International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 17s, 2025
https://theaspd.com/index.php

A Study On Consumer Behaviour Towards Select Paints In Thiruvarur Town

[1]**Ms. S. Suganthi,** [2]**Dr. S. Singaravadivel,**
Assistant Professor of Commerce, Rabiammal Ahmed Maideen College for Women, Thiruvarur. & Suganthimani1981@gmail.com
Research Advisor of Commerce, Swami Dayananda College of Arts & Science, Manjakkudi ssvphdragava@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
House painting is absolutely a quick and easy way to refresh home and it completely changes the aura of your house. A fresh coat of paint adds value to home and makes it more attractive. Most people have their house painted because the old paint gets damaged by the weather but that itself is not the reason. Read through our blog to know why painting is essential for your home. Painting your home interior and exterior certainly increase the valuation of property. Buyers need to look at the room and not the wall color or the furnishings. This way they can better visualize their belongings in this new space. Paint before you Stage more than happy to recommend color choices, even give you the paint color samples. Make sure trim is nice and white, baseboards and molding are not nicked, and doors are painted crated. When removing children's artwork or many pictures from a wall they most likely need to touch up the wall- recommend painting the whole wall instead of touching up 5 places. It will look new and fresh. Some interior designers always paint the ceiling a complimentary color for the design- but to sell a white ceiling is best. Fresh paint outside is also a very good idea. The front door and shutters and don't forget to look at the window sills, they take a lot of abuse and can easily have paint peeling.
Keywords: *House Painting, Valuation of Property, Baseboards and Molding and Interior Designers.*

INTRODUCTION

Painting's importance in history lies in its role as a powerful form of visual communication, cultural documentation, and artistic expression. It allows us to understand past cultures, events, and perspectives through the eyes of artists. Paintings act as time capsules, preserving historical narratives, social contexts, and individual experiences for future generations. Paintings can depict significant historical events, social customs, and daily life in various eras, offering insights into past civilizations that may not be available through written records. For example, ancient cave paintings offer glimpses into prehistoric life, while Dutch Golden Age paintings provide details about domestic life in 17th-century Holland. Paintings often reflect and preserve a culture's values, beliefs, and artistic styles. Indian miniature paintings, for instance, showcase religious themes, courtly life, and artistic techniques specific to different periods and regions. Painting allows artists to express emotions, ideas, and interpretations of the world around them. From the vibrant colors and dynamic compositions of Renaissance art to the diverse styles of modern and contemporary art, painting provides a rich visual language for conveying human experience

Statement Of The Problem

Painting has been chosen as a medium for various reasons, including preserving cultural memory, expressing emotions, and reflecting societal values. Paintings have served as visual records of events, people, and movements, offering insights into the past and inspiring reflection on both personal and collective values. They have also been used to communicate ideas, tell stories, and even challenge conventions.

Objectives Of The Study

1. To find the brand image and price of the paints,
2. To examine the quality and quantity of the paints,
3. To observe the cost effective and availability of the paints and
4. To analyze the media coverage and attractive package.

Data Collection

Data collection in research methodology is the process of gathering and measuring information on variables of interest in a systematic fashion. The present study process allows researchers to answer research questions, test hypotheses, and evaluate outcomes and used for 200 respondents in this study area. It's a crucial step in any research project, ensuring the accuracy and reliability of the findings.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Priya Soni (2010) 20 study aimed to evaluate the customer' perception towards the purchase of branded products. She says that there is prevailing high competition among various brands in India. In every product category, customers have more choices and higher expectations. The success of the strategy depends heavily on the marketer's understanding of the preference building and bonding process.

As per the Indian Paint Association report (2007) there is a shift in the consumer behavior with the paint buying and painting process evolving. The consumer is upgrading from buying distempers to emulsions and from buying paints to buying premium services, unlocking a completely new value chain. What it would mean for the industry is that it will have to serve the consumer now in newer innovative ways. The consumer is ready to pay the price and would be the key factor driving this change.

Factors Of Selection By The Customers

Factor – 1: H_0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Brand Image) in the study area.

Factor – 1: H_1: There is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Brand Image) in the study area.

TABLE – 1

BRAND IMAGE – SUMMARY OF STATISTICS

Brand Image	N	% of Total N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SE
Highly Satisfied	34	17.0%	1.706	.7190	.1233
Satisfied	116	58.0%	1.776	.5910	.0549
Dissatisfied	42	21.0%	1.786	.6063	.0936
Highly Dissatisfied	8	4.0%	2.125	.8345	.2950
Total	200	100.0%	2.120	.7285	.0516

Source: Primary Data

The above table 1 shows that the brand image; most of the 58% of the customers notified 'satisfied', followed by 17 % of the customers have understood highly satisfied, 21% of the customers have dissatisfied in brand image and rest of the 4% of the customers have 'highly dissatisfied' in the study area. Finally brand image average is 1.780, SD is 0.6273 and SE is 0.0444. It is concluded that the least standard deviation denoted as 'satisfied' i.e., highly consistent by the customers.

TABLE – 2 ANOVA – Factor 1 – Brand Image

	Sum of Squares	***df***	***Mean Square***	***F***	***Sig.***
Between Groups	1.142	3	.381	.967*	.409
Within Groups	77.178	196	.394		
Total	78.320	199			

Source: Primary Data *5% level of significance (CV>TV=Rejected)

It is observed that the *calculated value* .967 is more than table value 0.409. The difference is considered for significant. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Brand Image) in the study area.

Factor – 2: H_0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Price) in the study area.

Factor – 2: H_1: There is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Price) in the study area.

TABLE – 3 PRICE– SUMMARY OF STATISTICS

Price	N	% of Total N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SE
Highly Satisfied	53	26.5%	1.679	.5468*	.0751
Satisfied	89	44.5%	1.719	.6028	.0639
Dissatisfied	47	23.5%	1.957	.7210	.1052
Highly Dissatisfied	11	5.5%	2.000	.6325	.1907
Total	200	100.0%	2.0804	.8789	.0602

Source: Primary Data

The above table 3 observes that the price; most of the 44.5% of the customers notified 'satisfied', followed by 26.5% of the customers have understood highly satisfied, 23.5% of the customers have dissatisfied and rest of the 5.5% of the customers have 'highly dissatisfied' in the study area. Finally price average is 2.08, SD is 0.8789 and SE is 0.0602 It is concluded that the least standard deviation denoted as 'highly satisfied' i.e., highly consistent by the customers.

TABLE – 4 ANOVA – Factor 2 – Price

	Sum of Squares	***df***	***Mean Square***	***F***	***Sig.***
Between Groups	2.880	3	.960	2.495*	.061
Within Groups	75.440	196	.385		
Total	78.320	199			

Source: Primary Data *5% level of significance (CV>TV=Rejected)It is observed that the *calculated value* 2.495 is more than table value 0.061. The difference is considered for significant. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 2 (Price) in the study area.

Factor – 3: H_0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Package) in the study area.

Factor – 3: H_1: There is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Package) in the study area.

TABLE – 5 PACKAGE– SUMMARY OF STATISTICS

Package	N	% of Total N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SE
Highly Satisfied	58	29.0%	1.655	.5789	.0760
Satisfied	83	41.5%	1.795	.6393	.0702
Dissatisfied	34	17.0%	1.853	.7020	.1204
Highly Dissatisfied	25	12.5%	1.920	.5715*	.1143
Total	200	100.0%	2.1306	0.9759	0.0692

Source: Primary Data

The above table 5 observes that the package; most of the 41.5% of the customers notified 'satisfied', followed by 29% of the customers have understood highly satisfied, 17% of the customers have dissatisfied and rest of the 12.5% of the customers have 'highly dissatisfied' in the study area. Finally package average is 2.1306, SD is 0.9759 and SE is 0.0692. It is concluded that the least standard deviation denoted as 'highly dissatisfied' i.e., highly consistent by the customers.

TABLE – 6 ANOVA – Factor 3 – Package

	Sum of Squares	***Df***	***Mean Square***	***F***	***Sig.***
Between Groups	1.594	3	.531	1.357*	.257
Within Groups	76.726	196	.391		
Total	78.320	199			

Source: Primary Data *5% level of significance (CV>TV=Rejected)

It is observed that the *calculated value* 1.357 is more than table value 0.257. The difference is considered for insignificant. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 3 (Package) in the study area.

Factor – 4: H_0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Availability) in the study area.

Factor – 4: H_1: There is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Availability) in the study area.

TABLE – 7 AVAILABILITY– SUMMARY OF STATISTICS

Availability	N	% of Total N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SE
Highly Satisfied	82	41.0%	1.707	.6571	.0726
Satisfied	89	44.5%	1.854	.6133	.0650
Dissatisfied	19	9.5%	1.789	.6306	.1447
Highly Dissatisfied	10	5.0%	1.778	.4410*	.1470
Total	200	100.0%	1.7940	0.8304	0.0588

Source: Primary Data

The above table 7 observes that the availability; most of the 44.5% of the customers notified 'satisfied', followed by 41% of the customers have understood highly satisfied, 9.5% of the customers have dissatisfied and rest of the 5% of the customers have 'highly dissatisfied' in the study area. Finally availability average is 1.7940, SD is 0.8304 and SE is 0.0588. It is concluded that the least standard deviation denoted as 'highly dissatisfied' i.e., highly consistent by the customers.

TABLE – 8 ANOVA – Factor 5 – Availability

	Sum of Squares	***Df***	***Mean Square***	***F***	***Sig.***
Between Groups	1.530	4	.382	.971*	.424
Within Groups	76.790	195	.394		
Total	78.320	199			

Source: Primary Data *5% level of significance (CV>TV=Rejected)

It is observed that the *calculated value* .971 is more than table value 0.424. The difference is considered for significant. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 4 (Availability) in the study area.

Factor – 5: H_0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Quality) in the study area.

Factor – 5: H_1: There is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Quality) in the study area.

TABLE – 9 QUALITY– SUMMARY OF STATISTICS

Quality	N	% of Total N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SE
Highly Satisfied	82	41.0%	1.707	.6571	.0726
Satisfied	89	44.5%	1.854	.6133	.0650
Dissatisfied	19	9.5%	1.789	.6306	.1447
Highly Dissatisfied	10	5.0%	1.778	.4410*	.1470
Total	200	100.0%	2.020	0.8987	0.0637

Source: Primary Data

The above table 9 observes that the Quality; most of the 44.5% of the customers notified 'satisfied', followed by 41% of the customers have understood highly satisfied, 9.5% of the customers have dissatisfied and rest of the 5% of the customers have 'highly dissatisfied' in the study area. Finally Quality average is 2.020, SD is 0.8987 and SE is 0.0637. It is concluded that the least standard deviation denoted as 'highly dissatisfied' i.e., highly consistent by the customers.

TABLE – 10 ANOVA – Factor 6 – Quality

	Sum of Squares	***Df***	***Mean Square***	***F***	***Sig.***
Between Groups	6.347	3	2.116	5.762*	.001
Within Groups	71.973	196	.367		
Total	78.320	199			

Source: Primary Data *5% level of significance (CV>TV=Rejected)

It is observed that the *calculated value* 5.762 is more than table value 0.001. The difference is considered for significant. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 5 (Quality) in the study area.

Factor – 6: H_0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Quantity) in the study area.

Factor – 6: H_1: There is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Quantity) in the study area.

TABLE – 11 QUANTITY– SUMMARY OF STATISTICS

Quantity	N	% of Total N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SE
Highly Satisfied	54	27.0%	1.630	.6233	.0848
Satisfied	65	32.5%	1.769	.5235*	.0649
Dissatisfied	53	26.5%	1.868	.6516	.0895
Highly Dissatisfied	28	14.0%	1.929	.7664	.1448
Total	200	100.0%	2.2814	1.0106	0.07164

Source: Primary Data

The above table11 observes that the Quantity; most of the 32.5% of the customers notified 'satisfied', followed by 27% of the customers have understood highly satisfied, 26.5% of the customers have dissatisfied and rest of the 14% of the customers have 'highly dissatisfied' in the study area. Finally Quantity average is 2.2814, SD is 1.0106 and SE is 0.07164. It is concluded that the least standard deviation denoted as 'satisfied' i.e., highly consistent by the customers.

TABLE – 12 ANOVA – Factor 6 – Quantity

	Sum of Squares	***Df***	***Mean Square***	***F***	***Sig.***
Between Groups	2.256	3	.752	1.938*	.125
Within Groups	76.064	196	.388		
Total	78.320	199			

Source: Primary Data *5% level of significance (CV>TV=Rejected)

It is observed that the *calculated value* 1.938 is more than table value 0.001. The difference is considered for significant. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 6 (Quantity) in the study area.

Factor – 7: H_0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Free Offer) in the study area.

Factor – 7: H_1: There is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Free Offer) in the study area.

TABLE – 13 FREE OFFER– SUMMARY OF STATISTICS

Free Offer	N	% of Total N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SE
Highly Satisfied	56	28.0%	1.768	.6028	.0805
Satisfied	81	40.5%	1.840	.6974	.0775
Dissatisfied	47	23.5%	1.702	.5866	.0856
Highly Dissatisfied	16	8.0%	1.750	.4472*	.1118
Total	200	100.0%	2.121	0.9076	0.06434

Source: Primary Data

The above table 13 observes that the Free Offer; most of the 40.5% of the customers notified 'satisfied', followed by 28% of the customers have understood highly satisfied, 23.5% of the customers have dissatisfied and rest of the 8% of the customers have 'highly dissatisfied' in the study area. Finally Free Offer average is 2.121, SD is 0.9076 and SE is 0.06434. It is concluded that the least standard deviation denoted as 'dissatisfied' i.e., highly consistent by the customers.

TABLE – 12 ANOVA – Factor 7 – Free Offer

	Sum of Squares	***Df***	***Mean Square***	***F***	***Sig.***
Between Groups	.594	3	.198	.500	.683
Within Groups	77.726	196	.397		
Total	78.320	199			

Source: Primary Data 5% level of significance (CV<TV=Accepted)

It is observed that the *calculated value* 0.752 is less than table value 0.001. The difference is considered for insignificant. The H_o is Accepted and there is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 7 (Free Offer) in the study area.

Factor – 8: H_0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Attractive Package) in the study area.

Factor – 8: H_1: There is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Attractive Package) in the study area.

TABLE – 14 ATTRACTIVE PACKAGE – SUMMARY OF STATISTICS

Attractive Package	N	% of Total N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SE
Highly Satisfied	43	21.5%	1.698	.7411	.1130
Satisfied	77	38.5%	1.896	.5278*	.0601
Dissatisfied	54	27.0%	1.722	.6270	.0853
Highly Dissatisfied	26	13.0%	1.692	.6794	.1332
Total	200	100.0%	2.322	0.9519	0.0675

Source: Primary Data

The above table 14 observes that the Attractive Package; most of the 38.5% of the customers notified 'satisfied', followed by 21.5% of the customers have understood highly satisfied, 27% of the customers have dissatisfied and rest of the 13% of the customers have 'highly dissatisfied' in the study area. Finally Attractive Package average is 2.322, SD is 0.9519 and SE is 0.0675. It is concluded that the least standard deviation denoted as 'satisfied' i.e., highly consistent by the customers.

TABLE – 4.15 ANOVA – Factor 8 – Attractive Package

	Sum of Squares	***Df***	***Mean Square***	***F***	***Sig.***
Between Groups	1.710	3	.570	1.458*	.227
Within Groups	76.610	196	.391		
Total	78.320	199			

Source: Primary Data *5% level of significance (CV>TV=Rejected)

It is observed that the *calculated value* 1.458 is more than table value 0.227. The difference is considered for insignificant. The H_o is rejected and there is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 8 (Attractive Package) in the study area.

Factor – 8: H_0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Cost Effective) in the study area.

Factor – 8: H_1: There is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Cost Effective) in the study area.

TABLE – 16 COST EFFECTIVE – SUMMARY OF STATISTICS

Cost Effective	N	% of Total N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SE
Highly Satisfied	49	24.5%	1.816	.5654	.0808
Satisfied	79	39.5%	1.734	.6545	.0736
Dissatisfied	43	21.5%	1.977	.6722	.1025
Highly Dissatisfied	29	14.5%	1.552*	.5061	.0940
Total	200	100.0%	2.266	.987	.0699

Source: Primary Data

The above table 16 observes that the cost effective; most of the 39.5% of the customers notified 'satisfied', followed by 24.5% of the customers have understood highly satisfied, 21.5% of the customers have dissatisfied and rest of the 14.5% of the customers have 'highly dissatisfied' in the study area. Finally cost effective average is 2.266, SD is 0.987 and SE is 0.0699. It is concluded that the least standard deviation denoted as 'highly dissatisfied' i.e., highly consistent by the customers.

TABLE – 17 ANOVA – Factor 8 – Free Offer

	Sum of Squares	***Df***	***Mean Square***	***F***	***Sig.***
Between Groups	3.406	3	1.135	2.971*	.033
Within Groups	74.914	196	.382		
Total	78.320	199			

Source: Primary Data *5% level of significance (CV>TV=Rejected)

It is observed that the *calculated value* 2.971 is more than table value 0.033. The difference is considered for insignificant. The H_o is rejected and there is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 8 (Cost Effective) in the study area.

Findings Of The Study

1. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 1 (Brand Image) in the study area.
2. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 2 (Price) in the study area.
3. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 3 (Package) in the study area.
4. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 4 (Availability) in the study area.
5. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 5 (Quality) in the study area.
6. The H_o is rejected and there is a significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 6 (Quantity) in the study area.
7. The H_o is Accepted and there is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 7 (Free Offer) in the study area.
8. The H_o is rejected and there is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 8 (Attractive Package) in the study area.
9. The H_o is rejected and there is no significant difference in the mean score of towards selection paints factor 8 (Cost Effective) in the study area.

CONCLUSION

Paints are the basis to fill colors in the human life. The quality of paints impacts the life to give the beauty and imagination to live a life of better standards. The paints in the market are used in the houses to give the imagination, beauty and creativity to design the life for living with peace and progress. From this study, conclude that the usage of paint is growing at a very rapid rate. This is mainly due to advertisement and quality consciousness of consumer. Marketing of paint is enjoying a good reputation and share in market.

REFERENCE

1. C.R. Kothari "Research methodology" Second edition.
2. Buisness today "Paint industries" page 25, March 2005.
3. Business world "Growth of paint" page 35, Feb 2005.
4. Priya Soni (2010) ,Customer perception and preferences towards branded products, Indian Journal of Marketing Volume: 40 Number 2 February 2.