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**Abstract**

This study focuses on psycho-socio correlates in relation to brand wearing behaviour among men and women. The sample consisted of 200 adults whose age ranged between 13 to 60 years. The sample represented the population of Peshawar. A self-constructed questionnaire was designed to identify brand consciousness. To analyse self-esteem, *Current Thoughts Scale* was used. In order to gauge the narcissistic tendency among the population, *Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 Scale* was supplemented*.* Subjects’ level of current life satisfactionwas measured through *Satisfaction with Life Scale.* The phenomenon was studied in the context of consumer’s involvement in fashion brands thus the influence of psycho-social factors behind brand buying was investigated. The result of the study indicated that majority of the participants were found using brands. Most of the brand wearers had low self-esteem which led to a discrepancy in their real and ideal self. With this psychological landscape, the use of expensive brands helped them overcome their low self-esteem. Study has also revealed that expensive brands were seen as status symbol and were used for social approval. This study has led to the conclusion that the use of brands created a sense of joy and satisfaction which resulted in emotional relief.
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CHAPTER-I

**Introduction**

Fashion industry has stretched to billion dollars and has involved millions of people around the world. This fast growing industry has affected larger number of people over the globe due to its universality and ever evolving characteristic. For today’s consumers, fashion has become almost a ‘second nature’ (Svendsen, 2006), and it can be regarded as a part of any human activity (Solomon & Rabolt, 2009; Tungate, 2008). The use of fashion holds an important part in today’s world (O’Cass, 2004) where people practice fashion for its mimetic meaning (Fang et al., 2012; Perezet al., 2010). Social communication has a vivacious nature in the fashion milieu (Hackley, 2005) and consumers make social statements through their clothing; especially in terms of who they are and who they are not (Moynagh & Worsley, 2002; Banister & Hogg, 2007). As it is identified that clothing is used for social communication (Elliott, 1994), therefore, individuals make judgments about others based on their clothing (Banister & Hogg, 2007).

Clothes are the easiest way to define and introduce one’s culture and identity, hopes and desires of what he wants to attain in this world. Consciously or unconsciously, every individual make choices in his daily life which reflect how he wants to convey his self- image to the world. It is due to this, brand buying is becoming popular nowadays and people are willing to spend much money for brands. The association between brand consciousness and self-presentation is altering many researchers in developing countries (Khan, 2013). The present research is also directed towards the understanding of underlying cognitive process in relation to fashion clothing among the young adult population of Peshawar.

Branding, over the centuries, has been used to identify goods of different producers. It tells about product source and helps to make consumers aware to identify the products from its competitors. The basic idea behind naming a brand is that it is eye catching, different and can be easily differentiated from other brand names, easily recalled and is noticeable to consumers (Zeb, et al., 2011).

However; brands not only predict the identification of one product to another for the consumer, but they carry additional meaning and values for the consumer (Kay & Mark, 2006). Name of a brand is taken as the most vital factor for the representational values and is the first choice of the consumer (Alreck & Settle, 1999). Henderson et al., 2003 suggested that brand association and meaning are interrelated. Consumers and companies see values of brand from two different perspectives. For a company, brand denotes an important value (Raggio & Leone, 2007). But Brand has intrinsic and extrinsic values and sentimental connection for the consumers (Pitta & Franzak, 2008). The intrinsic values rather than extrinsic of a brand play an important part in the purchase decision of the customer (Hong, Pecotich, & Schultz, 2002).

Fashion is an unpredictable and vibrant force, while brands now have a great significance in consumer’s life. Consumers select brands and have trust on them as they want their family and friends to keep away and elude quality related concerns and uncertainty (Elliot & Yannopoulou, 2007). The name of a brand is known to be the most powerful tool for the symbolic values and a key factor affecting consumer inclination (Alreck & Settle, 1999). The meaning of a brand is actually the details of merchandise to the buyers; what it can offer them and how unique it is for them than other merchandise groups (Keller, 2004).

Brands have infused in our culture, while our world has become a culture of signs (Väistö, 2009). Since the emergence of the postmodern buyer culture in the 1960s, people buy products for their representative attributes and not only for their convenience (Wattanasuwan, 2005; Veloutsou, 2008; Elliott & Clare, 2004). Thus, brand use is always presumed to carry a representative power (Wattanasuwan, 2005). Consumers’ wants and requirements are not only fulfilled with simple items for use, but also by the use of the brand itself (First, 2009; Schroeder, 2005). Different circumstances e.g. demographics, requirements, emotional factor, values and self, household structures, group impact, information handling and decision making influence consumers’ buying behavior. Brands have gone so connected with utilization that nowadays brands have strong interactions with customers (Power & Hauge, 2008; Escalas & Bettman, 2005).

 Brand is the sign of status, quality, and luxury for most of the customers. A brand is in fact the description of merchandise to the customers: how it is distinct and what it can do for them in presence of other manufacturing groups (Keller, 2004). Moreover, Franzen, Giep, and Bouwman, (2001) defined ten different aspects of a brand i.e. brand sign, symbolic meaning, perceived quality, product-associated with the brand, assumed price, source and origin, sub brands, presentation, advertising and different other ways of communication.

A brand plays definitely an important part in the fashion business (Power & Hauge, 2008). Recently brand consciousness and self-realization has acquired much significance among researchers in the developing countries (Khan, 2013). Customers of underdeveloped countries like Pakistan give more preference to the international brands and relish the refined quality of products. Buyers of underdeveloped countries are more brands oriented and give more consideration to the specific variables for international brands like psychological values, assumed quality, and loyalty to the brand. Clothing is one sphere that is required to fulfil both practical and representative requirements of the customers. It has been recognized that growing consciousness and brands participation is modifying the customers’ image in the third world countries (Bhardwaj, Park & Kim, 2011).

In the present years, customers in less developed countries have gained much attention for marketers. Pakistan has an effective growing economy and in the recent years the textile industry has advanced greatly. The excessive use of trendy apparel and its ever evolving market has attracted international as well as local brands to cater the needs of its customers. Fashion industry not only consists of clothing but it is taking interest in other accessories like footwear, cosmetics and furnishing (Clamp et al., 1994). For centuries, branding has been a source to give buyers more choices and varieties. The name of a brand identifies it as exclusive; differentiate from other brands, easily recalled and is attractive to consumers (Keller, 2004).

People’s approach and buying behavior towards brands is different from one another and there are many factors behind them. Howarton and Lee, (2010) stated that women’s liking and disliking is the biggest factor behind buying behavior therefore, brand choices are influenced by functionality, comfort, material with color, fashion, style, and the brand name or conception. Study of Wu and Lo, (2009) has revealed that adults aging 18-34 have more brand loyalty than late adults which shows his buying behavior and the appraisal of that brand.

Self-Image and Branding

Conveying self-image has a major role in buying products because it can present attitude, social standing, and taste. Consumers purchase those brands that present their best self-image, thus brand concept eventually shows customer’s self-portrayal. Although psychological factors behind branding tell about the consumer, what they wish to be, or even how they want to be presented and portrayed. Fashion boosts up the spirit of its wearer to be more proficient, confident, and comfortable to present their identity through their clothing.

Now, brands not only sell individuality to the buyers but penetrate into their inner desires and eventually sell them their fantasies. Diana Vreel, former chief editor of Vogue, mentioned in her biography, “Very few people had ever breathed the pantry air of a house of a woman who wore the kind of dress Vogue used to show when I was young” (Thomas, 2007). Today the attire/clothes published in Vogue are mostly purchased by the more fashion conscious customer.

Now, luxurious brands seek new targets to touch middle class. Their most appealing motto is to buy their brand and be eligible for living a life of luxury. Tom Ford, a famous fashion designer became Women’s wear Designer for Gucci in 1990, has faith in creating world for the clothes and accessories where your buyers will dream to live. Brands providing luxury recognize that customers will adopt lush and splendid lifestyle if they promote its good image (Thomas, 2007).

Today customers are very concerned about symbolic brands and are now ready to spend more on a brand having representative value (Wu & Hsing, 2006). The people who are more fashion and brand conscious tend to spend more on expensive brands, which express their high level of association with those brands (Grant & Stephen, 2006). People buy branded products to show their definite image to others. People use fashion related products to rebuild their self-image which can imitate their self-concept too (Forney, Park, & Brandon, 2005).

 Consumers’ have wants and desires to impress others so pay high prices for high-status products and even though customers, who aspire for a need of high status and individuality, buy costly products for the improvement of self-presentation (Husic & Cicic, 2009). Consumers not only want to impress others with the expensive brands but they feel pride when they buy exclusive brands. Pride has an individual nonverbal expression that is known by adults and children across different cultures and people spontaneously present this expression in response to success and status (McFerran, Aquino & Tracy, 2011). Consumers purchase these expensive brands to show their self- image, success and supremacy relative to others rather than for only their practical value (e.g., Chadha & Husband, 2006; Mandel et al., 2006).

Customers who want to create superior image for high status usually prefer brands from those countries that have good and renowned brand names (Phau & Leng, 2008). One of the studies was carried out on imported brands in China and its result showed that those foreign brands were success markers for the status conscious people (Matthiesen & Phau, 2010).

**Social Status and Branding**

Status is a person’s position in relation to others within a society (Brekke 2003). A person who possesses status is someone who is highly graded on some distinguishing features (e.g., wealth, intelligence, or attractiveness) which are considered important to others (Hyman 1942). Status is typically complemented by respect, power, and entitlement (French, John & Raven 1959; Nelissen & Meijers 2011). Consequently, buyers who wear luxury brands enjoy reputation and improved social capital (Han, Nunes, & Drèze 2010; Nelissen & Meijers 2011; Veblen 1899), which can result in a number of social remunerations. For example, people who wear luxury brands are more likely to be considered for a job, are better at floating money than others, and are generally more useful at making people conform their requests than people who do not wear goods that bear status (Nelissen et al., 2011). The inference from these conclusions is that luxury brands are highly cherished by society because they are associated with status. As a result, people who wear luxury brands are socially appreciated. Customers are inspired to purchase luxury branded products for a variety of causes. However, status is often viewed as one of the most important elements in the decision to consume luxury brands (Griskevicius et al. 2007; Han, Nunes, & Drèze 2010; Kuksov & Xie 2012; Nelissen & Meijers 2011; Rucker & Galinsky 2008, 2009; Veblen 1899).

Personal, cultural, social and psychological facets are intensely influencing the customer’s behavior. A person may belong to a different group, institute or family; and the position of person in each group can be defined in terms of both role and status. People generally select those products which are appropriate to their role and status (Kotler & Amstrong, 2008).

Customer’s acquisitions are strongly affected by personal, social, psychological and cultural characteristics (Thomson at al., 1994). According to many researchers, status conscious and money-oriented people find possessions comprises buying of extravagant and luxurious items that indicate status and wealth and consumption of these symbolic products also enhance self-concept and social gratitude. It is arguable that status conscious customers are prone to buy expensive or branded apparel than non-status conscious customers, as it fulfils their dominant representative needs and wants.

The stimulating factors to buy luxury goods are the same throughout the world (personal, functional, financial and social dimensions of grand value recognition) and that this worldwide plea for expensive goods is a vital part of the universal buying culture (Eng & Bogaert, 2010). People having different income and social classes buy expensive and high-status goods and feel pleasure and confidence while wearing renowned brands (Husic & Cicic, 2009). Truong et al., (2008), and Gardyn, (2002) noted that expensive and high valued products have become more reasonable in prices and now accessible to new buyers,  and therefore customers are more interested to purchase high status and quality products at high prices. With this new hype in the luxury market, there is new interest in luxury operation research (Truong et al., 2008).

Consumption and related needs for status directly inspire the individuals to purchase high priced goods and services irrespective of their income or level of their social class. This need for status is consumption based. It is associated to the inclination towards buying products and services for status and social prestige value that they bestow on their holders irrespective of income or social standing (Eastman, Goldsmith, & Flynn, 1999). The apparent utility of expensive goods and show of wealth provides gratification to the consumer rather than it’s worth (Mason, 2001). Thus, Packard, (1959) describes that status conscious people make use of noticeable marks of the high grade which they aspire.

Consumers’ buying behavior, attitude and confidence denote his belief that his ability and information is enough or accurate about fashion clothing. Customers who take interest and give importance to branded product will likely build positive attitude towards the brands. Buying behavior of a consumer shows the value, worth, and attitudes for the product. Attitudes of the people about luxury items and its use are related to the show of wealth and prosperity, thus representative meaning builds one’s social standing and distinctiveness. People buy expensive brands to show status and to provide a visual image (O'Cass & Frost, 2002, O'Cass & McEwen, 2004). Attaining and expressing status are basic objectives of members of human society and achieving status through consumption has been studied for more than a century (Veblen, 1899). More recently, Solomon & Rabolt (2004) and O’Cass & Frost (2002) took fashion as a specimen of a product category used to express status and personal meaning. Brand engagement defines a strong focus on brands, their meanings, and using brands to outline and increase self-concept (Sprott et al., 2009).

Materialists find meaning in and extend the self with objects (Belk, 1988), and many companies emphasize their strategies on developing brands that have important meaning to customers. Indeed, status consumers are vulnerable to normative inspiration, but not necessarily informational influence (Clark et al., 2007). However status consumption refers to accumulation to express position, while materialism is more personal. Materialists’ things make them feel good directly, and status consumers’ things make them feel appreciated because they show-off their personal superiority to the world. At the same time, materialists do want to indicate status (Wang & Wallendorf, 2006), and materialistic consumers have shown to be especially familiar to products which have status and how buying them promotes the status (Loulakis & Hill, 2010).

Moreover, status utilization concludes indulgent consumption requirements (Eng & Bogaert, 2010). People purchase status products for internal or external reasons of owning status products (O’Cass & McEwen, 2004). They further define that status seekers purchase expensive products, and desire to be respected for the high status products. Truong et al., (2008) propose that status is associated to the customers and thus they are motivated for both their internal and external reasons stretching from self-esteem and self-respect to others’ approval and resentment. Brand-conscious customers are more interested in brand names and they are more conscious in buying renowned brands (Yasin, 2009).These customers think that the high price is directly related to high quality.

At a worldwide level a visible reformation has occurred in the field of luxury. The trade of luxury and status goods was considered the monopoly of the rich and the powerful till the 19th century but now it is available for all the people who can afford it. Now marketers are more interested to ensure the increase in the availability of luxury products throughout the world (Frank, 2000).

Today brand culture is famous everywhere and has become symbol of high status that’s why Asians pay more attention to luxury and expensive brands to redefine their identity and social position (Chada & Husband, 2006). Nowadays East Asia is very quickly growing and becoming the world’s largest market for luxury brands due to the presence of materialistic luxury buyers. The main incentive of Eastern Asian customers belonging to middle class is to buy expensive goods for the desire of status (Vatikiotis, 1996). According to Goldman, (1999) customers who belong to lower income group and they desire luxury goods to match and reach higher social class, are more worried and conscious about their status, while customers belonging to middle or higher income group and they purchase luxurious items not only for status, but also for their personal choices and well-being. Utilization and buying of expensive products can carry out three major motives: the development of identity, the maintenance of identity, and the exhibition of socio- economic status (Wattanasuwan, 2005). For a certain group of people, having expensive and unique goods is considered honour and dominance from the other population in society (Bhat & Reddy, 1998). It is clear that expensive goods fulfil one’s need not only practically but also emotionally (Dubois, Czellar & Laurent, 2001).

 For young adolescents, wearing dresses with high-status brand names seem to be very significant. Although wearing high-status brand name is not a new mania and craze but it has gained its popularity and reached its peak in the last decade. Of all social groups, teenagers give most attention and importance to beauty and fashion in general. Today marketers are more interested in youngsters and teenagers because of many reasons. Young people give more attention to form their own individual personalities during the adolescent and adulthood. They develop their own action and response tendencies, behaviors, and values to make their own utilization patterns. They develop loyalty and attraction/ association towards certain brands at their early stage of life which lasts well into adult age; resultantly they make up a potential market for future (Akturan et al., 2011). Teenagers relatively prefer spending more power on the fashion products and they may influence each other in adopting definite latest fashion trends (Makgosa, 2010). In fact, teenagers spend a big amount of their parent’s money on fashion products (Fikry, 2012), and their buying power has increased over the recent years (Rhee & Johnson, 2012). Moreover, teenagers spend their money quickly on fashionable branded products as soon as they get it. They are provoked by many factors like, status, possession, and independence (Akturan et al., 2011). Adolescents, like adults are often known as brand conscious consumers. Most consumer companies focus and target teens because they affect market when they come to status brands and they are also known as a generation which has very high purchasing power. Their yearly income is 211 billion US dollars and they spend 39 billion US dollars per year on fashion brands (Nowak et al., 2006).

People buying behavior towards fashion brands play a vital role in the decision-making process. Different factors like family, age, education, experience, economic scenario, the law and social background form the behaviour of customers (Grant & Stephen, 2005). Young people share their life experiences with their friends and therefore have strong influence on their life style and the need to be appreciated by friends has made the youngsters more brand oriented (Fernand, 2009). Generation-Y refers to persons born between 1977 and 1994 (Noble et al., 2009). They love trendy and fashionable goods, status brands, and clothes shopping (Tran, 2008), and therefore, present to buy relevant segment for studying online shopping. Generation-Y is spending money as they are free from other ﬁnancial commitments such as e from ﬁnancial commitments such as loans (Ma et al., 2012). “Generation-Y” males are fashion conscious like “Generation-Y” females, and they have strong understanding and fascination towards fashion brands (Bakewell et al., 2006). Researchers found that the intensity and number of self-brand connections has increased with the time and adolescents relate them with their own personalities (Rhee & Johnson, 2012).

Customers often make decision to buy products having symbolic meanings which can be further used for the development self or identity (Aaker, 1997). However, people’s buying intentions can be complex and different, therefore modern customers do not buy attire only to satisfy their physical needs , they also look for other advantages e.g. sensational pleasure, representative meaning, practical and psychological values (Rahman, Yan, & Liu, 2010; Rahman, Liu, Lam, & Chan, 2011). Adolescents also share that they want branded goods to present traits e.g. rich, trendy, or superior and they also realize that having status brands help them to take involvement in some social group activities (Rhee & Johnson, 2012).

Fashion and branding gained significant reputation over the period of time and people worldwide are giving more attention to their self by making visible consumption of latest brands. For example, the luxury market in Iran has witnessed growth in recent years and many brand conscious buyers want to buy expensive, latest trendy and well- known brands (Hanzaee & Aghasibeig, 2010). The study by Grant and Stephen, (2005) explained the effects of brands and purchasing decisions of new generation especially teen age girls for fashion clothing, on their behavior. Further, the results revealed that these buyers were mentally satisfied in paying the best for these trendy brands.

Emotional Management and Branding

Consumers buy brands and sometimes they consider other features of the brand including assessment if the brand satisfies emotional needs (Kumar, Kim, & Pelton, 2009). Today companies are trying to tap into consumer emotions and thoughts through their brands (Keller, 2008). It has been found in previous research that instead of cognition, emotional response has a major role in purchasing plan of a consumer (Knight & Kim, 2007). During decision making process consumers may have their response to brands in two ways i.e., emotionally and cognitively (Knight & Kim, 2007; Babin & Babin, 2001). Knight and Kim (2007), worked on “Japanese Generation-Y” customers, and they found that consumers’ buying intention are affected by the emotional values as did Babin & Babin, (2001) who surveyed American customers.

Nowadays luxury market has become large and different than ever before, and its estimate suggests that presently the global market for expensive and luxury goods has exceeded 151 billion dollars (Mintel, 2012) and it is expected that it will increase extensively over the next few years (PWC, 2013). Today, worldwide, high and expensive fashion industry has become a lucrative multibillion dollar industry and it influences not only the modern society but has a major role in the economy. During 90s, the democratization of expensive and luxury brands opened the door to general public so luxurious brands are in approach of common people (Chadha & Husband 2006). And, luxury has gained much importance (Kapferer & Bastien, 2009). One reason behind this growth is that today common people are purchasing luxury products at an increasing rate (Silverstein & Fiske, 2003). Consumers are buying expensive and luxury branded products for many reasons, because they are often signs of status, and they purchase to indicate high status to others (Han, Nunes, & Drèze, 2010; Veblen, 1899). Today, especially Asians, think that high-fi, expensive and renowned fashion brands could be used and bought to re-identify their identity and social standing (Chadha & Husband, 2006). Self-identity is strongly related to human behaviour. Researchers agree that self-identity is a result of social interaction and it influences individual behavior and intentions (Wylie, 1979; Rosenberg, 1979). Similitude and likeness is also believed as a major impact in society (Mcleod, 2007). Connected to fashion, the person who has high sense of likeness has inclination to value the presentation and show of goods with its expensive brands (Rose et al, 1998). Moreover, people of Southeast Asia are more interested in noticeable expensive goods, which have been indicated as the sign of wealth (Wong & Ahuvia, 1998).

Even the idea of luxury is as old as humankind and people were interested to make impression on others (Kapferer & Bastien, 2009). In the early days the word ‘luxury’ was used for goods that were unique and rare and available to a small section of the people (Sriviroj, 2007). The luxury things were not in access of the common people and were taken as extraordinary but in today’s world the market of luxury products has increased and gained its importance and surprisingly even the young people are aware of the luxury brands which expose their needs and imaginations. These brands show their social status, good quality, comfort, and self-esteem. Luxury goods not only have functional values, but social and emotional values (Srinivasan at al., 2014).

Buying behavior of consumers is sometime connected with materialism. Therefore, materialism is also related with pessimistic feelings, such as gloom: people who are driven by their sad moods spend more money for the buying of material goods (Cryder et al., 2008). Since the nineties, the luxury brand market has grown extensively (Nueno & Quelch, 1998). Several elements and circumstances encouraged this fabulous growth, such as the expanding need for luxury from developing markets (e.g., India and China) and the growth of the expensive category (Silverstein & Fiske, 2003). A hike in spending ability also encouraged the less privileged people from middle class to spend more on high brands (Vickers & Renand, 2003).

Luxury brands are associated with many features, such as exceptionality, distinctiveness, insufficiency, premium price, superb quality and acquisitiveness (Allérès, 1995; Kapferer, 1998; Nueno & Quelch, 1998; Vigneron & Johnson, 2004; Mortelmans, 2005; Chevalier & Mazzalovo, 2008). Through history we came to know that luxury brands were preserved for the rich people. However, nowadays, luxuries become more common for everyone (Silverstein & Fiske, 2003). More and more brands receive a luxury status and nowadays more people have enough money for luxury brands. Thus, the nature of luxury is continuously changing and this makes it difficult to express a general definition of luxury brand (Frank, 1999; Mortelmans, 2005; Thomas, 2007).

Pleasant feelings and Brand Buying

Luxury goods deliver sensory happiness and are the addition of the dominant or leading classes (Kapferer, 1997 as cited in Vigneron & Johnson, 2004). Luxury brands can also be described as high priced brands that consumers want to purchase to satisfy their psychological needs e.g. hedonic needs, money-oriented and social needs rather than for their functional and economical value (Nueno & Quelch, 1998). Thus, luxury brands can be described as catchy, prominent, special and refined and they present emotional and social value (Vigneron & Johnson, 1999). Luxury means not only splendour and aesthetics but it has a revealing effect and give more pleasure and preference (Kapferer, 1997). Similarly, luxury products rise an individual’s wants and give pleasure to its consumers so they are happy and satisfied (Srinivasan, 2014). People also buy luxury brands for personal experience of aesthetics and pleasure and in this way they aim to get social respect and approval (Israel, 2003; Danziger, 2005; Srivastava et al., 2014; Sunghyup & Heesup, 2015; Agarwal & Singh, 2015; Chen & Lamberti, 2015). Luxury products are considered at the top of all kinds of status brands along with excellent physical characteristics like outstanding quality and uniqueness plus psychological characteristics like providing self-identity, esteem and happiness (Vigneron & Johnson, 2004). Customers buy brands for expressing their personal identity and social values (Lewis & Bridger, 2000). In the underdeveloped countries customers blindly believe in the higher quality of the branded products than the customer of advanced countries, without actual knowledge about other features and welfares of its utility (Kinaram, 2006). Hence; a brand is the depiction of the goods which explains every characteristic of the product e.g. its utility, presentation, and about the customer feelings of happiness and joy (Pitta & Franzak, 2008).

Ideal Self, Real Self and Brand Buying

People show their personality by their consumption manners and selection of certain brands. Thus brands help in presentation of the self of the customer (Ahmad & Thyagaraj, 2015). Luxury brands are related with wealth, position, exclusion, achievement, and ego-enhancement (e.g., Mandel et al., 2006), and thus may be taken as a way of informing others about one's deeds, high status, and even distinction.  In light of luxury buyer’s behaviour, buyer’s need for individuality and being different from others is the driving force for him to purchase expensive goods and enhance his personal identity. This identity can be either their actual or a preferred identity or their ideal self which they want to display (Ahmad & Thyagaraj, 2015). Therefore, the long term slump and decreased in rate of population in Europe has compelled the business men to widen their business to Asian customers who consider Western expensive brands as a sign of good savour (Nueno & Quelch, 1998). Along with the people who buy expensive brands for showing their wealth, it is also the characteristic of materialistic people that they mostly wear expensive jewellery, outfits and drive an exclusive car. As per their belief money is the mark of success and a symbol of being rich. Also, it is their desire to live an extravagant life (Buzzle, 2010).

Like identity, likeness and adaptation is also considered to have an impact in society (Mcleod, 2007). Related to fashion, an individual who has high conformity will give preference and value to luxury brands (Rose et al, 1994). In addition, people of Southeast Asia consider public, specious and luxury possession, which as a sign of wealth for public show (Wong & Ahuvia, 1998). People buy goods that can converse high status, particularly young Thai women who inquire about the price at shop which shows that they give more importance to their personal appearance and buy high status and expensive goods (Schutte & Ciarlante, 1998). Today, young women are more interested and impressed in celebrities’ luxury lifestyle, and are influenced by them e.g. Paris Hilton and Victoria Beckham. They spend a huge amount of money on buying designer branded clothes. Because of this reason, young women are considered the major buyers for luxury branded goods (Kamolwan & Wiwatchai, 2010).

Customers use fashion brands for their social values and personal identity. They face peer’s pressures and this intergenerational pressure has a very important role in the choice of brands (Sarki et al., 2012). Young people are very sensitive towards symbols (Taylor & Cosenza, 2002). Young buyers get information regarding fashion and brand name from their social contacts and friends (Chowdhary, 1988). Brands are easily recognizable everywhere and they also serve high status so they are considered less risky for the teens. Because of this teenagers quickly rely on them and they make purchases (Bearden & Etzel, 1892; Wooten, 2006). On the other hand Adults know very well and have more information about fashion brands and mostly they use them to communicate in many social and personal situations. It was clear from the study that adults make strong associations with fashion brands that have a long lasting and long-term effect on their fashion buying behavior.

Consumer buying behavior also shows that they buy expensive brands not only for high status but their materialistic approach also discloses their severe needs to create impressive self-image on others. People want to satisfy actual-self through their consumption patterns but sometimes self-discrepancies appear which may lead to materialism. When self-contradictions between the real and ideal self are observed, or an individual’s self-presentation and image is at risk, compensation thought is stimulated. This thought or drive may direct them to buy material goods, which will at one end overcome the sharp self-threat but also cover the noticed self-deficiencies on the other hand (Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982).

**Self-Esteem and Branding**

The strong connection between self-esteem and brand shows that it influences the buying behavior of a consumer. A large number of researches (e.g. Veieria, 2009) are done to support the relationship of self-esteem with brand wearing. Self-esteem is one’s feelings about the value of its own self and it is also the measure of positivity of the self-assessment. Self-esteem shows one’s understanding of the way others perceive him (Rosenberg, 1979). Pettit & Sivanathan, (2011) said that individuals who have low self-esteem tend to buy luxurious products to reconstruct their image and dignity. These findings are also supported by Bell’s show one’s social status. Similarly, Eastman, Fredenberger, Campbell & Calvert, (1997) deliberated that prestigious goods are used to display high status rather than professional reputation. These point of views are also coherent with Prince, (1993) who endorsed that young adults are attracted towards money and they are more interested in the activities in which money is connected with power and self-esteem. People buy high-class goods to show status, social and economic power to accomplish their pleasure oriented needs (Bell, 1998; Belk, 1984) and to camouflage their low self-esteem (Faber & O’Guinn, 1992; Hanley & Wilhelm, 1992). Teen’s consumption pattern and motivation towards popular brands increases with age, maturity, and it has a special role in the development of self-concept (Churchill & Moschis, 1979).

Previous findings explain that high self-esteem of an individual is related with high self-concept clarity. Individuals having high self-esteem are more confident about their own qualities while people having low self-esteem are not clear and well-defined, and not so far hold a negative self-image. The self-concept of people having self-esteem is described by somewhat high levels of reluctance; instability, and inconsistency, thus external sources influence their self-concept more easily (Campbell et al., 1996). According to the authors, persons adapt behavior to maintain and improve their self-concept and as a result, consumers use material goods having status symbols and they give preference to those items which display their desired self-concept. Individuals having low self-concept clarity are more inclined to and dependent on the social milieu (Campbell, 1990). According to Han et al., (2010) some consumers are called “poseurs” who are highly motivated to buy luxuries only for the sake of status. Some bottom-tier customers want to buy expensive luxury brands so they will appear rich and well-off people (Ordabeyeva & Chandon, 2011). Han et al., (2010) showed that people with a high need for status and a desire to be related with the wealthy class are more likely to buy luxury products with a famous and familiar brand.

 According to the assessments of Wang Xue et al., (2014) customers having high self-esteem are positive and affirmative, and they assume that people admire them and they don’t even pay attention to opinions of others, so their consumption behaviors are sudden. However; those having low self-esteem, with negative opinion toward themselves experience negative emotions e.g. anxiety, distress, shyness, and insecurity, so they mould their behaviors according to others’ choices and situations (Sun, 2008).

People with low self-esteem have lack of self-confidence and have low estimation of themselves. They don’t even acknowledge their success and always fear the rejection by others. Therefore, alter their consumption patterns to avoid discrimination and being disqualified because they have not high or satisfactory status (Rudich & Gregg, 2007). When an individual’s identity is under threat, high self-esteem preferences of consumer will be constant; though, people with low self-esteem will purchase those goods which express their real self (White, Argo & Sengupta, 2012). Rucker et al., (2012) also find that people having low self-esteem will appreciate high purchase toward those products which could be a symbol of high status. Merethe & Knag (2012), Agarwal & Singh (2015) and Chen & Lamberti (2015) explain that luxury goods have many features such as high pricing, superior quality, magnificence, aesthetics, uniqueness and thus invite self-esteem and respect from society. Consumers having low self-esteem frequently buy magnificent and unique brands in order to improve their selves and specially self-esteem to avoid refusal (Mandel & Smeesters, 2008). Individuals having low self-esteem express higher utilization levels than the high self-esteem customers. In addition, compulsive buying behavior of an individual confirms lower self-esteem than other customers. They seem to increase their self-esteem by spending enough money on material goods and especially they prefer expensive brands (Faber & O’Guinn, 1992). Materialistic approach has also been associated with low self-esteem (Richins & Dawson, 1992; Kasser, 2002), and this introduction of low self-esteem or uncertainty directs to an acquisitive or materialistic approach (Chaplin & John, 2007).

**Narcissism and Branding**

We view narcissism (subclinical narcissism, to be exact) as a normally dispersed personality attribute. Narcissism is typically operationalized with the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988). We define narcissism as an argentic, conceited, self- aggrandizing, predominant, and controlling orientation (Emmons, 1987; Sedikides et al., 2004). Narcissists have highly overestimated and unrealistically positive self-views and feel entitled. They also lack regard for others, showing a moderated interest in connection, communal values, and pro-social behavior (Campbell & Foster, 2007; Cisek et al., 2008).

Self-esteem is connected with narcissism while narcissism is self-centeredness, self-important, central, and scheming orientation (Emmons, 1987; Sedikides et al., 2011). Narcissists have clear and positive self-opinion and they do not give importance to other’s opinions about them and they display a less interest in common values, relationships, and pro-social activities (Campbell & Foster, 2007). In fact, narcissism is definitely related with hostility, intense behavior, and opposition towards others, and it is negatively related with sociability, kindness, and confidence (Sedikides et al., 2007; Morf et al., 2011; Hepper et al., 2014).

Narcissists are passionate to self-esteem (Baumeister & Vohs, 2001) and too focused for self-improvement (Sedikides & Gregg, 2001). They are also considered status- conscious and they love to have powers (Bradlee & Emmons, 1992; Horton & Sedikides, 2009). Narcissists are often dependent on numerous self-regulatory therapies to maintain their highly positive self-presentation. They are often engaged in displaying self. Narcissists show off their wealthy condition in a way of self-presentation. Narcissists make purchases of expensive and luxurious products for defence of their fragile selves for the maintenance and strengthening of their greatly overstated self-view (Rucker & Galinsky, 2008). After all, carefully selected materialistic goods can be a sign of an individual’s feature, abilities, feelings, values, and personal determinations, which distinguish them from others and thus are considered as high-class and rare.

Narcissists’ self-esteem depends on the appreciation that they receive from others instead of on more significant and substantial relational bonds or on gaining true social admiration (i.e. respect). In agreement with this interpretation, Lee et al., (2013) established that, Narcissist consumers make decisions to satisfy their needs to distinguish themselves from others. They buy goods that are exceptional, high-class, and customizable, and they think that high status brands can help transmitting their own image.

Recently, numerous researchers have shown greater interest in the features and behavior patterns of narcissists’ buyers. Dunning (2007) and Sedikides, Gregg, Cisek, & Hart (2007) proposed that narcissists as consumers are more inclined to purchase impressive and high-class products in an attempt to support and uplift their self-positivity. According to this logic, narcissism can motivate people to buy highly exclusive and expensive products because the use of such products potentially serves as a means of endorsing excessively positive self-views. As a result, narcissists may show a particular attraction for impressive goods of high symbolic value. They recognize purchase of such goods a chance to settle, maintain, and encourage their self-presentation. Considering all this, it can be presumed that narcissism is related to materialism (Sedikides et al., 2011) and inclination to obsessive or compulsive buying (Rose, 2007). Narcissists clearly confess more interest in social status and wealth than to pursue relationship and conducts (Kasser & Ryan, 1996). They need goods for themselves (Cohen & Cohen, 1996) and have high aims and economic goals (Roberts & Robins, 2000) including financial goals, such as getting an advantageous job and a high status or having high life standards. Similar to money-oriented people, they always buy high-value and lavish products, which show class and status (Richins, 1994). Therefore, many characteristics of narcissism reveal materialism, representing that both materialistic approach and narcissisms compel individuals to excessive buying to raise their self-protect, and self-esteem and social-status from the appreciating reactions they receive.

Indeed, there is proof that levels of narcissism are on the rise both in Western culture (Twenge et al., 2008) and in Eastern (i.e., Chinese) culture (Cai et al., 2012). Present longitudinal studies (e.g., Twenge et al., 2008; Twenge & Campbell, 2009) revealed that a today people’s inclination towards self-love has increased, which is considered helpful in the growth of customers (Holmes, 2001).

Narcissism as a personality feature has both rational and motivational elements. Cognitively, narcissism comprises belief in one’s superior qualities (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007). Narcissists have a tendency to assess themselves highly on intelligence, resourcefulness, capability, and leadership abilities (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007; Farwell & Wohlwend-Lloyd, 1998; John & Robins, 1994; Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006). As a result, narcissists usually are proud of their abilities in task domains (Campbell et al., 2004). From a motivational viewpoint, narcissists possess strong needs to have their assumed superiority reaffirmed. They tend to be eager to receive admiration from others to authenticate their superiority. That is to say, substantiation of their narcissist’s positive self-image is, mostly, attained by the responses of others, in the forms of assertion, appreciation, and exaltation (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007; Wallace & Baumeister, 2002).

Narcissism is considered a good predictor of lavish purchases (Cunningham & Darke, 2010), an individual develop buying of lavish products to protect their weak characters and in order to endure and build up their inflated views associated to self (Rucker & Galinsky, 2008). Based on the extensive review of related literature regarding brand consciousness, a strong association among cloth, cognitive processes, and brand is suspected. Clothing serves more than the purpose of protection. While with branded clothing consumer tend to transform their psychological landscape for better psycho-social adjustment in life.

A Conceptual Frame Work for Brand Consciousness

1. Dependent Variable (Brand Consciousness).
2. Independent Variable (Self-Esteem, Emotional Wellness, Narcissism, Current life Satisfaction).

 The main purpose of this study is to investigate whether features namely Self-Esteem, Narcissism, Current Life Satisfaction, and Emotional Wellness affect customers of Peshawar to buy expensive brands or not. The focus of this study is to know the buying behavior of consumers regarding expensive brands which can be helpful for the students, fashion designers, and marketers in future. The following figure explicates dependent and independent variables of the study.

**Narcissism**

**Self-Esteem**

**Current Life Satisfaction**

**Emotional Wellness**

**Brand Consciousness**

**(Dependent Variable)**

Overall, clothing can be seen as a vital social tool in the lives of people and especially in the life of adults its importance cannot be ignored. In the present research brand consciousness was measured with help of a self-constructed questionnaire. Three well-established scales were used to investigate the samples. Thus narcissism, self -discrepancies in real and ideal-self due to low self-esteem and subject’s current life satisfaction was investigated.

**Rationale**

A brand is an ever increasing entity and is deeply rooted in reality and represents the idiosyncrasies of individuals. Be it emotional or practical, psychological or status oriented; the increasing influence of brands on peoples’ life all around the world has led to multi brands evolution and their increasing and excessive utility especially by the middle class. This specific research was carried out among adults with brand consciousness in Peshawar.

People buy expensive brands to overcome their low self-esteem and this research tends to reflect the self-esteem of the people of certain areas of Peshawar which have bound them to particular brands that have captured a certain share of customers mind.

 However; through a deep understanding of brand strategies, consumers can actually understand how fuzzy and irrational brand buying could be sometimes. Branded products are complementary medium through which people demonstrate who they are and what they want to be. Brands may help transform their own image. Social status is also related with buying behavior and people buy expensive brands to show off their superior status. Thus they make impression on others through expensive and popular brands. Especially narcissist personalities want to buy expensive products for the sake of high status and after brand buying they feel joy, happiness and emotionally relieved.

In the current research all the above mentioned aspects were studied. In the research many aspects of the consumer related to brands were elaborated so this research can be beneficial for both consumers and the producers. Consumers can get a basic knowledge of what personality traits brands tend to touch and even exploit so as to make their way in money market. On the other hand producers can utilize the research in knowing different factors effecting the brand selection of people of Peshawar.

The research could benefit purchasers in enlightening their understanding of the general scenario of the area and the social factors involved affecting their choice and making them brands bound. New brands who want to invade Peshawar can take this hand out as a ready material for getting the understanding of the financial, psychological and status levels of Peshawaries. They can analyse how far and how much they can get their market share by introducing their products in this particular area.

CHAPTER-II

Methodology

Statement of the Problem

The current research study aims to explore the psychological utility of brand consciousness among men and women of age ranged 13 to 60 years who belonged to Peshawar.

Aims and Objectives

1. To find out the relationship of self-esteem with brand wearing behavior.
2. To examine the role of impression management with the brand wearing behavior.
3. To determine the personal life satisfaction level of brand conscious individuals.

Hypotheses

1. Subjects who experience high discrepancies in their ideal and real-self have low self-esteem and are most prone to buy branded clothes so as to find their identity.

 2. Subjects tend to derive pleasure and emotional relief by wearing popular and expensive brands.

3. Subjects with narcissistic inclinations like to be viewed as different and superior, tend to buy branded cloth/es with great representational value.

4. Status seekers tend to use branded cloth/es in order to provide visible evidence of their wealth and superior status for social recognition.

Sample

A sample of N=200, men and women from various income groups and social classes were chosen to explore the psychological implications of wearing branded articles. Men and women of age ranged 13 to 60 years were targeted in the current study. The sample was drawn from the rural and urban areas of Peshawar to explore the reasons behind brand buying behavior.

Instruments

Along with few standardized scales a self-constructed questionnaire was designed specifically to gauge the range of responses that included demographic information and information pertaining to brand centricity.

1. *Demographic Information*

 The demographic information section consisted of information regarding gender, age, education, responsibilities of family, family size, family position, monthly income, and socio economic status.

1. *Brand Centricity*

A self-constructed questionnaire was designed for the study consisted of 36 open ended questions which were used to access the brand buying behavior. Thus brand users and non-brand users were identified for further investigation. The questions were designed to access the issues based on portions categorized as Brand Consciousness, Self-Esteem, Emotional Wellness, Social Status, and Real Self and Ideal Self. The questionnaire consisted of a 5-point Likert-type of scale with responses ranging from 1 (always) to 5 (never).The entire questions were simple, direct and easily understandable.

1. *Current Thoughts Scale (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991)*

This scale was developed by Heatherton & Polivy*,* (1991). It consists of 20 items and 3 subscales: Social, Performance, and Appearance self-esteem. Each item had endpoints marked as “not at all” and “extremely” for a 5-point scale. According to Heatherton & Polivy, (1991) possible overall scores ranged from 20 to 100 (Cronbach’s alpha = .90), while scores for the performance and social subscales each ranged from 7 to 35 (Cronbach’s alphas = .80 and .84, respectively), and scores for the appearance subscale ranged from 6 to 30 (Cronbach’s alpha = .83). Higher scores showed a high state self-esteem.

1. *Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985)*

Satisfaction with Life Scale is a 5-item scale that assessed satisfaction with current life situations. It was a 7-point Likert-type scale with responses ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). This scale proved to be a suitable and trustworthy indication of life satisfaction, suited for use for a wide range of age groups and applications, which saved interview time and as compared to many measures of life satisfaction (Pavot, et al., 1991).

1. *Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 Scale (Ames, Rose, & Anderson, 2006).*

The Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) Scale was a 16 items scale, developed by Ames, Rose, and Anderson, (2006). It was a short form of NPI-40, which was originally developed by Rasken and Terry, (1988) measuring subclinical narcissism. The test consisted of sixteen pairs of statements that had shown good predicative and internal validity (Ames, Rose, & Anderson, 2006).

Procedure

The target population consisted of the adults (men and women) of Peshawar. Initially, stratified sampling procedure based on geographical distribution was adopted. The geographical distribution included both rural and urban areas of Peshawar. Further, residential areas, work places and educational institutes situated in urban areas (Cantonment, Gulberg, Faqirabad, University Town, & Hayatabad) and rural areas (Chamkani, Baddaber, Palosaay, & Hasan Gari) were targeted. Later, the sample was approached from the identified strata by using systematic random sampling technique. The sample comprised of both working and nonworking population of adolescents and adults. Non-working population were contacted from the residential areas within the identified strata whereas, students and the working population were approached at educational institutions and work places, respectively. The written request for participation in the study was forwarded for their approval. After selection of sample and obtaining their consent, respondents were briefed about the objectives and purpose of the current study. The research instruments comprising a self-constructed questionnaire along with a set of scales were distributed to evaluate the brand consciousness behind buying behavior. Thus well-known brand buyers and ordinary brand buyers were identified and analysed for further investigation. Special permission was sought from administration to permit the students at educational institutions to complete the questionnaires during the class hours. A total of 10-15 minutes were needed to complete the paper questionnaire. Completed questionnaires were collected and prepared for statistical analysis.

Pilot Test

Pilot test was conducted before the actual study took place and it was conducted in an effort to evaluate the efficiency of the research design and selected tools. 50 individuals in the study adults men and women participated. Results obtained were carefully analyzed in order to test the hypotheses. Based on the results of the pilot test, minimal changes were made to redesign the items. The estimated completion time was also judged and it was found to take 10-15 minutes duration.

Data Analysis

The final data (N=200, men and women) was analyzed through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 17.0. Data analysis was done in many steps:

1. The demographic variables were analysed through Cross Tabulations and Chi-Square Tests and the result was depicted with the help of bar charts.
2. In this research Independent Sample T- test was employed to find out the relationship between Emotional Wellness and brand consciousness. Similarly to find the relationship and effects of social status and Satisfaction with Life Scale on brand consciousness, Analyses of variance test (ANOVA) was employed.
3. Multivariate analysis of variance test (MANOVA) was applied to study the relationship between the brand consciousness and Current Thoughts Scale to test the samples.
4. In order to account narcissist nature of the samples with brand consciousness, Analyses of variance test (ANOVA) was applied. Similarly to present the effects of discrepancy in the real and ideal self on brand consciousness, Analyses of variance test (ANOVA) was employed.

**Categorization of Variables**

A combination of open ended questionnaires and scales were used to elicit information from the participants under investigation. Demographic information was also collected. The controlled variables in the present study included: age, sex and the locality of the residence. Respondent’s age helps to ascertain its effect on the dependent variable i.e.; 13 to 60 years.

1. *Dependent Variable*

The dependent variable was brand consciousness of respondents. Clothing choices regarding expensive brands was assessed by open ended questions developed by the researcher based on the literature reviewed. Clothing is one of the way through which an individual expresses its self.

1. *Independent Variable*

The independent variables consisted of Self-esteem, Emotional wellness, Narcissism and Current life satisfaction. Self-esteem was assessed through Current Thoughts Scale developed by Heatherton & Polivy, (1991). Emotional wellness was evaluated through brand centricity (self-constructed) questionnaire. Narcissism was assessed through NPI-16 Scale developed by Ames, Rose, & Anderson, (2006). Personal current life satisfaction was judged through Satisfaction with Life Scale developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, (1985).

CHAPTER-III

**Results**

Table 1

Frequency and Percentages of the Incidence of Use of Brand by Gender

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Groups | Total |
|  |  | Non-Brand User | Brand User |  |
| Men | Count | 24(12%) | 72(36%) | 96(48%) |
| Women | Count | 25(12.5%) | 79(39.5%) | 104(52%) |
|  | Total | 49(24.5%) | 151(75.5%) | 200(100%) |

*χ2(1, 200), .025, p>0.05*

Table 1 showed that no significant difference was found in the use of branded products among men and women, χ2(1, 200), .025, p>0.05. The findings of the table showed that brand use was equally popular among men and women and both had shown more interest towards expensive brands.



Table 2

Frequency and Percentages of the Incidence of Use of Brand by Year of Birth

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Year of Birth | Groups | Total |
|  Non-Brand User | Brand User |  |
| 1950-60 |  Count | 3(1.5%) | 7(3.5%) | 10(5%) |
| 1960-70 |  Count |  14(7%) | 30(15%) | 44(22%) |
| 1970-80 |  Count | 11(5.5%) | 24(12%) | 35(17.5%) |
| 1980-90 |  Count | 16(8%) | 48(24%) | 64(32%) |
| 1990- Onwards |  Count | 5(2.5%) | 42(21%) | 47(23.5%) |
| Total |  Count | 49(24.5%) | 151(75.5%) | 200(100%) |

*χ2 (4, 200), 7.237, p>0.05*

According to the results in Table 2, the use of branded products was more common among Y-generation (1980-90). Somewhat linear trend for brand preferences were observed in groups classified by age. This shows that the use of brand gets more common as one age. The difference in the use of branded product among subjects classified on age was found statistically insignificant, χ2 (4, 200), 7.237, p>0.05.



Table 3

Frequency and Percentages of the Incidence of Use of Brand by Marital Status

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Marital Status | Groups | Total |
|  |  | Non-Brand User | Brand User |  |
| Married | Count | 32(16%) | 103(51.5%) | 135(67.5%) |
| Unmarried | Count | 17(8.5%) | 48(24%) | 65(32.5%) |
|  | Total | 49(24.5%) | 151(75.5%) | 200(100%) |
| *χ2(1, 200), 0.142, p>0.05* |

Although majority of the married respondents (51.5%) were using famous brands as compared to the unmarried respondents who constituted only 24% yet this difference was not found significant, χ2 (1, 200), 0.142, p>0.05, when Chi Square test applied.



Table 4

Frequency and Percentages of the Incidence of Use of Brand by Education

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Education | Groups | Total |
|  |  | Non-Brand User | Brand User |  |
| Primary | Count | 0(0%) | 11(5.5%) | 11(5.5%) |
| Matric | Count | 5(2.5%) | 23(11.5%) | 28(14%) |
| FA/F.Sc | Count | 2(1%) | 5(2.5%) | 7(3.5%) |
| BA/B.Sc | Count | 6(3%) | 9(4.5%) | 15(7.5%) |
| MA/M.Sc | Count | 23(11.5%) | 87(43.5%) | 110(55%) |
| M.Phil / MS | Count | 13(6.5%) | 16(8%) | 29(14.5%) |
| Total | Count | 49(25.5%) | 151(75.5%) | 200(100%) |
| *χ2(5, 200), 13.494, p<0.05* |

According to the findings, uses of brand and education had significant relationship, χ2(5, 200), 13.494, p*<*0*.*05. All the educational groups had shown their interest towards brands. However, brand use was quite popular among the respondents with 16 years of education.



Table 5

Frequency and Percentages of the Incidence of Use of Brand by Nature of Job

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Nature of Job | Groups | Total |
|  |  | Non-Brand User | Brand User |  |
| Public Sector | Count | 18(9%) | 45(22.5%) | 63(31.5%) |
| Private Sector  | Count | 16(8%) | 41(20.5%) | 57(28.8%) |
| Business SectorNo JobTotal  | Count | 12(6%) | 26(13%) | 38(19%) |
| Count Count |  3(1.5%) 49(24.5%) |  39(19%) 151(75.5%) |  42(21%)200(100%) |
| *χ2(3, 200), 8.827, p<0.05* |

The findings in a table divulged the insignificant relationship between uses of brand and nature of job, χ2(3, 200), 8.827 , p<0.05. Brand use was more common among all the subjects who were employed in public sector showed highest interest towards brands. Out of 75.5% brand users 22.5% were employed in public sector.



Table 6

Frequency and Percentages of the Incidence of Use of Brand by Income of family

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Income | Groups | Total |
|  |  | Non-Brand User | Brand User |  |
| 20, 000-50, 000 (Low) | Count | 13(6.5%) | 38(19%) | 51(25.5%) |
| 50, 000-3, 00000(Medium) | Count | 27(13.5%) | 91(45.5%) | 118(59%) |
| 3, 00000 and above (High)Total  | Count | 9(4.5%) | 22(11%) | 31(15.5%) |
| Count | 49(24.5%) | 151(75.5%) | 200(100%) |
| *χ2(2, 200), .538, p>0.05* |

 The findings in a table showed insignificant relationship between uses of brand and income of the family, χ2(2, 200), .538 , p>0.05. Brand use was equally popular among groups classified on the basis of income.



Table 7

Frequency and Percentages of the Incidence of Use of Brand by Savings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Savings | Groups | Total |
|  |  | Non-Brand User | Brand User |  |
| 1000-20, 000 | Count | 35(17.5%) | 131(65.5%) | 166(83%) |
| 20, 000-40, 000 | Count | 10(5%) | 9(4.5%) |  19(9.5%) |
| 40, 000 or more | Count | 4(2%) | 11(5.5%) | 15(7.5%) |
| Total | Count | 49(24.5%) | 151(75.5%) | 20(10%) |
| *χ2(3, 200), 10.795, p<0.05* |

The results of this table revealed significant relationship among the uses of brand and savings of the family, χ2(3, 200), 9.214, p<0.05*.* Out of 75.5% brand user, 65.5% subjects’ savings were PRs 1000-20,000 per month which was the least range of monthly savings mention above in the table.



Table 8

Frequency and percentages of Incidence of Use of Brand by Number of Dependent People

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Dependent People | Groups | Total |
| Non-Brand User | Brand User |  |
| None | Count | 4(2%) | 34(17%) | 38(19%) |
| Almost 4 | Count | 35(17.5%) | 89(44.5%) | 124(62%) |
| Almost 8 | Count | 10(5%) | 26(13%) | 36(18%) |
| More Than 8 | Count | 0(0%) | 2(1%) | 2(1%) |
| Total | Count | 49(24.5%) | 151(75.5%) | 200(100%) |
| *χ2(3, 200), 5.373, p>0.05* |

The calculations produced in Table 8 show that uses of brand and number of dependent people had insignificant relationship*,* χ2 (3, 200), 5.800, p>0.05. Brand use was equally popular among all groups of dependent people.



Table 9

Frequency and Percentages of the Incidence of Use of Brand by Position in the Family

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Position in a Family | Groups | Total |
|  |  | Non-Brand User | Brand User |  |
| Head | Count | 31(15.5%) | 56(28%) | 87(43.5%) |
| Supportive  | Count | 14(7%) | 57(28.5%) | 71(35.5%) |
| Dependent | Count | 4(2%) | 38(19%) | 42(21%) |
| Total | Count | 49(24.5%) | 151(75.5%) | 200(100%) |
| *χ2(2, 200), 11.799, p<0.05* |

Findings in a table displayed a significant relationship between brand use and position in a family, χ2(2, 200), 11.799, p*<*0.05*.* Brand use was popular among all the groups but the percentage of brand use was found equal in family heads and supporting members.



Table 10

Frequency and Percentages of the Incidence of Use of Brand by Responsibility in the family

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Responsibility in the family | Groups | Total |
| Non Brand User | Brand User |
| Kitchen | Count | 0(0%) | 1(0.5%) | 1(0.5) |
| Clothing | Count | 3(1.5%) | 22(11%) | 25(12.5%) |
| School | Count | 2(1%) | 8(4%) | 10(5%) |
| Utility Bills | Count | 7(3.5%) | 5(2.5%) | 12(6%) |
| Transport | Count | 2(1%) | 4(2%) | 6(3%) |
| None in Particular | Count | 8(4%) | 41(20.5%) | 49(24.5%) |
| Most of Above | Count | 27(13.5%) | 70(35%) | 97(48.5%) |
| Total | Count | 49(24.5%) | 151(75.5%) | 200(100%) |
| *χ2(6, 200), 12.578, p< 0.05* |

According to the results of the table, uses of brand and responsibilities in the family has significant relationship, χ2(6, 200), 12.578*,* p<0.05 *.*The findings in the above table exposed that most of the brand users (20%) had no particular responsibility at home. Clothing was the only area in which majority of the brand users (11%) were spending the most.



Table 11

Frequency and Percentages of the Incidence of Use of Brand by Size of family

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Size of family | Groups | Total |
|  |  | Non-Brand User | Brand User |  |
| Small (almost 4) | Count | 17(8.5%) | 57(28.5%) | 74(37%) |
| Medium (almost 8) | Count | 17(8.5%) | 67(33.5%) | 84(42%) |
| Large (more than 8) | Count | 15(7.5%) | 27(13.5%) | 42(21%) |
| Total | Count | 49(24.5%) | 151(75.5%) | 200(100%) |
| *χ2(2, 200), 3.774, p>.05* |

 Results in a table revealed insignificant relationship between uses of brand and size of the family, χ2(2, 200), 3.774, p>.05. The findings showed that brand use was more common among all the family groups consisted of different number of people. Brand use was quite popular among the respondents of medium size family, who were 33.5% of the population. |

 |

 |



Table 12

Frequency and Percentages of the Incidence of Use of Brand by Socio-Economic Status

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Socio-Economic Status | Groups | Total |
|  |  | Non-Brand User | Brand User |  |
| Lower | Count | 11(5.5%) | 19(9.5%) | 30(15%) |
| Middle | Count | 29(14.5%) | 110(55%) | 139(69.5%) |
| High | Count | 9(4.5%) | 22(11%) | 31(15.5%) |
| Total | Count | 49(24.5%) | 151(75.5%) | 200(100%) |
| *χ2(2, 200), 3.739, p>0.05* |

 According to the findings, uses of brand and socio-economic status had insignificant relationship, χ2(2, 200), 3.739, p>0.05. Surprisingly brand use was equally popular among all Socio-Economic Statuses. Out of 75.5% brand users 55% subjects belonged to the middle class and they showed more and popular brands interest towards expensive brands.



Table 13

Descriptive Statistics & Difference between the mean on Brand Consciousness by level of Self-Discrepancy with Self-Esteem as covariate

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

| Self-Discrepancy | Mean | SD | N |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Self-Discrepancy | 45.77 | 5.09 | 121 |
| Low Self-Discrepancy | 32.98 | 11.90 | 79 |
| Total | 38.04 | 11.61 | 200 |

 |

*Self-Discrepancy: F (1, 200), 22.215, P < .000*

*Self-Esteem: F (1, 200), 187.310, P < .000*

Descriptive statistics shown in Table 13 presents the Mean Scores on Brand Consciousness by level of Self-Discrepancy with Self-Esteem as covariate factor. The results indicate that individuals with High-Discrepancy scored high on Brand Consciousness Scale (Mean= 45.77 & Standard Deviation= 5.09). Whereas, individuals with Low Self-Discrepancy scored lower on Brand Consciousness Scale (Mean= 32.98 & Standard Deviation= 11.90). The F-Statistics reveals that the differences between the two groups were significant at alpha .01 level when accounted for Brand Consciousness, F (1, 200).

Table 14

Test of Hypothesis using K Matrix

| Simple Contrast on Self-Discrepancy | Brand Consciousness  |
| --- | --- |
| Level 2 vs Level 1  | Contrast EstimateHypothesized valueDifference (Estimate hypothesized)Self-EsteemSignificance | -5.4250-5.4251.151.001  |
|  | 95%(CID) | Low Boundary | -7.696 |
|  |  | Upper Boundary | -3.155 |

Reference category = 1

Table 14 represents the test of hypothesis using K Matrix for analyzing the groups classified on the basis of Self-Discrepancy for Brand Consciousness. The results revealed that the estimated hypothesized difference was -5.425 which was found significant at alpha .01 level. Thus the hypothesis that subjects who experience high discrepancies in their ideal and real-self have low self-esteem and are most prone to buy branded clothes so as to find their identity, was approved and accepted.

Table 15

Descriptive statistics on various components of Current Thoughts Scale by Brand Consciousness

|  | Brand Consciousness | Mean | SD |  N |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Current thought scale | Non-brand user | 53.71 | 10.65 | 49 |
| Brand user | 42.97 | 18.76 | 151 |
| Total | 45.61 | 17.72 | 200 |
| Performance Self-Esteem | Non-brand user | 19.41 | 4.94 | 49 |
| Brand user | 14.64 | 6.75 | 151 |
| Total | 15.81 | 6.67 | 200 |
| Social Self-Esteem | Non-brand user | 16.37 | 4.90 | 49 |
| Brand user | 12.15 | 6.58 | 151 |
| Total | 13.18 | 6.46 | 200 |
| Appearance Self-Esteem | Non-brand user | 11.29 | 4.18 | 49 |
| Brand user | 12.51 | 5.67 | 151 |
| Total | 12.21 | 5.36 | 200 |

Descriptive Statistics shown in Table 15 reveals that the Mean Score on Current Thoughts Scale for Non-Brand user was 53.71 and Standard Deviation was 10.65 whereas for Brand user the Mean Score was 42.97 with Standard Deviation was 18.76. Similarly the Performance Self-Esteem Mean Score for Non-Brand user was 19.41 with Standard Deviation was 4.94. The Mean Score for Brand user was 14.64 with Standard Deviation was 6.75. Likewise the Social Self-Esteem Mean Score for Non-Brand user 16.37 with Standard Deviation 4.90. The Mean Score for Brand user was 12.15 with Standard Deviation was 6.58. Similarly the Appearance Self-Esteem Mean Score for Non-Brand user was 11.29 with Standard Deviation was 4.18. The Mean Score for Brand user was 12.51 with Standard Deviation was 5.63.

Table 16

Multivariate analysis examining the effect of various components of Current Thoughts Scale by Brand Consciousness

| Effect | Value | F | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Brand Consciousness Result | Pillai's Trace | .523 | 53.49a | 4.000 | 195 .000 | .001 | .523 |
| Wilks' Lambda | .477 | 53.49a | 4.000 | 195 .000 | .001 | .523 |
| Hotelling's Trace | 1.097 | 53.49a | 4.000 | 195 .000 | .001 | .523 |
| Roy's Largest Root | 1.097 | 53.49a | 4.000 | 195 .000 | .001 | .523 |

The multivariate analysis produced four tests of significance. Accordingly to the results Pillai’s value is found Roburst therefore there is every reason to believe that Self-esteem had significant efficient on brand wearing, F (4, 200) 53.49, P < 0.00; Pillai’s Trace=.523.

Table 17

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances examining various components of Current Thoughts Scale by Brand Consciousness

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| Current Thought Scale | 55.70 | 1 | 198 | .001 |
| Performance Self-Esteem | 19.13 | 1 | 198 | .001 |
| Social Self-Esteem | 17.94 | 1 | 198 | .001 |

Since the sample size for the categorical variable Brand Consciousness was computed to examine the amount of difference between the Standard Deviations. The results indicate that the terrifying differences between the Standard Deviations are not obtained by chances but it was contributed by the use of brand.

Table 18

Difference between the mean on Emotional Wellness by Groups

| Items | Groups | N | Mean | SD | SEM | t | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The brand name is very important when I buy things. | Non-brand user | 49 | 2.04 | .81 | .11 | -18.91 | .001 |
| Brand user | 151 | 4.66 | .84 | .06 |
| I feel happy and satisfied by wearing braded cloth/es. | Non-brand user | 49 | 1.94 | .59 | .08 | -21.01 | .001 |
| Brand user | 151 | 4.60 | .81 | .06 |
| My energy level rises when I am wearing expensive and branded product. | Non-brand user | 49 | 1.90 | .84 | .12 | -16.42 | .001 |
| Brand user | 151 | 4.53 | 1.01 | .08 |
| My work performance gets better when I wear brands. | Non-brand user | 49 | 1.49 | 1.17 | .16 | -19.26 | .001 |
| Brand user | 151 | 4.56 | .89 | .07 |
| Wearing brands help me elevate positive emotions. | Non-brand user | 49 | 2.06 | .68 | .09 | -17.96 | .001 |
| Brand user | 151 | 4.48 | .85 | .07 |
| I experience extreme joy while wearing branded clothes. | Non-brand user | 49 | 2.00 | .76 | .10 | -18.18 | .001 |
| Brand user | 151 | 4.59 | .89 | .07 |
| The level of my excitement risesWhen I am wearing brands Emotional Wellbeing Total | Non-brand user | 49 | 1.84 | .87 | .12 | -16.04 | .001 |
| Brand userNon-Brand userBrand user | 15149151 | 4.3011.7825.74 | .953.80 6.42 | .07.54.52 | 14.40 | .001 |

Table 18 obtained the difference between the mean on Emotional Wellness by Use of Brands. The results revealed that for Brand User the name was very important (Mean= 4.66 & SD=.84) as compared to Non-Brand User (Mean=2.04 & SD=.81). Results further pointed out that the difference between the Mean Scores of two groups was significant, t (198, 200), -18.91, P < .000. Findings showed that Brand user felt happiness and satisfaction (Mean= 4.60, SD= .81) as compared to Non-Brand User (Mean= 1.94, SD= .59). Results further pointed out the difference between the Mean Scores of two groups was significant, t (198, 200), -21.01, P < .000. Findings revealed that Brand use helped them elevate positive emotions (Mean= 4.48, SD= .85) as compared to Non-Brand User (Mean=2.06, SD=.68). Outcomes further pointed out the difference between the two groups was significant, t (198, 200), -17.96, P < .000.

Table 19

Analysis of variance for Brand Consciousness by Narcissistic Tendencies

| NPI. Scale Result | Mean | SD | N | F | Sig |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Narcissistic | 38.97 | 8.95 | 91 | 1.07 | .301 |
| Non-Narcissistic | 37.26 | 13.42 | 109 |
| Total | 38.04 | 11.61 | 200 |  |  |

Table 19 compared Narcissistic with Non Narcissistic. The results show that Mean Score of Narcissistic on brand consciousness was 38.97 with Standard Deviation 8.95. On the other hand, the Mean Score of Non Narcissistic on Brand Consciousness was 37.26 with Standard Deviation of 13.42. The Analysis of Variance shows that the difference on Brand Consciousness between the two groups were found insignificant, F (1, 200), 1.07, P > .05. It is therefore, concluded that Narcissism has nothing to do with brand use.

Table 20

Difference between the mean on Self-Esteem by Narcissism

|  | NPI-Scale Result | N | Mean | SD | SEM | DF | t | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Self-Esteem | Narcissist | 91 | 45.81 | 20.22 | 2.12 | 198 | 3.49 | .001 |
| Non-Narcissist | 109 | 37.34 | 13.90 | 1.33 |

Table 20 obtained the difference between the mean on Self-Esteem by Narcissism. The Results reveals that Narcissist’s Self-Esteem (Mean= 45.81 and SD= 20.22) as compared to Non-Narcissist’s Self-Esteem (Mean= 37.34 and SD= 13.90). Results further pointed out that the difference between the Mean Scores of two groups was significant, t (198, 200) 3.496, P< .000. Results further pointed out that narcissists were found in low Self-Esteem thus popular brands didn’t affect them.

Table 21

Difference between mean on Sources of Motivation by Brand Consciousness

| Items | Source of Motivation | N | Mean | SD | SEM | t | Sig (2-tailed) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I prefer wearing brands | Personally Motivated | 51 | 2.27 | 1.25 | .17 | -10.59 | .001 |
| Socially Motivated | 149 | 4.30 | .94 | .07 |
| I would prefer style over brands | Personally Motivated | 51 | 2.65 | 1.38 | .19 | -8.21 | .001 |
| Socially Motivated | 149 | 4.27 | 1.15 | .09 |
| I buy branded cloth/es | Personally Motivated | 51 | 2.57 | 1.34 | .18 | -8.21 | .001 |
| Socially Motivated | 149 | 4.25 | .97 | .08 |
| Brands are very important to me | Personally Motivated | 51 | 2.61 | 1.35 | .19 | -8.22 | .001 |
| Socially Motivated | 149 | 4.20 | 1.13 | .09 |
| I am preoccupied when buying things (actual/imagination) | Personally Motivated | 51 | 3.57 | .78 | .10 | -3.74 | .001 |
| Socially Motivated | 149 | 4.09 | .87 | .07 |
| I get tempted towards brands | Personally Motivated | 51 | 2.43 | 1.43 | .20 | -8.33 | .001 |
| Socially Motivated | 149 | 4.22 | .94 | .07 |
| I buy things just for being branded | Personally Motivated | 51 | 2.41 | 1.45 | .20 | -7.38 | .001 |
| Socially Motivated | 149 | 4.00 | 1.27 | .10 |
| I buy brands for quality | Personally Motivated | 51 | 2.63 | 1.37 |  .19 |  -9.07 | .001 |
| Socially Motivated | 149 | 4.46 |  .784 |  .064 |
| I am wearing brands since too long | Personally Motivated | 51 | 2.69 |  1.34 |  .189 |  -7.25 | .001 |
| Socially Motivated | 149 | 4.19 |  1.03 |  .085 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Wearing brands express me having a strong background. | Personally Motivated | 51 | 2.43 | 1.43 | .20 | -8.06 | .001 |
| Socially Motivated | 149 | 4.06 | 1.17 | .09 |
| Total Score of(Brand Consciousness) | Personally Motivated | 51 | 26.25 | 12.27 | 1.71 | -8.57 | .001 |
| Socially Motivated | 149 | 42.07 | 8.14 | .66 |

Table 21 obtained the difference between the mean on sources of motivation by use of brands. The results revealed that Personally Motivated subjects preferred wearing brands (M= 4.30, SD= .94) as compared to Socially Motivated subjects (M= 4.30, SD= .94). Results furthered pointed out the difference between the Mean Score of two groups were significant t (198, 200), -10.59, P< .000. The results exposed that for Personally Motivated subjects bought things just for being branded (M= 2.41, SD= 1.45) as compared to Socially Motivated subjects (M= 4.00, SD= 1.27). Results furthered pointed out the differencebetween the Mean Score of two groups were significant t (198, 200), -7.38, P< .000. The results revealed that for Personally Motivated subjects bought brands for quality (M= 2.63, SD= 1.37) as compared to Socially Motivated subjects (M= 4.46, SD= .78). Results furthered pointed out the difference between the Mean Score of two groups were significant t (198, 200), -9.07, P< .000. The results revealed that for Personally Motivated subjects wore brands to express strong back ground (M=2.43, SD= 1.43) as compared to Socially Motivated subjects (M= 4.06, SD= 1.17). Results furthered pointed out the difference between the Mean Score of two groups were significant t (198, 200), -8.57, P< .000.

Table 22

Difference between mean on various components of Satisfaction with Life Scale by Brand Consciousness

| Satisfaction with Life | Brand Consciousness | N | Mean | SD | SEM | t | Sig (2-Tailled) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SWL-Total | Non-Brand user | 49 | 11.10 | 2.88 | .41 | -28.29 | .001 |
| Brand user | 151 | 26.70 | 4.49 | .36 |

Table 22 highlights the level of Satisfaction with Current Life by the use of brands. The results indicates that the life satisfaction was found higher for Brand Users who obtained the Mean of 26.70 with Standard Deviation of 4.49 as compared to Non-Brand Users who obtained the Mean Score of 11.10 with Standard Deviation 2.88. These statistics revealed that life satisfaction was found significantly different by the use of brand, t (198, 200), -28.292, P< .000.

CHAPTER-IV

Discussion

Fashion buying is rich in social and emotional implications. Wearing clothes is the easiest way of telling something about one’s history, culture, identity, desires/hopes and perception of one’s place in the world. And these are the factors that influence us to make intentional or unintentional choices how we present ourselves to the world. Fashion and apparel are the two aspects of behavior. Through fashion and apparel, people display their identity (Chamil, Viranga, & Rathnayake, 2011). Clothes act as signs/ranks to show personal features like; status, gender, social group allegiance and personality (Craik, 2009). Fashion buying has become a significant and vital activity in a clothing interested person’s life (Pentecost & Andrews, 2009).Much buying is done because customers think that buying products will help in reaching value-related goals (Salomon, 2008).

 Significant amount of work has been done in the field of customer brand relationship during the last ten years and is still continued by present researchers (Fournier, 1998; Albert et al., 2008; Sahay & Sharma, 2010). Brand relationships are based on affect and emotions (Whang et al., 2004; Thomson et al., 2005; Pawle & Cooper, 2006). Customers develop attachment with brands from their early childhood (Ji, 2002) and this process carries on even to the latter half of their lives (Olsen, 1999).

 For the current study a sample of N=200, men and women of age ranged 13 to 60 years were selected from various areas of Peshawar. Initially stratified sampling based on geographical distribution was adopted, later sample approached the identified strata by using the systematic random sampling technique. Demographic data of sample included age, marital status, gender, education, nature of job, family income and monthly savings, number of dependent people, position, responsibility, size and socio economic status of the family. Along with the demographic sheet, a self-constructed questionnaire was used in the study. About 36 close ended questions were asked from the subjects to know their preferences towards the brands. In the current study it was found that out of N=200, n=151 subjects were found brand user while n=51 subjects were non brand user.

In the study, three scales were used which helped to access the buying practices for brands and locate the results. Current Thought Scale,  (Heatherton & Polivy, 1990) was used to determine the self-esteem of subjects. This scale consisted of 20 items and 3 sub scales (Social, Performance, and Appearance Self-Esteem). In the study Multivariate test was applied on the scale to test the sample. The results indicated a significant relationship between consciousness and the scale.

To know the buying behavior of subjects for brands, a 5- point Likert Scale i.e. Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985) was used to access the current life situations of subjects. This scale helped the researcher to know about the problems faced by the subjects and consequences the buying behavior regarding brands. In the study Independent Sample-T test was applied on the scale for the assessment of the sample. A significant relationship was found between brand consciousness and Satisfaction with Life Scale.

Another scale used to judge the narcissism was Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 Scale (Ames, Rose, & Anderson, 2006). Thus it became helpful to know the subject’s behavior towards popular brands. Independent Sample -T test was applied to test the sample and no significant relation was found between the brand consciousness and Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 Scale.

Statistical characteristics that are found to affect an individual’s buying intention and behavior in a different scenario are gender and age. As Compared to males, females are more engrossed in buying activities (Slama & Tashlian, 1985) Chen and Dhillon, (2003) proposed that both age and gender have a high impact on the estimation of competence, honesty and goodwill of an Internet seller, and thus buyer’s trust in ecommerce. Therefore, we propose age and gender to be moderators of the relationship between value, brand trust, and brand loyalty. For example, older people might have more experience in buying consumer durables as a personal source of information which might result in a stronger effect of brand trust on both attitudinal and purchase loyalty.

Relationship of Demographics with Brand Consciousness

 In any research study demographics play an important role thus in the current study demographics had shown their huge impact on the clothing choices and buying behavior of an individual. Nowadays people think that expensive brands are a part of fashion and because they are very trendy so people are ready to spend high money on them. In the study both men and women were found brand conscious and they were interested in buying high brands. The results showed that women were found more in number than men. An insignificant relationship was found between the gender and brand consciousness.

Today the roles of gender have become flexible (Twenge, 1997) and clothing and fashion impart similar importance to both genders. Wernick, (1991), Bakewell et al., (2006), and Manrai et al., (2001) studied fashion consciousness in Eastern Europe and they found young males were more interested in fashion than females. Consumption and involvement of fashion goods are not confined to only females, now men are equally involved in fashion and brands. One of the previous studies found that men and women have different views and relationship with brands. Men see them as one-way relationship while women tend to see them as dual. Women also expect from the brand to reciprocate and to be good, whereas men do not expect too much from brands (Monga, 2002). Another study was carried out on men and their relationships with brands. The findings stated that, men form beneficial and functional relationships with brands thus they are keen towards achieving certain goals (Zayer & Neier, 2011).

Age is considered one of the important factors in buying clothing brands as every individual whether young or late adults, has different perception about self and clothing choices. In the current study all age groups of subjects were engaged in brand buying but Generation-Y had shown their high interest towards expensive brands. An insignificant relationship was found between brand buying and age groups of adults. These findings support that adolescents and especially adults give more attention and importance to their appearance, beauty, and fashion. Thus clothing is considered an important source by which they develop positive self-esteem and gratitude.

In the last few years, brands have shaped and influenced the customer’s living. Young shoppers are predisposed at a very early age to many kinds of fashion influences. From branding perspective, Generation-Y is one of the most vacillating groups and was born between 1985 and 2000 AD. (Gronbach, 2000). Although wearing prestigious brand is not a recent trend, it has been so common during the last decade. Youngsters are fashion innovators and they are tending to be fashion leaders and thus spend more on fashion products than non-leaders. They acts as role models for later adopters in fashion diffusion because they adopt new fashion propensities, fashion products, and they are more brand sensitive (Goldmith et al., 1993, & Beaudoin et al., 2003).

Along with different age groups, brand buying is largely connected with marital status of adults. In the study, married adults including men and women were found more concerned with brands than unmarried and they had their own living styles and expenditure of income. Therefore, they were free to spend money according to their own choices. The study exposed that marriage do not affect brand buying because both married and unmarried were interested in brand buying.

In the study most of the adults were found educated and were working on good positions thus they wanted to impress others through their branded clothes. A significant relation was found between adult’s educational level and brand consciousness. However, brand use was quite popular among the respondents with 16 years of education. Therefore they wanted to impress others through their beautiful clothes and impressive personality. Similar findings were also referred by a research conducted by Fog, (2005) he said that customers want to buy those brands in which their personality reflects best because brand image finally reflects one’s-image. Along with that consumers also want some inspirational qualities from brands, possibly the type of living style they would like to follow. The demand is transferring to those goods that present exclusive experiences: goods that implore our emotions, and add meaning to our search of ‘the good life’.

Furthermore nature of job plays an overbearing role in fashionable brand buying. Subjects of the study were employed in different categories of job. Large part of population was found to be employed in different occupations while less number of subjects was found jobless. In the study an insignificant relationship was found among nature of job and brand consciousness. Most of the subjects were employed in public sector while other subjects were working in private sector and a small number of subjects were employed in business sector. Respondents of all groups showed their concern for brand buying even they were employed in an ordinary job. Consumers employed in private jobs also spend high amount of money to fulfil their demands and camouflaged their self though branded clothing.

Income and buying are connected with each other. This income may be earned by the individuals themselves or may get as pocket money from parents or spouses or from any other earning source. Results of the study revealed that brand use was equally popular among groups classified on the bases of income. Subjects who had high monthly income had spent less money on expensive brands and even they were not willing to spend on expensive brands; this was the indication that they had other priorities regarding spending. At the same time subjects who had low monthly income had spent much money on expensive brands and fulfilled their desires, even high prices of brand did not affect their buying preferences. While respondents having medium range of monthly income had shown the highest percentage regarding expensive brand buying. Acikalin, Gul, and Develioglu, (2009) said that all of the people belong to all levels of society with different income range, from poor to well-off/rich, are in some way involved in buying expensive brand products.

Along with income, monthly savings showed that most of the subjects had saved very less money per month. In the study very small number of subjects saved very high amounts of money. A significant relationship was found among the uses of brand and savings of the family. Hence it was proved in the study that saving ratio became low after expensive brand buying. Prices of brands were mostly very high thus subjects of the study spent large amount on branded clothing so it became very difficult for the subjects to save sufficient amount of money.

In every family there are different numbers of people and they perform many duties within and outside of the family. Commonly it is assumed that number of dependent people in the family has an influence on the monthly family budget, but findings of the present study revealed that number of dependent people didn’t affect buying behavior. Respondents of all the categories of dependent people were engaged in the expensive brand buying. It was observed in the results that those families, in which few members were dependent on their family heads, were highly involved in buying expensive clothing brands. Families who had more dependent people were also found engaged in brand buying activities but their percentage was low of the population. Hence it is proved through the findings that families in which there are more number of dependent people, they still have high monthly expenses like food, schooling, clothing etc. and have an urge for high status brands. It will be discussed ahead that due to low self-esteem they made high purchases on expensive brands. Thus they don’t consider their monthly income and the number of dependent people in their family, and still buy high priced brands.

Along with the number of dependent people, position in a family has also an impact on the family. The findings of the study revealed significant relationship between brand use and position in a family. Results showed that most of the subjects were head of their families and being a head, they not only fulfilled their family demands and ultimately they run their families but had income in their own hands. Thus they made purchases according to their personal choices. Other subjects of the family were supportive members and they also shared many responsibilities with their family heads and the remaining subjects were dependent people. Percentage of brand buying was low in dependent category, while percentages of the heads and supportive members were almost alike which depicted that not only did they share many responsibilities but they also gave financial support to the family. Branding is boosted by social factors including family, peer, and other members of a society but family has a great impact on one’s life and people share their life experiences with them.

People in the family share various responsibilities like clothing, schooling, and transport etc. Results of the study showed that most of the brand user had no particular responsibility at home. Clothing was the only area in which majority of the brand users were spending most.

Size of the family also plays an important role has a great impact in buying practices. In a study no significant relationship was found between uses of brand and size of the family. The findings showed that most of the subjects belonged to medium size family while less number of subjects’ belonged to large size family. All the groups of family were interested in brand buying but medium size family showed the highest interest towards fashion brands. Large families had more monthly expenses and responsibilities, thus high expenditures at home didn’t allow the subjects to spend high amount of money on expensive clothing brands.

 Socio-Economic Status of the family also affects the buying behavior of a consumer. Surprisingly, this study revealed that brand use was equally popular among all the socio-economic statuses. No significant relation was found among brand use and socio-economic statuses. Most of brand buyers belonged to middle class group and this group was more concerned about their living style which results in expensive product consumptions. According to Anholt, (2003) in fact, “some brands-especially apparel brands, indicate our association of groups, schools of thought, lifestyle; they show our response towards authority, our mental age, our choices and our political inclinations”. People want to show their high status through branded clothing. The results also showed that lower class was also engaged in brand buying but overall their percentage in the population was low. Interestingly, results also revealed that high class did not take serious interest in expensive clothing brands too. While middle class who made a large portion of the population had shown their high inclination towards expensive brands.

Today brands symbolically signify a remarkable lifestyle and give high status to the user, and consumers access those brands according to their own self-concepts and capabilities (O’ Cass, 2002 & Goldsmith et al., 1999). Eastman, (1999) Goldsmith, (1999), Hogg, (2000), Vickers & Renand, (2003), and Parker, (2009) researches have examined the relationship between consumer’s social class and brand status consumption. Batra et al., (2000) and Kempen, (2004) investigated that how customer evaluates himself according to their reference groups or do these groups vary with gender. Many outcomes support that customers select, use, and aim to buy brands with high images they see as being matched with their actual self-concept (Malhotra, 1988). Nonetheless, the relationship with ideal-social-self-image, brand is strongly supported by empirical evidences. The debate of products image congruity and self-concept was introduced by Gardner and levy, (1957). By this time, the main attention was focused upon the images which were projected by many products.

Relationship of Self-Esteem with Brand Consciousness

Past studies related with luxury products consumption focus largely on motivations for conspicuous buying (Bagwell & Bernheim, 1996; Hong & Zinkhan, 1995; Mason, 1998, 2001; O’Cass & Frost, 2004). In these studies most of the samples were collected from wealthy class but in the current research sample reflected all the socio economic classes. Through the findings of Descriptive Statistics and Difference between the means on Brand Consciousness by level of Self-Discrepancy with Self-Esteem as covariate confirmed that people with low self-esteem tend to buy expensive branded clothes and brand has ability to enhance self-directed pleasure.

Expensive and impressive brands help to reduce discrepancy in real and ideal self. In the present study descriptive statistics confirmed that subjects overcame their low self-esteem by expensive and well-known brands thus discrepancy in real and ideal-self due to low self-esteem was compensated though brand buying. Past research in social psychology revealed that, people tend to get involve in money-oriented behavior when they have a low self-esteem (Braun & Wicklund, 1989; Chang & Arkin, 2002; Kasser, 2001).

 In order to crosscheck the low self-esteem and the reliability of the subjects Current Thoughts Scale was used and from the findings of scale 3 types of self- esteem i.e. performance, social, and appearance self-esteem of the subjects were observed. A very strong connection was found between brand consciousness and Current Thoughts Scale along with their 3 sub scales. Through Levene’s Test and Multivariate analysis, samples were further analyzed*.* Hence it was proved in the study that subjects who experienced high discrepancies in their ideal and real self-suffered from low self-esteem and were more enthusiastic to buy branded clothes so as to find their identity. A large numbers of researches (e.g. Lachance at el., 2003, Beaudoian, 2003 & Veieria, 2009) are available to support the relationship of self-esteem with brand wearing. The feeling of being unsuccessful in life along with the feeling of shame, mistake, and refusals; individuals tend to decrease their self-esteem. Under these conditions, management of visual appearance through particular brands can help people to establish self-esteem or else they may become more obsessive. People with higher self-esteem tend to prefer clothes which make them happy and they may not need clothes as a tool to attract the others. These findings should inspire/encourage future researches to comprise self-esteem as a precursor of luxury buying behavior.

Emotional Wellness and Brand Consciousness

Through brand buying people often feel joy and happiness thus they get emotional relief. To find out the relationship between emotional wellness and brand buying Independent Sample-T test was employed and the statistic in a study displayed a highly significant relationship between brand consciousness and Emotional Wellness. Adults were found busy in expensive brand consumptions and one of the reasons behind buying behavior was to look fashionable and impressive so this feeling make them happy and satisfied.

Brands create superb image in the eyes of themselves consumers to become popular thus their extensive use give feelings of joy and happiness. Today latest, stylish, and trendy clothing/accessories are available in different brands and consumers want to buy them to become a part of fashion. Although clothing and fashion are the two aspects of behavior, but people define their selves through fashionable clothing (Chamil, Viranga, & Rathnayake, 2011). Clothes work as a sign of indication of gender, status, social group, conformity and personality (Craik, 2009).Consumers buy many goods because they assume that buying products will help them in achieving valuable goals (Salomon, 2008).

 Usually it is observed in life that people enjoy shopping and buying fashionable and trendy products and especially pleasant feelings arise with expensive brands. In purchasing decision social behavior of the consumer helps him in buying thus consumer gets positive feelings e.g. happiness and joy from buying (Chang et al., 2004; Reynolds & Beatty, 2000).

In 1949, the connection between clothing, mood, and emotions exposed that the socially and emotionally maladjusted people were more anxious about their appearance and clothing choices than well settled people. Humphrey et al., (1971) presented how clothing can be used to show positive emotions or to overcome negative emotions regarding self-concepts. Kwon, (1991) also displayed how and how much one feels about themselves (their emotional standard), which can affect their clothing choices and behavior.

In the past decade a sufficient amount of work has been done in the field of consumer brand relationship and it is still a developing area of study for scholars and researchers (Fournier, 1998; Albert et al., 2008; Sahay & Sharma, 2010). Brand relationships are based on emotions and affects (Whang et al., 2004; Thomson et al., 2005; Pawle & Cooper, 2006). Customers make relationships with self-congruent brands which are an outcome of emotions such as joy and love, therefore with increased emotional reliance anxiety is removed (Kim et al., 2005). Wongsiriwat, (2007) explained in her study on acquisition of expensive hand bags in Bangkok that consumer show his buying practices through emotional spending and it is considered an essential part of any buying. Now spending money is based on one’s wants not on its needs. Brands are judged on the basis of emotional affection they predict (O’ Cass, 2004) and this is established upon the rational and emotional valuations of consumers (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001). Hence it was proved by the result of the study that subjects tend to experience more pleasant feelings and they get emotional relief by wearing expensive and popular brands.

Narcissistic Tendencies and Brand Consciousness

In the study Narcissism was analyzed through Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 Scale. Through findings less number of subjects was found narcissist while more number of subjects were non-narcissist. Through Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test it was identified that no significant relation was found between brand wearing and narcissistic personality Inventory-16 Scale. None of the items were found in a significant relation with each other except one item (question) where a significant relation was found. The item was ‘’ I am buying brands for quality”. Narcissists are devoted to self-esteem (Baumeister & Vohs, 2001) and struggling towards self-improvement (Sedikides & Gregg, 2001). They are always status-conscious and power-oriented (Bradlee & Emmons, 1992; Horton & Sedikides, 2009). They are ever involved in impressive show offs (e.g., boasting), exhibit their expensive possessions, and link it with high-status (Buss & Chiodo, 1991; Campbell, 1999).

Like materialistic people, narcissists are inclined to buy expensive and high-status products, which tend to indicate status and superiority (Richins, 1994). Therefore, many characteristics of narcissism are like materialism, signifying that both materialists and narcissists are engaged in excessive buying in struggle to enhance their status, raise self- esteem or self- protect from the retorts of appreciation by others. One important reason behind the promotion of materialism and consumption of high-status brands is the way these brands make efforts to do away with the doubts and inadequacies related to consumer’s self-esteem (Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982; Chang & Arkin, 2002).

 There is realistic back up for these theoretical assumptions. First, narcissists’ altitudes of self-worth oscillate more than non-narcissists (Bogart et al., 2004; Zuckerman & O’Loughlin, 2009; Zeigler-Hill et al., 2010). Secondly, narcissists have lower implied self-worth than non-narcissists (Jordan et al., 2003; Zeigler-Hill, 2006; Gregg & Sedikides, 2010). Thus, in narcissist customer, a policy and approach to overcome their self-doubts and insecurities has been noticed in their behavior. There is a positive impact of their purchases on to their self-esteem. In precise, they showed a different customer behavior patterns, where they displayed material goods (e.g., fashionable apparel, top-class cars, and high priced watches) that had significant marks (Sedikides et al., 2011).

 A narcissist reimburses his insecurities through buying expensive products, but in the current study less subjects were found narcissists and they denied to show their interest towards expensive brands. Thus brands with great symbolic values didn’t affect them. The reason behind this factor was further investigated by the application of Independent Sample T-test. In which Difference between the mean on Self-Esteem by narcissism was investigated. The results proved that narcissists were brand users but expensive brands with great symbolic value didn’t bring any change in their behavior and self. Actually the third intervening factor was subject’s low self-esteem, which actually affects narcissism. Thus the hypothesis that subjects with narcissistic inclinations who like to be viewed as different and superior tend to buy branded clothes is not approved.

Sources of Motivation and Brand Consciousness

People wear expensive and famous brands not only for experiencing joy but also want to show their high status and make impression on others. In the study Independent Sample-T test was used to test the subjects and in the result significant relationship was found between the brand consciousness and sources of Motivation. Majority subjects wore branded clothing and showed their high interest towards branded products. Hence it was proved that status seekers tend to use branded clothes in order to provide visible evidence of their wealth and superior status for social recognition.

 People buy products for practical reasons in order to deal more efficiently with their requirements of life, however, they also buy goods to express and define themselves (Belk, 1985; Dittmar, 1992; Aaker, 1996), to manage their emotions (Dittmar & Drury, 2000; Dittmar, 2011), to gain social status and self-esteem (Banerjee & Duflo, 2007; Sedikides et al., 2007), and to satisfy their desire for self-control (Dittmar, 2011). Similarly, Sivanathan and Pettit, (2010) established that people choose conspicuous and high-status possessions in order to re-establish their endangered image, thus in this way utilization process is an indirect way of self-assertion (Sherman & Cohen, 2006). These studies prove that people can deliberately use material things in the provision of self-related reasons.

Impact of Current Life Satisfaction on Brand Consciousness

Individuals’ personality has a great role on his life and different situations and phases in current life may affect their buying practices. To check brand consciousness and its relationship with life, Satisfaction with Life Scale was used. Independent Sample T-test was applied on the given scale and a significant relationship was found between brand consciousness and Satisfaction with Life Scale. The results of the study indicate that life satisfaction was more prevalent among the brand user.

Finally the result of the study directs that adults of Peshawar overcame low self-esteem through expensive and popular brands. Subjects camouflaged and overcame discrepancies in their real and ideal-self and showed status through expensive branded clothes. Actually brands are considered as status symbols and they create high impression on others thus through shopping of well-known and expensive brands subjects derive pleasure and emotional relief.

**Summary**

The current research study was carried out in Peshawar. Sample of N = 200 which encompasses adults (men and women) with age ranging from 13 to 60 years were randomly selected from rural and urban areas of Peshawar. Along with a few standardized scales, a self-constructed questionnaire was used to find out buying behavior of adults’ regarding brands, later the results were evaluated through SPSS 17.

Demographics such as age, marital status, education, nature of job, family income, monthly saving, number of dependents, position, responsibility, sizes and socio economic status of the family have huge impact on the clothing choices with regards to expensive and well-known brands. Married and well educated subjects had shown highest interest towards expensive and well-known brands. Most of them were employed in private and government sectors.

Individuals who had monthly income in medium range spent more and due to high prices of brands they saved very less per month. Moreover this study clearly attests that most of the subjects belonged to middle class and had large families but large families restrained them, from spending handsome money on buying expensive brands.

For the assessment of Self-Esteem *Current Thoughts Scale* was used in which appearance, social and performance self-esteems were judged. The obtained data was tested through the application of Multivariate test on the scale and it was observed that low self-esteem causes expensive brand consumption.

Through Independent Sample-T test it was exposed that subjects got emotional relief after buying expensive and popular brands. To judge the narcissism *Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 Scale* was used and through Independent Sample-T test it was revealed that most of such subjects were in the category of non narcissists. Whereas the remaining subjects were narcissists, however the denial was made by narcissist who brought a twist in the study result. Through the application of Independent Sample-T test it was revealed that low self-esteem of subjects didn’t allow them to affect narcissism. Hence, study didn’t prove that narcissists tend to buy branded clothes with great symbolic value.

Sources of Motivation (e.g. Social Status) and brand consciousness were tested through Independent Sample-T and it was found that most of the subjects bought brands for social status and to make impression on others. The buying behavior of subjects was studied with relation to their current life situations through *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. The results indicated that the current life satisfaction was found higher for brand user.

Finally adults of Peshawar showed their inclination towards expensive and popular brands and through those brands they derived pleasure and emotional relief, thus they made an impression on others.

**Conclusions**

The research was carried out in Peshawar and the adults of age ranged 13 to 60 years were targeted. During data collection many problems were faced that’s why there is the need to conduct more researches and improvement in this city. The biggest challenge was to collect data from the rural areas of Peshawar. People of some areas like Badaber, Paloosay, and Chamkani were very conservative and it was difficult for me to get permission and collect data from their females. Some problems related to working class were regarding secrecy of their institution’s names so I am bound to keep the name of the working institution confidential. It was also difficult to collect the data from the non-working class because of lack of interest in educational research and very busy schedule in house hold activities. Most of the questionnaires were not even returned by the respondents which wasted the time and resources of the researcher.

The study was confined only to the Peshawar so the results may change with the change in geographic regions. As the selected sample was educated therefore there was no need to translate the questionnaire. But there is the need to translate the questionnaire in Urdu and Pashto for future studies in order to include the less educated people in the research. Most of the relevant reviews were collected from the International research papers and journals and less number of reviews was from the National journals. Insufficient reviews of literature available related to the brand buying behavior of people of Peshawar

 The present research focuses on only few factors which affect buying behaviour of a consumer towards expensive and popular brands. Therefore future researches must consider other factors and their effect on buying behavior of adults. Adult buyers are living in a more modern way and they are more brand conscious than their elders. Marketers should keep reaching out to these power payers by selling their goods through using viral marketing with an attractive advertising plan. This practice of development will help in generating an attractive group identity for the adult buyers who are searching for an expressive and emotional association.

In selecting and buying decisions every individual has his own personal characteristics (Yin-fah, Syuhaily & Yeoh, 2011). The present research study depicts adult population and majority sample belonged to “generation-Y”. Young customers play a vital role in the marketplace as they have a huge impact over the grant of spending power regarding a rising number of product types now including fashion industry.

Finally, adult consumers are at a stage where they are in the activity of forming their own individuality and selfhood. Branding plays main role in making a positive interpretation which depicts high expectations and achievement. Clothing brands targeting adults need to comprehend, connect, and entertain them to produce a positive buzz. Brands control adult’s choice of clothing and targeting this group of customers is rewarding as marketers with vigilant elevations can generate a group of brand loyal consumers for the future. Therefore, marketers of expensive and popular branded clothing should act vigilantly as brands need to widen their vision and see beyond the limits to let youth understand the brand and choose for themselves.

Followings findings are deduced from the current study:

1. It is concluded in the study that adults of Peshawar mostly preferred expensive brands for their clothing choices.

 2. It is deduced from the study that adults examined in the study have discrepancies in their real and ideal- self due to low self-esteem. Thus resulting in buying expensive brands to overcome their psycho-social issues.

 3. Results of the study indicate that adults felt emotional relief, enjoyed pleasant feelings after buying expensive and well-known brands.

4. It is also established that there is a relation between narcissism and buying behavior. However majority of adults examined in the study were found non-narcissist. Due to low self-esteem, the self-love of narcissists was not affected by expensive and well-known brands

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This Research study has shown the most of the adults of Peshawar as intensive brand buyers with a strong inclination towards national and international brands. This has resulted in all the vicinities of the areas with the dozens of brand choices making them it an easy approach for the buyers. Many exclusive international brands are going to infuse the market in the near future to cater to the needs and interests of the local people of Peshawar. This Research study delivers deep understanding to companies and businesses regarding the improvement of their promotional and marketing tools to grasp the customers and increase profits. Marketers can understand that individuals in this glamorous age are moving towards branded and quality products. It is also important to understand the customer’s needs and priorities while selecting an international brand in underdeveloped countries. The marketer also could comprehend the market division and suitably, thus make modest marketing plans and utilize target market sensibly.

The findings of the study support most of the hypotheses regarding adults who are brand conscious. As such, apparel marketers should create an emotional association with adults on discernments of quality and value to hold brand loyalty. Additionally, psychological attachments make the brand unique, help distinguish a brand and bring lasting competitive advantages. Based upon the findings of this study it is suggested that further research can be conducted on older customers by utilizing the sample sizes, with more equal proportion of male and female. Furthermore research can also be done by taking some extra variables such as languages, cultural values, geographic security issues/circumstances, and present life style influences on the meaning of brands in Peshawar.

Adults are ambitious and they are strongly influenced by many psycho-socio factors. Moreover, they are searching for signs that convey status, distinction, and an image of being stylish and fashionable. Therefore, positive psychological attachments with a brand will increase interactive communication influencing others to promote the brand. According to Hillenbrand, Alcauter, and Cervantes, (2013) one of the most vital connection to the buyer is brand, as brand has the entire features to satisfy the requirement of people and company should focus to build up such a brand name which narrates the consumers’ needs positively.

**Limitations of the study**

The focus of this research is on the adults in a specific geographic location due to accessibility for data assortment. Most of the collected sample belonged to “Generation-Y” and they were found highly conscious of their physique, styles, fashion, and dressing. While less number of people belonged to the other age groups.

One limitation of the present study is that most of the sample was educated and were employed in Government sector therefore their psycho-social needs towards brands provoked them in expensive buying. The respondents in this study may also have shown different responses towards brands if compared with those with less formal education people or who live in different parts and especially big cities of the country.
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APPENDIX-1

Demoraphic Data sheet

**Part: I**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Name |  |
| 2 | Age |  |
| 3 | Year of Birth | 1. 1950 –1960
2. 1960-1970
3. 1970-1980
4. 1980-1990
5. 1990+
 |
| 4 | Gender | 1. Male
2. Female
 |
| 5 | Marital Status | 1. Married
2. Unmarried
 |
| 6 | Education |  |
| 7 | Nature of Job | 1. Public Sector
2. Private Sector
3. Business
4. None
 |
| 8 | Family Income  | Rs/- |
| 9 | Savings | Rs/- |
| 10 | Number of Dependent people |  |
| 11 | Position in the Family | 1. Head
2. Supporting
3. Dependent
 |
| 12 | Responsibility in the Family | 1. Kitchen Expenditure
2. Clothing Expenditure
3. School Expenditure
4. Utility Bills
5. Convince Expenditure
6. None in particular
7. Most of above
 |
| 13 | Family Size | 1. Small (almost-4 members)
2. Medium (almost-8 members)
3. Large (more than 8 members)
 |
| 14 | Socio-Economic Status | 1. Lower
2. Middle
3. High
 |

Appendix-11

Part: II (Self constructed questionnaire)

Select the correct options of the following:-

Key: Always (A) Often (O) Sometimes(S) Rare(R) Never (N)

**a. Brand Consciousness**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Items** | **A** | **O** | **S** | **R** | **N** |
| 1 | I prefer wearing brands. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | I would prefer style over brands. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | I buy branded cloth/es. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Brands are important to me. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | I am preoccupied when buying things (actual/imagination). |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | I get tempted towards brands. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | I buy things just for being branded. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | I buy brands for quality. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | I am wearing brands since too long. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Wearing brands express me having a strong background. |  |  |  |  |  |

 **b. Self Esteem**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Items** | **A** | **O** | **S** | **R** | **N** |
| 11 | I feel I look good what- ever I wear. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Wearing brands give faith in me that I am looking presentable.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Wearing brands bring confidence in me. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Brands help me enhance my image in the eyes of others. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | I feel much confidence in parties. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Most of the time I feel positive about my own self. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | I feel that I am a person of worth. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | I feel transformed these days. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | I feel myself helpless when I come across branded clothes. |  |  |  |  |  |

**c. Emotional Wellness**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Items** | **A** | **O** | **S** | **R** | **N** |
| 20 | The brand name is very important when I buy things. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | I feel happy and satisfied by wearing braded cloth/es. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | My energy level rises when I am wearing expensive and branded product.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  My work performance gets better when I wear brands.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | Wearing brands help me elevate positive emotions. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | I experience extreme joy while wearing branded clothes. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | The level of my excitement rises when I am wearing brands.  |  |  |  |  |  |

**d. Social Status**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Items** | **A** | **O** | **S** | **R** | **N** |
| 27 | For me brand symbolizes social status and they are very important. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | I feel confident when I wear branded cloth/es. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | Wearing branded clothing makes my high impression on other. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | I feel that branded clothing bring me to level of latest fashion trends. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | I wear branded cloth/es to become a part of current fashion or trend. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Wearing brands make me feel of superior in a social group. |  |  |  |  |  |

**e. Real self/Ideal self**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Items** | **A** | **O** | **S** | **R** | **N** |
| 33 | Whatever I persist about myself I actually know who I am and what I do. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | I feel satisfied with myself. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | I feel I can improve my appearance through special clothing products. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | My real image of self is what my ideal image of self is. |  |  |  |  |  |
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PART: III *(Satisfaction with Life Scale by Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985)*

Please express the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

Please place value from 1-7 on the line best indicates how you feel about each statement.

1. Strongly Disagree 5. Slightly agree
2. Disagree 6. Agree
3. Slightly Disagree 7. Strongly agree
4. Neither agree nor disagree

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Items** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** |
| 1 | In most ways, my life is close to ideal. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | The conditions of my life are excellent. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | I am satisfied with my life. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Part: IV *(Current Thought Scale by Heatherton & Polivy, 1991)*

Select the correct option of the following

1 = not at all 2 = a little bit

3 = somewhat 4 = very much

5= extremely

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Items | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  | I feel confident about my abilities. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I am worried about whether I am regarded as a success or failure.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel satisfied with the way my body looks right now. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel frustrated or rattled about my performance. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel that I am having trouble understanding things that I read. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel that others respect and admire me.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I am dissatisfied with my weight.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel self-conscious. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel as smart as others. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel displeased with myself. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel good about myself. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I am pleased with my appearance right now. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I am worried about what other people think of me. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel confident that I understand things. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel inferior to others at this moment. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel unattractive. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel concerned about the impression I am making. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel that I have less scholastic ability right now than others. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I feel like I’m not doing well. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | I am worried about looking foolish. |  |  |  |  |  |
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Part: V (*NPI-16 Scale by Ames, Rose, & Anderson, 2006).*

Select the correct option from the pair of the following statements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | 1. I really like to be the center of attention
2. It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention
 |
| 2 | 1. I am no better or no worse than most people
2. I think I am a special person
 |
| 3 | 1. Everybody likes to hear my stories
2. Sometimes I tell good stories
 |
| 4 | 1. I usually get the respect that I deserve
2. I insist upon getting the respect that is due me
 |
| 5 | 1. I don't mind following orders
2. I like having authority over people
 |
| 6 | 1. I am going to be a great person
2. I hope I am going to be successful
 |
| 7 | 1. People sometimes believe what I tell them
2. I can make anybody believe anything I want them to
 |
| 8 |  (a) I expect a great deal from other people  (b) I like to do things for other people |
| 9 | 1. I like to be the center of attention
2. I prefer to blend in with the crowd
 |
| 10 | 1. I am much like everybody else
2. I am an extraordinary person
 |
| 11 | 1. I always know what I am doing
2. Sometimes I am not sure of what I am doing
 |
| 12 | 1. I don't like it when I find myself manipulating people
2. I find it easy to manipulate people
 |
| 13 | 1. Being an authority doesn't mean that much to me
2. People always seem to recognize my authority
 |
| 14 | 1. I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so
2. When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed
 |
| 15 | 1. I try not to be a show off
2. I am apt to show off if I get the chance
 |
| 16 | 1. I am more capable than other people
2. There is a lot that I can learn from other people
 |