eISSN: 2774-1419 https://so08.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/artssu/index

Conceptualizing the Measuring Scale for Social Media Involvement

การกำหนดแนวคิดมาตรวัดการมีส่วนร่วมเชื่อมโยงบนสื่อสังคมออนไลน์

Jaruporn Tangpattanakit

จารุพร ตั้งพัฒนกิจ

Faculty of Management Sciences, Kasetsart University Sriracha Campus, Thailand

Corresponding author
e-mail: tangpattanakitj@gmail.com

Received 17-04-2020
Revised 01-07-2022
Accepted 17-07-2022

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to develop a measuring scale for social media involvement in multiple dimensions by developing existing concept of involvement knowledge in order to establish an operational concept and concept regarding the context of consumer's social media involvement. The measuring scale for social media involvement comprises 32 items which were developed to indicate the frequency of consumer participation in social media. This measuring scale was developed from a multidimensional perspective, comprising behavioral, affective, and cognitive components which are appropriate for the assessment of social media involvement. Research methodology includes a survey study to confirm the second item in order to assess the validity and the reliability of the measuring scale. This research employed a sample size of 640 participants. The research results identified that all three components were highly relevant when it comes to explaining social media involvement. Additionally, the scale was tested in the context of before-purchase behaviour and was proved to be accurate and reliable. This measuring scale of social media involvement can be used as a basis for further scientific studies and in other relevant fields.

Keywords: social media, involvement, measurement scale

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อพัฒนามาตรวัดระดับการมีส่วนร่วมเชื่อมโยงบนสื่อสังคมออนไลน์แบบหลายมิติ โดยพัฒนาความรู้ที่มีอยู่เกี่ยวกับแนวคิดการมีส่วนร่วมเพื่อให้เกิดแนวคิด ดำเนินการ และบริบทของแนวคิดเกี่ยวกับการมีส่วนร่วมของผู้บริโภคบนสื่อสังคมออนไลน์ มาตรวัดของการมีส่วนร่วมเชื่อมโยงบนสื่อสังคมออนไลน์นั้นประกอบไปด้วยองค์ประกอบ 32 ข้อที่พัฒนาขึ้นเพื่อเป็นตัวชี้วัดความถี่ที่ผู้บริโภคมีส่วนร่วมเชื่อมโยงบนสื่อสังคมออนไลน์ มาตรวัดดังกล่าวถูกพัฒนาจากแนวคิดโครงสร้างแบบหลายมิติ ประกอบไปด้วยการมีส่วนร่วมในเชิงพฤติกรรม ความเกี่ยวพันทางอารมณ์ และความเกี่ยวพันทางการรับรู้ ซึ่งถูกนำมาใช้ในการประเมินระดับความเชื่อมโยงสื่อสังคมออนไลน์ได้เป็นอย่างดี วิธีการดำเนินการวิจัยได้แก่ การศึกษาเชิงสำรวจและยืนยันองค์ประกอบลำดับที่สองเพื่อประเมินความถูกต้องและความน่าเชื่อถือของมาตรวัด งานวิจัยนี้มีขนาดกลุ่มตัวอย่าง 640 คน โดยผลการวิจัยพบว่าทั้งสามองค์ประกอบนั้นมีความเกี่ยวข้องกันอย่างมากในการอธิบายการมีส่วนร่วมเชื่อมโยงบนสื่อสังคมออนไลน์ นอกจากนี้มาตรวัดดังกล่าวได้รับการทดสอบในบริบทของพฤติกรรมก่อนการซื้อและพิจารณาแล้วว่าแม่นยำและเชื่อถือได้ มาตรวัดของการมีส่วนร่วมบนสื่อสังคมออนไลน์นี้สามารถใช้เป็นพื้นฐานในการศึกษาเชิงวิทยาศาสตร์และในศาสตร์อื่น ๆ ที่เกี่ยวข้องได้ด้วย

คำสำคัญ: สื่อสังคมออนไลน์ การมีส่วนร่วม มาตรวัด

Introduction

One of the most influential environmental changes in the 21st century is the introduction and proliferation of a communication infrastructure. Social media is increasing constantly and has become an integral part of our daily lives. As a result, the issues surrounding social media have become a top priority for businesses. The emergence of social media facilitates interaction between businesses and consumers, and social media is now presenting itself as an alternative to traditional marketing and advertising that allows organisations to reach larger and wider target audiences (Salam, Rao, & Pegels, 2000). With social media, marketers can potentially target and communicate with interested groups of consumers both locally and globally (Mehta & Sivadas, 1995). Moreover, review of survey data shows that whether access occurs through computer or mobile phone, around 24% of the total time cosumers spend online is devoted to social media sites (Wyatt, 2018).

These social media communities provide productive collaboration space for both businesses and their consumers, which enable the consumers to get exposure, advocate, traffic, and gain insights, knowledge, and information regarding products and services (Gummerus et al., 2012). Therefore, the existence of various social media applications offers consumers and businesses numerous opportunities to both interact and collaborate (Curtis et al., 2010).

The most stunning phenomenon of the past few years has been the speed at which social media has matured. The number of social media users is increasing rapidly year-by-year across the world, resulting in changes in the marketplace landscape (Cooke & Buckley, 2008). As they have established their position as mainstream marketing channels, social media platforms have become important to marketing strategies in this digital era. The key factor for a business's success is individual involvement with social media. Different clusters of consumers yield different responses. The key to successful involvement is to understand the consumers' underlying decision-making processes.

Previously, the notion of involvement has been frequently used in the context of the media (Rubin, 1998). However, the features of traditional media engagement and social media involvement are dissimilar. While social media is a two-way form of communication that enables users to engage, access, and interact in real time, traditional media is a one-way form of communication in which businesses broadcast their message to audiences through TV, radio, or print. It is believed that social media platforms are more homogenous than conventional media such as television or radio, resulting in social media being more effective per viewer. In addition, it is simpler for businesses and marketers to gain more precise amounts of exposure per viewer, which is more efficient for matching a customer to unique group demand as opposed to the group as a whole. Furthermore, recent studies show that younger individuals are becoming more active on social media (Stefanone, Lackaff, & Rosen, 2011). So, more research needs to be done on the topic of social media involvement, and at a scale that is more accurate, all-encompassing, and usable on a wider range of platforms.

The conceptual framework

Involvement is often a broad term that is more than just relevant for academic studies across decades , but there is no clear metric for the involvement of social networking that can be extended to generic networks. Many forms of involvement and different meanings of involvement in the area of multiple subjects have been determined as each analysis may explain involvement in terms of different types and objects. Conceptually, social media involvement is comparable to Internet involvement or media involvement. Bahk (2008) conceptualised Internet involvement as the degree to which a person engages in the regular use of the Internet. Stone (1984) described behavioural involvement as the amount of time and/or commitment needed for a specific task. According to Levy and Windahl's (1985) research, involvement is the extent to which an audience member perceives a relationship between himself or herself and mass media content, and

the extent to which the person interacts psychologically with a medium or its message. Rubin & Perse (1987) clarified that “cognitive, affective, and behavioural engagement during and because of exposure” was the definition of media involvement.

There have been a few recent attempts to improve the scale used for measuring social media involvement. According to the findings of Ha and Hu (2013), the continuum of social media activity is based on motivation and time usage aspects. Akhter (2014) characterised Internet involvement by shortening the product involvement scale from Zaichkowsky's study , which captures both situational and enduring involvement. The Facebook intensity scale, developed by Ellison et al., (2007), was designed to provide a more accurate assessment of Facebook usage than frequency or duration indices. This measure uses two self-reported measures of Facebook activity to figure out how engaged participants are: the number of Facebook "friends" and the average amount of time spent on Facebook each day. However, important indicators pertaining to the definition of social media involvement are included in observational research. Most social media involvement scales classify participants through either time-consumption or behaviour notifications or both (Sheldon, 2008; Park, 2009; Park et al., 2014). However, in the majority of previous research, the definitions of involvement use a Internet index as the relevant predictor. It is unsurprising that the bulk of prior research utilises intensity index usage as a significant predictor of engagement because it implies that the longer individuals spend online at a given site, the more they become interested in that site.

1. Multidimensional constructs are required

In light of the findings of the social media involvement studies, various conclusions about social media involvement constructions and construct definitions have been presented. First of all, understanding the idea of participation as a one-dimensional construct leaves room for misinterpretation of involvement constructions and behavioural effects; therefore, addressing the concept of participation as a multi-dimensional one is essential (Park, 1996). This is in line with Rothschild (1979), who states that "no single construct can individually [and] satisfactorily describe, explain, or predict involvement" (p.78). While Laurent & Kapferer (1985) established a categorization of involvement compatible with this idea, and justified their method by providing substantial empirical evidence demonstrating that involvement is not restricted to a single dimension, they believe that involvement should be measured as a multi-dimensional definition because the examination of one dimension seems to be ineffective. Multidimensional construction is, therefore, necessary. In this study, three main variables identified from prior empirical research.

2. Application of social media involvement

The conceptualization of social media involvement implies that an individual's level of involvement with social media is determined by the degree to which that individual participates and perceives social media to be of personal relevance and interest to himself or herself. This suggests that social media is personally relevant to an individual to the extent that he/she perceives that social media is self-related, or to the degree that access to social media allows him/her to achieve his/her personal goals, values, or objectives. To the extent that features of social media are associated with an individual, he/she will experience and develop strong feelings of affective involvement, while cognitive involvement deals with an individual's information processing. Therefore, in this study, "Social Media Involvement" refers to the perceived relevance of social media platforms with respect to an individual’s cognitive, affective, and behavioural involvement. The adaptation of the definition of "Social Media Involvement" is intended to explore the level of consumers’ involvement with social media in order to extend knowledge and understanding of consumer behaviour processes in a marketing context.

Methodology

The Process of Scale Development

Previous research has revealed that social media has different components. This section discusses how the dimensions of social media involvement were determined and how the scale was assessed using Churchill's (1979) approach for measuring multi-item marketing constructs.

1. The Proposed Measures

As mentioned above, numerous studies provide supporting evidence for the construction of a scale of social media involvement (Ha & Hu, 2013; Ellison et al., 2007). This research has argued that a single dimension is insufficient to define and measure the level of involvement; neither the intensity or frequency of use (or both) are sufficient. Once the limitation had been identified in the current study and it became clear that there was a lack of clarity regarding the involvement of social media, the researchers turned to an empirical approach to explore the issue of involvement. The researchers began by including the affective, cognitive, and behavioural aspects in the structural framework of involvement. The aim was to develop a practical and useful scale that could be easily applied to a variety of consumption behaviours.

The present study employs an empirical approach to explore the involvement issue. This conceptual approach seeks to reach an individual who is both psychologically involved in social media and via usage assessment. It comprises three core measures: cognitive perspective, affective perspective, and behavioural involvement. Based on the literature review and the conceptualization that was carried out, 32 indicators were generated that can capture the various facets of social media involvement. However, the scale in this study was constructed based on existing involvement literature (Sun, Rubin, & Haridakis, 2008; Rubin & Perse, 1987). Some of the elements were adapted and modified from others in order to make them applicable to the usage of social media that is displayed in Table 2. Social media engagement was conceptualised as a second-order multidimensional entity with three dimensions in this study. This section discusses each of the dimensions of social media involvement as a component of the social media involvement construct.

Table 1 Dimensions of Social Media Involvement

Social media involvement dimensions	Definition
Behavioural Involvement	The intensity of effort expended in pursuing a particular activity on social media
Affective Involvement	The extent to which an individual expands emotional energy or feeling towards activity on social media
Cognitive Involvement	The extent to which an individual has an active participation in processing information from social media

2. Data Collection

Since the research intends to study the involvement level of consumers with social media, an online survey was employed in the data collection. A convenience sampling method was conducted by sending an email and online survey to colleagues, students, professors, and other email contacts. Gravetter & Forzano (2019) suggested that the convenience sampling method is no guarantee of an unbiased sample, but due to limited time and financial resources, this approach

is the most frequently employed in social and behavioural science, and it has the advantage of obtaining a large number of responses (Durrheim & Painter, 2008). For the respondent profile of 29–33, was the most significant number of responses, with 40.3% of the total responses. In terms of gender, the population was skewed, with a higher proportion of female participants (65.4%). Moreover, the majority of the sample comprised educated individuals, with approximately 90% of respondents holding at least an undergraduate degree.

Table 2 Measures for social media involvement's dimensions

Construct / Indicator Item	**Reference**
Cognitive Involvement (CG)	Rubin & Perse, (1987); Eveland & Dunwoody, (2002)
CG1 I try to relate the online information in the story to my own experience	
CG2 While I am using my preferred social media, I think about how the online information relates to other things I know	
CG3 I find myself making connections between online information from my preferred social media and what I have read and heard about elsewhere	
CG4 While I am using my preferred social media, I concentrate on it	
CG5 I tried to think of the practical applications of what I read on my preferred social Media	
Affective Involvement - *Emotional Connectedness (EM)*	Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, (2007)
EM1 My preferred social media has become part of my daily routine	
EM2 I feel out of touch when I haven't access into preferred social media for a while	
EM3 I feel I am part of the social media community	
EM4 I would be sorry if my preferred social media shut down	
EM5 My preferred social media is part of my everyday activity	
Social Connectedness (SC)	Lee, Draper, & Lee, (2011)
SC1 I feel close to people on my preferred social media	
SC2 I can relate peers on my preferred social media	
SC3 I can connect with other people on my preferred social media	
SC4 I find myself activity involved with my preferred social media	
SC5 I feel disconnected from the world around me	

Table 2 Measures for social media involvement's dimensions (Cont.)

Construct / Indicator Item	Reference
Behavioural Involvement – Social Media Activities (SMA)	
SMA1 I am actively interacting with my friends on my social media	
SMA2 I am often sharing or accessing online information	
SMA3 I am often making comments or giving opinions on my social media	
SMA4 I always share with my friend network on social media site when I am seeking some form of support	
SMA5 When I see a friend or acquaintance on my preferred social media sharing good news, bad news and requesting advice or information I try to respond	New Measures
Frequencies (FR)	
FRE1 Whenever I am available, I log into my preferred social media	
FRE2 I spend most of my time on my preferred social media	
FRE3 How often do you do each of the following activities on you preferred social media sites such as Facebook or Instagram	
FRE4 Check your preferred social media feed from your smartphone	
FRE5 Check you preferred social media at work or school	
FRE6 Post status updates	
FRE7 Post or upload photos	Rosen et al. (2013)
FRE8 Browse profiles and photos	
FRE9 Read postings and contents	
FRE10 Comment on postings, status updates, photo or etc.	
FRE11 Share postings, status updates, photo etc.	
FRE12 Click "Like" to a posting, photo, etc.	

3. Instrument Validation

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to establish the five dimensions of the measurement scale. According to Bollen (1989), a null model is a model in which there are no explanatory variables. It simply means that no factors were considered on the way to underlining an observed variable; there is no correlation between observed variables. The variances towards the observed variables were not restricted; therefore, it was tested against a series of models as demonstrated below:

- A one factor model which suggests that the single value dimension of observed variables was presented.
- A Five factor model (in which dimension are as proposed in earlier discussion)

As a result, shown in Table 3, a five-factor solution model was supported (including with affective involvement, cognitive involvement, behavioural involvement, social connectedness, and frequency). The model demonstrated not only the lowest X2, but also the highest adjusted goodness of fit index and comparative fit index (CFI). It is recommended to include CFI within the comparative analysis of the model. The table below shows that the improvement over five factors, one factor, and the null model was significant.

Table 3 Comparative analysis of one factor and proposed model

Model	X^2	df	P	GFI	RMSEA	CFI
Null model	13290.269	496	0.000	0.236	0.201	0.000
One-Factor	7037.394	464	0.000	0.460	0.149	0.486
Five-Factor (Proposed model)	429.734	454	0.788	0.961	0.000	1.000

Confirmatory factor analysis was used to test the reliability and validity of the measures using AMOS version 24 (Arbuckle, 2011). The primary concern with this approach is to assess the validity of construct to propose the measurement theory (Hair et al., 2014). As can be seen in Table 3, the model was tested to show that how well it fit the observed data (Dwivedi, 2009). The results show that X2=429.734, df=454, p=0.788, GFI=0.961, RMSEA=0.000, CFI=1.000, SRMR=0.0243. In terms of reliability, all indicator loadings are higher than 0.7, and significance at level 0.001, which means that the construct reflects what the study aims to measure. Moreover, Cronbach's alpha was tested to demonstrate that each construct has the same meaning. The minimum recommended threshold value of 0.6 was exceeded, while the Composite reliability is higher than 0.7. Moreover, the average variance extracted (AVE) was performed for the constructs (Hair et al., 2014). A good rule of thumb for AVE is that the value should be higher than 0.50 or .70 (Hair et al., 2014). Table 3 displays AVE value which is higher than 0.5 in all indicators.

Table 4 Reliability measures on first order constructs

Construct	Indicator	Indicator Loading	*t*-Value	Composite Reliability	AVE	Cronbach's Alpha
Cognitive	CG1	0.768	18.88***	0.882	0.600	0.882
	CG2	0.818	20.09***			
	CG3	0.777	19.06***			
	CG4	0.763	18.75***			
	CG5	0.745	-			
Emotion	EM1	0.799	21.80***	0.897	0.636	0.897
	EM2	0.777	21.04***			
	EM3	0.809	22.14***			

Table 4 Reliability measures on first order constructs (Cont.)

Construct	Indicator	Indicator Loading	*t*-Value	Composite Reliability	AVE	Cronbach's Alpha
	EM4	0.806	22.02***			
	EM5	0.797	-			
Social	SC1	0.807	21.08***	0.898	0.637	0.897
	SC2	0.803	20.97***			
	SC3	0.793	20.67***			
	SC4	0.817	21.39***			
	SC5	0.769	-			
Social	SMA1	0.797	-	0.898	0.637	0.898
Media Activities	SMA2	0.797	21.72***			
	SMA3	0.794	21.63***			
	SMA4	0.809	22.15***			
	SMA5	0.794	21.63***			
Frequencies	FRE1	0.805	-	0.953	0.628	0.953
	FRE2	0.803	23.49***			
	FRE3	0.788	22.89***			
	FRE4	0.793	23.09***			
	FRE5	0.797	23.25***			
	FRE6	0.791	23.01***			
	FRE7	0.797	23.23***			
	FRE8	0.803	23.49***			
	FRE9	0.790	22.95***			
	FRE10	0.771	22.19***			
	FRE11	0.788	22.87***			
	FRE12	0.784	22.71***			

X^2=429.734, df=454, p=0.788, GFI=0.961, RMSEA=0.000, CFI=1.000

*** Significant at the 0.001 level

4. Discriminant Validity

Convergent validity describes the theoretical correlation between two measures of constructs which are, in fact, related. In this study, Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) were employed to approach convergent validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The result shows that the AVE is higher than 0.5, which supports the convergent reliability. Moreover, the composite reliability indices for all dimensions were calculated. Therefore, all composite reliability was found to be at a satisfactory level, i.e., higher than 0.8, since Hair et al. (2014) suggest that the desirable minimum index is 0.7. Discriminant validity can be assessed by comparing the AVE with the squared correlation of the constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), giving the average percentage of variation explained (variance extracted) among the items of a construct (Hair et al., 2014). If the square roots of average variance extracted are higher than the construct correlation or greater than 0.5, the discriminant validity is guaranteed (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). From Table 4, it can be seen that, in every row, the value of the square root of AVE is larger than the construct correlation, which indicates good discriminant validity.

Table 5 Discriminant validity of constructs

	Cognitive	**Emotion**	**Social**	**Social Media Activities**	**Frequencies**
Cognitive	**0.775**				
Emotion	0.182	**0.798**			
Social	0.170	0.469	**0.798**		
Social Media Activities	0.184	0.184	0.123	**0.792**	
Frequencies	0.096	0.101	0.090	0.471	**0.798**

* Diagonal = Square Root of AVE

5. Measurement model of estimation results

Bartlett's test of sphericity is another indicator that explains relationships between variables. When using Bartlett's test of sphericity, the KMO (Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin) measure of sampling adequacy is a test used to assess the appropriateness of using factor analysis on the data set. The general rule of thumb for KMO is that 0.6 is acceptable, but the closer to 1 the better (Field, 2013). The results illustrated in Table 6 show that the KMO test for this study is 0.94, which is well above the recommended acceptable value of 0.6, while the Barlett's Test shows the significance at < 0.001. The results also demonstrate an acceptable value between 0.885 and 0.977, with significant results < 0.001. Therefore, it can be confirmed that the data in this study are suitable and worth employing in the factor analysis technique. To assess the reflective second-order social media involvement construct, Hair et al. (2014) suggest that it is necessary to validate the first order construct to confirm that the second order construct is able to be formed. Thus, the weight of second-order constructs on first-order constructs and their significance were examined. According to Table 6, the weight is greater than 0.30. Therefore, the reflective second- order construct of social media involvement is composed of three dimensions, namely: behavioral involvement, cognitive involvement, and affective involvement.

Table 6 Factor composed by three dimensions namely interest behavioural involvement, cognitive involvement, and affective involvement.

Indicator	Frequencies	Emotional	Social	Social Media Activities	Cognitive
CG1	.021	.108	.057	.052	**.809**
CG2	.072	.023	.050	.087	**.844**
CG3	.025	.045	.042	.057	**.824**
CG4	.029	.100	.073	.055	**.806**
CG5	.015	.016	.050	.059	**.803**
KMO=0.885, Bartlett's test of Sphericity=1562.709, p=0.000, Eigen-value extraction=67.96%					
EM1	.070	**.808**	.192	.113	.055
EM2	.046	**.806**	.179	.043	.034
EM3	.016	**.824**	.188	.050	.068
EM4	.034	**.826**	.163	.031	.102
EM5	.020	**.820**	.176	.059	.054
KMO=0.892, Bartlett's test of Sphericity=1775.261, p=0.000, Eigen-value extraction=70.88%					
SC1	.046	.158	**.832**	.026	.066
SC2	-.001	.152	**.831**	.071	.060
SC3	.048	.207	**.805**	.027	.067
SC4	.039	.157	**.841**	.007	.056
SC5	.038	.223	**.787**	.033	.042
KMO=0.892, Bartlett's test of Sphericity=1780.883, p=0.000, Eigen-value extraction=70.90%					

Table 6 Factor Loading and Cross Loading (Cont.)

Indicator	Frequencies	Emotional	Social	Social Media Activities	Cognitive
SMA1	.196	.046	.014	**.818**	.091
SMA2	.261	.057	.038	**.795**	.037
SMA3	.246	.042	.098	**.785**	.141
SMA4	.201	.097	.017	**.826**	.036
SMA5	.266	.066	.013	**.789**	.055
KMO=0.892, Bartlett's test of Sphericity=1780.223, p=0.000, Eigen-value extraction=70.96%					
FRE1	**.811**	.050	-.001	.136	.008
FRE2	**.796**	.020	.039	.186	.069
FRE3	**.796**	.020	.004	.140	.013
FRE4	**.813**	.051	.002	.071	.042
FRE5	**.801**	.015	.036	.151	.011
FRE6	**.796**	.030	.048	.141	.016
FRE7	**.799**	.003	.009	.157	.018
FRE8	**.811**	.011	.052	.125	-.005
FRE9	**.797**	.039	.060	.121	.063

Table 6 Factor Loading and Cross Loading (Cont.)

Indicator	Frequencies	Emotional	Social	Social Media Activities	Cognitive
FRE10	**.781**	.030	.037	.129	.002
FRE11	**.797**	-.026	.010	.139	.014
FRE12	**.797**	.062	-.013	.107	.035
KMO=0.977, Bartlett's test of Sphericity=5649.796, p=0.000, Eigen-value extraction=65.90%					
Overall - KMO=0.945, Bartlett's test of Sphericity=13051.086, p=0.000, Eigen-value extraction=68.78%					

Table 7 Factor loading on second order constructs

Social Media Involvement Dimension		Factor Loading	*t*-value
Main Dimension	*Sub Dimension*		
Cognitive		**0.464**	-
Affective		**0.543**	3.315***
	Emotion	*0.758*	-
	Social	*0.618*	4.385***
Behavioral		**0.454**	3.466***
	Social Media Activities	*0.936*	-
	Frequencies	*0.503*	3.440***
X^2=430.956, df=457, p=0.804, GFI=0.961, RMSEA=0.000, CFI=1.000			

*** Significant at the 0.001 level

Discussion, Conclusion, and Implication

It is widely suggested that social media platforms are more homogeneous than traditional media such as television or radio, which results in social media being more effective per viewer exposed to it. Furthermore, it is easier for firms and marketers to obtain more accurate numbers of exposure per viewer since it is more effective to match a consumer to their specific group needs rather than the entire group. Moreover, recent evidence indicates that nowadays a greater number of younger people are increasingly involved with social media (Stefanone, Lackaff, & Rosen, 2011).

This research article provides a definition of social media involvement along with a conceptualization of measures. The research highlights the social media involvement measures. Significant studies have provided empirical evidence of the validity of the involvement theory in several contexts (Hollebeek & Brodie, 2009; Huang, Cho, & Lin, 2010; Jiang et al., 2010). The reliability, factor structure, and validity tests indicate that the 32-item social media involvement scale and its three dimensions have sound and stable psychometric properties. Social media involvement measures provide a solid foundation for understanding consumer behaviour to assist in the creation of social media marketing strategies. Depending on their level of involvement, individuals may be more passive or active when they receive advertising communication and limit or extend their processing of this information (Laurent & Kapferer, 1985). Therefore, social media involvement could be a useful instrument for marketers, helping them to adapt to these differences. The scale demonstrates that consumer involvement with social media assesses products, not just in functional terms of expected performance, value for money, and versatility, but also in terms of the enjoyment or pleasure derived from the product (emotional value) and the social consequences of what the product communicates to others (social value). Additionally, the scale was found to be reliable and valid in purchase situations, as well as in pre-purchase situations.

Furthermore, consumers who are involved with social media tend to be have demographic characteristics that are more attractive to marketers since they are more likely to perceive essential information from multiple sources (Gretzel, Yoo, & Purifoy, 2007). Marketers can implement strategies to promote the creation of generated content and enjoyment in a way that allows an individual to get involved. The results indicate that the measurement scale is a prototype with validity evidence, which allows other researchers to construct customized scales with different social media applications and research contexts. The development of social media involvement measures, which are key contributing factors to successful marketing strategies, would greatly benefit the business and market as social media involvement metrics help marketers better understand the emerging involvement concept. Moreover, understanding consumers' level of involvement with their preferred social media allows businesses to adapt and design strategies that contribute to consumer usage intent and other relationship marketing such as consumer loyalty. Whilst preliminary support is provided on this measurement scale, there is also some caution. It would be better to use other groups that are representative of the population to find out more about the validity of the measurement scale.

References

Akhter, S.H. (2014). Privacy concern and online transactions: The impact of internet self-efficacy and internet involvement. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 31(2), 118-125.

Arbuckle, J.L. (2011). *IBM SPSS Amos 20 User's Guide*. Chicago, IL: AMOS Development.

Bahk, C.M. (2008). Reliance, immersion, and enjoyment: An exploratory socio-psychological analysis on internet involvement. *Communications of the IIMA,* 8(1), 59-66.

Bollen, K.A. (1989). A new incremental fit index for general structural equation models. *Sociological Methods & Research,* 17(3), 303-316.

Churchill, G.A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research,* 16(1), 64-73.

Clement, J. (2019). *Social media - Statistics & facts*. Retrieved 20 November 2019, from https://www.statista.com/topics/1164/social-networks/

Cooke, M., & Buckley, N. (2008). Web 2.0, social networks and the future of market research. *International Journal of Market Research,* 50(2), 267-292.

Curtis et al. (2010). Adoption of social media for public relations by nonprofit organizations. *Public Relations Review*, 36(1), 90-92.

Durrheim, K., & Painter, D. (2008). Collecting qualitative data: Sampling and measuring. In Blanche, M.T., Durrheim, K. and Painter, D. (Eds.), *Research in Practice,* pp. 130-159, Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Dwivedi, Y.K. (2009). *Handbook of Research on Contemporary Theoretical Models in Information Systems*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.

Ellison, N.B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook "friends:" Social capital and college students' use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication,* 12(4), 1143-1168.

Eveland, W.P., Jr., & Dunwoody, S. (2002). An investigation of elaboration and selective scanning as mediators of learning from the Web versus print. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 46(1), 34-53.

Field, A.P. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*. 4th ed. London: Sage.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. *Journal of Marketing* Research, 18(3), 382-388.

Gravetter, F.J., & Forzano, L-A.B. (2019). *Research Methods for the Behavioral Sciences*. 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Gretzel, U., Yoo, K.H., & Purifoy, M. (2007): *Online travel review study: Role and impact of online travel reviews*. Retrieved 11 April 2019, from http://www.tripadvisor.com/pdfs/Onlinetravelreviewreport.pdf

Gummerus et al. (2012). Customer engagement in a Facebook brand community. *Management Research Review*, 35(9), 857-877.

Ha, L., & Hu, X. (2013). Social media involvement among college students and general population: Implications to media management. In Friedrichsen, M. and Muhl-Benninghaus, W. (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Media Management: Value Chain and Business Models in Changing Media Markets*, pp. 751-773, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Hair et al. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis.* 7th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Hollebeek, L.D., & Brodie, R.J. (2009). Wine service marketing, value co-creation and involvement: Research issues. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 21(4), 339-353.

Huang, C.Y., Chou, C.J., & Lin, P.C. (2010). Involvement theory in constructing bloggers' intention to purchase travel products. *Tourism Management,* 31(4), 513-526.

Jiang et al. (2010). Effects of interactivity on website involvement and purchase intention. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 11(1), 1-8.

Laurent, G., & Kapferer, J.-N. (1985). Measuring consumer involvement profiles. *Journal of Marketing Research,* 22, 41-53.

Lee, R.M., Draper, M., & Lee, S. (2001). Social connectedness, dysfunctional interpersonal behaviors, and psychological distress: Testing a mediator model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 48(3), 310-318.

Levy, M.R., & Windahl, S. (1984). Audience activity and gratifications: A conceptual clarification and exploration. *Communication Research,* 11, 51–78.

Mehta, R., & Sivadas, E. (1995). Comparing responses rates and response content in mail versus electronic mail surveys. *Journal of the Market Research Society*, 37(4), 429-440.

Rosen et al. (2013). The media and technology usage and attitudes scale: An empirical investigation. *Computers in Human Behavior,* 29(6), 2501-2511.

Rubin, A.M. (1998). Personal involvement with the media. In Trent, J.S. (Ed.), *Communication: Views from the Helm for the 21st Century*, pp. 257-263, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Rubin, A.M., & Perse, E.M. (1987). Audience activity and soap opera involvement a uses and effects investigation. *Human Communication Research,* 14(2), 246-268.

Salam, A.F., Rao, H.R., & Pegels, C.C. (2000). Internet involvement: Instrument development, measurement, and implications for electronic commerce. In Shaw, M. et al., (Eds.), *Handbook on Electronic Commerce*, pp. 175-194, Berlin: Springer.

Stefanone, M.A., Lackaff, D., & Rosen, D. (2011). Contingencies of self-worth and social-networking-site behavior. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking,* 14(1-2), 41-49.

Stone, R.N. (1984). The marketing characteristics of involvement. *ACR North American Advances*, 11, 210-215.

Sun, S., Rubin, A.M., & Haridakis, P.M. (2008). The role of motivation and media involvement in explaining internet dependency. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media,* 52(3), 408-431.

Wang, A. (2006). Advertising engagement: A driver of message involvement on message effects. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 46(4), 355-368.

Wyatt, M. (2018). Lafayette sexual predators are banned from using social media. That's not stopping them. Retrieved 11 April 2019, from https://www.theadvertiser.com/story/news/local/2018/08/06/despite-ban-lafayette-louisiana-sex-offenders-active-social-media/819066002/

Zaichkowsky, J.L. (1994). The personal involvement inventory: Reduction, revision, and application to advertising. *Journal of Advertising,* 23(4), 59–70.