society and ultimately indicate the wearer's group membership or position within a particular societal group (Holman 1980; Gronow, 1993). Our analysis suggests that individuals are interested in clothing because of its self-expressive element, which shapes their self-image and identity. Clothing is used as a

vehicle to reflect self-image and identity in a personal and social context (Holman, 1980). Thus clothing is personally relevant, making the individual motivated to become personally involved with it. This confirms self-expression as an antecedent of clothing involvement. Indeed, we suggest that self-expression (or sign value [Kapferer & Laurent, 1985a]) may be an antecedent of involvement for products with symbolic consumption meaning (e.g. perfumes, luxury goods, cars). This reinforces the notion that involvement facets (or antecedents) are product category-specific. Future research on involvement needs to consider the relevance of the self-expression facet with product context(s).

The second factor, which highlights the importance of clothing, relates to how clothes are used by individuals to conform or distinguish themselves from social norms and to attain social approval. Importance, which was the first concept used to explain involvement, is now commonly applied as one of its measures (Bloch and Richins, 1983; Howard and Sheth, 1969; Hupfer and Gardner, 1971; Lastovicka and Gardner, 1979). In this analysis, importance is reflected in four variables centring on the relationship between clothing and the individual's values, opinions or needs. There is also an element of self-expression (e.g. clothing helps me to express who I am) which confirms the notion that clothing helps individuals to express their individual identity in a social context.

RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The research findings have practical implications for retailers and clothing manufacturers. Clothing is a high profile and economically important sector. In such a context, consumer involvement plays a key role in maintaining interest and spending. For retailers and clothing manufacturers, there is an obvious incentive to better understand

and encourage involvement among consumers. Our interpretation of the involvement factors provides practical guidance in this regard.

Our interpretation of factor 1 suggests a self-indulgent and pleasure-seeking aspect to involvement. This implies that individuals' involvement is driven partly by their desire to spend time on an enjoyable activity. Retailers must therefore devote time and effort to the 'shopping experience', specifically to the process, physical ambience and service aspects of the service encounter. Involvement is also driven by individuals' motive to use certain products as a means to project a desired self-image. Practitioners seeking to encourage this aspect of involvement could feature these characteristics in marketing materials. For example, a communications campaign suggesting 'you are what you wear' would fall into this category. Given current trends towards catalogue and on-line shopping, we might speculate on whether these features can be provided via remote channels and how such types of shopping might ultimately impact on this aspect of involvement.

Our interpretation of factor 2 emphasises the use of clothing to fit into particular social contexts. This involvement aspect is concerned with being appropriately dressed, rather than with personal indulgence. Clothing manufacturers and retailers seeking to build on this aspect of involvement must demonstrate the suitability and social acceptability of products both at the point of sale and in marketing efforts. Given the emphasis on appropriate dressing, there may be a context-specific element to this involvement aspect.

Our treatment of clothing as a single category could be seen to limit this work. Future research might consider whether this type of involvement differs according to whether clothing is being purchased for work, for socialising, or for relaxation. For practical reasons our sample was confined to the sizeable database of a single clothing retailer.

This sample satisfied the need for convenience and enabled access for distribution of the online questionnaire. It is hard to see how the research could have progressed had these criteria not been met. However, we acknowledge that the use of statistical tests to non-true random samples might have implications for the research findings such as for their generalisability to other contexts. Future research should seek new samples across which involvement with these different sub-categories of clothing might be considered.

CONCLUSION

Consumer researchers' preoccupation with involvement has spawned a variety of empirical measures assessing the concept's dimensionality. The research presented here has applied some of these measures to examine the under-researched product category of clothing. The dimensionality of involvement has been a particular feature of the research. The paper addresses involvement with clothes as a multidimensional construct measured by a set of fifteen Likert-type items. The findings suggest that consumers think about their clothes in terms of two dimensions: interest and importance. Individuals are apparently interested in clothes because they give pleasure and help them to express themselves. This confirms the experiential aspect of involvement as theorised by previous literature and the symbolic meaning of clothes as a means of self-expressing one's image and identity. In addition, it suggests that individuals become involved with their clothes because this product class is an important part of their lifestyle. This interpretation has implications for the measurement of involvement across product contexts, because it highlights the need to consider involvement as a specific-product class phenomenon.

APPENDIX 1 ITEMS MEASURING INVOLVEMENT WITH CLOTHES

Item	Source	Dimension
1. It gives me pleasure to shop for clothes	Kapferer and Laurent (1985b)	Hedonism
2. I can think of instances where a personal experience was affected by the way I was dressed.	Lastovicka and Gardner (1979)	Importance
3. Because of my personal values, I feel that clothing ought to be important to me.	Lastovicka and Gardner (1979)	Importance
4. I enjoy buying clothes for myself.	Rogers and Schneider (1993) of the Kapferer and Laurent scale	Hedonism
5. I rate my dress sense as being of high importance to me.	Lastovicka and Gardner (1979)	Importance
6. Clothes help me express who I am.	Higie and Feick (1989)	Self expression
7. I attach great importance to the way people are dressed	Lastovicka and Gardner (1979)	Importance
8. It is true that clothing interests me a lot.	Kapferer and Laurent (1985b)	Interest
9. The kind of clothes I buy do not reflect the kind of person I am.	Rogers and Schneider (1993) of the Kapferer and Laurent scale	Sign value
10. I buy clothes for the pleasure they give me not others.	Rogers and Schneider (1993) of the Kapferer and Laurent scale	Hedonism
11. Clothing is a topic about which I am indifferent.	Kapferer and Laurent (1985a)	Interest
12. Clothing is not part of my self-image.	Higie and Feick (1989)	Self expression
13. Relative to other products, clothing is the most important to me.	Van Trijp et al. (1996)	Importance
14. Buying clothes feels like giving myself a gift.	Kapferer and Laurent (1985b)	Hedonism
15. I am not at all interested in clothes.	Van Trijp et al. (1996)	Interest

REFERENCES

- Antil, J.H. (1984) "Conceptualisation and Operationalisation of Involvement" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, T. C. Kinnear, (Ed.), Vol.11, 203-209.
- Auty, S. and Elliott, R. (1998) "Fashion Involvement, Self-Monitoring and the Meaning of Brands", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol.7, 2, 109-123.
- Beatty, S.B., Smith, S.M. (1983) "Involvement, Search and Satisfaction: A Path Analytic Model" *Proceedings of the AMA Winter Educators' Conference: Research Methods and Causal Modelling in Marketing*, W.R Darden, K.B. Monroe, W.R. Dillon (Eds.), 44-47, American Marketing Association.
- Beharrell, B., Denison, T.J. (1995) "Involvement in a Routine Food Shopping Context" *British Food Journal*, Vol.97, 4, 24-29.

- Bloch, P.H. (1981) "An Exploration Into The Scaling of Consumers' Involvement With A Product Class" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, K. B. Monroe (Ed.) Vol.8, 61-65.
- Bloch, P.H., Sherrell, D.L., Ridgway, N.M. (1986) "Consumer Search: An Extended Framework" *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.13, (June) 119-126.
- Brisoux, J.E., Céron, E.J. (1990) "Brand Categorisation and Product Involvement" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, M.E. Goldberg, G. Gorn and R.W. Pollay (Eds.) Vol.17, 101-109.
- Broderick, A.J., Mueller, R.D., Baron, P.J. (1995) "Clarifying The Construct of Consumer Involvement: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis", Occasional Paper 30, Leicester Business School, De Montfort University, Leicester.
- Celsi, L.R., Olson, J.C. (1988) "The Role of Involvement in Attention and Comprehension Processes" *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.15, (September), 210-224.
- Celuch, K., Evans, R. (1989) "An Analysis of the Convergent and Discriminant Validity of the Personal Involvement Inventory and the Consumer Involvement Profile" *Psychological Reports*, Vol.65, 1291-1297.
- Costley, C.L. (1988) "Meta-Analysis of Involvement Research" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, M.J. Houston (Ed.), Vol.15, 554-562.
- Dholakia, U.M. (1997) "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Perceived Risk and Product Involvement" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol.24, 159-167.
- Edgett, S.J., Cullen, C.W. (1993) "Service Organization Selection: A Cross-cultural Analysis of the Role of Involvement" *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol.27, 2,

33-45.

Elliott, R. (1999) "Symbolic Meaning and Post-modern Consumer Culture", in *Rethinking Marketing*, Brownlie, D., Sarem, M., Wensley, R. and Whittington, R. (eds), Sage Publications, London UK.

Elliott, R. and Wattanasuwan, K. (1998) "Brands as Symbolic Resources for the Construction of Identity", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol.17, 2, 131-145.

Fairhurst, A., Good, L., Gentry, J. (1989) "Fashion Involvement: An Instrument Validation Procedure" *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, Vol.7, 3, 10-14.

Flynn, L.R., Goldsmith, R.E. (1993) "A Causal Model of Consumer Involvement: Replication and Critique" *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, Vol.8, 6, 129-142.

Goldsmith, R.E., Emmert, J. (1991) "Measuring Product-Category Involvement: A Multitrait-Multimethod Study" *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.23, 363-371.

Gronow, J. (1993) "Taste And Fashion: The Social Function Of Fashion And Style" *Acta Sociologica*, Vol. 36, 89-100.

Higie, R.A., Feick, L. (1989) "Enduring Involvement: Conceptual and Measurement Issues" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, T. K. Sroll (Ed.) Vol.16, 690-696.

Higie, R.A., Feick, L.F. and Price, L.L. (1991) "The Importance of Peripheral Cues in Attitude Formation For Enduring and Task Involved Individuals" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, R.H. Holman and M.R. Solomon (Eds.) Vol.18, 187-193.

Holman, R.H. (1980) "Clothing As Communication: An Empirical Investigation" in *Advances In Consumer Research*, Vol. 7(1), 372-377.

- Howard, J.A., Sheth J.N. (1969) *the Theory of Buyer Behaviour*, John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Hupfer, N.T., Gardner, D.M. (1971) "Differential Involvement With Products and Issues: An Exploratory Study" *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Conference of the Association for Consumer Research*, D. Gardner (Ed.), 262-270.
- Jain, K., Srinivasan, N. (1990) "An Empirical Assessment of Multiple Operationalizations of Involvement" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, M.E. Goldberg, G. Gorn and R.W. Pollay (Eds.), Vol.17, 594-602.
- Jensen, T.D., Carlson, L., Tripp, C. (1989) "The Dimensionality of Involvement: An Empirical Test" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, T.K. Sroll (Ed.), Vol.16, 680-689.
- Kapferer, J-N., Laurent, G. (1985a) "Consumers' Involvement Profiles: New Empirical Results" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, E.C. Hirschman and M.B. Holbrook (Eds.), Vol.12, 290-295.
- Kapferer, J-N., Laurent, G. (1985b) "Consumers' Involvement Profiles: A New Practical Approach to Consumer Involvement" *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol.25, 6 (December-January), 48-56.
- Kapferer, J-N., Laurent, G. (1985c) "Measuring Consumers Involvement Profiles" *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.22, (February) 41-53.
- Knox, S.D., Walker, D., Marshall, C. (1994) "Measuring Consumer Involvement with Grocery Brands: Model Validation and Scale-Reliability Test Procedures" *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol.10, 137-152.
- Krugman, H.E. (1967) "The Measurement of Advertising Involvement" *Public Opinion*

- Quarterly, Vol.30 (Winter), 583-596.
- Laaksonen, P. (1997) "Consumer Involvement: Concepts and Research", Routledge, London, UK.
- Lastovicka, J.L., Gardner, D.M. (1979) "Components of Involvement" in Attitude Research plays for High Stakes, J.C.Maloney, B. Silverman, (Eds.), American Marketing Association Proceedings Series, 53-73.
- Leavitt, C., Greenwald, A.G., Obermiller, C. (1981) "What Is Low Involvement Low In?" in Advances in Consumer Research, K.B. Monroe (Ed.), Vol.8, 15-19.
- McQuarrie E.F., Munson, M.J. (1986) "The Zaichkowsky Personal Involvement Inventory: Modification and Extension" in Advances in Consumer Research, M. Wallendorf and P. Anderson, (Eds.) Vol.14, 36-40.
- McQuarrie E.F., Munson, J.M. (1992) "A Revised Product Involvement Inventory: Improved Usability and Validity" in Advances in Consumer Research, J.F. Sherry and B. Sternthal (Eds.), Vol.19, 108-115.
- Mitchell, A.A. (1979) "Involvement: A Potentially Important Mediator of Consumer Behaviour" in Advances in Consumer Research, W.L. Wilkie (Ed.), Vol.6, 191-195.
- Mittal, B. (1989) "Measuring Purchase-Decision Involvement" Psychology and Marketing, Vol.6, 2 (Summer), 147-162.
- Mittal, B., Lee, M.S. (1989) "A Causal Model of Consumer Involvement" Journal of Economic Psychology, Vol.10, 363-389.
- Nunnally, Jum C. (1978) Psychometric Theory, (2nd edition), New York, McGraw-Hill.
- O'Cass, A. (2000) "An Assessment of Consumer Product, Purchase Decision,

- Advertising and Consumption Involvement in Fashion Clothing” *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol.21, 545-576.
- Park, C.W., Mittal, B. (1985) “A Theory of Involvement in Consumer Behaviour: Problems and Issues”, *Research in Consumer Behaviour*, J.N. Sheth (Ed.), Vol.1, 201-231.
- Park, C.W., Young, S.M. (1983) “Types and Levels of Involvement and Brand Attitude Formation” in *Advances in Consumer Research*, R.P. Bogozzi, A.M. Tybout (Eds.) Vol.10, 320-324.
- Peter, P.J. (1981) “Construct Validity: A Review Of Basic Issues And Marketing Practices” *Journal Of Marketing Research*, Vol.18 (May), p133-145.
- Petty, R.E., Cacioppo, J.T. (1981) “Issue Involvement As A Moderator of the Effects On Attitude of Advertising Content and Context” in *Advances in Consumer Research*, K.B. Monroe (Ed.), Vol. 8, 20-24.
- Piacentini, M. and Mailer G. (2004) “Symbolic Consumption in Teenagers’ clothing Choices”, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol.3, 3, 251-263
- Pucely, M.J., Mizerski, R., Perrew, P. (1988) “A Comparison of Involvement Measures for the Purchase and Consumption of Pre-Recorded Music” in *Advances in Consumer Research*, M.J. Houston (Ed.), Vol.15,p37-42.
- Ratchford, B.T. (1987) “New Insights About the FCB Grid” *Journal of Advertising Research* (August/September), 24-38.
- Richins, M.L., Bloch, P.H. (1986) “After the New Wears Off: the Temporal Context of Product Involvement” *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.13, (September) 280-285.

- Rodgers, W.C., Schneider, K.C. (1993) "An Empirical Evaluation of the Kapferer-Laurent Consumer Involvement Profile Scale" *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol.4, (July-August), 333-345.
- Rothschild, M.L. (1979) "Advertising Strategies for High and Low Involvement Situations" in *Attitude Research Plays for High Stakes*, J.C. Maloney, and B. Silverman (Eds.), 74-93, American Marketing Association Proceedings Series.
- Rothschild, M.L. (1984) "Perspectives On Involvement: Current Problems and Future Definitions" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, T.C. Kinnear, (Ed.) Vol.11 216-217.
- Schenk C.S., Holman R.H. (1980) "A Sociological Approach To Brand Choice: The Concept Of Situational Self Image" in *Advances In Consumer Research*, Vol. 7 (1), 610-614.
- Sherif, M., Sherif, C. (1967) *Attitude, Ego Involvement and Change*, Saunders.
- Shimp, T.A., Sharma, S. (1983) "The Dimensionality of Involvement: A Test of the Automobile Involvement Scale" *Proceedings of the AMA Winter Educators' Conference: Research Methods and Causal Modelling in Marketing*, W.R Darden, K.B. Monroe, W.R. Dillon (Eds.), 58-61, American Marketing Association.
- Slama, M.E., Tashchian, A. (1985) "Selected Socio-economic and Demographic Characteristics Associated With Purchasing Involvement" *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.49, (Winter), 72-82.
- Stone, R.N. (1984) "The Marketing Characteristics Of Involvement" in *Advances In Consumer Research*, T.C. Kinnear, (Ed.) Vol.11, 210-215.
- Summers, T.A., Belleau, B.D., Wozniak, P.J. (1992) "Fashion and Shopping Perceptions,

- Demographics and Store Patronage” Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, Vol. 11 (1), p83-91.
- Tiger, D.J., Ring, L.J., King, C.W. (1976) “Fashion Involvement and Buying Behaviour: A Methodological Study” in Advances in Consumer Research, B.B. Anderson (Ed.) Vol.3, 46-52.
- Traylor, M.B. and Joseph, W.B. (1984) “Measuring Consumer Involvement With Products: Developing A General Scale” Psychology and Marketing Vol.1 (Summer) 65-77.
- Tyebjee, T.T. (1979) “Response Time, Conflict, and Involvement in Brand Choice” Journal of Consumer Research, Vol.6 (December), 295-304.
- Van Trijp, H.C.M., Hoyer, W.D., Inman, J.J. (1996) “Why Switch? Product Category-Level Explanations for True Variety-Seeking Behaviour” Journal of Marketing Research, Vol.33, 3, 281-292.
- Venkatraman, M.P. (1988) “Investigating Differences in the Roles of Enduring and Instrumentally Involved Consumers in the Diffusion Process” in Advances in Consumer Research, M.J. Houston (Ed.), Vol.15, 299-303.
- Vernette, E. (2004) “Targeting Women’s Clothing Fashion Opinion Leaders in Media Planning: An Application in Magazines” Journal of Advertising Research, Vol.44, 1, 90-107.
- Zaichkowsky, J.L. (1985) “Measuring the Involvement Construct” Journal of Consumer Research, Vol.12, (December), 341-352.