

Value-Based Segmentation of Generation Z Women Consumers of India : Replication and Validation of Model

Neetu Singh¹
Sakshi Nigam²

Abstract

This research aimed at understanding the luxury value perceptions of generation Z women consumers of India by using the luxury value perception model (LVP) given by Wiedmann et al. (2009). This study tried to validate and replicate the Wiedmann model, which categorized luxury values as financial, functional, individual, and social, using the emerging generation Z women consumers of India as a context. Data were collected from 208 women consumers across India using an online questionnaire from January – March 2021. The findings validated the usage of the LVP model to create homogeneous clusters based on the preferred luxury values of the generation Z women consumers. The overall luxury values which motivated the Indian generation Z women consumers towards luxury purchases are hedonic values (self-gift giving extravagance) followed by functional value (uniqueness) and then individual values (materialistic value). The results also validated the research done by the authors (Hennigs et al., 2012) later, finding interesting similarities between Indian, German, and US consumers. By identifying the drivers of luxury purchases for young emerging women consumers of India, the outcome of this research would enable luxury brand marketers and branders to build successful marketing strategies to be more profitable.

Keywords : luxury values, luxury, consumer behavior, consumer segmentation, generation Z

JEL Classification Code : M21, M30, M31, M39

Paper Submission Date : May 10, 2021; **Paper sent back for Revision :** July 7, 2021 ; **Paper Acceptance Date :** September 20, 2021 ; **Paper Published Online :** October 20, 2021

Luxury for an individual is usually a rare, authentic, symbolic, distinct product or service. Research in the luxury brand domain tries to establish the complex relationship between the consumers and their intention of purchasing luxury goods based on whether they are relevant enough to match their distinctive lifestyle. The concept of luxury albeit differs between societies (Schütte & Ciarlante, 1998), with collectivists purchasing luxury predominantly to show off (Shukla, 2010) while individualists indulge in luxury consumption for personal pleasure (Tsai, 2005). The cultural behavior related to luxury consumption has been well documented (Hennigs et al., 2012), with young Americans purchasing luxury based on superior product quality, while social factors influenced Koreans. The Indian consumers are no strangers to luxury, having been exposed to a rich royal lineage and craftsmanship, making them avid consumers of luxury, which is highly dominated by social consequences (Atwal & Williams, 2009; Shukla, 2010). The international luxury market braved substantial upheavals to record 4% growth to reach €281 billion in the year 2019 (Bain & Company, 2019). The reason for the growth is the influx

¹ Assistant Professor, Symbiosis Institute of Design, Symbiosis International (Deemed) University, Lavale, Mulshi, Pune - 412 115, Maharashtra. (Email : neetu.singh@sid.edu.in) ; ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0338-9846>

² M.Sc. Applied Statistics, Symbiosis Statistical Institute (SSI), Symbiosis International (Deemed) University, Lavale, Mulshi, Pune - 412 115, Maharashtra. (Email : sakshinigam12297@gmail.com)

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2021/v14i10/166641>

of young buyers known as Generation Z consumers born between the years 1997 – 2012 (Dimock, 2019) who will be instrumental in driving the luxury purchase and will account for 40% of the buyer population by the year 2025.

The Indian luxury market is currently valued at US\$ 50 billion (Bhuchar, 2017) as compared to US \$30 billion in the year 2018 (Agarwal, 2016). India alone is home to the largest world's population totaling 609 million under the age of 24 (Bain & Company, 2019), with the burgeoning middle-class HENRY (high-earners-not-rich-yet) (Advait, 2020; Deloitte, 2018) driving low and mid-priced luxury purchases. Within the luxury market, the women's luxury products command a significantly higher premium than the men's as women bestow significant symbolic and social value upon luxury purchases and depict significant purchase intention as compared to men who follow a task-oriented, life goal specific, performance motivating buying behavior (Meyers-Levy & Loken, 2015). Since research on generation and gender influences on luxury purchase behavior is limited, this research provides empirical aid to the often conceptualized but untested framework of luxury value perceptions from a generation Z, women consumer perspective in a developing country context. By using the luxury value perception model propounded by Wiedmann et al. (2009), the research empirically segregates the Indian generation Z women consumers' luxury value perceptions as financial, functional, individual, and social, having a significant influence on their luxury purchase motivation and providing considerable insights for luxury brands to build the same via their business strategies.

Theoretical Framework

Influence of Gender on Luxury Purchase Behavior

The notion of luxury has changed phenomenally over a period of time, as earlier it was considered an expression of wealth and prestige, while the current day consumer perceives it as an experience than an acquisition (Yeoman & McMahon-Beattie, 2018). The social structure theory of gender classifies people based on sex type attributes and roles (Brewer & Lui, 1989; Sangeetha & Natarajan, 2019), stereotyping gender roles. Thus, due to a difference in self-concept, men manage to separate their independent self from others' opinions (Deaux & Major, 1987; Thriveni Kumari, 2020), while women still give considerable importance to opinions defining their self-esteem (Wang & Waller, 2006; Workman & Lee, 2011). Psychologically too, the genders assess each other differently, with women judging men by their financial stability resulting in men indulging in more conspicuous consumption (Wang & Griskevicius, 2014). On the other hand, men judge a woman based on her physical attractiveness, dependent on individual preference and perception of beauty, making women seek products to appear attractive (Garza et al., 2016). Therefore, luxury purchases by men are treated as conspicuous consumption meant to portray economic strength (O'Cass & McEwen, 2004), while the female consumption pattern is dominated by quality, exclusivity, and social values (Bocheliuk et al., 2019; Wiedmann et al., 2009). Male consumers, therefore, assimilate single inference heuristic shopping cues effectively and focus on the functional aspects of the products, while the female consumers consolidate their information and give importance to structural relations along with interpretive dimensions (Jaušovec & Jaušovec, 2009; Meyers-Levy & Loken, 2015). Due to a significant difference in the luxury purchase behavior between men and women, this paper focuses on the gender influence, especially women who belong to the young generation Z cohort, and the value perceptions influencing their luxury purchase behavior in a developing country context.

Generation Z and Their Luxury Value Perceptions

This generation of the population born between 1997 and 2012 (Dimock, 2019) depicts distinctly different buying behavior and value perceptions as compared to their predecessors, mainly because they are born in a digital era

and have had high digital proliferation in their lives, mainly through smartphones, television, internet, and social media (Palley, 2012; Turner, 2015). Due to the continuous internet proximity, this generation of consumers is extremely tech-savvy, accumulates extensive information on products, and multi-tasks with online shopping brands sharing information online (Smolağ et al., 2016). As a generation slated to be accountable for 40% of luxury purchases by the year 2022 (Bain & Company, 2019; Deloitte, 2018), the digital generation depicts completely different luxury value perceptions as compared to their predecessors, the millennials (Kastiya & Sharma, 2020; Patra et al., 2019). This generation of consumers is not exceedingly brand loyal and seeks instant gratification, exclusivity, and engagement from their brands in particular (Berkup, 2014; Merriman, 2015). This group of consumers seeks comfort and innovation from the technological world, leading them to engage in escapist pursuits like video games, movies, music, extreme sports, and creating an alternate world (Bassiouni & Hackley, 2014; Priporas et al., 2017). Also, since they are born in the era of financial and economic instability, they seek security from their purchases (Merriman, 2015). This behavior has propelled the market of experiential luxury products and services such as travel, dining, resorts, cruises, gourmet cuisines, fine wines, designer furniture, cars, yachts, and smartphones valued at €590 billion out of the total €920 billion global luxury market (Danziger, 2019). The typical generation Z consumer behavior, especially with regard to luxury purchases, has not yet been ascertained, which is why the current paper has used the Wiedmann et al. (2009) model to focus on the value perceptions influencing the young generation Z women consumers, especially situated in a developing country like India, which is currently showing stupendous growth pushed by the young consumers (Deloitte, 2018).

Luxury Values and Hypotheses Development

Various models have tried to identify the drivers of luxury consumption (Jain & Mishra, 2018; Kapferer, 1997; Nueno & Quelch, 1998) and focus on the conceptual work in this field (Berthon et al., 2009; Vigneron & Johnson, 1999). The model describing conspicuous consumption (Vigneron & Johnson, 1999) further categorizes luxury value as “interpersonal (conspicuous, uniqueness, & social values) and personal (hedonic and quality values),” stating that people buy luxury “to impress others” (Hennigs et al., 2012). Both interpersonal and personal values were cited by Vigneron and Johnson (2004), who tabulated brand luxury index (BI) using social (conspicuous, uniqueness, and quality values) and personal value considerations (hedonism and extended self). The model propounded by Vickers and Renand (2003) used functional, experiential, and symbolic value perceptions, while Fionda and Moore (2009), Han et al. (2010), and Truong (2010) elucidated the social and personal value perceptions, ignoring others. Finally, in 2007, Wiedmann et al. (2007), using Bourdieu's (1986) capital theory along with Vigneron and Johnson's (2004) BLI model, created the luxury value perception (LVP) model, which is the outcome of four factors: financial, functional, individual, and social. The authors later in their study found, “consumer's perceptions of luxury value appear to be determined mainly by functional, individual, and social aspects, with the financial dimension in terms of the price acting as a moderating variable” (Wiedmann et al., 2009, p. 637), which led them towards removing the financial dimension and retaining the other three. Hence, the new model consisted of factors that measured usability value, uniqueness value, quality value, self-identity value, materialistic value, and hedonic value contributing to the consumers' luxury brand perceptions.

Several studies have focused on the determination of value perceptions influencing the luxury purchase motivation of consumers in developing countries (Aliyev & Wagner, 2018; Chattalas & Shukla, 2015; Shukla & Purani, 2012). However, gender and generational cohort-based value perceptions driving luxury purchase intentions have not been addressed significantly. This research, therefore, utilizes the shortened version of the LVP model (Hennigs et al., 2012; Wiedmann et al., 2009) to identify and interpret the value perceptions

influencing the luxury purchase intentions of generation Z women consumers of India. A brief description of the LVP model values is as follows.

(1) Financial Values : Economically, luxury goods are considered rare, exclusive, and bestow high prestige value upon its users as against goods that are considered a necessity (Wilkinson, 1981). Luxury evokes desire and pleasure due to its exclusivity and craftsmanship, so consumers wish to indulge in it. Conspicuous value can be described as the “perceptions of price and social status associated with the brand” (Vigneron & Johnson, 2004, p. 68) or an ostentatious display of wealth usually meant to alleviate ego or status in a city (O’Cass, 2004). The financial dimension hence refers to the monetary value of luxury goods with evidence pointing towards high price being equated with high quality or superior performance (Dubois et al., 2001; Vigneron & Johnson, 2004) by the consumers. The LVP scale concluded that the financial dimension acts only as a moderator of luxury values. The same was validated in a later study in a cross-cultural context (Hennigs et al., 2012), with our current findings based on the “functional, individual and social dimensions of luxury value consumption” (Wiedmann et al., 2009, p. 637).

(2) Functional Values : Price is an important consideration for luxury buying; however, several other values apart from price drive luxury consumption. The utilitarian aspects of shopping depict the functional value of luxury goods or services (Babin et al., 1994), where the consumers judge a product by its desired characteristics, usability, and performance standards (Smith & Colgate, 2007). The functional value has been further divided into three values defined as usability value, quality value, and uniqueness value. Usability value depicts the utilitarian or functional attributes of the products (Roux et al., 2017; Srinivasan et al., 2014). The quality value reflects a consumer's attitude towards a brand, perceiving it to be of a higher quality because of the higher value of the product. Consumers, therefore, believe that the superior craftsmanship, performance, and high quality of their luxury brand communicates an upscale lifestyle (Hung et al., 2011; Li et al., 2012). The uniqueness value or the “snob effect” (Husic & Cicic, 2009) is based on the rarity syndrome of luxury goods depicting that rarity and desirability of a luxury item are positively correlated and is therefore of more importance to female consumers as against non-luxury items (Netemeyer et al., 2004; Stokburger-Sauer & Teichmann, 2013). Therefore, our hypothesis based on functional values is :

❖ **H1:** The luxury value-based segmentation of Indian generation Z women consumers can be done based on their perceived functional value of luxury brands/services.

(3) Individual Values : Individual values refer to the luxury consumers' individual values on how buying, possessing, and using a luxury brand instills self-confidence, self-fulfillment, and builds self-identity in return (Jiang & Shan, 2018; Truong, 2010). Self-identity is an outcome of three components: brand personality congruity, brand user imagery congruity, and brand usage image congruity, where the brands' personality and user imagery enable the consumers to visualize themselves using the brand and align their self-identity with the brands' personality (Liu et al., 2012). The individual value dimension has been further categorized as hedonic and materialistic values of the consumers. Hedonism refers to the feelings of self-actualization, pleasure, and self-fulfillment that consumption of a product evokes in the consumers' mind, leading to the consumers' positive cognitive and affective well-being (Amatulli & Guido, 2011; Kalyoncuoglu & Sahin, 2017; Truong, 2010). Luxury products are therefore categorized as hedonistic as they evoke self-pleasure and create emotional bonding with the consumers (Wiedmann et al., 2009), boosting their self-identity and self-confidence (Deeter-Schmelz et al., 2000). Materialism is the consumers' preference for materialistic acquisitions compared to spiritual ones, with females scoring higher on the materialistic scale than men (Vigneron & Johnson, 1999; Workman & Lee, 2011). Therefore, the second hypothesis based on individual values is as follows :

✍ **H2:** The luxury value-based segmentation of the Indian generation Z women consumers can be done based on their perceived individual value of luxury brand/service.

(4) Social Values : Social value reflects the consumers' desire to be accepted in a social format (Vigneron & Johnson, 1999). The luxury purchase has a socially directed symbolic value meant to evoke self-confidence and augment self-esteem by the society's appreciation and compliments. The LVP model categorizes two antecedents of social value as perceived conspicuous consumption and perceived prestige value in social networks, which appropriately convey elitism and hence be considered an important criterion of luxury value perception (Wiedmann et al., 2009). Perceived conspicuousness value refers to wasteful and frivolous spending behavior by the consumers (Wang & Griskevicius, 2014) in order to create an impression upon others and achieve a definitive social status in society. Perceived social value is a result of social referencing (Vigneron & Johnson, 2004), where luxury consumption serves as an indicator of a social club or group membership (Dubois et al., 2001). The following proposed hypothesis can hence assess the social value perceptions of the luxury buying consumer :

✍ **H3:** The luxury value-based segmentation of the Indian generation Z women consumers can be done based on their perceived social value of luxury brands/services.

Measurement Instrument

To ascertain the luxury value perception of generation Z Indian women consumers, we used the LVP scale created by Wiedmann et al. (2009), categorizing the dimensions as functional, individual, and social. A questionnaire was created using the items from the LVP model and was administered to 260 Indian women consumers aged between 18 – 20 years of age using convenience sampling. The period of this study was between January – March 2021. Of this, only 208 consumers fully responded to the questionnaire. All respondents were college-going students and had engaged in the purchase of at least one luxury good in the last six months, which was a criterion for filling the questionnaire. As per the Wiedmann et al. (2009) model, the definition of luxury is left to the consumers' perception as the meaning of luxury differs between subjects. For some, a Michael Kors bag can be construed as a luxury, while for others, an iPhone or an OLED television can be considered a luxury good. The data were analyzed using the SPSS statistical package to generate the results.

Analysis and Results

The data of 208 respondents were analyzed further using various approaches. Due to high dimensionality and existing high correlation in the data, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) which was further analyzed using confirmatory factor analysis. Due to the existing high correlation in factors and high cross-loadings in varimax rotation, we used principal component analysis with oblimin rotation. The outcome of EFA clearly resulted in six factors, with 26 variables out of 48 variables (Kaiser - Meyer - Olkin (KMO) statistic value of 0.85 and p -value of Bartlett's test of sphericity much lower than 0.05). The remaining variables were dropped because they did not meet the minimum threshold of > 0.5 factor loading and high cross-loadings. The EFA resulted in a two-factor model for functional value dimension, a three-factor model for individual value dimension, and one factor model for social value dimension, as represented in Table 1.

CFA is performed in the remaining 26 items to verify the factor structure obtained from EFA. The performance indicators of the model (Chi-square = 651.404, df = 325, p -value < 0.001 , CFI = 0.942, TLI = 0.934, RMSEA = 0.069, SRMR = 0.15) are all in the allowable range, establishing the existence of a relationship between the underlying latent variable and the observed variables. As represented in Table 2, the Cronbach's alpha

Table 1. Items Extracted from Exploratory Factor Analysis

Variable Name	Items	Factor Loading
FVD	Functional Value Dimension	
FV	Factor 1: Usability Value	
FV1	In my opinion, luxury is really useless. ^R	0.764
FV2	In my opinion, luxury is just swanky. ^R	0.517
FV3	*In my opinion, luxury is pleasant.	0.4
FV4	In my opinion, luxury is old-fashioned. ^R	0.72
FV5	In my opinion, luxury is good.	0.586
FV6	*Luxury products make life more beautiful.	0.281
FV7	I am not interested in luxury. ^R	0.627
UV	Factor 2: Uniqueness Value	
UV1	A luxury product cannot be sold in supermarkets.	0.909
UV2	True luxury products cannot be mass-produced.	0.909
UV3	Few people own a true luxury product.	0.561
UV4	People who buy luxury products try to differentiate themselves from others.	0.686
QV	Factor 3: Quality Value	
QV1	*I'm inclined to evaluate the substantive attributes and performance of a luxury brand myself rather than listen to others' opinions.	0.432
QV2	*The luxury brand is preferred by many people, but that does not meet my quality standards and will never enter into my purchase consideration.	0.407
QV3	*I buy a luxury brand for satisfying my personal needs without any attempt to make an impression on other people.	0.486
IVD	Individual Value Dimension	
SI	Factor 4: Self-Identity Value	
SI1	I never buy a luxury brand inconsistent with the characteristics with which I describe myself.	0.757
SI2	The luxury brands I buy must match what and who I really am.	0.741
SI3	My choice of luxury brands depends on whether they reflect how I see myself but not how others see me.	0.649
MV	Factor 5: Materialistic Value	
MV1	My life would be better if I owned certain things I don't have.	0.639
MV2	I'd be happier if I could afford to buy more things.	0.575
MV3	It sometimes bothers me quite a bit that I can't afford to buy all the things I'd like.	0.793
MV4	*I have all the things I really need to enjoy life. ^R	0.421
HVSG	Factor 6: Hedonic Value - Self-Gift Giving	
HVSG1	Purchasing luxury brands can be seen as giving myself gifts to celebrate an occasion that I believe is significant to me.	0.666
HVSG2	*On the whole, I may regard luxury brands as gifts I buy for treating myself.	0.49
HVSG3	When in a bad mood, I may buy luxury brands as self-given gifts for alleviating the emotional burden.	0.838
HVSG4	Reward for hard work or that I feel I have earned or am entitled to is an important motivator for my luxury consumption.	0.619

HVSG5	To me, luxury consumption is a way to reduce stress. ^R	0.038
HVEX	Factor 7: Hedonic Value - Extravagance	
HVEX1	I enjoy spending money on things that aren't practical.	0.602
HVEX2	*I usually buy only the things I need. ^R	0.25
HVEX3	*Buying things gives me a lot of pleasure.	0.406
HVSD	Factor 8: Hedonic Value - Self Directed Pleasure	
HVSD1	*Luxury brands are one of the sources for my own pleasure without regard to the feelings of others.	0.384
HVSD2	*I can enjoy luxury brands entirely on my own terms, no matter what others may feel about them.	0.386
HVLE	Factor 9: Hedonic Value - Life Enrichment	
HVLE1	*For me as a luxury consumer, cultural development is an important motivator.	0.238
HVLE2	*Purchasing luxury brands provides deeper meaning to my life.	0.429
HVLE3	*Self-actualization is an important motivator for my luxury consumption.	0.388
HVLE4	Luxury consumption enhances the quality of my life.	0.434
SVD	Social Value Dimension	
SV	Factor 10: Prestige Value in Social Networks	
SV1	*I like to know what brands and products make good impressions on others.	0.452
SV2	I usually keep up with style changes by watching what others buy.	0.631
SV3	*Before purchasing a product, it is important to know what brands or products to buy to make good impressions on others.	0.346
SV4	Before purchasing a product, it is important to know what kinds of people buy certain brands or products.	0.678
SV5	Before purchasing a product, it is important to know what others think of people who use certain brands or products.	0.638
SV6	*I tend to pay attention to what others are buying.	0.498
SV7	Before purchasing a product, it is important to know what my friends think of different brands or products.	0.716
SV8	*I actively avoid using products that are not in style.	0.295
SV9	If I were to buy something expensive, I would worry about what others would think of me.	0.501
SV10	*Social standing is an important motivator for my luxury consumption.	0.302
SV11	For me as a luxury consumer, sharing with friends is an important motivator.	0.506
SV12	*I often consult my friends to help choose the best alternative available from a product category.	0.466
SV13	My friends and I tend to buy the same brands.	0.584

Note. *Variables not selected, R: Reverse coded variables.

coefficient and the composite reliability, if the factors are in the range of 0.6 – 0.95, indicate a medium internal consistency for the factor structure proposed. All the items included in the factors are statistically significant at the 5% level of significance ($p < 0.05$).

The factor scores were calculated from the factor analysis to analyze the data further using Hierarchical (agglomerative) clustering from Ward's method. This method helped identify three clusters from the 26 items, which were further verified using K means clustering. The sample taken from the Indian population suggested that

Table 2. CFA Results with Factor Loadings and Reliability Measures

Factor Names	Initial Variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-value*	Alpha	Composite Reliability
Factor 1: Usability Value	<i>FV1</i>	0.168	0.025	6.775	0.78	0.91
	<i>FV2</i>	0.116	0.015	7.568		
	<i>FV4</i>	0.171	0.021	8.336		
	<i>FV5</i>	0.154	0.022	7.081		
	<i>FV7</i>	0.186	0.026	7.152		
Factor 2: Uniqueness Value	<i>UV1</i>	0.018	0.148	0.12	0.64	0.68
	<i>UV2</i>	0.018	0.148	0.12		
	<i>UV3</i>	-0.001	0.008	-0.109		
	<i>UV4</i>	-0.012	0.099	-0.118		
Factor 3: Self Identity Value	<i>SI1</i>	0.153	0.023	6.646	0.6	0.89
	<i>SI2</i>	0.121	0.02	5.949		
	<i>SI3</i>	0.212	0.024	8.728		
Factor 4: Materialistic Value	<i>MV1</i>	0.032	0.031	1.033	0.66	0.78
	<i>MV2</i>	0.28	0.096	2.934		
	<i>MV3</i>	0.07	0.027	2.581		
Factor 5: Hedonic Value (Self Gift Giving Extravagance)	<i>HVSGG1</i>	0.155	0.027	5.829	0.66	0.60
	<i>HVSGG3</i>	-0.004	0.022	-0.167		
	<i>HVSGG4</i>	0.119	0.023	5.14		
	<i>HVEX1</i>	-0.07	0.024	-2.924		
Factor 6: Prestige Value in Social Networks	<i>SVD2</i>	0.141	0.024	5.805	0.79	0.93
	<i>SVD4</i>	0.146	0.023	6.283		
	<i>SVD5</i>	0.205	0.028	7.201		
	<i>SVD7</i>	0.217	0.031	7.097		
	<i>SVD9</i>	0.225	0.032	7.104		
	<i>SVD11</i>	0.105	0.019	5.591		
	<i>SVD13</i>	0.135	0.023	5.734		

Note. All the values are statistically significant, with $p < 0.05$.

consumers' uniqueness value ($F = 113.829$), materialistic value ($F = 102.726$), and hedonic value ($F = 131.49$) have considerable difference (as represented in Table 3). Cluster 3 comprised of 38.5% of the sample, which is the largest among all the other clusters, while the other two clusters contributed to 30.8% of the sample each. The cluster analysis results are verified through linear discriminant analysis (LDA), with 94.6% of the observations correctly classified in each cluster as represented in Table 4. This substantiates the results obtained from cluster analysis. In Cluster 1 (Unique Materialists), materialistic value contributes the most, with the highest mean rating of 85.23%. In Cluster 2 (Prestige Seekers), the contribution of prestige value in social networks is the highest, with a mean rating of 37.82%, and in Cluster 3 (Hedonic Introverts), hedonic value contributes the most, with the highest mean rating of 81.75%.

Table 3. Final Three Clusters from K Means Clustering

Luxury Value Dimensions	Cluster 1 (Unique Materialists) (n = 64)	Cluster 2 (Prestige Chasers) (n = 64)	Cluster 3 (Hedonic Functionalists) (n = 80)	F ^a
Functional Value Dimension				
Usability Value	-0.49	-0.44	0.74	54.11
Uniqueness Value	0.85	-0.98	0.10	113.83
Individual Value Dimension				
Self-Identity Value	-0.50	-0.36	0.69	43.61
Materialistic Value	0.88	-0.92	0.03	102.73
Hedonic Value -Self Gift Giving Extravagance	-0.03	-0.99	0.82	131.49
Social Value Dimension				
Prestige Value in Social Networks	0.06	0.38	-0.35	10.63

Note. ^a. All the F - values are significant.

Table 4. Verification of the Clusters Using LDA

Discriminant Function	Eigen Value	Canonical Correlation	Wilk's Lambda	χ^2	Sig.
1	1.56	0.781	0.188	338.492	0.000
2	1.078	0.720	0.481	148.130	0.000
				Function 1	Function 2
Centroids (Group Means)					
Cluster 1				0.296	-1.527
Cluster 2				-1.777	0.458
Cluster 3				1.184	0.855
Significant Variable (Structure Matrix)					
Usability Value				0.427	0.475
Uniqueness Value				0.621	-0.687
Self-Identity Value				0.359	0.457
Materialistic Value				0.544	-0.708
Hedonic Value				0.891	0.204
Prestige Value in Social Networks				-0.246	-0.092

Discussion

The findings of this study validate the hypotheses H1, H2, and H3, confirming that functional, individual, and social values influence the luxury value perception of the generation Z women consumers of India. The findings of confirmatory factor analysis create eight factors as against 10 factors of the Wiedmann et al. (2009) model. The emerging adults or generation Z women consumers did not relate to functional-quality values and hedonistic-life enrichment and self-directed pleasure values, leading us to drop these three factors altogether. Both extravagance and self-gift giving hedonistic values load together on the eighth - factor, leading us to combine them as one factor

as the consumer was considering them the same. We call the eighth-factor Hedonic Value-Self Gift-Giving Extravagance. The Wiedmann et al. (2009) model had 10 factors, however, the final discriminant analysis reveals that the consumers' perception of individual hedonic values, self-gift giving and extravagance, is positive and negative for life enrichment and self-directed pleasure values, which we have removed from our analysis. This change could be possible because mid and low-priced luxury brand variants are increasingly available in the Indian market (Deloitte, 2018). The largest Cluster 3 comprises of 38% of the women population (Hedonic Functionalists) seeking hedonistic values (self-gift giving and extravagance) from their luxury purchases. This group also valued the functional aspects of luxury followed closely by self-identity values.

Interestingly, prestige value is unimportant for this group and did not motivate them towards luxury consumption. Group two consists of 31% of the women population (Prestige Chasers), for whom the most important value is prestige value in social networks. The other two values: functional (materialistic, uniqueness) and self-identity (hedonic-self gift-giving extravagance, self-identity) are unimportant for this group of consumers as they purchased luxury predominantly to create a social impression and achieve social status in society. The third group also comprises of 31% of the women population (Unique Materialists). This group values the materialistic acquisition of luxury over other values, which is characteristically true for women consumers. This group of consumers also values the uniqueness value associated with luxury as it imparts a “snob value” upon the user, imparting a distinguished status socially. This group is also affiliated with social value identification, albeit much lesser than materialistic and uniqueness values, which are the highest for this group as compared to others. The overall luxury values which motivate the Indian generation Z women consumers towards luxury purchases are hedonic values (self-gift giving extravagance) followed by the functional value (uniqueness) and then individual values (materialistic value), which is in accordance with several studies done on the subject, associating young women consumers' luxury purchase motivation with individual values focusing more on self-indulgence, uniqueness, and status as compared to non-luxury brands (Jain et al., 2015; Stokburger-Sauer & Teichmann, 2013).

The significant difference between the functional, individual, and social value perceptions of the Indian generation Z women consumers clearly proves the luxury construct's multidimensionality (Kapferer, 1997). The findings ratify the value set forth by Wiedmann et al. (2007), where consumers' individual value perceptions played an important role in determining their luxury purchase motivation (Chattalas & Shukla, 2015; Tsai, 2005) rather than luxury being used as just a display of social status and prestige. A smaller-scale tested by Hennigs et al. (2012) in a cross-cultural context with an average age of the participants being 22.7 years and middle-income levels also depicted similar results. The findings indicated that apart from France, Brazil, Hungary, and Slovakia, no other country was associated with the financial value of luxury. The results validate our research on generation Z women consumers of India, ratifying that while German consumers related with the functional and materialistic aspects of luxury, consumers from the US, India, Brazil, and Italy emphasized the hedonic, affective, and materialistic aspects of luxury (Hennigs et al., 2012).

Theoretical and Managerial Implications

The research holds immense value for market research and business practices, especially in a developing country framework where luxury brands are scrambling to stay relevant in emerging consumers' minds. It is thus crucial for luxury brands to utilize the luxury value perceptions of the generation Z women consumers of India to tailor consumer-specific offerings to stay relevant in the consumers' minds. Given that the Indian generation Z women consumers uphold their individual values (self-gift giving and extravagance) the highest apart from functional values (uniqueness & functional), it is essential for luxury brands prevalent in India to add these dimensions in their branding, marketing, and sales pitches. Companies may choose to highlight their brands' hedonic values

(self-gift giving and extravagance) for the consumers to affiliate with them. Thus, luxury brands like Gucci, Prada, etc., can position themselves as a well-deserved reward in the consumers' minds, which they need to seek at any price possible. Uniqueness and functional values are also crucial for the generation Z women consumers, which is why luxury brands like Michael Kors, Coach, and Moschino, which are popular in the Indian market, should market themselves focusing on the snob value as well as the functional attributes of their offerings to foster sales and retail consumer loyalty.

Limitations of the Study and Scope for Further Research

The framework of this research is limited to the generation Z women consumers in a developing country context. This work's theoretical and analytical aspects can be used by researchers and luxury brands alike to identify the values perceptions influencing luxury purchase motivations of varied generation cohorts and consumer segments situated in different geographic or economic contexts.

Authors' Contribution

Dr. Neetu Singh was responsible for conceptualizing the idea of the paper and developing a quantitative framework to undertake the empirical study. She was responsible for searching out the literature and undertaking a relevant literature review for the study. Both Dr. Neetu Singh and Ms. Sakshi Nigam worked on identifying the analytical outcome of the paper, making a comprehensive questionnaire, and getting it filled by all the respondents. The comprehensive statistical analysis was conducted by Sakshi Nigam using SPSS statistical tool. The interpretation of the data leading towards the conclusions and the theoretical & managerial implications from the data analysis were drawn by both the authors.

Conflict of Interest

The authors certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest or non-financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

Funding Acknowledgment

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or for the publication of this paper.

References

- Advait, P. R. (2020, February 5). India's Gen Z consumers are not big borrowers...yet. *Bloomberg | Quint*. <https://www.bloombergquint.com/business/indias-gen-z-consumers-are-not-big-borrowersyet>
- Agarwal, S. (2016, April 2). Luxury market to grow tenfold : Amitabh Kant. *Mint*. <https://www.livemint.com/Consumer/5bNy9dsaJbL8b8fovXPiK/Luxury-market-to-grow-tenfold-Amitabh-Kant.html>
- Aliyev, F., & Wagner, R. (2018). Cultural influence on luxury value perceptions: Collectivist vs. individualist luxury perceptions. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 30(3), 158–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2017.1381872>

- Amatulli, C., & Guido, G. (2011). Determinants of purchasing intention for fashion luxury goods in the Italian market. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 15(1), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13612021111112386>
- Atwal, G., & Williams, A. (2009). Luxury brand marketing – The experience is everything! *Journal of Brand Management*, 16(5–6), 338–346. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51127-6_3
- Babin, B. J., Darden, W. R., & Griffin, M. (1994). Work and/or fun: Measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(4), 644–656. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209376>
- Bain & Company. (2019, June 13). *Global personal luxury goods market expands to €260bn in 2018, with similar growth forecasted for 2019*. <https://www.bain.com/about/media-center/press-releases/2019/spring-global-luxury-report/>
- Bassiouni, D. H., & Hackley, C. (2014). “Generation Z” children’s adaptation to digital consumer culture: A critical literature review. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, 13(2), 113–133. <https://doi.org/10.1362/147539214X14024779483591>
- Berkup, S. B. (2014). Working with generations X and Y in Generation Z period: Management of different generations in business life. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(19), 218–229. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n19p218>
- Berthon, P., Pitt, L., Parent, M., & Berthon, J.-P. (2009). Aesthetics and ephemerality: Observing and preserving the luxury brand. *California Management Review*, 52(1), 45–66. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2009.52.1.45>
- Bhuchar, P. (2017, October 20). Luxury’s new face: Wrap your head around the trendiest in India today. *India Today*. <https://www.indiatoday.in/magazine/nation/story/20171030-indian-luxury-market-growth-1067329-2017-10-20>
- Bocheliuk, V. I., Panov, N. S., Fedorenko, M. I., Zhuzha, L. A., & Cherepiekhina, O. A. (2019). Gender particularities of value ideals of chiefs. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 12(10), 33–43. <https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2019/v12i10/147815>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In, *Readings in economic sociology* (pp. 280–291). Blackwell Publishers Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470755679.ch15>
- Brewer, M. B., & Lui, L. N. (1989). The primacy of age and sex in the structure of person categories. *Social Cognition*, 7(3), 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.1989.7.3.262>
- Chattalas, M., & Shukla, P. (2015). Impact of value perceptions on luxury purchase intentions: A developed market comparison. *Luxury Research Journal*, 1(1), 40–57. <https://doi.org/10.1504/LRJ.2015.069806>
- Danziger, P. N. (2019, May 29). 3 ways millennials and Gen-Z consumers are radically transforming the luxury market. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/pamdanziger/2019/05/29/3-ways-millennials-and-gen-z-consumers-are-radically-transforming-the-luxury-market/#39463fa9479f>
- Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. *Psychological Review*, 94(3), 369–389. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.369>
- Deeter-Schmelz, D. R., Moore, J. N., & Goebel, D. J. (2000). Prestige clothing shopping by consumers: A confirmatory assessment and refinement of the *Precon* scale with managerial implications. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 8(4), 43–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2000.11501879>

- Deloitte. (2018). *Global powers of luxury goods 2018 - Shaping the future of the luxury industry* (pp. 1–52). Deloitte University Press.
- Dimock, M. (2019). *Defining generations: Where Millennials end and Generation Z begins*. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/01/17/where>
- Dubois, B., Laurent, G., & Czellar, S. (2001). *Consumer rapport to luxury : Analyzing complex and ambivalent attitudes* (HEC Research Papers Series 736). <https://ideas.repec.org/p/ebg/heccah/0736.html>
- Fionda, A. M., & Moore, C. M. (2009). The anatomy of the luxury fashion brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, 16, 347–363. <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2008.45>
- Garza, R., Heredia, R. R., & Cieslicka, A. B. (2016). Male and female perception of physical attractiveness: An eye movement study. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 14(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474704916631614>
- Han, Y. J., Nunes, J. C., & Drèze, X. (2010). Signaling status with luxury goods: The role of brand prominence. *Journal of Marketing*, 74(4), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.74.4.015>
- Hennigs, N., Wiedmann, K.-P., Klarmann, C., Strehlau, S., Godey, B., Pederzoli, D., Neulinger, A., Dave, K., Aiello, G., Donvito, R., Taro, K., Tábořská-Petrovičová, J., Santos, C. R., Jung, J., & Oh, H. (2012). What is the value of luxury? A cross-cultural consumer perspective. *Psychology & Marketing*, 29(12), 1018–1034. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20583>
- Hung, K., Huiling Chen, A., Peng, N., Hackley, C., Amy Tiwsakul, R., & Chou, C. (2011). Antecedents of luxury brand purchase intention. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 20(6), 457–467. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10610421111166603>
- Husic, M., & Cicic, M. (2009). Luxury consumption factors. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 13(2), 231–245. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13612020910957734>
- Jain, S., & Mishra, S. (2018). Effect of value perceptions on luxury purchase intentions: An Indian market perspective. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 28(4), 414–435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593969.2018.1490332>
- Jain, V., Roy, S., & Ranchhod, A. (2015). Conceptualizing luxury buying behavior: The Indian perspective. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 24(3), 211–228. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-07-2014-0655>
- Jaušovec, N., & Jaušovec, K. (2009). Do women see things differently than men do? *NeuroImage*, 45(1), 198–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.11.013>
- Jiang, L., & Shan, J. (2018). Heterogeneity of luxury value perception: A generational comparison in China. *International Marketing Review*, 35(3), 458–474. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-12-2015-0271>
- Kalyoncuoglu, S., & Sahin, B. (2017). Moderating role of materialism in the effect of perceived value on purchase intention of counterfeits of luxury brands. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 9(4), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v9n4p76>
- Kapferer, J.-N. (1997). Managing luxury brands. *Journal of Brand Management*, 4(4), 251–259. <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.1997.4>
- Kastiya, S., & Sharma, A. (2020). Impact of internet addiction on workplace procrastination: An empirical study on millennial employees. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 13(1), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2020/v13i1/149947>

- Li, G., Li, G., & Kambele, Z. (2012). Luxury fashion brand consumers in China: Perceived value, fashion lifestyle, and willingness to pay. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(10), 1516–1522. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.10.019>
- Liu, F., Li, J., Mizerski, D., & Soh, H. (2012). Self - congruity, brand attitude, and brand loyalty: A study on luxury brands. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(7/8), 922–937. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090561211230098>
- Merriman, M. (2015). *What if the next big disruptor isn't a what but a who?* Ernst & Young. [https://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/EY-rise-of-gen-znew-challenge-for-retailers/\\$FILE/EY-rise-of-gen-znew-challenge-for-retailers.pdf](https://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/EY-rise-of-gen-znew-challenge-for-retailers/$FILE/EY-rise-of-gen-znew-challenge-for-retailers.pdf)
- Meyers-Levy, J., & Loken, B. (2015). Revisiting gender differences: What we know and what lies ahead. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 25(1), 129–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.06.003>
- Netemeyer, R. G., Krishnan, B., Pullig, C., Wang, G., Yagci, M., Dean, D., Ricks, J. & Wirth, F. (2004). Developing and validating measures of facets of customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(2), 209–224. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(01\)00303-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00303-4)
- Nueno, J. L., & Quelch, J. A. (1998). The mass marketing of luxury. *Business Horizons*, 41(6), 61–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813\(98\)90023-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813(98)90023-4)
- O'Cass, A. (2004). Fashion clothing consumption: Antecedents and consequences of fashion clothing involvement. *European Journal of Marketing*, 38(7), 869–882. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560410539294>
- O'Cass, A., & McEwen, H. (2004). Exploring consumer status and conspicuous consumption. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 4(1), 25–39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.155>
- Palley, W. (2012). *Generation Z: Digital in their DNA*. http://icabrazil.org/2016/files/557-corporateTwo/downloads/F_INTERNAL_Gen_Z_0418122.pdf
- Patra, G., Mukhopadhyay, I., & Dash, C. K. (2019). Digital employer branding for enabling Gen +Y in the ITeS sector in Eastern India. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 12(3), 38–49. <https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2019/v12i3/142339>
- Priporas, C.-V., Stylos, N., & Fotiadis, A. K. (2017). Generation Z consumers' expectations of interactions in smart retailing: A future agenda. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 77, 374 – 381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.01.058>
- Roux, E., Tafani, E., & Vigneron, F. (2017). Values associated with luxury brand consumption and the role of gender. *Journal of Business Research*, 71(1), 102–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.10.012>
- Sangeetha, D., & Natarajan, L. M. (2019). Unleashing the power of self-esteem: Focus on emotional intelligence and self-efficacy. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 12(7), 7–21. <https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2019/v12i7/145582>
- Schütte, H., & Ciarlante, D. (1998). Consumer behaviour in Asia. In, *Consumer behaviour in Asia* (1st ed.). Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-14862-2>
- Shukla, P. (2010). Status consumption in cross-national context: Socio-psychological, brand and situational antecedents. *International Marketing Review*, 27(1), 108–129. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02651331011020429>

- Shukla, P., & Purani, K. (2012). Comparing the importance of luxury value perceptions in cross-national contexts. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(10), 1417–1424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.10.007>
- Smith, J. B., & Colgate, M. (2007). Customer value creation : A practical framework. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 15(1), 7–23. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679150101>
- Smolağ, K., Ślusarczyk, B., & Kot, S. (2016). The role of social media in management of relational capital in universities. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 9(10), 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2016/v9i10/103072>
- Srinivasan, R., Srivastava, R. K., & Bhanot, S. (2014). Influence of ethnicity on uniqueness & snob value in purchase behaviour of luxury brands. *Journal of Research in Marketing*, 2(3), 172–186. <https://doi.org/10.17722/jorm.v2i3.67>
- Stokburger-Sauer, N. E., & Teichmann, K. (2013). Is luxury just a female thing ? The role of gender in luxury brand consumption. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(7), 889–896. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.12.007>
- Thriveni Kumari, K. (2020). Effect of professional attributes on professional - life conflict : Gender as a moderator in the Indian IT industry. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 13(1), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2020/v13i1/149946>
- Truong, Y. (2010). Personal aspirations and the consumption of luxury goods. *International Journal of Market Research*, 52(5), 655–673. <https://doi.org/10.2501/S1470785310201521>
- Tsai, S. - P. (2005). Impact of personal orientation on luxury-brand purchase value: An international investigation. *International Journal of Market Research*, 47(4), 427–452. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147078530504700403>
- Turner, A. (2015). Generation Z: Technology and social interest. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 71(2), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jip.2015.0021>
- Vickers, J. S., & Renand, F. (2003). The marketing of luxury goods: An exploratory study – three conceptual dimensions. *The Marketing Review*, 3(4), 459–478. <https://doi.org/10.1362/146934703771910071>
- Vigneron, F., & Johnson, L. W. (1999). A review and a conceptual framework of prestige-seeking consumer behavior. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 1(1), 1–15.
- Vigneron, F., & Johnson, L. W. (2004). Measuring perceptions of brand luxury. *Journal of Brand Management*, 11(6), 484–506. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bm.2540194>
- Wang, P. Z., & Waller, D. S. (2006). Measuring consumer vanity: A cross-cultural validation. *Psychology and Marketing*, 23(8), 665–687. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20123>
- Wang, Y., & Griskevicius, V. (2014). Conspicuous consumption, relationships, and rivals: Women’s luxury products as signals to other women. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(5), 834–854. <https://doi.org/10.1086/673256>
- Wiedmann, K. - P., Hennings, N., & Siebels, A. (2007). Understanding and measuring luxury value: A multidimensional model of consumers’ luxury perception. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 11(7), 393–395.

- Wiedmann, K. - P., Hennigs, N., & Siebels, A. (2009). Value-based segmentation of luxury consumption behavior. *Psychology & Marketing*, 26(7), 625–651. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20292>
- Wilkinson, R. K. (1981). Review of *Economics and Consumer Behaviour* by A. Deaton & J. Muellbauer. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)*, 144(4), 538–538. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2981834>
- Workman, J. E., & Lee, S.-H. (2011). Materialism, fashion consumers and gender: A cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 35(1), 50–57. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2010.00935.x>
- Yeoman, I., & McMahon-Beattie, U. (2018). The future of luxury: Mega drivers, new faces and scenarios. *Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management*, 17(4), 204–217. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41272-018-0140-6>

About the Authors

Neetu Singh is currently working as Assistant Professor, Fashion Marketing at Symbiosis Institute of Design, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Pune. She has a PhD in fashion management with 10 years of experience working with brands like Victoria's Secret, Tesco, and Walmart.

Sakshi Nigam is currently working as an Analyst in the Analytics Engineering Department at Morgan Stanley Capital International, Inc. She has a post-graduate degree in Applied Statistics from Symbiosis Statistical Institute, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Pune, Maharashtra.