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Abstract
This research seeks to determine what are the reasons that encourage the consumer to knowingly purchase counterfeit luxury goods. The current study analyses the role of purchase intention as a mediator between the socio-economic, psychological factors and consumer purchase behaviour. Data collected from a sample of 402 Pakistani respondents through self-administered questionnaires and analysed with Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) in AMOS. The findings supported that purchase intention mediated the relationship between contextual factors and consumer purchase behaviour. The findings will help brand managers, law enforcement agencies, brand manufacturers, and Governments to evaluate their existing strategies and develop anticounterfeits strategies. Similarly, international luxury manufacturing companies can devise strategies based on the findings that purchase intention determines the actual purchase behaviour of Pakistani consumers.
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Introduction
The history of product counterfeiting is as old as human civilisation and has been affecting businesses for centuries. The Pakistan Penal Code Section 28 defines counterfeiting, "A person is said to counterfeit who causes one thing to resemble another thing, intending by means of that resemblance to practice deception, or knowing it to be likely that deception will thereby be practised(Pakistan Penal Code, Act XLV of 1860)". The world sales of counterfeit goods are increasing with every passing year and this problem not limited to few countries(Gentry, Putrevu, & Shultz, 2006). Pakistan is not an exception and its “General Trade Related Index of Counterfeiting and Piracy of Economies” (GTRIC-e) stand at 1.657459, which is comparatively on the higher side (OECD, 2009).
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The knowledge of consumer behaviour towards counterfeit luxury goods will help the stakeholders to develop more appropriate anti-counterfeiting strategies. Considering the same, this research paper aims to analyse the factors like economic benefits, collectivism, hedonic motive, materialism and perceived value as independent variables while purchasing intention as mediating variable on consumer behaviour the dependent variable. The major objectives of the current research are:

- To get an insight of the counterfeit luxury goods purchase behaviour of Pakistani consumers by developing a theoretical model.
- Analyse the relationships of contextual variables to understand counterfeit luxury goods purchase behaviour.
- Provision of some remedies to anti-counterfeiting organisations.

These objectives achieved through these main research questions:

- What are the prominent factors that influence consumers during the purchase of counterfeit luxury goods?
- Is there any variable that has a mediating role between independent and dependent variables?
- How can the selected variables targeted to reduce counterfeit luxury goods purchases?

**Literature review**

*The concept of counterfeiting*

A counterfeit trademark product is “any goods bearing, without authorization, a trademark which cannot be distinguished in its essential aspects from the trademark registered for such goods (OECD, 2009)”. According to (Bian & Moutinho, 2009) the counterfeit product is an unauthorised reproduction of a genuine brand and its brand elements mimic with the original product. Pakistan is among the top ten countries of the world where most counterfeit goods originate and sold openly in the market (Ahmad, Yousif, Shabeer, & Imran, 2014). The easy availability of counterfeit goods encourages consumers to purchase counterfeits. (Penz & Stöttinger, 2005; Chaudhry & Stumpf, 2011). Similarly, the counterfeit manufacturers attract towards counterfeit goods production due to low risk, high return, the weak or non-existent anti-counterfeit laws.

*Types of counterfeiting*
Most of the researchers distinguish counterfeit goods either deceptive or non-deceptive (Chakraborty, Alred, & Bristol, 1996). In the deceptive form of counterfeiting, the consumer unaware that the goods he is going to purchase are not original (Phau & Teah, 2009). While non-deceptive counterfeiting means consumers buy a product although he realised that the product is not original due to a number of factors like significant price difference, lower quality or because genuine manufacturers incorporated certain features to recognise originality (Eisend & Schuchert-Güler, 2006). Bian, 2006, p.31) introduced another type of counterfeiting with the name of blur counterfeiting.

Hypotheses development
The selected variables that influence consumer behaviour towards counterfeit goods were classified into two main groups i.e. socio-economic influences and psychological influences.

Socioeconomic Influences
The economic status, the social influence and the environment in which a person living in the society determine the behaviour of an individual (Ang, Cheng, & Lim, 2001). The social pressure and economic standing in society significantly influence the decision-making process to choose or not to choose counterfeit goods (Bian & Moutinho, 2009).

Economic Benefits and Purchase Intention
The price gap between a genuine and counterfeit is the decisive single factor that encourages customers to opt for a counterfeit product (Albers-Miller, 1999). Based on that we hypotheses:
H1: Economic benefits positively influenced consumers purchase intention for counterfeit luxury goods.
H2: Economic benefits positively influenced consumers purchase behaviour towards counterfeit luxury goods.

Collectivism and Purchase Intention
Hofstede, (1980) mentioned that collectivist thinking-inclined more towards sharing. Pakistan, with a very low score of 14, is considered a collectivistic society. In collectivist societies, consumers have a much higher willingness toward counterfeit goods (Husted, 2000). Therefore, we hypotheses:
H3: Collectivism positively related to consumers purchase intention toward the counterfeit luxury goods.
H4: Collectivism positively related to consumers purchase behaviour toward counterfeit luxury goods.
Psychological Influences
Psychological factors help in determining the actual behaviour of customers while they were passing through the decision-making process to purchase a counterfeit. This study used factors like hedonic motives, materialism, and perceived value as the influencing variables to understand the psychological dimension of consumer behaviour.

Hedonic Motives and Purchase Intention
Consumers considered luxury goods as a novel, status symbol and try to match them with their personality. Due to these hedonic characteristics’ consumers get attracted and purchased counterfeit goods. (Penz & Sto’ttinger, 2008). Therefore, we hypotheses:

H5: Hedonic motives positively influenced the consumer’s purchase intention toward counterfeit luxury goods.
H6: Hedonic motives positively influenced consumer purchase behaviour toward counterfeit luxury goods.

Materialism and Purchase Intention
“Materialism is a set of centrally held beliefs about the importance of possessions in one’s life Richins & Dawson, (1992, p. 308)”. Fournier & Richins, (1991) observed that materialistic consumers feel happy when they acquire materialistic goods. Due to these findings, we hypotheses that materialism positively affects counterfeit and presented the following hypotheses:

H7: Materialism positively affects the consumer’s purchase intention toward counterfeit luxury goods.
H8: Materialism positively affects the consumer’s purchase behaviour towards counterfeit luxury goods.

Perceived Value and Purchase Intention
Perceived value plays an important role in developing long term relationships with customers. If the difference of quality between original and counterfeit is negligible consumers will prefer a counterfeit product. Previous research confirmed that some consumers are not ready to believe that counterfeit is basically low-quality products (De Matos et al., 2007; Penz & St¨ottinger, 2009). Perceived value positively affects consumer purchase intentions (Wells, Valacich, & Hess, 2011). Therefore, the hypotheses derived:

H9: Perceived value is positively related to the consumer’s purchase intention towards counterfeit luxury goods.
H10: Perceived value is positively related to the consumer’s purchase behaviour towards counterfeit luxury goods.
Mediating Effect of Purchase Intention
This research seeks to determine whether purchase intention acts as a mediator between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Past studies have provided the theoretical background for the mediation effect of purchase intention on consumer behaviour (Beck & Ajzen, 1991; Hieke, 2010. Based on the extant literature, we proposed that purchase intention plays a mediating role between independent variables and consumer behaviour. The proposed hypothesis is:

\[ H11: \text{Purchase intention mediates the relationship between contextual factors and consumer behaviour.} \]

Research Methods
Theoretical Framework
The current study theoretically based on the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1980 and the theory of planned behaviour (Beck & Ajzen, 1991). Fishbein & Ajzen, (1980) explained TRA that humans are generally rational and systematically used information. The ultimate objective of TRA is to determine the factors which define the behaviour of an individual. In TPB they included perceived behavioural control that means the perceived ability to perform a behaviour, which was missing in TRA.

Research Design
The sample size for this study was 402 and out of these 161 respondents submitted their responses through online while 241 responses were collected through self-administered questionnaires. The introductory part of the questionnaire briefly explained the research, definition of counterfeit goods and guidelines to complete the questionnaire. The data were collected from Pakistani consumers through snowball sampling technique.

Measures
The questionnaire consisted of 66 items with seven variables. The variables economic benefits measured on six items from the scale introduced by Lee & Yoo, (2009), collectivism measured on sixteen items adopted from the Individualism and Collectivism Scale (ICS) proposed by Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, (1995), hedonic motives measured on ten items adapted from the scale developed by Babin, Darden, & Griffin, (1994), the materialism measured by using nine items of Richins, (1994) materialism scale, the perceived value measured on ten items by using consumer perceived value (PERVAL) scale of Sweeney, Jillian C. Soutar Geoffr, (2001), purchase intention measured by using four items from the scale formulated by De Matos et al., (2007), consumer behaviour measured
using five items that were adapted from Fan, Lan, Huang, & Chang, (2013). All these constructs were measured with the help of five-point Likert scale where 1 represents “strongly disagree” to 5 means “strongly agree”. The demographic analysis consists of gender, age, location, qualification, occupation, and monthly income.

**Analysis**

Structural equation modelling technique used through AMOS 21 to test the proposed hypotheses. The collected data first examined for missing values and for this purpose a widely accepted listwise deletion method was selected. The data collected online was free of missing value because the online submission of the questionnaire was only possible if the questionnaire filled completely. However, five questionnaires were rejected out of 246 self-administered questionnaires. The reason for rejections of these questionnaires were either missing entries, overwriting or selecting multiple answers.

**Descriptive Statistics**

The demographic analysis of sample population indicated that the selected sample of the population consists of mostly young, educated, a salaried person with a quite reasonable income and the sample equally distributed on gender basis across Pakistan. As presented in

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>13 to 19 Yrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 30 Yrs.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 to 40 Yrs.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 to 50 Yrs.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 Yrs. and above</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Federal Area</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baluchistan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KPK</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Matric or below</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Empirical Results

Skewness and kurtosis tests were performed to determine the application of the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) in SEM. So, it is recommended to check the estimated kurtosis of the data. The recommended best fit range of kurtosis is ±2 (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). While kurtosis measure how much flat the symmetric distribution top is in data (Pearson, 1905). The data confirmed that all sixty variables were within the recommended best fit range of kurtosis. Table 2 report the bivariate correlations amongst the studied variables. Similarly, all independent variables and mediating variable purchase intention have a strong relationship with dependent variable i.e. consumer behaviour.

Table 2: Bi-variate correlations and Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>HM</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>PV</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>CB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**
Diagonal values are the square root of AVE.
N = 402
The Measurement Model

In the measurement model, each latent variable was connected to others and the covariance of the variables estimated. “The measurement model helps in assessing the reliability of each scale item and its relevant contribution in the model (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995).” The measurement model helped to test unidimensionality, reliability, and validity through maximum likelihood by using Confirmatory Factor Analysis in AMOS. The ultimate objective is to check that items load are significant on the selected factors.

1.1. The Structural Model

The hypotheses testing is done through structural equation modelling as shown in figure 1.

Figure 1: The Structural Model

Six indices were used to check the structural model fit. The results of the fit indices confirmed that the structural model had a good fit. The summary of the fit indices presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Measure</th>
<th>Perfect Fit</th>
<th>Accepted Fit</th>
<th>Structural Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative/Normal Chi-Square (χ²/df) (CMIN/DF)</td>
<td>X²/df&lt;3</td>
<td>3&lt;χ²/df&lt;5</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)</td>
<td>0.95&lt;TLI&lt;1</td>
<td>0.90&lt;TLI&lt;0.95</td>
<td>0.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>0.97&lt;CFI&lt;1</td>
<td>0.95&lt;CFI&lt;0.97</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>0&lt;RMSEA&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.05&lt;RMSEA&lt;0.08</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR)</td>
<td>A value of zero indicates perfect fit.</td>
<td>SRMR&lt;0.08</td>
<td>0.0437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another important measure to evaluate a model is by analysing the critical ratios (CR) through regression weights of individual scale items. These ratios are the “parameter estimate divided by its standard error (SE)” (Byrne, 2016). This test statistic should be > 1.96 at p>0.05. Those scale items unable to meet the standard considered for deletion and removed from further analysis. Table 4 shows the standardised regression weight, S.E in the model.

**Table 4:** Regression Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI ——&gt; EB</th>
<th>.108</th>
<th>.055</th>
<th>1.968</th>
<th>.049</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI ——&gt; C</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI ——&gt; HM</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI ——&gt; M</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI ——&gt; PV</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>2.399</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB ——&gt; PI</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>7.551</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB ——&gt; EB</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>3.693</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB ——&gt; C</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>2.696</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB ——&gt; HM</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>3.664</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB ——&gt; M</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB ——&gt; PV</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>2.246</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

EB = Economic Benefit, C = Collectivism, HM = Hedonic Motives, M = Materialism, PV = Perceived Value
PI = Purchase Intention & CB = Consumer Behaviour.

1.2. The Mediating Analysis of Purchase Intention

The results of bootstrapping method confirmed that purchase intention acts as a mediator between the independent variables (economic benefits, collectivism, hedonic motives, materialism & perceived value) and the dependent variable (consumer purchase behaviour). As shown in table 5.

**Table: 5 Mediating Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Path (A)</th>
<th>Path (B)</th>
<th>A*B</th>
<th>Bootstrapping Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB ——&gt; PI ——&gt; CB</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C ——&gt; PI ——&gt; CB</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM ——&gt; PI ——&gt; CB</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M ——&gt; PI ——&gt; CB</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV ——&gt; PI ——&gt; CB</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EB = Economic Benefit, C = Collectivism, HM = Hedonic Motives, M = Materialism, PV = Perceived Value, PI = Purchase Intention & CB = Consumer Behaviour

**Discussion and Conclusion**
The results strongly supported that all proposed independent
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variables significantly influence consumer purchase behaviour towards counterfeit luxury goods. The mediating analysis supported hypothesis “Purchase intention mediates the relationship between the contextual variables and consumer behaviour”. The results of goodness-of-fit confirmed that fit statistics were in the range of prescribed fit values and the model was satisfactory. Based on research findings, all hypothesis accepted positively.

Implications of the Study
In Pakistan, very few researches were conducted to empirically analyse counterfeit luxury goods purchase behaviour. The research findings will provide a holistic picture to the marketing professionals to have a better understanding of the purchasing behaviour of Pakistani consumers. The development of the conceptual model also facilitates viewing similar issues in other socio-economic environments. Therefore, International manufacturing company’s interested in penetrating in Pakistan device their strategies based on this assumption that the purchase intention of Pakistani consumer a real determinant of their purchase behaviour. Marketing practitioners should realise the importance of reference groups in collectivist societies because due to their social status they have an influence on the consumer purchase decision. Customise brand communication messages based on individual customer behaviour can encourage customers to avoid counterfeit goods. The results of this research will help governments, brand managers, manufacturers, public policy makers, and organisations providing anti-counterfeiting services.

Limitations
The selected sample was carefully chosen for this study; however, it cannot be claimed that it is a perfect representation of all Pakistani consumers. In cross-sectional research data collected at a time will only represent a time-bound consumer behaviour. Although the researcher has tried his best in selecting the most appropriate scales even then, the selected scale used in the current research may not produce the same results with other counterfeit goods. This study covered only counterfeit luxury goods and if the same parameter applied to other types of counterfeit products like food, medicines, and auto parts etc. may result in more unfavourable consumer behaviour towards counterfeits. Finally, this study is time and money constraint.

Direction for Future Research
Future researchers can study the counterfeit goods post-purchase behaviour of consumers. This will help in understanding consumers feelings after using these goods. These feelings will not base on
hedonic motives or emotion so may be different then this study like shame, regret due to poor quality etc. Future researchers can examine those consumers who exclusively buy counterfeit goods online and even can make a comparison of online purchasing with traditional purchasing of counterfeit goods. The model used in this research can be applied in other countries where social, cultural, economical and legal differences exist and laws relating to counterfeiting are different. Future investigators can use a different scale with the same variables and this change of scales may open new dimensions. Another suggestion for future researchers is to observe the actual behaviours and emotions of the consumers through an experiment with real customers and retailers.
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