

Male fashion leadership: Hedonic and utilitarian clothing shopping motivations within the South African context

Lizelle Janse van Rensburg^a, Bertha Jacobs^a and Marien Graham^b

^aDepartment of Consumer and Food Sciences, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa;

^bDepartment of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

*CONTACT: Marien Graham. Email: marien.graham@up.ac.z

Abstract

This study aimed to explore how male fashion innovators and opinion leaders differ regarding hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations for clothing. The survey data were collected using an online self-administered questionnaire that was developed from existing scales. A total of 220 usable questionnaires completed by a purposive sample of male respondents residing and working in urban metropolitans around Gauteng, South Africa, were analysed. MANOVA tests were run to determine the differences between fashion innovators and fashion opinion leaders in terms of hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations. The findings indicated that fashion innovators were significantly more motivated by hedonic shopping motivation, especially escapism, role, social, and idea shopping. Fashion opinion leaders, alternatively, were more motivated by efficiency shopping. Interestingly, achievement shopping motivation was the most influential shopping driver for both fashion opinion leaders and fashion innovators.

Keywords: fashion leadership, innovators, opinion-leaders, shopping motivations; hedonic, utilitarian

1. Introduction

Fashion change is an important growth strategy for retailers. Fashion change is the planned obsolescence of fashion or product trends promoted by retailers to get consumers to purchase new products (Rahman et al., 2014). The fashion change strategy is carried out by constantly introducing new clothing products. Consumers are encouraged to reject older styles for the latest fashionable styles (Lang & Armstrong, 2018). Fashion change is also achieved through targeting fashion leaders (Kim & Hong, 2011; Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010). Fashion leaders play a fundamental role in retailers' success in launching fashion products as they act as agents of change who facilitate the diffusion of fashion products and accelerate adoption (Clark & Goldsmith, 2006).

Because fashion leaders are instrumental in the fashion adoption and diffusion process, several studies have focused on fashion leadership (Workman & Lee, 2017; Cho & Workman, 2014; Kim & Hong, 2011; Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010). However, most fashion leadership research has primarily focused on women, as women are more likely to be considered fashion leaders (Cho & Workman, 2014). This has led to male fashion leadership receiving limited attention in research. Generally, male consumers are believed to be less interested in fashion products and less involved in shopping for clothing. Research suggests otherwise, as a definite shift in societal roles and gender expectations has taken place in recent years, sparking males' interest and involvement in fashion and appearance (Koksal, 2014; Naderi, 2013; Shepard et al., 2016). Even though female fashion leaders are mainly the focus of apparel retailers and marketers, retailers are becoming more consumer-centric, aiming to serve all their target markets better to maintain profit and increase market share (Varley, 2014). Apart from introducing new products and being customer-centric to stimulate sales, introducing new fashion products to new consumer markets has become an invaluable strategy for retailers (Guercini & Runfola, 2019). Male consumers' interest and involvement

in shopping for fashion opened the opportunity for retailers to tap into unexplored markets. Insights into male fashion leadership might also lead to a reduced marketing budget as fashion leaders are the enablers and promoters of the latest fashion trends (Al-Obaidi et al., 2020). More so understanding male fashion leadership in South Africa, with many emerging consumer segments, could be critical for retailers, because it explains the role of specific consumer motivations to engage in buying new fashion products and ultimately ensure commercial success and profitability in the competitive fashion retail industry (Marketline, 2021; Guercini & Runfola, 2019).

Previous studies (Kim & Hong, 2011; Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010) did not explicitly explain what drives male fashion leadership or what motivates male fashion leaders. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to empirically investigate the difference between male fashion innovators' and fashion opinion leaders' shopping motivations (i.e., hedonic and utilitarian motivations) in South Africa.

2. Review of literature

2.1 Theoretical framework

The Diffusion of Innovation theory (DoI) (Rogers, 2003) was employed to support the difference between fashion innovators' and fashion opinion leaders' hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations. Rogers' DoI model has been adapted and used in various studies investigating consumer behaviour and adoption of fashion in different social systems (Workman & Lee, 2017). The DoI theory considers that individuals in a social system do not simultaneously adopt an innovation. Different adopter categories can be identified based on their level of innovativeness (Rogers, 2003). Individuals in the adopter categories reflect distinctive behavioural traits that differentiate early adopter groups from followers (Phau & Lo, 2004). Following Rogers' (2003) DoI theory, fashion leadership is a personal

characteristic exhibited by early adopter groups who represent a small portion of individuals who are the first to adopt new fashion or innovation in their social system (Kaiser, 1997).

Even though fashion leaders represent a small portion of the consumer market (16%), they are the primary buyers of fashion products in the introductory stage and have consumer characteristics that are essential to activate the fashion diffusion process (Kim & Hong, 2011; Brannon & Divita, 2015). Fashion leaders are also consumer change agents because of their ability to influence or ‘change’ others’ decisions to adopt new ideas or innovations (Rogers, 2003).

2.2 Fashion leadership

Fashion leadership is a two-dimensional construct consisting of fashion innovators and fashion opinion leaders (Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010). Fashion innovators and opinion leaders respectively represent 2.5% and 13.5% of the population (Rogers, 2003). Fashion innovators are the ‘instigators of fashion change’ (Cho & Workman, 2014, p.372) and the first to adopt and buy new fashion before other consumers. They give new fashion visibility within their social networks (McDonald & Alpert, 2007; Workman & Studak, 2005). In comparison, fashion opinion leaders are not necessarily the first to adopt new fashion but are vital in spreading information and awareness about the fashion in their social groups through interpersonal communication (Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010; Goldsmith & Clark, 2008). They encourage others, visually and verbally, to buy and wear the latest fashion (Cho & Workman, 2014).

Fashion innovators have distinct consumer characteristics such as high levels of innovativeness, fashion involvement, and a need for uniqueness (Workman & Lee, 2017; Workman & Studak, 2005). At the same time, fashion opinion leaders are characterised by their higher socioeconomic status, knowledge of new fashion, and use of interpersonal

communication to influence fashion followers within their social system (Bertrandias & Goldsmith, 2006). Even though these two early adopter categories are characterised differently (Rogers, 2003), researchers have found that change agents such as fashion innovators and fashion opinion leaders are essential in activating and influencing other consumers to adopt new fashion (Kaiser, 1997; Rahman et al., 2014; Workman & Lee, 2017).

2.3. Male consumers' fashion behavior in the South African market

In 2020, menswear contributed 37% (\$2,610.3 million) of the total apparel retail value of \$6,931.3 million in the South African retail industry (Marketline, 2021). Prinsloo (2015) highlights the growing trend in South African males' interest and involvement in shopping for clothing. Especially, younger males (under 45 years) in South Africa are more involved in fashion purchasing and tend to be more fashion conscious than their older counterparts (Venter et al., 2016; Tshabalala, 2014). Moreover, South African males are price and brand conscious when shopping for clothing (Van Belkum, 2016). Men are also more affected by normative receptiveness when buying clothing than women across South African population groups (Kolatsis, 2017), suggesting that men strongly consider advice from their reference group when purchasing clothing. This is consistent with Tshabalala (2014), who found that more fashion involved Generation Y male consumers act as fashion opinion leaders amongst their social network – providing advice on what to buy and wear.

Previous studies found differences across gender in fashion involvement, fashion consciousness, and reference group influences in South Africa (Kolatsis, 2017; Venter et al., 2016; Tshabalala, 2014; Kotzé et al., 2012,). However, very limited research exists on differences within male fashion leadership groups, particularly between fashion innovators and fashion opinion leaders and the driving forces behind their shopping for fashion in the South African context.

2.4 Fashion leadership and shopping motivations

Shopping motivations refer to internal driving forces that compel consumers to behave specifically when purchasing fashion products (Solomon & Rabolt, 2004). The shopping motivations that drive shopping decisions and activity comprise hedonic and utilitarian motivations (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003; Babin et al., 1994). On the one hand, hedonic shopping motivations relate to the multisensory and enjoyable aspects of consumption (Cardoso & Pinto, 2010; Arnold & Reynolds, 2003). On the other hand, utilitarian shopping motivations are task-orientated, rational, and depend on a particular consumption need or accomplishing a specific goal with the shopping trip (Cardoso & Pinto, 2010). Individuals with higher fashion innovativeness or opinion leadership differ in consumer behavior (Cho & Workman, 2014) and may not be similarly motivated by hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations (Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010).

2.4.1 Hedonic shopping motivations

Arnold and Reynolds (2003) developed six broad dimensions of hedonic shopping motivations: adventure shopping, social shopping, gratification shopping, idea shopping, role shopping, and value shopping. *Adventure shopping* refers to shopping for stimulation, adventure, and the feeling of being in another world. *Social shopping* is defined as the enjoyment of shopping with friends and family, socialising while shopping, and bonding with others while shopping. *Gratification shopping* involves shopping for stress relief and alleviating a negative mood. *Idea shopping* refers to shopping to keep up with fashion trends and innovations. The enjoyment that shoppers derive from shopping for others or finding the perfect gift refers to *role shopping*. Kang and Park-Poaps, (2010) found female fashion innovators to be more influenced by hedonic shopping motivations such as adventure, gratification, idea, social, and role shopping motivations. Finally, *value Shopping* is described

as shopping for sales, looking for discounts, and hunting for bargains (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003).

2.4.2 Utilitarian shopping motivations

Consumers are motivated to purchase products with an efficient and timely expenditure of resources (Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010). Overall male fashion leaders tend to focus on more utilitarian aspects such as quality, price, convenience, and service (Koksal, 2014). Kim (2006) defines two dimensions of utilitarian motivation: efficiency and achievement. *Efficiency* refers to the consumer's need to save time and resources. Male shoppers are believed to spend less time shopping, are more time-conscious, and do not invest the same resources in shopping as women (Workman & Lee, 2011). Many men avoid shopping altogether, and if they cannot avoid it, they shop speedily. *Achievement*

shopping refers to a goal related shopping orientation where success in finding specific planned products (Kim, 2006). Workman and Studak (2005) found that men reflected a 'need-based' approach to fashion problem recognition, indicating that men lean towards achievement shopping motivations. Shopping for men is not a social and fun activity but rather completing a task (Workman & Cho, 2013).

Fashion leaders' characteristics could account for differences in their motivational drivers. Fashion innovators are more venturesome and actively seek new ideas and fashion (Zeba & Ganguli, 2019). They have a greater need for uniqueness and variety in the form of mental stimulation (Michon et al., 2007). Fashion innovators portray specific behavior towards idea shopping and keeping up with trends because they enjoy the mental stimulation; they seek information through media and store environments (Brannon & Divita, 2015). This implies that fashion innovators' desire for new ideas and experimenting with new fashions at the very first stage of the fashion lifecycle are primary motivations (Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010; Zeba & Ganguli, 2019). In contrast, consumers portraying high levels of fashion

opinion leadership were more motivated by utilitarian shopping motives, such as the achievement of shopping goals and efficiency of the shopping process, rather than hedonic shopping motivations (Cardoso & Pinto, 2010; Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010). Male consumers with higher opinion leader traits are more likely to be brand loyal, have knowledge about well-known brands, price competitiveness, and seek out knowledgeable salespeople (Carpenter & Brosdahl, 2011; Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010).

This study hypothesises that male fashion leaders (i.e., fashion innovators and fashion opinion leaders) would be motivated by different shopping motivations.

H1a: Hedonic shopping motivations (adventure, social, gratification, idea, role, and value shopping) will differ between male fashion innovators and fashion opinion leaders.

H2a: Utilitarian shopping motivations (efficiency and achievement shopping) will differ between male fashion innovators and fashion opinion leaders.

4. Method

A survey research design explored the different shopping motivations that drive male fashion leadership behaviour. With a survey design, the opinions of a sample from the larger target population can be obtained about the specific phenomenon under investigation (Creswell, 2014). The survey data was used to test the hypotheses developed for this study.

4.1 Sample, sampling, and data collection

Primary data was collected from a purposive sample via a pre-tested self-administered questionnaire. An online survey tool, Survey Monkey©, was used to collect the data. Male consumers who portrayed fashion leadership characteristics and lived in Gauteng, a province in South Africa, were the target population. Previous research has indicated that fashion

leaders are generally younger and largely reside in cities (Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010). Therefore to obtain a meaningful sample, a purposive sampling technique was employed to target males living in metropolitans. Purposive sampling is especially effective when specific characteristics, representative or typical attributes are required for the sample (Strydom, 2011).

Purposive and snowball sampling techniques were employed to include males who contained characteristics of fashion leadership, which was a requirement for analysis in this study. The researchers first approached personal and professional male contacts who portrayed fashion leadership behaviour to participate in this study. The male contacts who indicated that they: are usually the first in their social group to buy and wear new fashion, enjoy experimenting with new fashion; are knowledgeable about the latest fashion, and are frequently asked by their friends what to wear or buy, were invited to participate in the study. The survey link with more detail about the purpose of the study was emailed once they gave their consent.

Following this, a snowballing technique was used to recruit more participants. Communication patterns and friendships among a clique of innovators are common, even though they may be geographically distanced (Rogers, 2003). Therefore, these contacts were asked to share the survey link with potential participants who portrayed similar fashion leadership characteristics. The referral or snowballing technique maximised exposure and provided access to similar and appropriate participants (Strydom, 2011). Due to the snowballing technique, it was impossible to determine how many potential participants received the survey link through other participants or referrals. Initially, 276 participants started the questionnaire, and 250 completed it, resulting in a completion rate of 90.5%. A total of 220 usable questionnaires without missing values were subjected to data analysis.

4.2 Instrument development

Existing scales measuring fashion leadership and shopping motivations were adapted to develop the survey instrument. The survey instrument also captured general demographic information about the participants, such as age, population group, income, and where they reside within Gauteng. Goldsmith, Flynn, and Moore's (1996) six-item domain-specific innovativeness scale and Flynn, Goldsmith, and Eastman's (1996) fashion opinion leadership scale were adapted to measure fashion leadership. Shopping motivation constructs were measured by adjusting Arnold and Reynolds' (2003) scale for the hedonic shopping dimensions and Kim's (2006) utilitarian motivation scale for achievement and efficiency constructs. The reliability and validity of these scales have been established in previous studies on fashion behavior (Cardoso & Pinto, 2010; Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010). The scales were also adapted to address the hypotheses within a South African context. Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with each statement according to their self-perception on a six-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 = very strongly disagree to 6 = very strongly agree. A six-point Likert-type scale was used to avoid neutral responses that are generally popular responses in five and seven-point Likert scales (Mazzocchi, 2008). Validity was accomplished by using scales that have been proven successful in previous research, the conceptualisation and operationalisation of constructs, and the adaptation of scales to the context of the study.

4.3 Data analysis

SPSS was used to perform data analysis, including descriptive statistics, reliability measures, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), cluster analysis, and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). To divide the sample into two clusters according to the participants' level of fashion innovativeness or fashion opinion leadership, a *proc fastclus* cluster analysis was

performed. A *k*-means analysis has a predetermined number of clusters (*k*), and it groups the number of participants into clusters with similar mean scores on the variables of interest (Hair et al., 2014). Once the clusters were identified, MANOVAs were performed. MANOVA allowed determining whether significant differences exist between the independent groups for a set of variables or more than one dependent variable (i.e., hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations) (Mazzocchi, 2008).

5. Results

5.1 Sample characteristics

A total of two-hundred-and-twenty ($N = 220$) questionnaires were analysed. The sample included males residing and working in two urban metropolitans, Pretoria (62%) and Johannesburg (38%) in Gauteng, South Africa, between 19 and 58 years, with an average age of 28.68 years. Most participants (71.11%) were between 19 and 29 years, with 21.78% of participants between 30 and 39 years, and only 7.11% of the participants over 40 years of age.

5.2 Exploratory factor analysis

Even though reliable existing scales were used to develop the survey instrument, the scales were initially used and validated on samples from more developed contexts. Reliability and validity cannot be assumed when an instrument is used in a new setting or on a new sample (Hair et al., 2014; Sabbah et al., 2003). To assess the construct validity and internal consistency of the underlying factor structure, an EFA was conducted for items related to fashion leadership (i.e. fashion innovativeness, fashion opinion leadership), hedonic shopping motivations (i.e., adventure, social, gratification, idea, role, value) and utilitarian shopping motivations (i.e., efficiency, achievement). The EFA was performed utilising

varimax rotation with Kaiser normalisation. Based on Kaiser's criterion, all factors with an eigenvalue of ≥ 1 and items with a factor loading of ≥ 0.5 and no cross-loadings were retained (Mazzocchi, 2008).

Nine factors, each with an eigenvalue of above one, were retained. **Table 1** presents these factors, which explain 60.31% of the cumulative variance in male fashion leadership. The first factor, which was re-labelled as escapism shopping, was formed by collapsing two hedonic shopping motivation constructs: adventure and gratification. The escapism shopping factor had an eigenvalue of 15.54 and explained 31.60% of the variance. This factor included nine items about participants' preference for shopping for pleasure, stimulation, adventure, stress relief or escape from their mundane everyday life. The second factor, *fashion innovativeness*, had an eigenvalue of 3.52, explained 6.55% of the variance, and included six items. Four items were retained from the original fashion innovativeness scale, relating to participants' need for uniqueness, being the first to know about new fashion, and being the first to buy new fashion. Two items from the original fashion opinion leadership scale: "My friends do not turn to me for advice when they are buying fashionable clothing" and "Other people rarely come to me for advice about choosing fashionable clothes" were retained for this factor. Fashion innovators are essential, as these consumers are the first to adopt a style and influence the adoption of others by creating initial awareness (Phau & Lo, 2004). Although fashion innovators are not the consumers who spread the innovation through word-of-mouth, they create awareness through visual display by buying and wearing new fashion (Brannon & Divita, 2015).

Table 1. Exploratory factor analysis for constructs

Variable	Factor loading	Eigen-value	α	Mean
<i>Escapism Shopping (Adventure and Gratification)</i>				
To me, shopping for clothes is a way to relieve stress	0.83	15.54	0.92	3.03
I go shopping to make myself feel better	0.83			
When I'm in a down mood, I go shopping for clothes to make me feel better	0.79			
I go shopping when I want to treat myself to something special	0.72			
I find shopping stimulating	0.69			
Shopping for clothing is a fun experience	0.68			
Shopping makes me feel like I am in another world	0.63			
Shopping is a way for me to get away from my everyday routine	0.61			
To me, shopping for clothing is an adventure	0.60			
<i>Fashion Innovativeness</i>				
In general, I am among the last in my circle of friends to purchase a new outfit or fashion	-0.82	3.52	0.89	3.56
In general, I am among the last in my circle of friends to know the latest fashion trends	-0.76			
My friends do not turn to me for advice when they are buying fashionable clothing	-0.74			
In general, I am the last on my circle of friends to know the names of the latest designers	-0.74			
Other people rarely come to me for advice about choosing fashionable clothes	-0.72			
Compared to my friends, I do little shopping for new clothing fashions	-0.62			
<i>Value Shopping</i>				
When shopping for clothing, I prefer going to sales	0.84	3.14	0.84	3.74
I enjoy hunting for bargains when I shop for clothing	0.82			
For the most part, I go clothes shopping when there are sales	0.78			
I enjoy looking for discounts when I shop	0.71			
<i>Achievement Shopping</i>				
It is important to me to find what I had planned on a particular shopping trip	0.71	2.56	0.70	4.46
It is important that I know what clothing I am looking for when shopping and that I find it	0.69			
It feels good to know that my shopping trip was successful	0.59			
On a particular shopping trip, it is important to find the clothes I am looking for	0.51			
<i>Fashion Opinion Leadership</i>				
I often influence people's opinions about fashion	0.69	1.99	0.78	3.12
People that I know make their clothing choices based on what I have told them	0.64			
I talk to my friends about the new clothing I have bought	0.51			
<i>Efficiency Shopping</i>				
I like shopping for clothing when it is over quickly	0.75	1.66	0.75	4.27
A good store visit is when it is over very quickly	0.70			
It is frustrating when I have to go to multiple stores to complete my clothes shopping	0.55			
I like shopping for clothing when it is easy to find what I want	0.55			
<i>Role Shopping</i>				
I prefer shopping for others	0.83	1.59	0.85	2.67
I like buying clothes for others because when they feel good, I feel good	0.75			
I enjoy shopping for my friends	0.74			
I enjoy shopping for my family	0.67			
I enjoy shopping around to find the perfect clothing gift for someone	0.62			
<i>Social Shopping</i>				
Clothing shopping trips with friends are enjoyable	0.84	1.29	0.88	3.01
Shopping with others is a bonding experience	0.80			
I enjoy hanging out with my friends when I shop for clothes	0.74			
I go clothing shopping with my friends to socialise	0.72			
I prefer shopping alone	0.62			
<i>Idea Shopping</i>				
I like to buy new clothes as soon as it becomes available in stores	-0.80	1.18	0.89	2.97
I go shopping to keep up with new fashions	-0.78			

I go shopping to keep up with the trends	-0.72
I like to buy unique clothes as soon as it becomes available in stores	-0.72
I don't care about new fashions when I go shopping for clothes	-0.57
I go shopping to see what new products are available	-0.56
I often persuade other people to buy the fashion that I like	-0.55

The third factor, *value shopping*, retained all four original items and measured the extent to which the participants sought out sales, looked for discounts, and hunted for bargains when purchasing clothing. This factor had an eigenvalue of 3.14 and explained 5.81% of the variance. The fourth factor, *achievement shopping*, tapped into how the participants were motivated by finding what they wanted, reaching their goals, and the success rate in locating specific products planned when purchasing clothing. This factor obtained an eigenvalue of 2.56 and explained 4.35% of the variance. The fifth factor, *fashion opinion leadership*, retained three of the seven original items. The remaining three items related strongly to word-of-mouth- and interpersonal communication between participants and their social groups. Fashion opinion leaders are likely to use interpersonal communication to influence their intimate group of friends in new fashion (Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010). Fashion opinion leadership had an eigenvalue of 1.99, and this factor explained 3.36% of the variance.

The sixth factor, *efficiency shopping*, retained all four original items, measuring the need to save time. The eigenvalue for efficiency shopping was 1.66, explaining 2.64% of the variance. The seventh factor, *role shopping*, also retained all five original items measuring participants' derived pleasure from shopping for others. Role shopping had an eigenvalue of 1.59 and explained 2.55% of the variance. The eighth factor, *social shopping*, consisted of five items indicating an overall preference for socialising whilst shopping for clothing. This factor had an eigenvalue of 1.29, and 1.84% of the variance was explained by it. The last factor, *idea shopping*, retained the four original idea shopping items, two fashion innovativeness, and one fashion opinion leadership item. Idea shopping measured

participants' overall need to seek new trends or products or find unique clothes first. Idea shopping rendered an eigenvalue of 1.18 and explained 1.61% of the variance.

The validity of the proposed instrument that emerged through the EFA was assessed by evaluating the internal consistency of each factor. The Cronbach alpha values indicated that the internal reliability for all constructs was high, varying from 0.70 (Achievement shopping) to 0.92 (Escapism shopping), indicating a good measure of internal consistency of all the constructs (Mazzocchi, 2008).

5.3 Cluster analysis

The *k*-means cluster analysis aimed to divide the sample into two independent groups: fashion innovators (FI) and fashion opinion leaders (FOL). To form the distinct clusters, "measurements on a set of variables" can be used (Mazzocchi, 2008, p. 264). The two clusters were formed using the items retained from the EFA measuring fashion innovativeness and fashion opinion leadership (**Table 1**). The two clusters rendered a good cubic clustering criterion of 39.726 (> 3), indicating two distinguishable clusters or groups (Statsoft, 2013). The fashion innovator cluster consisted of 46.81% ($n=103$; $M=4.35$) and the fashion opinion leadership cluster 53.18% ($n=117$; $M=3.89$) of the sample. Items used to form the clusters, and the descriptive statistics of each cluster are outlined in **Table 2**.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for clusters from EFA

Scale items from EFA	Mean	Std dev	α
<i>Cluster 1: Fashion Innovators (FI_{clus1}) (n= 103)</i>	4.35		0.89
In general, I am among the last in my circle of friends to purchase a new outfit or fashion	4.53	0.81	
In general, I am among the last in my circle of friends to know the latest fashion trends	4.65	0.90	
My friends do not turn to me for advice when they are buying fashionable clothing	4.17	1.01	
In general, I am the last in my circle of friends to know the names of the latest designers	4.67	1.17	
Other people rarely come to me for advice about choosing fashionable clothes	4.17	0.97	
Compared to my friends, I do little shopping for new clothing fashions	3.89	1.05	
<i>Cluster 2: Fashion Opinion Leaders (FOL_{clus2}) (n=117)</i>	3.89		0.78
I often influence people's opinions about fashion	3.93	0.99	
People that I know make their clothing choices based on what I have told them	3.70	0.98	
I talk to my friends about the new clothing I have bought	4.03	1.20	

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) tests were run to determine if there were any noteworthy differences between the identified clusters FI_{clus1} and FOL_{clus2} (independent variables) in terms of shopping motivations (dependent variables) (Mayers, 2013). Levene's test for equality of variance confirmed the homogeneity of variance for the two clusters to be the same and significant at $p \leq 0.05$ (Mazzocchi, 2008). A test of equality of covariance was run to test the null hypothesis that the dependent variables were equal across groups. The Wilk's Lambda tests ($F = 22.36(\text{df: } 5, 214.00)$) at $p < 0.001$ confirmed that at least two of the means for hedonic shopping motivations differed significantly. The same was true for the utilitarian shopping motivations means (Wilk's Lambda ($F = 24.76(\text{df: } 2, 217.00)$) $p < 0.001$) across the two clusters. The null hypotheses, H1₀: Hedonic shopping motivations (adventure, social, gratification, idea, role, and value shopping) will not differ between male fashion innovators and fashion opinion leaders; and H2₀: Utilitarian shopping motivations (efficiency and achievement shopping) will not differ between male fashion innovators and fashion opinion leaders were rejected.

5.4 Hedonic shopping motivations

The test statistics of between-subjects indicated a significant difference at $p < 0.001$ between the means of hedonic shopping motivations: escapism shopping, role shopping, social shopping, and idea shopping across the FI and FOL clusters. Value shopping, however, had a p -value of 0.259, indicating no significant difference in means across the FI and FOL clusters exists. **Table 3** presents the results for the between-subject effects for hedonic shopping motivations.

Table 3: Test for between-subjects effects regarding hedonic motivations

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Clusters	Escapism Shopping	41.368	1	41.368	47.791	0.000*
	Value Shopping	1.329	1	1.329	1.283	0.259
	Role Shopping	19.809	1	19.809	23.129	0.000*
	Social Shopping	21.642	1	21.642	25.122	0.000*
	Idea Shopping	76.400	1	76.400	113.765	0.000*

*Significant at $p < 0.001$

Table 4 presents the MANOVA with the mean scores for escapism shopping ($M_{FI} = 3.49$; $M_{FOL} = 2.62$), role shopping ($M_{FI} = 2.98$; $M_{FOL} = 2.38$), social shopping ($M_{FI} = 3.02$; $M_{FOL} = 2.39$) and idea shopping ($M_{FI} = 3.51$; $M_{FOL} = 2.33$) across the FI and FOL clusters at $p < 0.01$. However, no significant difference was observed between the means for value shopping ($M_{FI} = 3.82$; $M_{FOL} = 3.66$) between the clusters. Fashion innovators are seemingly more motivated by hedonic shopping motivations than fashion opinion leaders.

Table 4. MANOVA pairwise comparison for hedonic shopping motivation between clusters

Dependent Variable	Cluster	Mean	Std. Error	99% Confidence Interval for difference ^b	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Escapism Shopping*	FI	3.49	0.092	3.30	3.67
	FOL	2.62	0.086	2.45	2.79
Value Shopping	FI	3.82	0.100	3.62	4.02
	FOL	3.66	0.094	3.48	3.85
Role Shopping*	FI	2.98	0.091	2.80	3.16
	FOL	2.38	0.086	2.21	2.55
Social Shopping*	FI	3.02	0.091	2.84	3.20
	FOL	2.39	0.086	2.22	2.56
Idea Shopping*	FI	3.51	0.081	3.35	3.67
	FOL	2.33	0.076	2.18	2.48

*The mean difference is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level; b-Adjustment for multiple comparisons: least significant difference.

5.5 Utilitarian shopping motivations

As illustrated in **Table 5**, the test for between-subjects indicated a significant difference in the mean for efficiency shopping ($p < 0.001$) but no significant difference in terms of achievement shopping ($p = 0.085$) in terms of utilitarian shopping motivations.

Table 5. Test for between-subjects effects regarding utilitarian motivations

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Cluster	Achievement shopping	1.849	1	1.849	2.987	0.085
	Efficiency shopping	32.983	1	32.983	41.172	0.000*

*Significant with $p < 0.001$

Table 6 presents the MANOVA with the mean scores for the utilitarian shopping motivations across the FI and FOL clusters at $p < 0.01$. The mean scores differed significantly between the two clusters for efficiency ($M_{FI} = 3.85$; $M_{FOL} = 4.63$) but not for achievement shopping ($M_{FI} = 4.56$; $M_{FOL} = 4.38$). Therefore, fashion opinion leaders are more motivated by efficiency shopping motivations than fashion innovators. Fashion opinion leaders and fashion innovators are equally motivated by achievement shopping.

Table 6. MANOVA pairwise comparison for utilitarian shopping motivation between clusters

Dependent Variable	Cluster	Mean	Std. Error	99% Confidence Interval for difference ^b	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Achievement Shopping	FI	4.56	0.078	4.41	4.71
	FOL	4.38	0.073	4.23	4.52
Efficiency Shopping*	FI	3.85	0.088	3.68	4.03
	FOL	4.63	0.083	4.47	4.79

*The mean difference is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level; b-Adjustment for multiple comparisons: least significant difference.

6. Discussion and Conclusions

This study found that fashion innovators and opinion leaders have small nuanced differences in what drives their fashion behaviour. These differences are related to their hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations.

6.1 Hedonic shopping motivations and male fashion leadership

Hedonic shopping motivations are linked to the enjoyment and entertainment associated with shopping (Kim & Hong, 2011). The findings indicated that significant differences occur between fashion innovators' and opinion leaders' hedonic shopping motivations, especially in escapism, role, social, and idea shopping motivations. No significant differences were found in terms of value shopping motivation.

Fashion innovators were more motivated by *escapism shopping* motivations than fashion opinion leaders. This confirms previous findings that fashion innovators seek and desire adventure (Kang & Park-Poaps, 2010) and are more willing to take risks in terms of the products that they buy (Cho & Workman, 2014). Fashion innovators are predisposed to immerse themselves in shopping and seek memorable shopping experiences (Zeba & Ganguli, 2019). Escapism as a shopping driver can be further enhanced by focusing on the fashion innovator's desire for stimulation and out-of-the-ordinary experiences and to engender excitement and stress relief. Retailers could implement creative marketing

campaigns, exciting imagery, aesthetic design elements, and eye-catching visual merchandising to reach fashion innovators (Kim et al., 2010).

Regarding *role shopping*, fashion innovators were slightly more motivated by role shopping than fashion opinion leaders. Role shopping is mainly concerned with gift-giving and purchasing for other individuals. With the lowest mean ($M= 2.67$), the findings suggest that overall male consumers do not enjoy shopping for others. *Social shopping* refers to enjoying socialising while shopping (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003). Fashion innovators were more motivated by social shopping than opinion leaders. However, the mean score was average ($M= 3.01$), indicating that social shopping motivation might not be a strong driver for male fashion leaders. This confirms Shephard et al's (2014) findings that in general males might not find shopping itself an enjoyable social activity. To address social shopping motivations successfully, retailers should create an enjoyable shopping experience which can be communicated to friends and family in-person or via various interesting communication channels such as social media platforms and mobile apps (Shephard et al., 2014; Cho & Workman, 2011). Fashion opinion leaders use social shopping as an information-seeking activity (Kang & Park-Poaps, 2011). By encouraging word-of-mouth fashion opinion leaders can provide advice to family and friends on the latest fashion whereas fashion innovators fulfil their social shopping motivation by social browsing or postings on social media platforms (Kang & Park-Poaps, 2011).

Idea shopping relates to browsing to keep up with trends and new fashion products (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003). The findings showed that fashion innovators are significantly more motivated than fashion opinion leaders by idea shopping. Fashion innovators want to keep up with trends, and they also enjoy the mental stimulation they get from browsing (Brannon & Divita, 2015). Retailers targeting male fashion innovators should create fashion information-rich marketing material that pushes the boundaries of creativity and appeals to

the innovators' need to keep up with trends and new ideas and be the first to have new products (Al-Obaidi et al., 2020). Male fashion leaders are influenced by impersonal and personal information sources, therefore, store and window displays should be aesthetically pleasing and convey the latest fashion and sales staff should be knowledgeable about products to provide custom-made information (Rhaman & Kharb, 2020; Shephard et al., 2015). Conversely, retailers should utilise various online and social media platforms (e.g., Instagram, Twitter) to communicate with fashion opinion leaders as they are constantly seeking information about the latest fashion to convey visually and verbally to their social groups and are crucial in the spreading of new fashion ideas (Cho & Workman, 2014).

Value shopping motivations relate to shopping for sales, looking for discounts, and hunting for bargains (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003). The means for value shopping motivations did not differ significantly between fashion innovators and opinion leaders. The findings show that fashion innovators and opinion leaders are equally motivated by value purchases. This confirms previous findings that searching for value provides shopping satisfaction and a sense of accomplishment for male shoppers (Kotzé et al., 2012). As the most influential hedonic shopping driver in this study, retailers could appeal to fashion leaders by improving the value offering of products (Carpenter & Brosdahl, 2011). Quality is one of these aspects as it creates the impression of value for money, especially when combined with good and market-related price points (Solomon & Rabolt, 2004). Moreover, visible value offerings will increase the trailability and observability of fashion products, making these even more appealing to male fashion leaders (Rogers, 2003).

6.2 Utilitarian shopping motivations and male fashion leadership

Both fashion opinion leaders and innovators were equally motivated in terms of achievement shopping motivations. This aligns with other studies that have found that men

tend to shop with an end goal in mind and focus on fulfilling this need or purpose (Workman & Studak, 2005; Otnes & McGrath, 2001). Interestingly, *achievement shopping* was overall the most influential shopping motivation ($M = 4.46$, **Table 1**) for male fashion leaders. As the most influential shopping motivation for fashion innovators and opinion leaders, retailers should focus most of their marketing efforts and product offering on satisfying achievement shopping drivers. Aspects such as convenience, quick service, and easy-to-find merchandise are important (Kotzé et al., 2012; Workman & Lee, 2011). Merchandising new fashion products so that it is visible and easy to find in stores will ensure that fashion leaders see and buy these styles. Furthermore, the merchandise assortment should align with what the fashion leader was looking for at the onset of the shopping trip. Offering convenient retail channels (e.g., online stores) for shopping will also appeal to fashion leaders and provide a higher level of achievement. On top of that, excellent customer service and readily available information about fashion products will activate the diffusion process early on (Brannon & Divita, 2015).

A significant difference was found between fashion innovators and opinion leaders in *efficiency shopping* motivations. For fashion opinion leaders, it was the most vital driver. Efficiency can be stimulated by offering the perception of saving time and resources (Kim, 2006). Fashion opinion leaders need to be targeted by highlighting an efficient shopping environment. Fashion opinion leaders interact and spread fashion innovation visually and verbally (Goldsmith & Flynn, 1992). Therefore, fashion followers constantly imitate fashion opinion leaders. Fashion opinion leaders need to find the fashion products quickly and view the value offerings as this saves time and resources. Offering the merchandise selection, they are looking for at the right price coupled with excellent customer service will also translate to positive word-of-mouth communication by fashion opinion leaders. Overall male fashion leaders are driven by quality, value for money, efficiency, and effortlessness (Workman &

Cho, 2012). Emphasis is placed on the fact that retailers need to focus on providing fashion products in an environment that is effortless for fashion leaders to patronise.

The successful diffusion of fashion products depends on fashion leaders' adoption of trends and products, and interpersonal communication, as they influence later adopters through word-of-mouth and their actions (Clark & Goldsmith, 2006). Although retailers determine how many fashion products are introduced into the market, fashion leaders dictate if that fashion product will be adopted or rejected (Brannon & Divita, 2015). The findings indicate that male fashion innovators and opinion leaders can successfully be targeted through hedonic and utilitarian drivers, especially within the current competitive retail climate. The success of new products will increase if retailers ensure a fashionable product offering at the right price, merchandised for easy access and convenience. Creating the perception of a quality shopping experience that will save time and resources will appeal to male fashion leaders. However, the fashion innovator still desires the more frivolous. Fashion innovators are influential consumers that can be targeted through hedonic shopping motivations such as escapism, role, and idea. Retailers need to display a high degree of fashionability, novelty, exclusivity, and relevant information to appeal to fashion innovators, but above all, the shopping experience should be effortless, and effective, and the desired product should be visible and easy to find for both fashion innovators and opinion leaders.

This study advances current insight into the shopping motivations behind male fashion leadership in South Africa. A clear understanding of male fashion leaders' motivations, needs, and wants is vital to ensure the commercial success of fashion products in the competitive retail landscape. Understanding the different nuances within male fashion leadership can enable retailers to accelerate the adoption process of their fashion products and yield an increased return on investment for retailers, better customer satisfaction and loyalty, and tailored retail offerings and shopping experiences for male consumers. Fashion leaders

are incredibly influential in the initial stages of a product's acceptance, and therefore understanding what drives male fashion leadership could assist in getting a sell-through of the latest fashion products in retail stores. The findings of this study could provide retailers with strategic ideas about which shopping motivations to focus on for which respective fashion leadership segment (i.e., fashion innovators or fashion opinion leaders). Additionally, the findings related to male fashion leaders' motivational needs could assist in market segmentation and tailoring product and promotional offerings for the respective fashion leadership groups. Through effective market segmentation, retailers and marketers will improve communication with the respective male fashion leadership segment, ensuring rapid adoption of their new fashion products. Finally, the findings confirm that male fashion shoppers' traditional characteristics are changing as men now have a prominent presence in shopping activities because of social and cultural changes (Koksal, 2014).

7. Limitations and recommendations for future research

The findings of this study were limited to male consumers only. Future studies could focus on comparisons between genders as well as generational cohorts. Comparative studies could also determine the differences between female and male fashion leaders, different population groups, and different cohorts. Additionally, as the sample size was relatively small future studies would benefit from a bigger sample size to get more representative data. As this study was quantitative, future studies could focus on qualitative designs to uncover other personal characteristics or psychological factors that might drive fashion leadership.

Furthermore, it has been found that innovative behaviour cannot be generalised across different product categories or domains and that a consumer may be innovative about one product category but not towards another (Muzinich et al., 2003). This study focused on fashion products, which includes an overall view of clothing as a fashion product category.

Future research could focus on different fashion product categories, such as accessories, shoes, and jeans, to better understand and predict fashion leadership behavior related to a particular fashion product category. Finally, future studies could explore the role of social media platforms in the communication strategies of fashion leaders. This could provide important insight into how, what, and with whom fashion leaders communicate information about fashion products such as clothing.

References

- Al-Obaidi, L., Bataineh, A., Aljabaly, S. and Salhab, H., 2020. Factors influencing youths fashion leadership behavior of fashion retailing stores in Jordan. *Management Science Letters*, 10(16), 3833-3842.
- Arnold, M.J. & Reynolds, K.E. (2003). Hedonic shopping motivations. *Journal of Retailing*, 79(2), 77-95.
- Babin, B.J., Darden, W.R. & Griffin, M. (1994). Work and/or fun: measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 20(4), 644-656.
- Bertrandias, L. & Goldsmith, R.E. (2006). Some psychological motivations for fashion opinion leadership and fashion opinion seeking. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*. (10)1, 25-40.
- Brannon, E.L. & Divita, L. (2015). *Fashion Forecasting*, 4th ed, Bloomsbury, New York.
- Cardoso, P.R. & Pinto, S.C. (2010). Hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations among Portuguese young adult consumers. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*. 38(7), 538-558.
- Carpenter, J.M. & Brosdahl, D.J.C. (2011). Exploring retail format choice among US Males. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*. 39(2),

886-898.

- Cho, S. & Workman, J.E. (2011). Gender, fashion innovativeness and opinion leadership and need for touch. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*. 15(3), 363-382.
- Cho, S. & Workman, J.E., 2014. Relationships among gender, fashion leadership, need for affect, and consumers' apparel shopping preference. *Family And Consumer Sciences Research Journal*. 42(4), 369-385.
- Clark, R.A. & Goldsmith, R.E. (2006). Interpersonal influence and consumer Innovativeness. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 30(1), 34-43.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Flynn, L.R., Goldsmith, R.E., & Eastman, J.K. (1996). Opinion leaders and opinion seekers: two new measurement scales. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 24(2), 137-147.
- Goldsmith, R.E. & Clark, R.A. (2008). An analysis of factors affecting fashion opinion leadership and fashion opinion seeking. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*. 12(3), 308-322.
- Goldsmith, R.E. & Flynn, L.R. (1992). Identifying innovators in consumer product markets. *European Journal of Marketing*. 26(12), 42-55.
- Goldsmith, R.E., Flynn, L.R., & Goldsmith, E.B. (2003). Innovative consumers and market Mavens. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*. 11(4), 54-65.
- Goldsmith, R.E., Flynn, L.R., & Moore, M.A. (1996). The self-concept of fashion leaders. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*. 14(4), 242-248.
- Goldsmith, R.E., Heitmeyer, J.R. & Freiden, J.B. (1991). Social values and fashion Leadership. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*. 10(1), 37-45.
- Guercini, S. & Runfola, A., 2019. Developing fashion retail operations to grow in emerging

- markets. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*. 10(2), 145-162.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. & Anderson, R.E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis*.
New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Kaiser, S.B. (1997). *The social psychology of clothing: Symbolic appearances* (2nd ed.).
New York: Fairchild.
- Kang, J. & Park-Poaps, H. (2010). Hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations of fashion
Leadership. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*. 14(2), 312-328.
- Kang, J. & Park-Poaps, H. (2011). Motivational antecedents of social shopping for fashion
and its contribution to shopping satisfaction. *Clothing and Textiles Research
Journal*. 29(4), 331-347.
- Kim, H.S. (2006). Using hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations to profile inner city
Consumers. *Journal of Shopping Centre Research*. 13(1), 57-79.
- Kim, H.S. & Hong, H. (2011). Fashion leadership and hedonic shopping motivations of
female consumers. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*. 29(4), 314-330.
- Kim, H., Fiore, A.M., Niehm, L.S. & Jeong, M. (2010). Psychographic characteristics
affecting behavioural intentions towards pop-up retail. *International Journal of
Retail and Distribution Management*. 38(2), 133-154.
- Koksal, M. H. (2014). Psychological and behavioural drivers of male fashion leadership.
Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics. 26(3), 430-449.
- Kotzé, T., North, E., Stols, M. & Venter, L. (2012). Gender differences in sources of
shopping enjoyment. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 36(4), 416-424.
- Kolatsis, S. (2017). Differences in interpersonal and impersonal influences on clothing brand
status consumption across different population groups (Masters dissertation,
University of Pretoria). Available at <https://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/63303>.
- Lang, C., & Armstrong, C. M. J. (2018). Fashion leadership and intention toward clothing

- product-service retail models. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 22(4), 571–587.
- Marketline. (2021). “Apparel retail in South Africa”, *Marketline Industry Profile*. Retrieved from <https://advantage-marketline-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/Analysis/ViewasPDF/south-africa-apparel-retail-140131>.
- Mayers, A. (2013). *Introduction to Statistics and SPSS in Psychology*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Mazzocchi, M. (2008). *Statistics for Marketing and Consumer Research*. London: SAGE.
- McDonald, H. & Alpert, F. (2007). Who are “innovators” and do they matter? A critical review of the evidence supporting the targeting of “innovative” consumers. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*. 25(5), 421-435.
- Michon, R., Yu, H., Smith, D., & Chebat, J.C. (2007). The shopping experience of female fashion leaders. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 35(6), 488-501.
- Mitchell, V.W. & Walsh, G. (2004). Gender differences in German consumer decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*. 3(4), 331-346.
- Muzinich, N., Pecotich, A., & Putrevu, S. (2003). A model of the antecedents and consequents of female fashion innovativeness. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. 10, 297–310.
- Naderi, I. (2013). Beyond the fad: a critical review of consumer fashion involvement. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 37(1), 84-104.
- Otnes, C. & McGrath, M.A. (2001). Perceptions and realities of male shopping behaviour. *Journal of Retailing*. 77(1), 111-137.
- Phau, I. & Lo, C.C. (2004). Profiling fashion innovators: a study of self-concept, impulse buying and Internet purchase intent. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and*

- Management*. 8(4), 399-411.
- Prinsloo, E. (2015). South African male consumers' involvement in their clothing purchases (Masters dissertation, University of Pretoria). Available at <https://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/53552>
- Rahman, O. & Kharb, D. (2018). Fashion innovativeness in India: shopping behaviour, clothing evaluation and fashion information sources. *International Journal of Fashion Design, Technology and Education*. 11(3), 287-298.
- Rahman, S.U., Saleem, S., Akhtar, S., Ali, T., & Hkan, M.A. (2014). Consumer's adoption of apparel fashion: the role of innovativeness, involvement, and social values. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*. 6(3), 49-64.
- Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovation* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Sabbah, I., Drouby, N., Sabbah, S., Retel-Rude, N., & Mercier, M. (2003). Quality of life in rural and urban populations in Lebanon using SF-36 health survey. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*. 1(1), 30-37.
- Shephard, A.J., Kinley, T.R., & Josiam, B.M. (2014). Fashion leadership, shopping enjoyment, and gender: Hispanic versus, Caucasian consumers' shopping preference. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. 21(3), 277-283.
- Shephard, A., Pookulangara, S., Kinley, T.R. & Josiam, B.M. (2015). Media influence, fashion, and shopping: a gender perspective. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*. 20(1), 4-18
- Solomon, M.R. & Rabolt, N.J. (2004). *Consumer behaviour in fashion*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Statsoft. (2013). *Electronic statistics textbook*. Retrieved from: <http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/>.
- Strydom, H. (2011). Sampling in the quantitative paradigm. in De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H.,

- Fouché, C.B. & Delport, C.S.L. (Ed.). *Research at Grass Roots: For the Social Sciences and Human Service Professions* (4th ed., pp. 222-234). Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Tshabalala, P. J. (2014). Fashion clothing involvement, opinion leadership and opinion seeking amongst black generation Y students (Masters dissertation, North West University). Available at <http://repository.nwu.ac.za/handle/10394/13089>.
- Varley, R. (2014). *Retail product management: buying and merchandising*. New York: Routledge.
- Van Belkum, M. (2016). Male consumers' evaluation of apparel assortments in South African speciality stores (Masters dissertation, University of Pretoria). Available at <https://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/57330>.
- Venter, M., Chinomona, R. & Chuchu, T. (2016). Factors Influencing Fashion Adoption among the Youth in Johannesburg, South Africa. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*. 8(4), 92-108.
- Workman, J. E., & Lee, S. H. (2011). Materialism, fashion consumers and gender: A cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 35(1), 50–57.
- Workman, J.E. & Cho, S. (2012). Gender, fashion consumer groups, and shopping Orientation. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*. 40(3), 267-283.
- Workman, J.E. & Lee, S.H. (2017). What do we know about fashion adoption groups? A proposal and test of a model of fashion adoption. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 41(2017), 61-69.
- Workman, J.E. & Studak, C.M. (2005). Relationship among fashion consumer groups, locus of control, boredom proneness, boredom coping and intrinsic enjoyment. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 31(11), 66-75.
- Zeba, F. & Ganguli, S. (2019). Novelty seeking as driving factor for fashion apparel innovators: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Global Fashion*

Marketing. 10(3), 246-266.