

MEASURING CONSUMERS' ATTITUDES TO LUXURY

Nicole STEGEMANN

University of Western Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Sara DENIZE

University of Western Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Kenneth E. MILLER

University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

ABSTRACT

Since the 90's, there has been an increasing interest in the concept of luxury and luxury brand management. In this paper we focus on attitudes towards the concept of luxury and aim to identify the limitations of the extant measure proposed by Dubois & Laurent (1994). Our focus on a generalised attitudinal measure is particularly relevant given the significance of attitudes and perceptions in forming brand equity, and its role in the consumers' purchase decisions.

Using a panel of expert judges we reviewed the validity of the measure. We then considered the reliability by reviewing other studies and subsequently performed our own reliability checks using a small study (n=139) of Australian business students. Our analysis highlights concerns with the validity and reliability of the scale initially developed by Dubois & Laurent (1994). Thus, we advocate a complete revision of the measure following Rossiter's scale development procedure C-OAR-SE (2002). The paper concludes with a proposed framework to be further tested using Rossiter's (2002) approach.

Key Words: Luxury, Scale Development, Measurement, Reliability, Validity

Correspondence

n.stegemann@uws.edu.au

s.denize@uws.edu.au

ken.miller@uts.edu.au

MEASURING CONSUMERS' ATTITUDES TO LUXURY

1. Introduction

In 1990, McKinsey (1990) estimated the market for luxury brands to be a \$60 billion (USD). At that time French brand names made up for 50% of the world market with a turnover of €30 billion worldwide (July 1991). Between 1985 and 1993, the luxury goods association Comité Colbert doubled their sales, with a turnover of \$5.5 billion (USD) in 1993 (Dubois & Laurent 1994). Similar meteoric growth is reported by other luxury brands, for example Louis Vuitton Moët Hennessy (LVMH) increased their net sales by 100% between 1997 and 2006 (LVMH 2000, 2006).

The significance of the luxury brand market has stimulated increasing attention to the phenomenon in the academic literature. Since the 90's, there has been an increasing interest in the concept of luxury and luxury brand management (Dubois, Czellar & Laurent 2005; Dubois & Laurent 1994; Dubois, Laurent & Czellar 2001; Kapferer 1997; Vigneron & Johnson 2004). This development is also confirmed by the special issues on researching luxury brands in *Revue Française du Marketing*, 132-133 (1991), and *Décision Marketing*, 9 (1996). Further, the business school ESSEC, Paris and LVMH jointly established the LVMH Chair to facilitate teaching and research in luxury brand management. The MBA Luxe has been successfully offered since 1995 (www.essec.fr).

Previous research has considered the socio-demographic characteristics of consumers and their preferences for, and attitudes to, luxury and luxury brands (Andrus, Silver & Johnston 1986; Bourdieu 1979; Dubois 1992; Dubois & Duquesne 1993; Dubois & Laurent 1993; Hirschman 1988; Kapferer 1997; LaBarbera 1988; Leibenstein 1950; Mason 1981, 1993; Stanley 1989; Wong & Ahuvia 1998). Other studies have examined consumers' luxury brand buying motives (Kapferer 1998; Vigneron & Johnson 1999), people's opinions of luxury brands (Weber & Dubois 1995), and consumers' attitudes towards the concept of luxury (Dubois, Czellar & Laurent 2005; Dubois & Laurent 1994; Dubois, Laurent & Czellar 2001; Wong & Zaichkowsky 1999; Wong & Ahuvia 1998).

In this paper we focus on attitudes towards the concept of luxury and aim to address the limitations of the extant measure proposed by Dubois, Laurent & Czellar (2005; 2001). In particular we consider the issues of reliability and validity and make a number of suggestions for further refinement of the scale. Our focus on a generalised attitudinal measure is particularly relevant given the significance of attitudes and perceptions in forming brand equity, and its role in the consumers' purchase decisions

(Dubois, Laurent & Czellar 2001; Vigneron & Johnson 2004).

2. Theoretical Background: Attitudes towards the Concept of Luxury

Luxury is an abstract concept as its meaning is determined by personal and interpersonal motives, and is therefore primarily built on consumer perceptions (Vigneron & Johnson 2004). It is these perceptions that we now consider. The word luxury is derived from the Latin words "luxus" [excess, extravagance] and "luxuria" [extravagance, opulence, excess, dissipation, extravagance] (Cawley 2006; Roux & Floch 1996). So luxury combines both positive and negative connotations—which vary depending on the social context (Roux & Floch 1996).

Dubois & Laurent (1994) and Dubois, Laurent & Czellar (2001) found that consumers' attitudes towards the concept of luxury and luxury brands vary considerably. Consumers simultaneously displayed strong positive and negative feelings towards luxury—with relatively few individuals expressing indifference. Individuals spontaneously associated the term luxury with expressions such as upscale, quality, good taste, and class, as well as flashiness and bad taste. Affluent consumers usually express positive attitudes towards the concept of luxury, as they consider luxury as part of their life. Individuals less familiar with the concept of luxury appear to be more critical. They are often unsure about the purchase and have mixed attitudes towards the concept of luxury (Dubois, Laurent & Czellar 2001). Negative connotations centre around the view that people buy luxury goods to copy the affluent, and to be different (Dubois, Laurent & Czellar 2001). Overall, most people expressed positive attitudes towards the concept of luxury while admitting their relative lack of expertise and familiarity with purchasing luxury brands. Individuals' avoidance and attraction reactions to luxury further emphasise the dual nature of the concept. Otnes et al. (1997) explain that consumers can't understand their own contradictions, and therefore show inconsistencies when self-reporting their attitudes.

The attitude scale initially developed by Dubois & Laurent (1994) and extensively reported by Dubois, Laurent & Czellar (2005; 2001) consists of 34 items—33 of which were classified as cognitive, affect and behaviour-related themes, with a single item added later (see Table 1 below). Items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree). The initial scale development proceeded using a sample of 440 consumers in a

French language instrument (Dubois & Laurent 1994). The factor analysis produced 10 factors explaining some 60% of the variance. According to the authors (1994), the first 4 factors explaining 46% of the variance relate to attitude components. Factor 1 expresses the subjects' lack of familiarity leading to disinterest in luxury, factor 2 describes the subjects' positive position towards luxury for hedonic reasons, factor 3 portrays the subjects' negative evaluations of luxury of others, and factor 4 recaps the subjects' mythical and symbolic values attached to luxury. The other 6 factors relate to dimensions not directly associated with the concept of luxury such as price perceptions and scarcity.

In a second study, items were translated to English and administered to management students in 20 countries across Europe plus Australia, Canada, New Zealand and USA. This study produced a final sample 1848 subjects (Dubois, Czellar & Laurent 2005). This larger dataset was analysed using exploratory factor analysis. However, the final factor structure did not conform to the predicted theoretical framework. Instead these researchers found there to be as many as eight factors explaining less than 45% of the variance (Dubois, Czellar & Laurent 2005). The authors (2005) reject a traditional scale purification process recommended by DeVellis (2003), arguing the *prima face* case for content validity. However, the authors are silent on issues of reliability and validity—these issues are now considered.

3. Evaluating Validity

Expert judges were used to review the validity of the Dubois, Laurent & Czellar (2005; 1994) measure. We follow the second procedure described by Hardesty and Bearden (2004) in which items are classified based on construct definitions. A panel of 10 expert judges (marketing academics familiar with branding and consumer behaviour literature) classified each of the 34 items as (i) either a generalised luxury concept or as relating to a luxury brand, and (ii) as a cognitive, affective or behavioural attitudinal dimension. To maximise coherence judges were provided with definitions of these attitude components. Table 1 shows the original items and designation (Dubois, Czellar & Laurent 2005; Dubois & Laurent 1994) as well as the judges' classification of those items. When using judges to evaluate items Allison (1978) recommends agreement of at least 60% between expert judges. Here, we have adopted a more conservative approach. Following the recommendations of Hardesty and Bearden (2004) we use a minimum for consensus of 80% (8 of the 10 judges).

First we assessed face validity, "*since inferences are made based on the final scale items and, therefore, they must be deemed face valid if we are to have confidence in any inferences made using the*

final scale form" (Hardesty & Bearden 2004, p. 99). The requirement for face validity is satisfied if the items included in a scale reflect the desired construct (Hardesty & Bearden 2004). The construct at hand is "attitudes to luxury"—a generalised measure. Other specific measures have been developed, which focus on attitudes to luxury goods/brands (for example see Vigneron & Johnson (2004)). Thus we propose that items which focus on products or brands are outside of the domain for the construct. The classification of expert judges in relation to this is shown in Table 1 on page 9.

Only twelve of the items were unambiguously classified by the judges as reflecting generalised luxury (using the 80% agreement criterion). These items are shown in bold on Table 1. The remaining items were evaluated as focusing on luxury brands/product or were coded ambiguously by the judges. For example, the item "*a fine replica of a luxury brand is just as good*" is unambiguously outside the conceptual domain of the construct (i.e. not general luxury), whereas the item "*I would not feel at ease in a luxury shop*" is viewed as within the domain by some judges and outside by others. This analysis has highlighted concerns with the face validity of the scale developed by Dubois, Czellar & Laurent (2005) and Dubois & Laurent (1994). We therefore suggest that only the 12-items consistently judged to be within the domain be retained in a refined measure.

Content validity is the extent to which a measurement reflects the specific construct domain (Carmines & Zeller 1991). Fink (1995) points out that the case for content validity requires an a priori theoretical perspective. Dubois & Laurent (1994) and Dubois, Czellar & Laurent (2005) used the well established work on dimensions of attitudes, i.e. cognitive, affective and behavioural, (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975) to develop items reflecting attitudes to luxury. Established measure development theory suggest that between four to seven items are required to reflect each dimensions and that each dimension should have approximately the same number of items (DeVellis 2003). We note here that the measure is relatively unbalanced with the preponderance of items designated as cognitive by the authors (16/34 items, c.f. 7/34 affective items and 9/34 behavioural items). One of the items was not classified a priori.

We assessed the content validity by asking judges to classify items as relating to cognitive, affective or behavioural themes. As shown in Table 1 below there was relatively little agreement between judges in respect to this task. We also note that there is limited correspondence between the classification provided by Dubois, Czellar & Laurent (2005) and the judges. Only four of the 16 designated cognitive items were clearly classified by the judges as reflecting the cognitive dimension. Similar results were found for affective (3 of 7 items) and behavioural (2 of 9 items) dimensions. The limited consensus between judges

highlights the difficulty that has often been reported in respect to establishing content validity for attitudes—they are multi-faceted and in most cases can't be attributed to specific attitude components but rather interact and overlap (Chaudhuri 2006, p. 3). The concept of luxury has proven to be particularly ambiguous (Dubois, Laurent & Czellar 2001) and this ambiguity has been attributed to its abstract and symbolic nature (Roux & Boush 1996). We argue later in the paper that in order to understand Luxury

we need to understand its dimensions as well as the dimensions of attitudes (see section 5). Vigneron & Johnson (1999; 2004) have proposed that Luxury (cf Attitudes) can be conceived of as having non-personal (conspicuousness, uniqueness and quality) and personal components (hedonic and extended self). The scale is based on attitudes toward luxury but has been developed specifically to evaluate individual brands.

TABLE 1: Attitude to Luxury Items and a priori designation (Dubois, Czellar & Laurent 2005) and expert Judge classification

	Dubois et al (2005)	Expert Judges classification of "Attitude to Luxury" items				
		Cognitive	Affective	Behavioural	Generalised	Luxury Brand
I don't know much about the luxury world.	Cognitive	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
In general, luxury products are better quality products.	Cognitive	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	7 (07%)
A fine replica of a luxury brand is just as good.	Cognitive	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)
Luxury products inevitably are very expensive.	Cognitive	9 (90%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)
In my opinion, luxury is too expensive for what it is.	Cognitive	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	8 (89%)	1 (11%)
Few people own a truly luxury product.	Cognitive	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	8 (80%)	2 (20%)
Truly luxury goods cannot be mass produced.	Cognitive	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	3 (40%)
A luxury product cannot be sold in supermarkets.	Cognitive	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)
A real luxury brand does not advertise its products.	Cognitive	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	6 (60%)
In my opinion, luxury is pleasant.	Cognitive	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
Some education is needed for appreciating luxury products.	Cognitive	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)
In my opinion, luxury is really useless.	Cognitive	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
A product must be somewhat useless to be a luxury product.	Cognitive	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	7 (70%)
In my opinion, luxury is old fashioned.	Cognitive	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
In my opinion, luxury is flashy.	Cognitive	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
In my opinion, luxury is good taste.	Cognitive	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
All things considered, I rather like luxury.	Affect	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
I am not interested in luxury.	Affect	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	8 (80%)	2 (20%)
Luxury makes me dream.	Affect	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	8 (80%)	2 (20%)
Luxury products make life more beautiful.	Affect	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	6 (60%)
I could talk about luxury for hours.	Affect	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	7 (70%)	8 (80%)	2 (20%)
I would not feel at ease in a luxury shop.	Affect	2 (20%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	4 (50%)
When I wear a luxury item, I feel a bit like I'm disguising myself.	Affect	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	7 (70%)
I almost never buy luxury products.	Behaviour	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)
One buys luxury goods primarily for one's pleasure.	Behaviour	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	7 (70%)
For the most part, luxury goods are to be offered as gifts.	Behaviour	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	7 (70%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)
One needs to be a bit of a snob to buy luxury products.	Behaviour	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	3 (30%)
The luxury products we buy reveal a little bit of who we are.	Behaviour	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	3 (30%)
Today, everyone should have access to luxury goods.	Behaviour	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)
People who buy those products seek to imitate the rich.	Behaviour	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)
People who buy those products try to differentiate themselves from others.	Behaviour	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	7 (70%)
Those who buy luxury brands are refined people.	Behaviour	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)
Luxury items should be taxed more heavily.	-	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)

TABLE 2: Comparison of work replicating the Dubois and Laurent (1994) original study of attitudes to luxury

	Dubois & Laurent (1994)	Tidwell & Dubois (1996)	Nyeck & Roux (2003)	This study
Sample size	n = 440	n = 167	n = 110	n = 139
Variance Explained	60%	72.7%	52%	62%
Notes			Reduced item pool	
Knowledge-Related Themes				
• I don't know much about the luxury world.	F1	F2		
• In general, luxury products are better quality products.				F3
• A fine replica of a luxury brand is just as good.				
• Luxury products inevitably are very expensive.				
• In my opinion, luxury is too expensive for what it is.	F3	F4	F2	F3
• Few people own a truly luxury product.			F2	
• Truly luxury goods cannot be mass produced.			F3	
• A luxury product cannot be sold in supermarkets.			F3	
• A real luxury brand does not advertise its products.		F1		
• In my opinion, luxury is pleasant.	F2			F1
• Some education is needed for appreciating luxury products.	F2			F1
• In my opinion, luxury is really useless.				F1
• A product must be somewhat useless to be a luxury product.				F3
• In my opinion, luxury is old fashioned.	F2	F1	F2	
• In my opinion, luxury is flashy.	F4	F4		F4
• In my opinion, luxury is good taste.			F1	F1
Affect-Related Themes				
• All things considered, I rather like luxury.	F1		F1	F1
• I am not interested in luxury.	F1			F1
• Luxury makes me dream.	F4		F1	F2
• Luxury products make life more beautiful.			F1	F2
• I could talk about luxury for hours.	F1			F2
• I would not feel at ease in a luxury shop.	F1	F2		
• When I wear a luxury item, I feel a bit like I'm disguising myself.	F1			F1
Behaviour-Related Themes				
• I almost never buy luxury products.	F1			
• One buys luxury goods primarily for one's pleasure.	F2		F1	
• For the most part, luxury goods are to be offered as gifts.				
• One needs to be a bit of a snob to buy luxury products.			F2	
• The luxury products we buy reveal a little bit of who we are.	F4			F4
• Today, everyone should have access to luxury goods.		F3	F3	
• People who buy those products seek to imitate the rich.	F3		F2	F4
• People who buy those products try to differentiate themselves from others.	F3	F3		F4
• Those who buy luxury brands are refined people.	F4		F3	
Plus				
• Luxury items should be taxed more heavily.				F1

4. Evaluating Reliability

A number of approaches can be used for establishing measure reliability, the most robust of which is to confirm the performance of the measure in repeated studies (DeVellis 2003). We examine the original work by Dubois & Laurent (1994) and subsequent study by Dubois, Czellar & Laurent (2005), the results from two different studies using the measure as well results from a further study undertaken for this project. Table 2 summarises these studies with exception to Dubois, Czellar & Laurent (2005), as

only general details for the factor analysis of their study were provided.

In the original work by Dubois and Laurent (1994) a sample of 440 French consumers was used to investigate attitudes to luxury. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) produced ten factors explaining about 60% of the variance. Dubois and Laurent (1994) suggested that only the first four factors (comprising fourteen items) were linked with the core attitudinal structure: 1) lack of interest due to limited expertise, 2) positive evaluation of luxury goods/hedonic motives, 3) negative perceptions attached to the behaviour of others, and 4) mythical

and symbolic values attached to luxury. Though the authors discussed an 18-item 4 factor structure, they suggested that in future work a short measure to be developed based on a 12-item 4-factor solution – no explanation was provided.

Using the initial 33-item pool (Dubois & Laurent 1994), the data of a larger sample of 1848 business students from 20 different countries, produced a factor analysis comprising of as many as 8 factors explaining only 44.7% of the variance (Dubois, Czellar & Laurent 2005). These results were accounted to the complex nature of attitudes comprising many and largely unrelated facets.

The measure was first replicated by Tidwell & Dubois (1996) using an Australian sample of 117 management students. This work used all 34 original items. EFA produced 4-factor structure (with eight items and only six of these were from the short form measure proposed by Dubois and Laurent (1994). There is limited correspondence between the Australian replication and the original measure (Tidwell & Dubois 1996) and also from the work presented in Dubois, Czellar & Laurent (2005). Nyeck & Roux (2003) used a reduced 20-items set to measure the attitudes to luxury of 110 MBA students in Quebec. EFA produced a three-factor solution explaining 52.2% of the variance. Although there is some correspondence between this work and the original study (Dubois & Laurent 1994) this is difficult to establish given the differences in item pools.

In comparing these three studies we observe that there is little evidence of reliability, the items included vary from study to study, and the magnitude of these loadings vary considerably. In each case EFA fails to provide much evidence of correspondence with the proposed theoretical structure and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was not used to assess this.

To provide further clarification regarding the scales reliability a convenience sample of 146 Australian business students completed a survey which including the full scale initially developed by Dubois & Laurent (1994). This sample design is in line with Dubois, Laurent & Czellar (2005; 2001) who surveyed management students across 20 countries. Business students have been used in several empirical studies, and have been found suitable for studies of consumer behaviour (Eastman, Goldsmith & Flynn 1999; Kapferer 1998; Vigneron 1998; Vigneron & Johnson 2004). Surveys that were incomplete or incorrectly answered were removed; 139 surveys were found appropriate for this research. EFA produced 10 factors explaining 62%, while the first 4 factors explain 38% and the first factor 15.6% of the variance. Table 2 shows the first four factors. Here we find little correspondence with any of the previous work (as shown in Table 2). Nor do the factors reflect the affective, cognitive and behavioural dimensions suggested by the a priori

theoretical framework. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to verify the theoretical structure of the scale. Items were assigned to cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions based on the item distribution suggested by Dubois, Czellar & Laurent (2005). This analysis indicated a poor fit with the theoretical structure ($\chi^2(461) = 994.3$, $p=0.000$; TLI= 0.317; CFI= 0.404; IFI= 0.445).

It has been suggested that the lack of fit and poor reliability for this attitude to luxury measure stems from the ambivalent and inconsistent attitudes that consumers have toward luxury and that clearer results would be obtained if consumers were first classified into segments reflecting their underlying orientation (Dubois, Czellar & Laurent 2005). While this may be so, it is difficult to exclude scale development issues as a primary cause of the problems observed. An alternative approach is discussed in the conclusion section below.

5. Refining the Measure

We have argued throughout the paper that the extant measure of ‘attitudes to luxury’ performs poorly in respect to validity and reliability. Thus, we advocate a complete revision of the measure. First, we propose that items not clearly reflecting the domain of the concept be removed from the measure. Expert judges have unambiguously identified twelve items as reflecting luxury (rather than a luxury brand/product) and these twelve items would form the basis for a revised scale.

Following Rossiter (2002), we advocate a systematic approach to scale development. The C-OAR-SE procedure is specifically designed to address content validity problems and enhance the likelihood of producing reliable scales (Rossiter 2002). The procedure begins with careful construct definition including the specification of the object (thing that is rated), attribute (dimension of judgement) and rater (Rossiter 2002). In this case we define the construct as “a person’s (rater) attitude to (attribute) luxury (object)”. Next consideration is given to the classification the object. Here we view Luxury as an abstracted formed object—as having different components. This is because, as discussed above, interpretations of Luxury vary considerably (Dubois, Laurent & Czellar 2001; Vigneron & Johnson 2004). Abstract formed objects possess multiple components that form the object’s meaning. Using the 34 items derived in the original study (Dubois & Laurent 1994), Dubois, Laurent & Czellar (2001) identified the following ten components: extreme quality, high price, scarcity, aesthetics, personal history/competence, superfluity/plenty, mental reservations/ conspicuousness, personal distance & uneasiness, involvement: sign value. However, these components were not verified by expert raters and also appear to include components not clearly representing attitudes towards luxury.

Vigneron and Johnson (2004) identified two broad and five specific components for the concept of luxury: non-personal (Conspicuous, Uniqueness, Quality) and personal (Hedonic, Self-extension). These components have proved to be relatively robust in our studies using the index. Thus we propose that components of luxury should include the aforementioned five dimensions. Naturally this requires further confirmation using expert judges and a panel of the target raters (consumers). The final measure must retain all components of the object (to remain valid) and should be combined to form an index. Thus item reduction approaches which emphasis high alpha's are unsuitable for in this context, as "...they may lead to deletion of items that form part of the definition of the object" (Rossiter 2002, p. 312).

Next the C-OAR-SE procedure requires that consideration be given to the type of attribute. Rossiter (2002) argues that Attitudes are particularly problematic because they may be classified at concrete, abstract-formed (i.e. formed by different components) or abstract-eliciting (manifestations of the underlying attitude) depending on the study context. Here we view attitudes as abstract eliciting comprising three dimensions (affective, cognitive and behavioural) and each of these dimensions are themselves abstract eliciting. Following Rossiter (2002) we note that we expect each component (i.e. affective, cognitive and behavioural) "to be respectively unidimensional [that is within components] by factor analysis and the ... components' scores moderately positively correlated for most attitude objects". Thus we do not expect a factor analysis of all items to reveal the underlying affective, cognitive, behavioural types.

Next scale formation is considered. The C-OAR-SE procedure advises that scales are formed by considering the object and attribute parts. Luxury (attribute) is formed by five component parts (following Vigneron and Johnson's (2004) work) and these parts are summed to create an INDEX. Each component of luxury is measured by affective, cognitive and behavioural items. At a minimum there must be at least one affective, cognitive and behavioural item for each object part (requiring at least fifteen items), although because we view the attribute components as second order abstract eliciting they themselves should be made up of multiple items. Thus the ideal scale would comprise between 45-60 items (assuming three to four items were required to measure each attitude component). Such a scale would be unwieldy in most studies. A short form scale would include 15-items. Item reduction procures would not be necessary.

Table 3 provides a summary and tentative classification of the 12-items our expert raters' judged to be within the domain of a generalised luxury object.

Table 3 illustrates the inadequacy of the item coverage of the extant measure. For example, none of the existing items measure the luxury component "Quality" and few exist to capture the component uniqueness. Future work must address this. Our expert raters also commented that the item wording impacted that clarity with which they were able to judge items as attribute type (i.e. affective, cognitive or behavioural). For example, items beginning "*in my opinion*" were regarded to be particularly ambiguous in the opinion of the judges. After completing the enumeration of all items appropriate pre-testing is necessary. This involves further evaluation by expert raters and subsequently by the target rater (in this case persons or consumers).

The remaining steps of the C-OAR-SE procedure consider the development of the appropriate response format. Rossiter (2002) makes a strong case against the use of Likert answer formats (which were used in the extant measure). This theorist's concern stems from the problem with ambiguity created by Likert response formats. For example, strong disagreement with the item "I could talk about luxury for hours" could mean the rater does not talk about luxury, seldom talks about luxury or is definite in their disagreement regarding the item. The problem arises because the intensity measure is embedded in the item itself (i.e. for hours). Instead the C-OAR-SE procedure advocates that this should be included in the response format. Thus an appropriate response format should measure probability or frequency which describes rater attitudes to luxury. Rossiter's work (2002) provides a full discussion of this issue, addressing matters such as numerical and verbal response formats, the number of categories and so forth. Here we recommend the use of a verbal measure of degree "not at all" (0), "slightly" (1), "quite" (2), and "extremely" (3), which has been demonstrated to produce interval scales (Cliff 1959; Cohen 1987).

The final stage of the C-OAR-SE procedure involves the enumeration of the measure—the formation of the measure (using a summative index in this case), the transformation of the score to a meaningful range (here the 15-items produce an index ranging from 0 to 45, transformation to an index range of 0 – 10 is more interpretable for most readers), and the reporting of appropriate estimates of precision (here the average Proportional Reduction in Loss (Rust & Cooil 1994) over all object and attribute items for expert judges and then a 95% confidence interval for survey data).

6. Conclusion and Future Research

We have argued that a measure of a person's attitude to luxury is a useful tool for marketers to understand consumer responses to luxury brands. Adequate measures of brand luxury exist (i.e. the Brand Luxury Index of Vigneron and Johnson

TABLE 3: A priori classification of attitudes (attributes) to luxury (object) using the C-OAR-SE procedure (Rossiter 2002)

Object Classification	Attribute Classification	Existing Items
Personal – Self-extension	Affective	All things considered, I rather like luxury.
	Cognitive	I don't know much about the luxury world.
	Behavioural	<i>none available</i>
Personal – Hedonism	Ambiguous	Luxury makes me dream. I am not interested in luxury.
	Affective	<i>none available</i>
	Cognitive	<i>none available</i>
	Behavioural	I could talk about luxury for hours. In my opinion, luxury is pleasant. In my opinion, luxury is good taste.
	Ambiguous	<i>none available</i>
Non-personal - Quality	Affective	<i>none available</i>
	Cognitive	<i>none available</i>
	Behavioural	<i>none available</i>
	Ambiguous	–
Non-personal – Uniqueness	Affective	<i>none available</i>
	Cognitive	Few people own a truly luxury product.
	Behavioural	<i>none available</i>
	Ambiguous	–
	Affective	<i>none available</i>
Non-personal – Conspicuousness	Cognitive	<i>none available</i>
	Behavioural	<i>none available</i>
	Ambiguous	In my opinion, luxury is too expensive for what it is In my opinion, luxury is really useless. In my opinion, luxury is old fashioned. In my opinion, luxury is flashy.
	Affective	<i>none available</i>
	Cognitive	<i>none available</i>

(2004)), however as we have demonstrated the extant measure of consumers attitudes to luxury is inadequate. We have argued that future measure development work should proceed along the lines proposed by Rossiter (2002) in his C-OAR-SE procedure. In particular, new items are required to provide adequate coverage of the concept (its object and attributes). Future research will test the refined scale

References

- Allison, N.K. 1978, 'A psychometric development for a test for consumer alienation from the marketplace', *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 15, pp. 565-575.
- Andrus, D.M., Silver, E. & Johnston, D.E. 1986, 'Status Brand Management and Gift Purchase: A Discriminant Analysis', *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, vol. 3 (March), pp. 5-13.
- Bourdieu, P. 1979, *La distinction: Critique sociale de jugement*, Les éditions de Minuit, Paris.
- Carmine, E.G. & Zeller, R.A. 1991, *Reliability and validity assessment*, Sage Publications, Newbury Park.
- Cawley, K. 2006, *Latin Dictionary and Grammar Aid*, University of Notre Dame Archives, viewed 11/12/2006 2006 <<http://archives.nd.edu/latgramm.htm>>.
- Chaudhuri, A. 2006, *Emotion and Reason in Consumer Behavior*, Elsevier Inc., Burlington, MA, USA.
- Cliff, N. 1959, 'Adverbs as multipliers', *Psychological Review*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 27-44.
- Cohen, B. 1987, 'Some Observations on Rating Scales', *Marketing Review*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 25-27.
- DeVellis, R.F. 2003, *Scale Development: Theory and Application*, 2nd edn, Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Dubois, B. 1992, 'Comment surmonter les paradoxes du marketing du luxe', *Revue Française de Gestion*, vol. Janvier-Février, pp. 30-37.
- Dubois, B., Czellar, S. & Laurent, G. 2005, 'Consumer Segments Based on Attitudes Toward Luxury: Empirical Evidence from Twenty Countries', *Marketing Letters*, vol. 16, no. 2, p. 115.
- Dubois, B. & Duquesne, P. 1993, 'The market for luxury goods: Income versus culture', *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 27, no. 1, p. 35.
- Dubois, B. & Laurent, G. 1993, 'Is There a Euro-Consumer For Luxury Goods?' in F.V. Raaij & G. Bamossy (eds), *European Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 1, Association For Consumer Research, Provo, UT, pp. 58-69.
- Dubois, B. & Laurent, G. 1994, 'Attitudes toward the concept of luxury: An exploratory analysis', *Asia-Pacific Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 273-278.
- Dubois, B., Laurent, G. & Czellar, S. 2001, 'Consumer rapport to luxury: Analyzing complex and ambivalent attitudes', Working Paper Series: CR 736/2001, Paris.
- Eastman, J.K., Goldsmith, R.E. & Flynn, L.R. 1999, 'Status Consumption in Consumer Behaviour: Scale Development and Validation', *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, no. Summer, pp. 41-52.

- Fink, A. 1995, *How to measure survey reliability and validity v. 7*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. 1975, *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company., Reading, MA.
- Hardesty, D.M. & Bearden, W.O. 2004, 'The use of expert judges in scale development: Implications for improving face validity of measures of unobservable constructs', *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 57, pp. 98-107.
- Hirschman, E. 1988, 'Upper Class Wasps as Consumers: A Humanistic Inquiry', in E. Hirschman (ed.), *Research in Marketing*, vol. 3, JAI Press Inc., pp. 115-147.
- Joly, H. 1991, 'Industry du Luxe: Rebondir sur la Crise: Leviers pour le Succes dan les Annee 90', *Revue Française du Marketing*, vol. 132/133, pp. 97-109.
- Kapferer, J.-N. 1997, 'Managing luxury brands', *Journal of Brand Management*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 251-260.
- Kapferer, J.-N. 1998, 'Why are we seduced by luxury brands?' *Journal of Brand Management*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 44-49.
- LaBarbera, P.A. 1988, 'The Nouveaux Riches: Conspicuous Consumption and the Issue of Self Fulfilment', in E. Hirschman (ed.), *Research in Marketing*, vol. 3, JAI Press Inc, pp. 179-210.
- Leibenstein, H. 1950, 'Bandwagon, snob, and Veblen effects in the theory of consumers' demand', *Journal of Economics & Business*, vol. 64 (May), pp. 183-207.
- LVMH 2000, *Annual Report 1999*, viewed 11/12/2006 2006 <http://www.lvmh.com/comfi/pdf_gbr/lvmh9920_gbr.pdf>.
- LVMH 2006, *First Half Report 2006*, LVMH, viewed 12/11/2006 2006 <http://www.lvmh.com/comfi/pdf_gbr/rapport_semestriel_2006_gbr.pdf>.
- Mason, R. 1981, *Conspicuous Consumption*, St Martin's Press, New York, N.Y.
- Mason, R. 1993, 'Cross Cultural Influences on the Demand for Status Goods', in F. Van Raaij & G. Bamossy (eds), *European Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 1, Association for Consumer Research, Provo, U.T, pp. 46-51.
- McKinsey 1990, *The Luxury Industry: An Asset for France*, McKinsey, Paris.
- Nyeck, S. & Roux, E. 2003, 'Valeurs Culturelle et Attitudes par Rapport au Luxe: L'Exemple du Québec', *ASAC*, Nova Scotia.
- Rossiter, J., R. 2002, 'The C-OAR-SE procedure for scale development in marketing', *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 305-355.
- Roux, E. & Boush, D.M. 1996, 'The role of familiarity and expertise in luxury brand extension evaluation', *EMAC Conference Proceedings*, Budapest, Hungary.
- Roux, E. & Floch, J.-M. 1996, 'Gérer L'Ingérable: La Contradiction Interne de toute Maison de Luxe', *Décisions Marketing*, vol. 9 (September-December), pp. 15-23.
- Rust, R.T. & Cooil, B. 1994, 'Reliability Measures for Qualitative Data: Theory and Implications', *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1-14.
- Stanley, T.J. 1989, *Selling to the Affluent*, Irwin, Homewood, Ill.
- Tidwell, P. & Dubois, B. 1996, 'A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Attitudes toward the Luxury Concept in Australia and France', *Asia Pacific Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 2, pp. 31-35.
- Vigneron, F. 1998, 'Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Prestige Perceptions of Brands', Dissertation thesis, The University of Sydney, Sydney.
- Vigneron, F. & Johnson, L.W. 1999, *A review and a conceptual framework of prestige-seeking consumer behavior*, Marketing Science Institute, <<http://www.Vancouver.wsu.edu/amsrev/search.htm>>.
- Vigneron, F. & Johnson, L.W. 2004, 'Measuring Perceptions of Brand Luxury', *The Journal of Brand Management*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 484-506.
- Weber, D. & Dubois, B. 1995, 'The Edge of Dream: Managing the Brand Equity in the European Luxury Market', in L. Kahle & M. Chiagouris (eds), *Values, Lifestyles and Psychographics*, Lawrence Elbaum Associates, Hillsdale, N.J.
- Wong, A.C.Y. & Zaichkowsky, J.L. 1999, 'Understanding luxury brands in Hong Kong', *European Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 4, pp. 310-316.
- Wong, N.Y. & Ahuvia, A.C. 1998, 'Personal Taste and Family Face: Luxury Consumption in Confucian and Western Societies', *Psychology and Marketing*, vol. 15 (August), pp. 423-441.