Journal of Business Research xxx (2012) xxx–xxx

Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect

Journal of Business Research

How captive is your audience? Defining overall advertising involvement

Nathalie Spielmann [a],*, Marie-Odile Richard [b],[1]

[a] Reims Management School, 59 rue Pierre Taittinger, BP 302, 51061 Reims Cedex, France
[b] University of Montreal, Ecole d'Optométrie, Canada

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 1 February 2011
Received in revised form 1 November 2011
Accepted 1 December 2011
Available online xxxx

Keywords:
Overall advertising involvement
Message involvement
Media involvement
Creative involvement
Scale development

ABSTRACT

This article aims to reconcile some inconsistencies on the three constructs of advertising involvement, advertising relevance and media engagement. Then it develops a scale to holistically measure overall advertising involvement. Three previously measured types of involvement (message, media, and creative) are regrouped into one multidimensional structure with three correlated dimensions. The scale is then used to show that overall advertising involvement is capable of shaping attitudes leading to various consumer outcomes. Contributing to the literature on advertising involvement, this research confirms that overall advertising involvement is both situational and enduring. From a professional perspective, the research proposes a measurement tool better suited to understanding the scope of overall consumer involvement with advertising.

© 2011 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In 1964, Marshall McLuhan stated: "The medium is the message" and mass media was not about "the size of the audience, but of the fact that everybody becomes involved" (p. 349). McLuhan meant that consumers are not immune to advertising stimuli; rather, they react to various components of advertising, and media, message, and creative execution may all together work to influence consumers. For example, would Super Bowl ads for Doritos be as involving if they were in print rather than on television, about nutritional facts rather than the pleasure of snacking during a great game, presented in a bland rather than a humorous execution?

The advent of new formats, media convergence and diversification of consumer target markets is forcing advertisers to reconsider and reconfigure campaign metrics in order to better understand why advertising works, not just if it does (Rappaport, 2007; Woodard, 2006). Thus, the ad industry wants to define involvement with media, subject, and advertiser, and this has led to the desire to shift from impression-based models to what advertisers are calling engagement-based models (Abdul-Ghani, Hyde, & Marshall, 2011; Mollen & Wilson, 2010; Skerik, 2011). Unfortunately, advertisers have various definitions of what are involvement, relevance, and/or engagement. The same is true of researchers, e.g. Wang (2006) considers it contextual relevance whereas Heath (2009) considers it to be the result of stimulation of emotions.

This article seeks first to review and reconcile some inconsistencies on the three constructs advertising involvement, relevance and engagement, and to introduce the concept of overall advertising involvement. Then, we develop a scale to holistically measure overall advertising involvement. Three types of involvement (i.e., message, media, and creative) are regrouped into one second-order construct with three correlated dimensions. The new measure is used to show that overall advertising involvement is able to shape attitudes leading to several consumer outcomes.

Contributing to the literature on advertising involvement, this article confirms that overall advertising involvement is both situational and enduring. From a managerial perspective, we propose a measure better suited to understanding overall advertising involvement.

2. Literature review

2.1. Defining advertising involvement

A literature review reveals that since 1960, the topic of involvement has been widely discussed. For Krugman (1965), consumers can be in low involvement and change their attitudes after ad repetitions and only if their perceptions are influenced. Alternatively, consumers in high involvement experience rapid changes in cognitions and beliefs post ad exposure, leading to attitudinal and behavioral changes. Greenwald and Leavitt (1984) discuss four levels of audience involvement: preattention, focal attention, comprehension, and elaboration. Ray et al. (1973) claim that different levels of involvement lead to different sequences of impacts on cognitions, affect and behavior. Zaichkowsky (1986) showed that different consumers can be involved with an ad, i.e., more involved consumers respond

---

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +33 6 03 32 34 09; fax: +33 3 26 04 69 63.
E-mail addresses: nathalie.spielmann@reims-ms.fr (N. Spielmann), odile10@hotmail.com (M.-O. Richard).
[1] Tel.: +1 514 738 3520.

0148-2963/$ – see front matter © 2011 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.12.002

Please cite this article as: Spielmann N, Richard M-O, How captive is your audience? Defining overall advertising involvement, J Bus Res (2012), doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.12.002

more to ads, and consumers use different cues when evaluating ads depending on the relevance of the topic. Since Krugman's (1965) dual intensity model of involvement, and in light of Mitchell's (1979) experimental manipulations of involvement, most researchers used (various types of) involvement as a mediating or moderating variable by classifying respondents as either high or low involvement, and not based on the type of involvement.

The terminology on advertising involvement is varied. Making distinctions among involvement, relevance and engagement can be difficult, as the words are often used interchangeably, even within the same manuscript. For example, for Laczniak and Muehling (1993), consumers who are highly *involved* attend to ad claims that they find *relevant*. Similarly, for Batra and Ray (1986), message *involvement* occurs when the message is deemed *relevant*. For Wang (2006), *engagement* results from contextual *relevance*. Thus, relevance cannot be present if consumers are not involved and engagement is a result of perceived relevance. Thus, it appears that involvement, relevance and engagement are more synonyms than distinct constructs. The differences in use depend on the scope (i.e., academic or professional). For the rest of this article, we define all forms of consumer involvement, engagement, and perceived relevance as dimensions of overall advertising involvement.

2.2. Types of involvement used in advertising research

In the advertising literature, while the discourse on ad involvement is wide, how to classify ad involvement and the results of studies using ad involvement do not always allow for a clear understanding of what involvement entails (Day, Stafford, & Camacho, 1995). Several types of involvement can be found: situational (Celsi & Olson, 1988); product-related (Zaichkowsky, 1994); enduring (Lumpkin, 1985); message (Lord & Burnkrant, 1993); purchase (Slama & Tashchian, 1985); and program (Levy & Nebenzahl, 2006) involvement, to name a few. Generally, involvement types are regrouped into either enduring or situational (Day et al., 1995), even if some types can be classified as both, depending on the ad context and how they are manipulated. For example, political involvement can be situational when a campaign is relevant or interesting, or enduring when politics have a central role for consumers. Thus, political involvement differs based on how consumers answer two similar but distinct statements: “this political campaign is important to me” and “I am interested in politics.”

For Celsi and Olson (1988), situational involvement occurs when individuals are motivated to act upon their feelings. It is a more action oriented aspect of involvement. What is relevant to consumers is outlined as felt involvement (Celsi, Chow, Olson, & Walker, 1992). “This perspective explicitly recognizes that a consumer's perception or feeling of personal relevance for an object or event is an acute state that only occurs at certain times and in certain situations” (Celsi & Olson, 1988, p. 211). Situational involvement is ephemeral and at times inconsistent, as what is relevant today may not be tomorrow. Thus, situational involvement can be highly subjective and dependent on past experiences, memories, interpretations and ultimately, on how relevant the advertising is to the consumer well-being (Petty, Cacioppo, & Goldman, 1981).

In contrast, enduring involvement relates to interests and relevance. Howard and Sheth (1969) mention types of products or characteristics as reasons for involvement—stating that the relevance of these likely leads to purchase intent. Other examples are involvement with politics (Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, & Burton, 1990), or product involvement (Zaichkowsky, 1994). Other than product, media can have an influence if consumers feel an ad is relevant. For Krugman (1965), television is a low involvement medium, and print is a high involvement one, regardless of the content or the advertiser. De Pelsmacker, Geuens, and Anckaert (2002) discuss media context as “an important situational factor. Media context is defined as the characteristics of the content of the medium in which an ad is inserted” (p. 49). Seemingly, they allude to media involvement as being situational rather than enduring, in contrast to Krugman (1965). Yet they make the link between content and media and the relationship between these two features of advertising working in tandem rather than independently.

In marketing, involvement is a state modified by personal characteristics, including motivation, and dependent on the personal relevance of the involving object (Day et al., 1995). As such, involvement can be manipulated prior to advertising exposure and/or measured after advertising exposure (Kamins, Assael, & Graham, 1990; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979). In advertising, an involvement manipulation requires personal relevance to be created via stimuli, or relevance to be supported by the stimuli using quality arguments and evaluative cues (Zaichkowsky, 1986). It is argued that artificially manipulating involvement creates situational involvement whereas classifying respondents based on their existing levels of involvement gauges enduring involvement (Laczniak & Muehling, 1993). As such rather than examining involvement as a state variable, researchers look at the antecedents of involvement as a means to explain the outcomes of involvement (Bloch & Richins, 1983; Zaichkowsky, 1986).

2.3. Involvement as an antecedent: one or many dimensions?

Several studies show the value of involvement as a marketing variable. For example, Laczniak and Muehling (1993) compare brand related beliefs across varying levels of message involvement. Others sought to create measures for involvement types, for example product involvement (Zaichkowsky, 1985). While some proposed scales of involvement, others caution against generalizing the concept of involvement (Laczniak & Muehling, 1990). Day et al. (1995) state: “Because the object of involvement ranges from activities and issues to advertisements and purchases, no single scale can measure all kinds of involvement” (p.72). Similarly to Zaichkowsky (1986), for Day et al. (1995) while it is known what types of involvement there are and how the intensity of involvement can impact marketing variables, little is known about the combination of these involvement constructs in advertising and what involves consumers overall. It could be that an advertisement is involving because the media format in which it is presented, the product that is shown and the messages in the ad are all *together* captivating. Few studies combine involvement with other variables, for example, product involvement and media format in order to examine consumer outcome behaviors (De Pelsmacker et al., 2002). However these studies model involvement and context as opposing factors rather than as related dimensions of an overall concept.

2.4. Is engagement the same as overall involvement?

The various involvement measures used in academic research can make understanding what involvement means confusing and difficult to apply in professional contexts. Recently, both practitioners and academics tried to understand how integrated marketing communications work (Calder & Malthouse, 2005) and examined a new concept called *engagement*. Wang (2006) defines engagement as a “critical measurement of when consumers are strongly engaged in brands, brand messages, and their surrounding environments” (p. 356). Rappaport (2007) defines engagement as brand relevance and an emotional relationship between the consumer and the brand, all occurring within a quality context (see also, Geuens, De Pelsmacker, & Faseur, 2011). Briefly Wang (2006) makes the link between engagement and involvement by claiming that once contextual relevance is achieved, engagement drives message involvement.

Empirically, engagement is rarely operationalized. In some designs, engagement is manipulated as with or without contextual relevance between a primary task and an online advertisement (Wang, 2006). When engagement is tested it is identified at the focal attention stage (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984), and it is only possible to

Please cite this article as: Spielmann N, Richard M-O, How captive is your audience? Defining overall advertising involvement, J Bus Res (2012), doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.12.002

دریافت فوری ← **متن کامل مقاله**

ISIArticles
مرجع مقالات تخصصی ایران

- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه تمام متن مقالات انگلیسی
- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه ترجمه شده مقالات
- ✓ پذیرش سفارش ترجمه تخصصی
- ✓ امکان جستجو در آرشیو جامعی از صدها موضوع و هزاران مقاله
- ✓ امکان دانلود رایگان ۲ صفحه اول هر مقاله
- ✓ امکان پرداخت اینترنتی با کلیه کارت های عضو شتاب
- ✓ دانلود فوری مقاله پس از پرداخت آنلاین
- ✓ پشتیبانی کامل خرید با بهره مندی از سیستم هوشمند رهگیری سفارشات