

Consumer Behaviour Towards Branded Sunglasses Amongst The Students Of Kottayam City

Mejo Varghese¹ Dr. R.Thiru Murugan² Radha Thangarajan³

¹Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Kalasalingam Academy of Research and Education, Krishnankoil, Tamilnadu.

²Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Kalasalingam Academy of Research and Education, Krishnankoil, Tamilnadu.

³Assistant Professor, St. Claret College Autonomous, Bengaluru.

Abstract

Recent studies show that marketers are increasingly emphasizing branding, believing that a well-established brand can more effectively influence consumer decisions. Branding does not operate in isolation—integrated marketing communication plays a key role in shaping consumer preferences. This study investigates consumer behavior towards branded sunglasses, focusing on student preferences in Kottayam city. Primary data was collected from 130 student respondents using a structured questionnaire. Secondary data was sourced from journals, e-newspapers, and websites to support and interpret the findings. The research aims to understand customer perception and brand consciousness in choosing sunglasses, and to identify factors influencing buying decisions. Hypothesis testing was conducted to examine the impact of demographic factors on brand selection. Results indicate that quality and social image significantly affect brand choice, while price has minimal influence. The findings offer valuable insights for marketers and future research in consumer behavior.

Keywords-

Brand Preference, Branded vs Unbranded. Sunglasses.

Introduction

Brand names are a source of differentiation. Kohli and Thakor (1997) once said that consumer buy brand names and are willing to pay a premium for them, consumer do not buy jeans; they buy Levi's, they do not buy sunglasses; they buy Ray Ban and they do not buy sparkling water; they buy Perrier. Branding does influence a consumer's choice. The approval rating for Kellogg's Corn Flakes increased from 47 percent in a "blind" test to 59 percent when the name was revealed (Saporito, 1986) cited in Kohli and Thakor (1997). Similarly, preference for Armstrong tiles increased from 50 percent in a blind test to 90 percent when the name was revealed (Aaker, 1991) cited in Kohli and Thakor (1997). In a study conducted by BBDO Worldwide, one of the leading advertising agencies, consumers believed that there were greater differences between brands in product categories that emphasized image in comparison to product categories where physical attributes were emphasized (BBDO Worldwide, 1988). Thus, people feel there is more variation between the various brands of mineral water and less variation between the various brands of paper towel. In reality, however, this need not be true (Kohli & Thakor, 1997).

Today brands play an integral part in marketing strategy in capturing consumer attention. This is because brands have become an important marketing component to the manufacturer and a rich source of information for consumer. The awareness, created in the initial stages can be turned up as brand equity in the later stage at the bottom of the pyramid in the model through

several stages proposed by *Jonson in 1997*. These stages include Brand awareness, brand associations, brand familiarity, brand attitudes, brand identity, brand personality, brand image, brand position, brand preference, brand loyalty and brand equity (*Agarwal et al 2012*).

A brand, as defined by *Keller*, is “a product, but one that adds other dimensions that differentiate it in some way from other products designed to satisfy the same need (*Biplab, S. B., 1998*). These differences may be rational and tangible – related to product performance of the brand – or more symbolic, emotional, and intangible – related to what the brand represents”.

Review Of Literature

According to Moon, Chadee and Tikoo (2008) Consumer behavior is characterized as a procedure of customer settling on a choice with respect to the buying, utilizing, and transfer of merchandise and ventures. The model of purchaser purchasing conduct exacerbated with basic leadership process is outside boosts, which comprise of advertising jolts (item, value, place, advancement), and other boosts (economy, innovation, law and political, culture)

Kotler (1997) highlight the necessity to inquire about consumer behaviour is the manner by which consumers are probably going to react the different stimuli's (item and administration determination, mark choice, merchant decision, affiliate determination, buy timing, repurchase interim, and buy sum). The Black Box show formulated, clarified the concealed nature (inside boost) of shopper basic leadership process. The purchaser's black box containing the purchaser's qualities (state of mind, inspiration, discernment, and way of life, identity, and learning) and basic leadership process (issue acknowledgment, data look into). Much customer look into was embraced to take in more around six questions (what buyers purchase, who purchase, how they purchase, when they purchase, where they purchase, and why they purchase)

Eye glasses, also known formally as glasses or spectacles, are frames bearing lenses worn in front of the eyes (Rosen, 1956). They are normally used for vision correction. A contact lens is a thin lens placed directly on the surface of the eye. Contact lenses are considered medical devices and can be worn to correct vision, or for cosmetic and therapeutic reasons (Farandos et al., 2014).

Recent reports show that customers choose to wear eye glasses or contact lenses for vision correction based on personal preferences. Lifestyle, comfort, convenience and aesthetics should all factor into the decision-making process (Riley & Chalmers, 2005)

Mills, Juline(2000),This study examined consumer attitude towards adding branded quick-service Items on domestic airline in-flight menus with the aim of assessing the variables of perceived customer value and customer satisfaction. A random sample of one hundred Sixteen frequent flyers residing in the United States participated in the study.

Rajput, Kesharwani and Khanna (2012) International Journal of Marketing Studies, The relationship between consumers' decision-making styles and their choice between domestic and imported brand clothing is investigated using a sample of Indian consumer. The objective of this paper is to gauge the factors affecting purchase decision taking gender perspective as base. Empirical findings are calculated using survey technique and chi square test with a sample

of 320 participants in Delhi and NCR.

Kathuria, Mohan L., Gill P. British Food Journal (2013), The consumption trends of Kahramanmaras type ice cream of Turkish consumers have been considerably increasing for the last decade due to improvements related to the consumers' purchase powers, a rapid progress in ice cream technology, and dietary and health concerns.

Objectives Of The Study

- To identify various factors affecting buying behaviour of customers towards branded sunglasses.
- To identify the impact of demographic factors on buying behaviour of customers towards branded sunglasses.

Methodology

The study has been conducted on all the students using the branded sunglasses in the Kottayam city. The research focused on the students willing to participate. The data collected through a structured questionnaire based on 5point Likert's type questions based on the scale by-Strizhakova, Couter and Price (2008). Total 16 questions were asked including demographic variables to collect the responses of customers buying behaviour while purchasing branded sunglasses.

The study has been focused on students of Kottayam region. Selection of sample was on judgemental basis. Total 140 responses were collected from different categories of students – Post Graduate/ Graduate/ School Going, out of which 11 responses were dropped due to insufficient information filled.

The data so collected was tested for its reliability and validity of the construct. The Cronbach alpha was calculated for the data and value for the same has been 0.827. Since the value is higher than 0.5, therefore it shows that data for the study is reliable. It further shows that the data is fit for factor analysis.

KMO and Bartlett's Adequacy Test was also conducted to examine the adequacy of data to conduct factor analysis and value for the same has been 0.861. Since the value is higher than 0.6, therefore it shows that data for study is adequate. Then factors affecting buying behaviour of customers towards branded sunglasses were carved out by applying factor analysis technique using SPSS 20 software.

Analysis

Three major factors were identified after applying a factor analysis – Social association, Personal association and Quality. Amongst these Social association has playing the most significant role as having highest total factor load of 5.67 followed by quality (3.048) and personal association (2.67).

Table 1: Factor- Social Association (Total Factor Load is 5.677)

Statement	Load
I choose brands that are associated with	.849

the social class I belong to.	
I buy branded sunglass that my parents buy/have bought.	.814
I use branded sunglass that my family uses or have used.	.783
I avoid choosing brands that do not reflect my social status.	.781
I buy branded sunglass because they are an important tradition in my household.	.663
My choice of a brand says something about the people I like to associate with.	.621
I communicate my achievements through the brands I own and use.	.593
Using brands can help me connect with other people and social groups.	.573

Table 2: Factor - Quality (Total Factor Load Is 3.048)

Statement	Load
I choose branded sunglass because of the quality they represent.	.802
I choose branded sunglass because I support the values they stand for.	.793
I can tell a lot about a sunglass quality from the brand name.	.762
A brand name tells me a great deal about the quality of a product.	.691

Table 3: Factor - Personal Association (Total Factor Load is 2.668)

Statement	Load
The branded sunglasses I use communicate important information about the type of person I am.	.785
I choose branded sunglass that helps to express my identity to others.	.664
I choose brands that bring out my personality.	.616
I feel a bond with people who use the same brands as I do.	.603

Findings

Hypothesis 1:

H_{0a} – There is no significant difference amongst the buying opinion of male and female towards coffee.

H_{1a}– There is no significant difference amongst the buying opinion of male and female

towards coffee.

Table 4: Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Error Mean
Response_Total	Male	103	49.2330	1.01691
	Female	26	47.5769	1.44560

Table 5: Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Response_Total	2.449	.120	.769	127	.443	1.65609	2.15314	2.60459	5.91676
			.937	52.701	.353	1.65609	1.76745	1.88944	5.20161

In the above test, as we can see P value of Levene's test for equality of variance i.e. **.120** is greater than significant value 0.05, so we will assume that variances are equal. Now in Independent Sample- T test, P value is .443 which is greater than significant value 0.05 which means the data is insignificant. So, there is no significant difference amongst the buying opinion of male and female towards branded sunglasses.

Hypothesis 2:

H_{0b} – There is no significant difference amongst the buying opinion due to frequency of consumption

H_{1b} – There is no significant difference amongst the buying due to frequency of consumption

Table 6: ANOVA

Response Total

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	713.757	2	356.879	3.888	.023
Within Groups	11565.933	126	91.793		
Total	12279.690	128			

Table 7: Multiple Comparisons
Dependent Variable: Response Total Tukey HSD

(I) Your Monthly Family Income	(J) Your Monthly Family Income	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Upto 50,000	50,001 - 1,00,001	-4.37685	1.99867	.077	-9.1172	.3635
	Above 1,00,001	-5.13757*	2.07907	.039	-10.0686	-.2066
50,001 - 1,00,001	Upto 50,000	4.37685	1.99867	.077	-.3635	9.1172
	Above 1,00,001	-.76071	2.21754	.937	-6.0201	4.4987
Above 1,00,001	Upto 50,000	5.13757*	2.07907	.039	.2066	10.0686
	50,001 - 1,00,001	.76071	2.21754	.937	-4.4987	6.0201

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

It is observed from the above table, at 5% level of significance the $p (.023) < \alpha (0.05)$ so we reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. We can say that there is significant difference amongst the buying opinion due family monthly income. Further, the data in tested on Post-hoc Test and found that as significance value between family income 'upto 50,000' and 'above 1,00,001' which means people into these categories thinks differently while selecting branded sunglasses.

Conclusion

The study has been conducted on all the students using the branded sunglasses in the Kottayam city. The customers of different categories (Post graduate, Graduate, and School Students) have been selected under convenience based random sampling method. For the further study, Consumer buying behavior has no association with gender. Preference for branded sunglasses is equal for men and women. Both categories are equally prospective target audience. Consumer buying behavior has no association with monthly family income. Preference for branded sunglasses is equal for all the categories of income i.e. low-income group, medium income group and high-income group. All the categories are equally prospective target audience. Consumer buying behavior has no association with region to which respondents belong. All the categories are equally prospective target audience. The manufacturers of branded Sunglasses must focus on all these factors to formulate branding strategies effectively and to sustain their growth.

References

1. Batra, R., Lenk, P., & Wedel, M. (2010). Brand extension strategy planning: Empirical estimation of brand-category personality fit and atypicality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47(2), 335–347. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.47.2.335>
2. BBDO Worldwide. (1988). *Focus: A world of brand parity*. New York, NY: BBDO.
3. Bearden, W. O., & Rose, R. L. (1990). Attention to social comparison information: An individual difference factor affecting consumer conformity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16(4), 461–471. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209228>

4. Biplab, S. B. (1998). *Handbook of marketing management*. Himalaya Publishing House.
5. Carrigan, M., & Attalla, A. (2001). The myth of the ethical consumer: Do ethics matter in purchase behavior? *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 18(7), 560–578. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760110410263>
6. Cottarelli, V., Puccetti, A. C., & Saporito, P. E. (1986). Osservazioni sul genere *Psammopsyllus* (Copepoda, Harpacticoida, Cylindropsyllidae) e descrizione di tre nuove specie. *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Verona*, 11, 1–29.
7. Aaker, D. A. (1991). *Managing brand equity: Capitalizing on the value of a brand name*. Free Press.
8. Ellis, A. W., Holmes, S. J., & Wright, R. L. (2010). Age of acquisition and the recognition of brand names: On the importance of being early. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 20(1), 43–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2009.10.002>
9. Farandos, N. M., Yetisen, A. K., Monteiro, M. J., Lowe, C. R., & Yun, S. H. (2015). Contact lens sensors in ocular diagnostics. *Advanced Healthcare Materials*, 4(6), 792–810. <https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.201400504>
10. Fornell, C., Mithas, S., & Morgeson, F. V. III. (2009). The economic and statistical significance of stock returns on customer satisfaction. *Marketing Science*, 28(5), 820–825. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.1090.0524>
11. Fornell, C., Mithas, S., Morgeson, F. V. III, & Krishnan, M. S. (2006). Customer satisfaction and stock prices: High returns, low risk. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.70.1.3.qxd>
12. Harvinder, & Dharamveer. (2011). Rebranding – A boon to survive. *Indian Journal of Marketing*, 41(6), 55–60.
13. Kamalaveni, D., Kalaiselvi, S., & Rajalakshmi, S. (2008). Brand loyalty of women consumers with respect to FMCGs. *Indian Journal of Marketing*, 38(9), 44–50.
14. Kathuria, M. L., & Gill, P. (2013). [Review of food safety standards in India]. *British Food Journal*, 115(9), 1255–1280.
15. Kohli, C., & Thakor, M. (1997). Branding consumer goods: Insights from theory and practice. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 14(3), 206–219. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363769710166792>
16. Lalitha, A., Ravikumar, J., & Padmavali, K. (2008). Brand preference of men wear. *Indian Journal of Marketing*, 38(10), 33–36.
17. Martensen, A., & Grønholdt, L. (2003). Understanding and modeling brand equity. *Asian Journal on Quality*, 4(2), 73–100. <https://doi.org/10.1108/15982688200300015>
18. Islam, M. M., et al. (2014). Customer perceptions in buying decision towards branded Bangladeshi local apparel products. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(7), 451–460.
19. Mills, J. E. (2000). *The impact of internet technology on hospitality industry: Brand relationships in cyberspace* [Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
20. Mishra, S. (2009). New retail models in India: Strategic perspective analysis. *Journal of Marketing and Communication*, 4(2), 39–47.
21. Mitchell, V., & Walsh, G. (2004). Gender differences in German consumer decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 3(4), 331–346. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.146>
22. Musante, M. D. (2000). *The impact of brand alliances on brand image and favorability perceptions* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst].
23. Nandamuri, P. P., & Gowthami, C. (2012). Relevance of branding in rural markets: An empirical study. *IUP Journal of Marketing Management*, 11(3), 48–63.

24. Kotler, P. (1997). *Marketing management: Analysis, planning, implementation and control* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall International.
25. Pathak, S. V., & Tripathi, A. P. (2009). Consumer shopping behaviour among modern retail formats: A study of Delhi & NCR. *Indian Journal of Marketing*, 39(2), 31–35.
26. Rios, R. E., & Riquelme, H. E. (2008). Brand equity for online companies. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 26(7), 719–742. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02634500810916620>
27. Rajput, N., Kesharwani, S., & Khanna, A. (2012). Dynamics of female buying behavior: A comparative study. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 4(2), 111–120. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v4n2p111>
28. Riley, C., & Chalmers, R. L. (2005). Survey of contact lens-wearing habits and attitudes toward methods of refractive correction: 2002 versus 2004. *Optometry and Vision Science*, 82(6), 555–561.
29. Rosen, E. (1956). The invention of eyeglasses. *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, 11(1), 13–46.
30. Saporito, S. M., & Cunningham, R. P. (1988). Nucleotide sequence of the info gene of *Escherichia coli* K-12. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 170, 5141–5145.
31. Shainesh. (2004). Understanding buying behaviour. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 28(1), 118–127.
32. Sherlaker, S. A. (1995). *Marketing management* (1st ed.). Himalaya Publishing House.
33. Simintiras, A. C. (1997). Prepurchase satisfaction and first-time buying behavior. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(11/12), 737–872. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090569710178914>
34. Sumathi, S. (2003). *Marketing research and consumer behavior* (1st ed.). Vikas Publishing House.
35. Vani, G., Ganesh Babu, M., & Panchanatham, N. (2011). Consumer buying behavior: Model for toothpastes. *Indian Journal of Marketing*, 41(10), 57–67.
36. Washburn, J. H., Till, B. D., & Priluck, R. (2000). Co-branding: Brand equity and trial effects. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 17(7), 591–604. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760010357734>