International Journal of Research in Finance and Management

P-ISSN: 2617-5754
E-ISSN: 2617-5762
IJRFM 2023; 6(2): 18-22
www.allfinancejournal.com
Received: 20-04-2023
Accepted: 25-05-2023

Sheena Gupta
Ph.D. Scholar, NIFT, Delhi, New Delhi, India

Dr. Sougata Banerjee
Associate Professor, NIFT, Kolkata, West Bengal, India

Correspondence Author:
Sheena Gupta
Ph.D. Scholar, NIFT, Delhi, New Delhi, India

Categorizing the Indian consumer according to their purchase intention towards affordable luxury apparel

Sheena Gupta and Dr. Sougata Banerjee

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26175754.2023.v6.i2a.239

Abstract
A rising nation like India is seeing a significant rise in the availability of affordable luxury. The rise of affordable luxury brands may be attributed to a number of factors, including an increase in HNIs and an urban middle class with a preference for premium goods. Retailers and brand owners are finding the marketing landscape to be both demanding and intriguing. This study aimed to categorise the segment into customers with high and low purchase intentions using a discriminant equation based on certain recognised factors. The study attempted to predict the target segment's purchasing intentions during a time when brand awareness and brand knowledge are at their highest levels. Through this method, businesses may evaluate the market for their brand, which will in turn help the marketer to reduce the market risk.

Keywords: Affordable luxury, apparel, discriminant analysis, purchase intention

Introduction

India is a sizable, intricate market with a shaky consumption structure. Despite the fact that many international companies view India as a market for luxury consumption, they must keep in mind that the Indian market is extremely complicated and diversified. The large middle class in India is growing, moving up the economic ladder, and becoming intermittent consumers of luxury goods (Fashionunited, 2013) [10]. The surge in luxury expenditure in the nation is being attributed to this relatively new class of aspirational households, supporting Dubois & Laurent's (1996) [9] argument that luxury is intended for a "happy many" rather than a "happy few". Traditional luxury is extremely distinct from affordable luxury or premium luxury (Sorger & Udale, 2006) [39].

Literature Review

The landscape of luxury products has significantly transformed during the past ten or so years (Kapferer & Valette-Florence, 2018) [20]. The democratisation of luxury, particularly in developing nations like India and China, is among the main causes of this new environment. According to Gupta (2018) [13], the Indian luxury market is expected to increase by 30% annually to reach USD 30 billion by 2020.

Nowadays, a number of luxury firms strive for a "happy many" and are emphasising expansion in contrast to traditional connotations with luxury that meant a "happy few" and focused on uniqueness (Dubois & Laurent, 1996) [9]. Even luxury firms steeped in history are now using creative methods to engage young luxury consumers as a result of new social media trends and the rise of this demographic (Ko & Woodside, 2013) [22].

The Indian luxury market is projected to rise by 3.8% yearly up to 2025 (Statista, 2018) [24]. India has one of the most youthful populations in the world, and as a result of rising consumer incomes, living standards have increased (Davar, 2018). Indian aspirants want to have a "global lifestyle." The middle-class customer in modern India who is seeking a better quality of life is this aspiring Indian. These objectives can be met by investing in luxury products. To provide these customers a taste of the lifestyle they desire, several firms are entering the affordable luxury market (Bhanot, 2013) [4].

Luxury that is within the financial means of a much larger audience than simply the HNIs and UHNIs is referred to as accessible or affordable luxury (Fury, 2015) [11].

'Affordable luxury' is a contradiction in terms. In terms of price and perception, affordable luxury lies between luxury and high-street brands (Fashionunited, 2013) [10].

Affordable luxury has been referred to by several titles in literature since it is a relatively new idea. These brands are sometimes referred to as diffusion brands, bridge-to-luxury brands, upper-range brands, or accessible luxury companies (Sorger & Udale, 2006; Kapferer, 2008) [39, 21]. The inexpensive luxury category also includes step-down line extensions (Jackson & Shaw, 2009) [16].

The value-conscious Indian customers are seen by luxury brands as a significant pull for their inexpensive or bridge-to-luxury items. The major benefit of purchasing luxury for this consumer is brand desire and awareness rather than the actual experience or product quality (Gupta, 2018) [13].

Finding and Analysis

Discriminant analysis is the best statistical approach when the variable under investigation is categorical and the independent variables are quantitative. The connection between a single categorical dependent variable and a group of quantified independent variables is estimated using discriminant analysis. The process involves creating a variate, which is the linear combination of two or more independent variables and offers the best discriminating between predetermined categories.

The descriptive approach gradually pinpoints a linear configuration of characteristics known as canonical discriminant values (equations) that most significantly aids in group separation. The cases with D values below the cut-off value are then divided into two groups, and the cases with D values over the cut-off value are divided into two groups as well.

By combining five predictor or independent variables - age, brand awareness, value consciousness, brand trust, and brand associations - the researcher attempted to create a discriminant function with a linear form of purchase intention of consumers to purchase affordable luxury clothes as a grouping variable. All four of the other predictor variables were recovered using exploratory factor analysis in SPSS, with the exception of age. When compared to the statements from the other components that were retrieved, these four factors had the largest communalities.

Group Statistics tables

Without a doubt, the Group Statistics Table (Table 1) shows that each group's predictors may be distinguished from one another. Additionally, the Tests of Equality of Group Means Table (Table 2) demonstrates that each of the five predictors exhibits statistically significant differences. Particularly noteworthy are the high F values for Brand Awareness (256.817), Value Consciousness (207.07), and Age (160.625), which suggest that these may be useful differentiators in the future. For predicting group membership, these factors with substantial separations and high F values are essential. The Pooled within Group Matrix (Table 3) confirms this by showing that all variables have modest and statistically negligible inter correlations. This enhances their capacity to act as discriminators.

Table 1: Group Statistics

Purchase Intention		Mean	Std. Deviation	Valid N (list wise)	
				Un-weighted	Weighted
Low	Brand Awareness	1.74	.709	49	49.000
	Value Conscious	2.25	.640	49	49.000
	Brand Trust	2.45	.829	49	49.000
	Brand Associations	2.29	.700	49	49.000
	Age	38.26	7.50	49	49.000
High	Brand Awareness	3.96	.800	96	96.000
	Value Conscious	4.17	.705	96	96.000
	Brand Trust	3.29	.842	96	96.000
	Brand Associations	3.90	.7-1	96	96.000
	Age	26.01	4.419	96	96.000
Total	Brand Awareness	3.32	1.297	145	145.000
	Value Conscious	3.49	1.061	145	145.000
	Brand Trust	2.90	.894	145	145.000
	Brand Associations	3.36	.913	145	145.000
	Age	30.34	8.280	145	145.000

Table 2: Tests of Equality of Group Means

	Wilks' Lambda	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Brand Awareness	.349	256.817	1	143	.000
Value Conscious	.397	207.07	1	143	.000
Brand Trust	.874	10.670	1	143	.000
Brand Associations	.564	105.479	1	143	.000
Age	.456	160.625	1	143	.000

Table 3: Pooled Within-Groups Matrices

		Brand Awareness	Value Conscious	Brand Trust	Brand Associations	Age
Correlation	Brand Awareness	1.000	.076	-.060	-.262	-.198
	Value Conscious	.076	1.000	.048	-.082	-.051
	Brand Trust	-.060	.048	1.000	.038	.028
	Brand Association	-.262	-.082	.038	1.000	.082
	Age	-.198	-.051	.028	.082	1.000

Log determinants and Box's M tables

The log determinants must be equal in order for this hypothesis to be true. In order to show similarity and the absence of significant differences when using Box's M, the researcher looks for a non-significant M. Given that the log determinants are similar, Box's M is 31.75 and F=2.025, which are both significant at p =.010 and less than.05 (Table 5), in this case. As a result, the null hypothesis may be disproved, showing that there are differences in the covariance matrices between dependent groups. On the other hand, when the sample size is expanded (big sample size), the converse can happen.

Table 4: Log Determinants

Purchase Intention	Rank	Log Determinant
Low	5	.881
High	5	.572
Pooled within-groups	5	.897
The ranks and natural logarithms of determinants printed are those of the group covariance matrices.		

Table 5: Test Results

Box's M		31.75
F	Approx.	2.025
	df1	15
	df2	38826.538
	Sig.	.010
Tests null hypothesis of equal population covariance matrices.		

Table of Eigenvalues

Each of the created discriminating functions (equations) is affected by this information. The number of groups minus one determines the maximum number of discriminant functions that can be produced. Only one function is shown since only two groups - "high purchase intention" and "low purchase intention" - are being used. A canonical correlation of 0.923 in this study's Table 6 shows that the model, which determines if an individual has an elevated or decreased purchase intention, accounts for 85.32 percent of the variation in the grouping variable.

Summary of Canonical Discriminant Functions

Table 6: Eigenvalues

Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical Correlation
1	5.785[a]	100.0	100.0	.923
a. First 1 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.				

Wilks' lambda

According to Hair *et al.* (2014) [15], Wilks' lambda demonstrates the importance of the discriminant function. This table (Table 7) offers the percentage of total variability not explained, i.e., it is the opposite of the squared canonical correlation, and indicates a very significant function (p =.000, which is less than.05, and the Null Hypothesis is rejected). So, the 14.7% variation is unaccounted for.

Table 7: Wilks' Lambda

Test of Function (s)	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	.147	269.012	5	.000

The standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients table

An index of the importance of each predictor may be seen in Table 8. The relationship's nature is made clear by the symbol. The most important predictor was brand awareness, which was followed by brand associations, value consciousness, and age (please note the minus sign). The high and low purchase intention groups can be distinguished by membership in these variables with high coefficients. Brand Trust Score did not perform as well as predictions.

Table 8: Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

	Function
	1
Brand Awareness	.616
Value Conscious	.489
Brand Trust	.161
Brand Associations	.585
Age	-.354

The Structure Matrix Table
The relative value of the predictors is presented in a different way in Table 9, and the similar trend can be seen below. Structure matrix correlations are frequently used by researchers because they are thought to be more accurate than Standardised Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients. The links between each variable and each discriminating function are shown in the table of the structural matrix.

Table 9: Structure Matrix

	Function
	1
Brand Awareness	.568
Value Conscious	.512
Age	-.454
Brand Associations	.366
Brand Trust	.158

Pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and standardized canonical discriminant functions Variables ordered by absolute size of correlation within function.

The Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficient Table
D = (−0.060 × Age) + (0.191 x Brand Trust) + (0.852 x Brand Associations) + (.803 × Brand Awareness) + (.729 × Value Conscious) − 6.680.

Table 10: Canonical discriminant function coefficients

	Function
	1
Brand Awareness	.803
Value Conscious	.729
Brand Trust	.191
Brand Associations	.852
Age	-.060
(Constant)	-6.680
Unstandardized coefficients	

Group centroids table
One may further understand the outcomes of discriminant analysis by characterising each group in terms of its profile using the group means of the predictor variables. These are referred to as centroids or group means. These are displayed in the table Group Centroids. Consumers who are more likely to make a purchase have a mean of 1.706 in this study, while those who are less likely to do so have a mean of -3.343. Cases with scores near to a centroid are anticipated to fall into that category.

Table 11: Functions at Group Centroids

Purchase Intention	Function
	1
Low	-3.343
High	1.706

Unstandardized canonical discriminant functions evaluated at group means

Conclusion
To determine if a consumer had a high or low buy intention, a discriminant analysis was done. Age, brand awareness, value consciousness, brand trust, and brand connections were predictor factors. For each predictor, there were sizable mean differences. The premise of equality of covariance was also accepted, as evidenced by the close similarity of the log determinants and Box's M. A substantial correlation between groups and all predictors was found using the discriminate function, which accounted for 85.32% of the variance between groups. Only four significant indicators emerged from a thorough examination of the structure matrix: brand knowledge, value consciousness, age, and brand connections, with brand trust doing poorly.

With the use of the discriminant equation derived from this study, it is possible to determine whether new buyers of affordable luxury will have a high or low purchase intention. This might be of great assistance to those who work in the luxury yet affordable market. Brand managers can identify the characteristics that are most important in separating a specific customer segment from another by examining the distinctions between the two groups. They may develop strategies that successfully target each category by using the data to customise their marketing efforts. This study may be utilised by people who work in the affordable luxury clothes sector to identify the critical characteristics or elements that affect how customers perceive a certain affordable luxury brand.

References

1. Ahn JH, Kim JE, Kwon H. The influence of brand associations on consumer responses to affordable luxury brands: The mediating role of brand experience. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services. 2021;60:102468.
2. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behaviour. Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes. 1991;50(2):179-211.
3. Atwal G, Williams A. Luxury brand marketing: The experience is everything! Journal of Brand Management. 2009;16(5-6):338-346.
4. Bhanot S. Identifying Luxury Value Dimensions among Consumers and using these Dimensions for Market Segmentation. FIIB Business Review; c2013. p. 53-70.
5. Bhatnagar A, Misra S, Rao HR. On risk, convenience, and Internet shopping behaviour. Communications of the ACM. 2000;43(11):98-105.
6. Bian Q, Forsythe S. Purchase intention for luxury brands: A cross-cultural comparison. Journal of Business Research. 2012;65(10):1443-1451.
7. Chang Y, Tseng Y. Building consumer trust in the luxury brand market. Journal of Business Research. 2016;69(12):5743-5748.
8. Davar M. India Now - Business and Economy, the Luxe Edit; c2018 Feb-Mar. Retrieved from www.ibef.org: file:///C:/Users/sheen/Desktop/Papers%20for%20submissions/India-Now-February-March-2018.pdf
9. Dubois B, Laurent G. The functions of luxury: a situational approach to excursionism. Advances in Consumer Research. 1996;2(3):470-477.
10. Fashionunited; c2013 Feb 27. /bridge-to-luxury-brands-gain-momentum-in-india/. Retrieved from www.fashionunited.in:https://fashionunited.in/v1/fashion/bridge-to-luxury-brands-gain-momentum-in-india/201302279677

11. Fury A; c2015 Aug 16. Accessible-luxury-brands-may-be-devaluing-luxury-but-they-re-making-a-mint. Retrieved from www.independent.co.uk: https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/fashion/features/accessible-luxury-brands-may-be-devaluing-luxury-but-they-re-making-a-mint-10458063.html
12. Godey B, Pederzoli D, Aiello G, Donvito R, Wiedmann KP. Luxury brand strategies and customer experiences: Contributions to theory and practice. Journal of Business Research. 2016;69(12):5749-5751.
13. Gupta A. How-luxury-brands-should-target-indias-super-rich; c2018. Retrieved from www.retaildive.com: https://www.retaildive.com/ex/mobilecommercedaily/how-luxury-brands-should-target-indias-super-rich
14. Hair JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, Anderson RE, Tatham RL. Multivariate data analysis. Pearson; c2006, 6.
15. Hair JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, Anderson RE. Multivariate data analysis (7th ed.). Pearson; c2014.
16. Jackson T, Shaw D. Mastering Fashion Marketing. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan; c2009.
17. Jahanzeb S, Khattak J, Fatima T. The influence of brand awareness on purchase intention and brand loyalty of cosmetic products among university students. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics. 2020;33(3):599-616.
18. Ji M, Jeon HM. The effects of perceived value and brand awareness on purchase intention of luxury fashion products: Moderating effects of consumer innovativeness. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services. 2019;51:393-400.
19. Johnson RA, Wichern DW. Applied multivariate statistical analysis (6th ed.). Pearson; c2007.
20. Kapferer. The new strategic brand management: Creating and sustaining brand equity long term. London: Kogan Page; c2008.
21. Kapferer J, Valette-Florence P. The impact of brand penetration and awareness on luxury brand desirability. Journal of Business Research. 2018;83:38-50.
22. Ko E, Woodside AG. Luxury fashion and culture. Emerald Group Publishing; c2013.
23. Kothari CR. Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques. 2nd Edition. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers; c2004.
24. Statista. Luxury-goods/India; c2018. Retrieved from www.statista.com: https://www.statista.com/outlook/21000000/119/luxury-goods/india
25. Li J, Su J. The influence of brand associations on consumer response to affordable luxury brands: A study of Chinese consumers. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services. 2018;44:284-291.
26. Lin YC, Mattila AS. Exploring luxury fashion consumption among young consumers. Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management. 2019;23(2):192-208.
27. Liu SQ, Wei WH, Zhang ZC, Tian HW. A comparative analysis of brand personality and brand authenticity in affordable luxury versus luxury brands. Journal of Global Fashion Marketing. 2021;12(1):1-16.
28. Manly BFJ. Multivariate statistical methods: A primer (3rd ed.). Chapman and Hall/CRC; c2004.
29. Martínez-López FJ, Gázquez-Abad JC, Rodríguez-Molina MA. The role of luxury brand heritage in shaping consumer behavior. Journal of Business Research. 2019;96:49-60.
30. Morrison DF. Multivariate statistical methods (4th ed.). Thomson Learning; c2005.
31. Mundel J, Huddleston P, Vodermeier M. An exploratory study of consumers' perceptions: What are affordable luxuries? Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services; c2017. p. 68-75.
32. Nargundkar R. Marketing Research: Text and Cases. Tata McGraw-Hill Educational; c2008.
33. Phau I, Prendergast G. Consuming luxury brands: The relevance of the 'rarity principle'. Journal of Brand Management. 2001;8(2):122-138.
34. Phau I, Leng HK, Teah M. Attitudes towards luxury brands: An exploratory analysis from a transitional economy. Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management. 2010;14(2):161-180.
35. Riegner C. The effects of brand loyalty on consumer purchase intention. International Journal of Latest Engineering Research and Applications. 2018;3(11):32-36.
36. Rosen D, Vaughan MW. Predictive and discriminant analysis: A comparison. Journal of Marketing Research. 1982;19(3):297-303. DOI: 10.1177/002224378201900307
37. Shin H, Lee HJ. Antecedents and consequences of brand trust in the context of affordable luxury fashion brands. Journal of Global Fashion Marketing. 2019;10(3):245-258.
38. So KKF, King C, Sparks B. Luxury retailing in Hong Kong: Psychological attributes, hedonism, and shopping value. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services. 2014;21(5):773-782.
39. Sorger, Udale. The Fundamentals of Fashion Design. London: AVA Publishing; c2006.
40. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS. Using multivariate statistics (7th ed.). Pearson; c2019.
41. Wiedmann KP, Hennigs N, Siebels A. Value-based segmentation of luxury consumption behavior. Journal of Business Research. 2009;62(12):1156-1162.