

인지된 혁신속성이 패션혁신행동에 미치는 영향

박 경 애

영남대학교 생활과학대학 의류학과

The Effects of Perceived Innovation Attributes On Fashion Innovative Behavior

Kyungae Park

Dept. of Clothing and Textiles, Yeungnam University
(1999. 9. 30 접수)

Abstract

기술적 혁신과는 달리 상징적 혁신(symbolic innovation)은 기존 제품에 부가된 사회적 의미가 변화함으로써 창조된다. 따라서, 상징적 혁신에서 새로운 사회적 의미와 관련된 속성은 기능적 속성만큼이나 중요하다. 본 연구는 상징적 혁신의 대표적인 의류제품을 이용, 패션혁신행동에 영향을 미치는 인지된 혁신속성(perceived innovation attributes)을 구별하고, 패션혁신행동의 두 유형(구매와 사용)에 미치는 이러한 속성의 영향을 고찰하였다. 대학생 집단을 표본으로 이용, 설문지 조사를 통해 수집된 515부의 응답지가 분석되었다. 인지된 혁신속성은 유사성(compatibility), 기능적 상대적 잇점, 사회적 상대적 잇점, 인지된 위험으로 구분되었다. 의복흥미가 구매와 사용 두 측면의 패션혁신행동에 영향을 주었으나 인지된 혁신속성은 사용측면에만 영향을 주었다. 유사성과 기능적 상대적 잇점이 사용혁신행동에 긍정적 영향을, 인지된 위험이 부정적 영향을 미쳤다. 혁신속성이 영향을 미치지 않은 반면 의류소비정도가 구매혁신행동에 영향을 주었다. 본 연구의 결과는 사용혁신성이 높은 소비자는 구매혁신성이 높은 소비자보다 혁신속성의 평가에 더 관여한다는 것을 시사한다.

Key words: innovation attributes, fashion innovative behavior, use innovativeness;

혁신속성; 패션혁신행동; 사용혁신성

I. Introduction

Innovativeness researchers agree that an individual's perceptions of innovation attributes rather than personal characteristic variables are better predictors of an adoption.¹⁻⁴⁾ The effects of perceived innovation attributes on adoption have been studied for over two decades. However, most conceptualization and empirical research of

innovation attributes have been conducted for technological innovations and only at purchase decision point. Such research may not be generalized to symbolic innovations and to post-adoption process.

Product innovations may arise from symbolism as well as from technology.⁵⁾ For products with high social or symbolic characteristics but low technological characteristics(i.e., apparel, hair styles or jewelry), an innovation is created by a change

of social meaning rather than a change of physical aspects.⁵⁾ That is, "its(innovation's) physical form remains predominantly unchanged but the meaning assigned to that form is novel... It may have been physically present in society for an extensive period of time, yet be considered an innovation at a specific time, generating a secondary diffusion."⁵⁾ For example, new fashion trends are often revived from the physical forms existed at a certain time in the past. In that sense, intangible attributes of new social meaning rather than functional attributes would be more important in the adoption decision of fashion innovations.

While past innovativeness research has focused on the initial purchase of new products and ignored the post-adoption usage process, recent research⁶⁻⁸⁾ segments the concept of innovativeness into the two aspects: purchase(adoption of a new product); and use. Use Innovative behavior is usage behavior of a previously adopted product(or even a new product) in an innovative fashion.⁶⁻⁸⁾ Use innovative consumers are creative in nature, and they often experiment new and various end uses of a product and sometimes invent new uses of an adopted product.⁶⁾ Particularly, in clothing fashion examples are frequently observed(i.e., torn jeans, unique mix and match of clothing items). While innovative consumers tend to be heavy buyers,⁹⁾ use innovative consumers are highly committed to products.⁶⁾ Faced with an adoption decision of new fashion product, they are engaged in the evaluations of innovation attributes, and they may decide not to purchase but to develop a way to adapt existing clothing products.⁶⁾ Therefore, it is assumed that innovation attributes in fashion are more seriously evaluated by use innovative consumers than by purchase innovative consumers.

The objective of this study is to apply

innovation attributes to a symbolic innovation—clothing fashion and examine the effects of perceived innovation attributes on the two differentiated fashion innovative behaviors of purchase and use. Specifically, the study: 1) identifies the perceived innovation attributes for clothing fashion; and 2) compares the effects of those identified attributes on the two fashion innovative behaviors—purchase and use.

II. Research Background

1. Perceived Innovation Attributes

Rogers¹⁰⁾ identifies five innovation attributes that influence the rate of an innovation adoption. Those attributes evaluated for new products include: 1) relative advantage as the degree to which an innovation is perceived as superior to ideas it supersedes; 2) compatibility as the degree to which an innovation is perceived as consistent with the existing values, past experiences, and needs of potential adopters; 3) complexity as the degree to which an innovation is perceived as relatively difficult to understand and use; 4) triability as the degree to which an innovation may be experienced with on a limited basis; and 5) observability as the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others.¹⁰⁾ Ostlund¹¹⁾ suggests the sixth attribute, perceived risk, which is the degree to which risks are perceived as associated with the innovation. In general, innovations perceived by consumers as having the greater relative advantage, compatibility, triability, and observability and less complexity and perceived risk will be adopted more rapidly.^{4, 10, 11)}

Which attributes are more important to an adoption decision depends on product categories and consumer characteristics. For technological innovations, complexity and compatibility ranked highest in discriminating adopters and non-

adopters.²⁾ Holak and Lehmann⁴⁾ found that compatibility, relative advantage and perceived risk directly influenced the adoption of consumer durables. Holak³⁾ revealed that compatibility and relative advantage were positively related to purchase intentions but compatibility had the dominating impact on purchase intentions across product groups within the technological product category. Therefore, past research proves the effects of compatibility, relative advantage, complexity, and perceived risk on the adoption of technological products.

Among the six innovation attributes, some are relatively less considered for the evaluation of new fashion items. For example, complexity would be less evaluated as clothing fashion does not contain technological features that are difficult to understand and use. Because of nature of visibility in clothing fashion, observability would not be a major attribute to emphasize unless research is interested in comparing the effects of attributes on underwear items with those on outerwears. Therefore, for clothing fashion compatibility, relative advantage, and perceived risk appear to be major innovation attributes evaluated for the adoption decision of new fashion.

2. Symbolic Innovations

Symbolic innovations result from the reassignment of social meaning to an existing product.⁵⁾ Physical forms of an innovation are not unfamiliar as they existed in the past. What more affects an individual's adoption decision for symbolic innovations is social meaning that is newly attached to the physical form. Rogers¹⁰⁾ contends that both of social and economic aspects need to be considered as innovation attributes. He argues that social acceptance or recognition is important for an individual to decide an adoption.¹⁰⁾ Hence, for an adoption decision of clothing fashion, which

is highly visible in its nature, intangible attributes of socio-psychological aspects should be more emphasized than should technological functions.

Because a symbolic innovation(new style) is not radically different from existing products(old styles) and most times an innovation depends on a consumer's novel perception, it is easier for the consumer to adopt and even create an innovation.⁵⁾ Consumers may adopt symbolic attributes(new innovation idea or new social meaning) by adapting old products without buying a new one.

3. Fashion Innovative Behavior: Purchase Versus Use

Consumer innovative behavior can be specified into purchase and use. Separated from purchase which is an adoption of a new product, use innovative behavior is considered for a new aspect of consumer innovative behavior. Price and Ridgway⁷⁾ contends the relationship of these two as following: "A consumer may purchase a product or instead choose not to purchase—stretching a currently owned product to additional uses..... this decision to buy or not to buy represents nearly dichotomous manifestations of high stimulation needs."

While purchase innovative behavior focuses on the time perspective in terms of whether and when the consumer adopts the product, "the basic idea underlying use innovativeness is that the consumer acts in an innovative fashion when s/he uses a previously adopted product to solve a novel consumption problem."⁶⁾ That is, use innovative behavior is an innovative behavior relative to the product usage process rather than to the product purchase process.

In clothing fashion, experimental consumers may develop a new way of wearing clothes by mixing and matching different clothing items or altering them. Such consumers exhibit use

innovativeness and are more committed to clothes they already own. Such tendency of use innovativeness is explained by an individual's creativity and problem-solving capabilities.⁶⁾ That is, when use innovators face an adoption decision of a new product, they are competent in examining alternatives as they are used to considering various attributes of clothing items. Hence, use innovative consumers do not always buy new products, instead they may develop a way to adapt existing products.⁶⁾ On the other hand, purchase innovative consumers tend to spend more and become heavy buyers.⁷⁾ Therefore, even though these two innovative consumers are interested in the same product category, innovation attributes are expected to be more seriously considered, as a process of alternative evaluation, by use innovative consumers than by purchase innovative consumers. Hirschman, however, contends that creative consumers may exhibit both innovative behaviors on more occasions.⁶⁾

III. Method

This study focused on the impacts of perceived innovation attributes on the two innovative behaviors of purchase and use in clothing fashion products. To identify the influencing innovation attributes and compare the differences in their impacts on the two types of fashion innovative behavior, clothing interest and spending level were added to influencing variables.

Survey by a self-administrated questionnaire was used for data collection. The questionnaire was developed through a pretest to 66 students enrolled in a marketing class. Data from the pretest was analyzed for Cronbach's alpha, factor analysis and basic correlations and revised based on the results. The revised questionnaire was completed by 6 graduate students who also

participated in a focus group interview. The final questionnaire was completed based on all the previous steps of pretest.

For measurement of perceived innovation attributes, 68 features of consumer durable products by Holak and Lehmann,⁴⁾ negative comments from rejecters of the midi-skirt by Reynolds and Darden,¹²⁾ and "types of information entering into the decision process" by Sproles¹³⁾ were reviewed. Based on those sources of past research, the attribute inventory of clothing consisting of 20 items was developed. Each attribute was described briefly as suggested by Armstrong and Overton¹⁴⁾ and Holak and Lehmann,⁴⁾ and the format of the question was borrowed from Venkatramann.¹⁵⁾ The respondent was asked to indicate how important each attribute was in purchasing a new clothing product and using clothing products on a 5-point scale. The inventory was factor analyzed during the pretest, and the revised final inventory consisted of 16 items.

Of the fashion innovative behavior, the purchase innovative behavior scale was developed based on the cross-sectional method by asking respondents to list up all the new clothing items they had purchased in the last two months and to evaluate the level of innovativeness of each item on a 5-point scale. Such a measurement that made the respondent define an innovation was appropriate as an innovation depended on the consumer's perception.¹⁰⁾ That is, "the innovation need not to be new in an absolute sense. What is important is an individual's perception of an object as new..."¹³⁾ The use innovative behavior scale was developed based on the guidelines provided by Hirschman⁶⁾ and the specific usage behavior and use pattern questions by Price and Ridgway.⁸⁾ The scale asked the respondents the extent to which they had used their owned clothes in a new way and in a

variety of ways in the last two seasons. After the pretest the final scale included 7 items on a 7 point scale, and the alpha coefficient was .86. Schrank's clothing interest scale¹⁶⁾ was adapted for the clothing interest with the alpha score of .87. Spending amount for clothing was measured in one question asking respondents how much they spent for clothing in a year.

College students of a major university in a southeastern state in the USA were subjects. The questionnaires were distributed to volunteering students in several courses and collected during the regular class meetings. Total 563 responses were collected. Except uncompleted and unusable responses, 515 responses were used for data analysis. Approximately 61 percent(n=312) of the respondents were females and 39 percent(n=203) were males. Most respondents were white(90.5%). Major, school year and family income were relatively evenly distributed across the given categories.

IV. Results

1. Identification of Perceived Innovation Attributes

Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to categorize the perceived innovation attributes. As seen at Table 1, four factors were extracted. Factor 1 represented the perceived extent to which the innovation item was consistent with existing clothing life styles and was named Compatibility. Factor 2 and 3 described functional and social aspects of relative advantage, and were named Functional Relative Advantage and Social Relative Advantage, respectively. Factor 4 described perceived risk. Except factor 2, all the attributes reflected intangible aspects.

2. Effects of Perceived Innovation Attributes on Fashion Innovative Behavior

Multiple regression was used to examine the

Table 1. Factor Analysis: Perceived Innovation Attributes

Factor	Item	Factor loading	Eigen value	% of variance	Alpha
Compatibility	Fitting with my image	.73	4.86	30.4	.77
	Matching other styles	.73			
	Fitting with physical appearance	.72			
	Appropriate for occasion	.70			
	Not getting bored with	.55			
Functional relative advantage	Sale item	.73	2.31	14.4	.73
	Ease of care	.69			
	Price	.67			
	Versatility	.67			
	Comfort	.62			
Social relative advantage	Pretty/good looking	.79	1.27	7.9	.76
	Quality	.70			
	Fashion	.66			
	Looking attractive	.52			
Perceived risk	Acceptable to others	.84	1.12	7.0	.80
	Socially acceptable	.80			

effects of four perceived innovation attributes on the two fashion innovative behaviors of purchase and use. Clothing interest and spending amount were added to this step for better understanding of the relationships. As seen at Table 2, spending amount and clothing interest significantly influenced purchase innovative behavior, but none of perceived innovation attributes did. Spending amount was the best predictor of purchase innovative behavior (Beta=.35). Clothing interest, compatibility, perceived risk, and functional relative advantage had significant effects on use innovative behavior while spending amount and social relative advantage did not. Perceived risk had a negative effect on use innovative behavior. Clothing interest was the best predictor for use innovative behavior (Beta=.32).

It is interesting to find that purchase innovative behavior is not affected by perceived innovation attributes. Such result contradicts the past research conducted for technological products.²⁻⁴⁾ Clothing is a relatively lower involvement product comparing to consumer durables. Therefore, when an individual has financial resources to activate the interest on clothing, s/he does not have

to be seriously engaged in the evaluation of each innovation attribute. Impacts of spending amount on purchase innovative behavior supports such interpretation. That is, purchase innovators as heavy buyers can afford new products on more occasions and are not necessarily concerned with innovation attributes.

Use innovative behavior is influenced by perceived innovation attributes, particularly by compatibility, perceived risk and functional relative advantage. Such result supports the Hirschman's conceptualization⁶⁾ in that use innovative consumers are more engaged in the evaluation of a new product. Based on their evaluation, they may decide not to buy an innovation. Hence, the extent of spending does not necessarily explain use innovative behavior. The result also supports the past research²⁻⁴⁾ of technological adoptions in which compatibility and relative advantage are the most important attributes. Whether a new clothing item is perceived to be consistent with current clothing life styles is the most important attribute for use innovative consumers. A negative influence of perceived risk indicates that consumers who exhibit high use innovative behavior are less

Table 2. Regression for Fashion Innovative Behavior

	Variable	B	Beta	T-value	F	R ²
Purchase	Compatibility	-.00	-.00	-.02	27.20 ^{****}	.24
	Functional relative advantage	.16	.03	.74		
	Social relative advantage	.51	.08	1.52		
	Perceived risk	-.30	-.04	-.88		
	Clothing interest	.67	.21	4.05 ^{***}		
	Spending amount	4.62	.35	7.71 ^{***}		
Use	Compatibility	.44	.23	4.27 ^{****}	19.00 ^{****}	.18
	Functional relative advantage	.17	.09	1.90 [°]		
	Social relative advantage	-.18	-.07	-1.36		
	Perceived risk	-.45	-.14	-3.25 ^{**}		
	Clothing interest	.43	.32	6.28 ^{****}		
	Spending amount	.15	.03	.60		

[°]p<.05 ^{**}p<.01 ^{***}p<.001 ^{****}p<.0001

concerned with whether the clothing is socially acceptable style. In other words, use innovative consumers may be more confident of their clothing behavior and more independent in clothing selection. As much as they are practical, functional relative advantage explains use innovative behavior better than does social relative advantage.

Clothing interest significantly influences both of purchase and use innovative behaviors. Such finding supports past innovativeness research in that consumer innovators are interested in the specific product category in which they tend to be innovators.^{9, 10)}

V. Conclusion

Four perceived innovation attributes of compatibility, perceived risk, symbolic relative advantage, and functional relative advantage were extracted for fashion innovative behavior. The results revealed that among those attributes compatibility, perceived risk, and functional relative advantage affected use innovative behavior. None of these attributes influenced purchase innovative behavior. Instead, purchase innovative behavior was explained by spending amount on clothing.

The findings indicate that faced with an adoption decision—making, use innovators evaluate innovation attributes more seriously. Whether the innovation is compatible with existing clothing life style is the most important attribute these consumers are looking for. A negative relationship with perceived risk indicates that they are confident of their own ways of wearing clothes. Also, use innovators appear to be rational buyers who go through a more extensive evaluation stage while purchase innovators tend to be heavy buyers.

Use innovative behavior, which requires

continued commitment to the product, is a result of consumer satisfaction and in turn influences consumer's future decision—making such as repurchase, word-of-mouth, and attitude toward brands or stores. Therefore, understanding use innovative behavior along with purchase innovative behavior will help apparel retailers develop a long-term relationship with their customers. Promotional strategies emphasizing consistency and economical and functional benefits of a new fashion product may lead to positive product evaluations of use innovative consumers.

A major limitation of this research is in the sampling. College students can not represent general consumer population. Despite the limitation, this study provides valuable information in understanding fashion innovative behavior by examining the importance of perceived innovation attributes to such symbolic innovation. Further, the study that extends fashion innovative behavior beyond the purchase point introduces a new interesting construct of consumer behavior to investigate. For a sound conclusion of the difference between the two fashion innovative behaviors in the impacts of perceived innovation attributes, more theoretical investigations for the concept of use innovativeness and examples in the real world need to be developed. Also, the perceived innovation attributes scale for clothing products need to be refined and tested in the future study.

References

1. Ostlund, L. E.(1974), Perceived Innovation Attributes as Predictors of Innovativeness, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1(Sep), 23–29.
2. Labay, D. G. and Kinnear, T. C.(1981), Exploring the Consumer Decision Process In the Adoption of Solar Energy Systems, *Journal of Consumer*

- Research*, 8(Dec), 271-278.
3. Holak, S. L.(1988), Determinants of Innovative Durables Adoption: An Empirical Study with Implications for Early Product Screening, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 5, 50-69
 4. Holak, S. L. and Lehmann, D. R.(1990), Purchase Intentions and the Dimensions of Innovation: An Exploratory Model, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 7, 59-73.
 5. Hirschman, E.(1982). Symbolism and Technology as Sources for the Generation of Innovations. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 9, 537-541.
 6. Hirschman, E.(1980), Innovativeness, Novelty Seeking, and Consumer Creativity, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7(Dec), 283-295.
 7. Price, L. L. and Ridgway, N. M.(1982). Use Innovativeness, Vicarious Exploration and Purchase Exploration: Three Facets of Consumer Varied Behavior, *American Marketing Association Educators' Conference Proceedings*, Chicago: AMA, 56-60.
 8. Price, L. L. and Ridgway, N. M.(1983), Development of a scale to measure use innovativeness, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 10, 679-684.
 9. Gatignon, H. and Robertson, T. S.(1985), A Propositional Inventory for New Diffusion Research, *Journal of Consumer Research* 11(March), 849-867.
 10. Rogers, E. M.(1983) *Diffusion of Innovations*, 3rd ed. The Free Press, New York.
 11. Shim, S. and Kotsiopulos, A.(1994), "Technology innovativeness and adopter categories of apparel/gift retailers: From the diffusion of innovations perspective," *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 12(2), 46-57.
 12. Reynolds, F. D. and Darden, W. R.(1972), "Why the Midi Failed," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 12(4), 139-144.
 13. Sproles, G. B.(1979), *Fashion: Consumer Behavior toward Dress*, Minneapolis: Burgess.
 14. Armstrong, J. S. and Overton, T.(1971), "Brief vs Comprehensive Descriptors in Measuring Intentions to Purchase," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8(Feb), 111-117.
 15. Venkatraman, M. L.(1991) "The impact of innovativeness and innovation type on adoption," *Journal of Retailing*, 67(1), 51-67.
 16. Schrank, H. L. and Gilmore, D. L.(1973). "Correlates of Fashion Leadership," *The Sociological Quarterly*, 14, 534-543.