International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)
Volume: 09 Issue: 02 | Feb - 2025 SJIF Rating: 8.448 ISSN: 2582-3930

A Study on Dealers and Contractors perception towards building materials in Hyderabad Market

Ms.Shreya Barai, Mr.Chaitanya Muppavarapu, Dr.Chandrashekar , Mr.Raghuvamsi Siva Sivani Institute of Management, Hyderabad,

shreya2023@ssim.ac.in , mchaithanya@ssim.ac.in , Chandra@ssim.ac.in , Raghu2023@ssim.ac.in

Abstract

The construction sector in Hyderabad is expanding rapidly, increasing the demand for high-quality building materials. This study, titled *"A Study on Dealers, Architects, and Applicators' Perception Towards Building Materials in the Hyderabad Market,"* aims to analyze key factors influencing brand preference, purchase decisions, and satisfaction levels among stakeholders. The primary objectives of this research are to identify the factors affecting brand perception, evaluate customer satisfaction with various brands, and understand the role of pricing, quality, and availability in influencing choices.

The study employs a quantitative research methodology, utilizing structured surveys to collect data from 156 respondents, including 76 dealers, 28 architects, and 52 applicators. Key independent variables include brand awareness, product quality, service support, and pricing, while dependent variables focus on brand preference and purchase intent. Data analysis was conducted using cross-tabulations and chi-square tests to examine associations between variables. Findings indicate that product availability, pricing strategy, and sales support significantly impact brand perception. MYK Laticrete emerged as a leading preference among respondents, while other brands varied in acceptance across different categories. The insights from this study can help building material companies refine their market strategies to enhance penetration and customer engagement in Hyderabad.

Introduction

The construction industry in Hyderabad has witnessed rapid growth in recent years, driven by increasing urbanization, infrastructure development, and rising demand for residential and commercial spaces. This surge has led to a competitive market for building materials, where manufacturers and suppliers strive to establish a strong foothold. In this context, understanding the perception of key stakeholders—dealers, architects, and applicators—towards building materials becomes crucial for companies aiming to enhance their market presence. Their preferences and decision-making processes significantly influence the selection and adoption of specific brands and products in construction projects.

This study, titled *"A Study on Dealers, Architects, and Applicators' Perception Towards Building Materials in the Hyderabad Market,"* seeks to analyze the factors that impact brand preference, purchase decisions, and overall satisfaction with different building material brands. Given the increasing competition, companies must focus on elements such as product quality, pricing, availability, and after-sales support to establish a strong market presence.

The perception of dealers plays a significant role in brand distribution and market penetration, as they act as intermediaries between manufacturers and end-users. Similarly, architects influence brand selection through recommendations in construction projects, prioritizing factors like durability, innovation, and sustainability.

Applicators, who handle the practical application of these materials, evaluate brands based on ease of use, reliability, and long-term performance. By analyzing these three stakeholder groups, this research aims to provide valuable insights that can help building material companies refine their marketing strategies, improve customer engagement, and address gaps in service delivery.

To achieve these objectives, this study employs a structured research methodology, including a survey of 156 respondents—76 dealers, 28 architects, and 52 applicators. Data analysis includes cross-tabulations and chi-square tests to identify statistical relationships between various influencing factors. The findings will contribute to a deeper understanding of market trends and offer actionable recommendations for companies looking to strengthen their presence in Hyderabad's building materials industry.

Review of literature

1. **Dealer Satisfaction (Dependent Variable)**
Dealer satisfaction refers to the overall contentment of dealers with a brand's products, services, pricing, and promotional strategies.

2. **Factors Influencing Dealer Satisfaction (Independent Variables)**

   - **Product Quality**: The durability, consistency, and performance of the building material directly impact dealer satisfaction.
   - **Pricing & Profit Margins**: Competitive pricing and adequate margins influence a dealer's preference for a brand.
   - **Brand Reputation**: A strong brand presence and market credibility increase dealer confidence.
   - **Sales Promotion & Incentives**: Discounts, loyalty programs, and financial benefits encourage long-term dealer engagement.

Review of Literature

1. **A Study on Dealer Satisfaction with Special Reference to ACC Cements Limited**
This study analyzes dealer satisfaction in the cement industry, highlighting the impact of product quality, pricing, and distribution efficiency. It concludes that consistent supply, competitive margins, and brand image significantly enhance dealer loyalty.

2. **Strategic Issues in Marketing of Consumer and Technology Products – Dealer Satisfaction Survey**
This research explores the challenges faced by technology product dealers. It emphasizes the importance of dealer-company relationships, sales promotions, and profit-sharing models in improving satisfaction and business performance.

3. **A Study on the Dealers' Opinion about the Effect of GST with Reference to the Cement Industry**
The study evaluates how GST implementation affected dealer pricing strategies, profitability, and

operational costs in the cement sector. It finds that tax reforms have both positive and negative impacts, influencing dealer satisfaction and supply chain efficiency.

4. **A Study on "Factors Influencing Dealer's Buying Behaviour Towards Sadanand PVC Pvt. Ltd"**
This research identifies key factors such as pricing, promotional offers, and customer service that shape dealer preferences. It reveals that timely deliveries and financial incentives play a critical role in dealer decision-making.

5. **Sales Promotion and Satisfaction of Dealers: A Case of Havells India Ltd.**
The study investigates the role of promotional schemes in enhancing dealer satisfaction in the electrical industry. Findings suggest that loyalty programs, volume performance.

Research methodology

1. Introduction

The study aims to analyze the perception of dealers, architects, and applicators toward building materials in the Hyderabad market. It focuses on understanding key factors that influence their satisfaction, brand preference, and buying behavior.

2. Research Design

This research follows a **descriptive research design** as it seeks to understand and describe the perceptions and satisfaction levels of key stakeholders in the building materials industry.

3. Sample Size and Sampling Method

The study consists of **156 respondents**, categorized as follows:

- **Dealers:** 76
- **Architects:** 28
- **Applicators:** 52

A **non-probability convenience sampling method** was used to select participants, as the focus was on gathering responses from industry professionals who were readily available and willing to participate.

4. Data Collection Tools and Software

- **Primary Data**: Data was collected using a **structured questionnaire** designed to assess dealer, architect, and applicator perceptions regarding building materials. The questionnaire included both **closed-ended and Likert scale-based questions** to measure satisfaction and brand preference.
- **Software Used**: The data was analyzed using **cross-tabulations, chi-square tests.**

5. Data Collection Method

- The survey was conducted **both online and offline** by directly visiting dealers, architects, and applicators in Hyderabad.
- Phone calls were made to architects and contractors to gather additional responses.

6. Data Analysis Techniques

The collected data was analyzed using **quantitative techniques**, including:

- **Cross-tabulation**: To understand the relationship between variables such as brand preference and level of satisfaction.
- **Chi-Square Test**: To examine the significance of associations between categorical variables like profession type and brand preference.
- **Descriptive Statistics**: Used to summarize findings and highlight key trends in market perception.

Data Analysis

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Applicator	52	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Architect	28	17.9	17.9	51.3
	Dealer	76	48.7	48.7	100.0
	Total	156	100.0	100.0	

The table provides the distribution of respondents categorized as Applicators, Architects, and Dealers based on their frequency and percentage contributions to the total sample size of 156. Applicators account for 33.3% of the respondents (52 individuals), Architects represent 17.9% (28 individuals), and Dealers form the largest group with 48.7% (76 individuals). The cumulative percentage indicates that Applicators and Architects collectively make up 51.2% of the total, while the inclusion of Dealers brings the cumulative total to 100%. This distribution reflects a balanced sampling approach, with a slightly higher emphasis on Dealers, likely due to their critical role in the distribution and sales of tile adhesive products.

1. As per you, which are the top tile adhesive brands in the industry?

		1. As per you, which are the top tile adhesive brands in the industry?																								
		Kerakoll	Mapei	Mapei nd akemi	Mapie	Marmo	My laticretr	Myk	MYk	MYK	Myk , Weber , roff	MYK and khajaria	MYK laticrate roff and kajaria gres bond	MYK laticrete	MYK Laticrete	MYK LATICRETE	MYK latictate	MYK latricate	MYK Latricate	MYK, Roff	Others	Roff	Ultra tech	Ultratech	Weber	Total
Type	Applicator	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	52
		0.0%	32.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	65.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	100.0%
	Architect	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	1	1	0	0	0	28
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	89.3%	0.0%	3.6%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer	1	5	1	0	1	1	3	3	29	1	1	1	2	17	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	76
		1.3%	6.6%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	3.9%	3.9%	38.2%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	2.6%	22.4%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	3.9%	100.0%
Total		1	22	1	1	1	1	3	3	29	1	1	1	2	51	1	1	1	26	1	1	1	1	1	4	156
		0.6%	14.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	1.9%	1.9%	18.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	1.3%	32.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	16.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	2.6%	100.0%

	Value	df	
Pearson Chi-Square	224.095[a]	46	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	218.268	46	0.000
N of Valid Cases	156		

The survey analyzed the top tile adhesive brands based on responses from 156 participants (52 applicators, 28 architects, 76 dealers). MYK Laticrete emerged as the most recognized brand (32.72% overall), with strong preference among applicators (65.4%), architects (25%), and dealers (22.42%). MYK (general) was popular among dealers (38.2%), while Kerakoll, Mapei, Weber, and Ultratech had lower visibility.

The Pearson Chi-Square test (224.095, p = 0.000) confirms a significant difference in brand perception among respondent types. Dealers prefer MYK, while applicators favor MYK Laticrete. 62 cells (86.1%) had low expected counts, indicating small sample sizes for some brands.

This suggests companies should enhance branding efforts for less recognized brands and tailor marketing strategies for different respondent groups, particularly improving awareness among architects and dealers.

2. You are dealing in which tile adhesive brands?

2. You are dealing in which tile adhesive brands?

		Mapei	Mapie	MYK Laticrete	MYK Laticrete, Fosroc, Others	MYK Laticrete, Kerakoll, Weber, Others	MYK Laticrete, Mapei, Weber, Others	MYK Laticrete, Others	MYK Laticrete, Roff	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Dr. Fixit	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Kerakoll, Others	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Mapei	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Mapei, Kerakoll, Others	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Mapei, Others	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Others
Type	Applicator	17	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		32.7%	0.0%	63.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Architect	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Dealer	5	0	30	1	1	1	6	2	1	1	2	2	1	3
		6.6%	0.0%	39.5%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	7.9%	2.6%	1.3%	1.3%	2.6%	2.6%	1.3%	3.9%
Total		22	1	63	1	1	1	6	2	1	1	2	2	1	3
		14.1%	0.6%	40.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	3.8%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	1.3%	1.3%	0.6%	1.9%

		MYK Laticrete, Roff, Others	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Weber	MYK Laticrete, Weber	MYK Laticrete, Weber, Dr. Fixit, Others	MYK Latricate	Other	Others	Roff	Roff	Roff, Others	Roff, Weber	Weber	Weber, Others	Total
Type	Applicator	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	52
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	Architect	0	0	0	0	25	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	28
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	89.3%	3.6%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer	2	3	1	1	0	0	4	0	3	1	1	2	2	76
		2.6%	3.9%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	3.9%	1.3%	1.3%	2.6%	2.6%	100.0%
Total		2	3	1	1	25	1	5	1	3	1	1	3	2	156
		1.3%	1.9%	0.6%	0.6%	16.0%	0.6%	3.2%	0.6%	1.9%	0.6%	0.6%	1.9%	1.3%	100.0%

	Value	df	
Pearson Chi-Square	205.669^{a}	52	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	200.152	52	0.000
N of Valid Cases	156		

The survey examines which tile adhesive brands respondents deal with, including applicators (52), architects (28), and dealers (76). MYK Laticrete is the dominant brand (40.4% overall), especially among applicators (63.5%) and dealers (33.5%), while architects mostly deal with Roff (89.3%). Mapei has minimal presence (14.1% overall), mainly among applicators (32.7%).

The Pearson Chi-Square test (205.863, p = 0.000) indicates a significant variation in brand choices among respondent types. Dealers engage with a broader mix, including MYK Laticrete, Roff, Weber, and others, while applicators primarily use MYK Laticrete. 74 cells (91.4%) had expected counts below 5, highlighting limited representation for some brands.

This suggests MYK Laticrete has strong market penetration, while other brands need targeted strategies to expand presence, particularly among dealers and architects.

International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)
Volume: 09 Issue: 02 | Feb - 2025 SJIF Rating: 8.448 ISSN: 2582-3930

3. Which brands provide Value for Money Products?

		3. Which brands provide Value for Money Products?																				
		Kerakoll	Local team Conflict	Mapei	Mapie	MYK Laticrete	MYK Laticrete, Others	MYK Laticrete, Roff	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Asian paints, Dr. fixit	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Kerakoll, Others	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Mapei	MYK Latricate	No Rewards/ Schemes	Others	Product Quality	Roff	Roff	Roff, Weber	Service issues	Timely Reward	Weber	Total
Type	Applicator	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	10	0	0	0	14	13	0	52
		0.0%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%	0.0%	19.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.9%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Architect	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	28
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	89.3%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer	1	0	5	0	35	3	1	1	1	1	0	0	17	0	0	5	2	0	0	4	76
		1.3%	0.0%	6.6%	0.0%	46.1%	3.9%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	22.4%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	100.0%
Total		1	12	5	1	35	3	1	1	1	1	25	3	18	10	1	5	2	14	13	4	156
		0.6%	7.7%	3.2%	0.6%	22.4%	1.9%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	16.0%	1.9%	11.5%	6.4%	0.6%	3.2%	1.3%	9.0%	8.3%	2.6%	100.0%

	Value	df	
Pearson Chi-Square	304.799[a]	38	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	312.027	38	0.000
N of Valid Cases	156		

The survey analyzes which tile adhesive brands provide value-for-money products across applicators (52), architects (28), and dealers (76). MYK Laticrete dominates (22.4%), especially among dealers (35 responses, 23.4%), while applicators favor local brands (23.1%). Architects primarily consider Roff (89.3%) as a value-for-money brand.

Key concerns include service issues (13%) and timely rewards (9%), indicating areas for improvement. Some respondents (1.3%) feel no brand offers rewards/schemes, which could impact loyalty.

The Pearson Chi-Square test (304.793, p = 0.000) confirms significant differences in brand perception across respondent types. 50 cells (93.3%) have expected counts below 5, suggesting limited representation in certain categories.

This indicates MYK Laticrete's strong positioning, while brands like Mapei and Weber need better value propositions. Addressing service issues, rewards, and pricing concerns could enhance brand perception and market penetration.

4. Which brand is perceived as the most premium?

		4. Which brand is perceived as the most premium?											
		Customer demand	Kerakoll	Mapei	Mapie	MYK Laticrete	MYK Latricate	Others	Others_____	Roff	Roff	Weber	Total
Type	Applicator	0	0	17	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	52
		0.0%	0.0%	32.7%	0.0%	65.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	100.0%
	Architect	0	0	0	1	0	25	1	0	1	0	0	28
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	89.3%	3.6%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer	1	3	7	0	49	0	5	1	0	3	7	76
		1.3%	3.9%	9.2%	0.0%	64.5%	0.0%	6.6%	1.3%	0.0%	3.9%	9.2%	100.0%
Total		1	3	24	1	83	25	6	1	1	3	8	156
		0.6%	1.9%	15.4%	0.6%	53.2%	16.0%	3.8%	0.6%	0.6%	1.9%	5.1%	100.0%

	Value	Df	
Pearson Chi Square	174.755	20	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	167.005	20	0.000
N Of Valid Cases	156		

The survey identifies which tile adhesive brand is perceived as the most premium among applicators (52), architects (28), and dealers (76). MYK Laticrete leads (53.2%), primarily due to strong recognition among dealers (64.5%) and applicators (65.4%). Architects, however, prefer Roff (89.3%), suggesting it holds a premium perception in architectural applications.

Mapei (15.4%) follows as the second-most premium, mainly driven by applicators (32.7%). Brands like Kerakoll (3.9%) and Weber (5.1%) have a lower premium perception, indicating a need for stronger branding or product differentiation. The Pearson Chi-Square test (174.755, p = 0.000) confirms statistically significant differences in premium brand perception across respondent types. 26 cells (78.8%) have expected counts below 5, showing limited representation in some categories.

Overall, MYK Laticrete dominates premium positioning, while Roff leads among architects, and other brands need stronger positioning to compete in the premium segment.

5. What are the important factors you consider before taking an agency of a particular brand?

		5. What are the important factors you consider before taking an agency of a particular brand?																	
			Brand Reputation	Brand Value	Brand Value, Credit Period	Brand Value, Market Demand	Brand Value, Market Demand, Other	Brand Value, Sales Representative PR, Market Demand, Credit Period	Brand Value, Schemes/ Rewards	Cost	Credit Period	Environmental impact	Market Demand	Other	Performance specifications	Quality	Sales Representative PR	Schemes/ Rewards	Schemes/ Rewards, Credit Period, Other	Total
Type	Applicator	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	9	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	52
		0.0%	30.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.2%	0.0%	17.3%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Architect	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
		100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer	0	0	24	1	3	1	1	1	0	2	0	21	5	0	0	9	7	1	76
		0.0%	0.0%	31.6%	1.3%	3.9%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	27.6%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	9.2%	1.3%	100.0%
Total		28	16	24	1	3	1	1	1	10	2	9	21	5	5	12	9	7	1	156
		17.9%	10.3%	15.4%	0.6%	1.9%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	6.4%	1.3%	5.8%	13.5%	3.2%	3.2%	7.7%	5.8%	4.5%	0.6%	100.0%

	Value	df	
Pearson Chi-Square	312.000[a]	34	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	319.751	34	0.000
N of Valid Cases	156		

a. 44 cells (81.5%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected count is .18.

The survey explores factors influencing decisions when choosing an agency for a particular brand, based on responses from applicators (52), architects (28), and dealers (76). Key insights reveal that Brand Value (15.4%) and Brand Reputation (17.9%) are significant considerations across respondent groups, with architects exclusively prioritizing brand reputation (100%). Quality (7.7%) and Market Demand (13.5%) also play critical roles, particularly among dealers, who emphasize market demand (27.6%). Cost (6.4%) and Environmental Impact (5.8%) are influential, especially for applicators. Factors like Performance Specifications (3.2%) and Schemes/Rewards (4.5%) are noted but are not primary drivers of decisions. Statistical analysis using Pearson Chi-Square (312.000, p = 0.000) confirms significant variations in responses across different respondent types. However, with 81.5% of cells having expected counts below 5, some data categories are underrepresented, highlighting potential limitations in the distribution of responses.

6. Which services provided by the company are the top priority for you?

	Value	df	
Pearson Chi-Square	282.401[a]	38	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	297.676	38	0.000
N of Valid Cases	156		

			6. Which services provided by the company are the top priority for you?																			
			After Sales Service	Brand Value	Complaint Resolution	Delivery Time	Delivery Time, Complaint Resolution	Delivery Time, Complaint Resolution, Promotional Activities	Delivery Time, Complaint Resolution, Schemes/ Rewards, Market Demand	Delivery Time, Pricing	Delivery Time, Promotional Activities	Delivery Time, Schemes/ Rewards	Mapei	Market Demand	MYK Laticrete	Others	Others,	Promotional Activities	Sales Representative PR	Sales support	Schemes/ Rewards	Weber	Total
Type	Applicator		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	52
			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.7%	0.0%	65.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	100.0%
	Architect		8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6	0	28
			28.6%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer		0	0	6	39	2	1	1	1	2	2	0	2	0	2	1	5	0	1	11	0	76
			0.0%	0.0%	7.9%	51.3%	2.6%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%	1.3%	6.6%	0.0%	1.3%	14.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Total			8	8	6	39	2	1	1	1	2	2	17	2	34	2	1	5	6	1	17	1	156
			5.1%	5.1%	3.8%	25.0%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	1.3%	1.3%	10.9%	1.3%	21.8%	1.3%	0.6%	3.2%	3.8%	0.6%	10.9%	0.6%	100.0%

a. 50 cells (83.3%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected count is .18.

The survey investigates the top-priority services provided by companies, based on feedback from applicators (52), architects (28), and dealers (76). Among the key factors, Market Demand (10.9%) and Sales Representative Public Relations (3.8%) emerged as significant considerations. Delivery Time was identified as a critical priority, particularly by dealers, with 51.3% emphasizing its importance, contributing to its overall weight of 25.0%. Other moderately valued factors included Complaint Resolution (3.8%) and After-Sales Service (5.1%). Schemes and Rewards (10.9%) and Promotional Activities (3.2%) also influenced decision-making to a considerable extent. Architects displayed a strong preference for Market Demand (32.7%) and were predominantly aligned with MYK Laticrete (65.4%). Dealers, on the other hand, placed significant emphasis on Delivery Time (51.3%) and Schemes/Rewards (14.5%). Statistical analysis using Pearson Chi-Square (282.401, p = 0.000) revealed significant variations across respondent groups, though 83.3% of cells had expected counts below 5, indicating underrepresentation in some response categories.

7. Which brand provides the best pre-sales service in the industry?

			7. Which brand provides the best pre-sales service in the industry?														
			Asian Paints	Complaint Resolution	Complaint Resolution, Dealer relationship with you	Complaint Resolution, Dealer relationship with you, Others____	Complaint Resolution, Delivery Time	Complaint Resolution, Others____	Dealer relationship with you	Delivery Time	Mapei	MYK Laticrete	Others	Others____	Roff	Weber	Total
Type	Applicator		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	33	0	0	1	1	52
			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.7%	63.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.9%	100.0%
	Architect		0	5	1	1	1	1	8	7	0	0	0	4	0	0	28
			0.0%	17.9%	3.6%	3.6%	3.6%	3.6%	28.6%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	45	0	0	3	76
			1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%	28.9%	59.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	100.0%
Total			1	5	1	1	1	1	8	7	22	55	45	4	1	4	156
			0.6%	3.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	5.1%	4.5%	14.1%	35.3%	28.8%	2.6%	0.6%	2.6%	100.0%

	Value	df	
Pearson Chi-Square	221.994[a]	26	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	217.639	26	0.000
N of Valid Cases	156		

a. 34 cells (81.0%) have expected less than 5. The minimum expected count is .18.

The survey examines brand preferences for pre-sales services based on responses from applicators (52), architects (28), and dealers (76). MYK Laticrete emerged as the most preferred brand, garnering 35.3% of the overall responses, with strong support from dealers (59.2%) and applicators (63.5%). Mapei ranked as the second-most preferred brand, favored by 14.1% of respondents, particularly among applicators (32.7%) and dealers (22.4%). Factors such as Dealer Relationship (5.1%) and Delivery Time (4.5%) were also identified as important considerations. Architects displayed a more varied preference, valuing Delivery Time (25%) and Other Brands (14.3%) as significant factors in their decision-making process. Statistical analysis using Pearson Chi-Square (221.994, p = 0.000) revealed significant differences in brand preference across the respondent groups. However, 81% of cells had expected counts below 5, highlighting underrepresentation in some response categories. Overall, MYK Laticrete leads in pre-sales services, with Mapei serving as a strong alternative.

8. Which brand provides the best post-sales service in the industry?

		8. Which brand provides the best post-sales service in the industry?																			
		Asian paints	Better performance	Good Going with them currently so will continue with them.	Good quality	Mapei	MYK Laticrete	Others	Others____	Product demonstration	Roff	Roff is good as well so try it once	Sponsorship event	Sponsorship events	Technical training	Technical workshops	Training meetings	Weber	Workshop demonstrations	Workshops	Total
Type	Applicator	0	3	1	15	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	1	5	4	5	6	0	1	3	52
		0.0%	5.8%	1.9%	28.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.5%	0.0%	1.9%	1.9%	9.6%	7.7%	9.6%	11.5%	0.0%	1.9%	5.8%	100.0%
	Architect	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	89.3%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer	1	0	0	0	6	36	19	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	76
		1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%	47.4%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total		1	3	1	15	7	61	19	1	7	9	1	1	5	4	5	6	6	1	3	156
		0.6%	1.9%	0.6%	9.6%	4.5%	39.1%	12.2%	0.6%	4.5%	5.8%	0.6%	0.6%	3.2%	2.6%	3.2%	3.8%	3.8%	0.6%	1.9%	100.0%

	Value	Df	
Pearson Chi-Square	186.202	36	0.0000
Likelihood Ratio N Of Valid Cases	225.161 156	36	0.0000

The tabulation of responses from applicators, architects, and dealers regarding the best post-sales service provided by brands in the tile adhesive industry. It highlights preferences for attributes such as "Good Quality," brand-specific offerings (e.g., Mapei, MYK Laticrete, Roff, Weber), and services like technical training, workshops, and product demonstrations. MYK Laticrete emerged as the most preferred brand, with 39.1% overall preference, particularly favored by architects (89.3%) and dealers (47.4%). "Good Quality" ranked second, accounting for 9.6% of the preferences, with applicators predominantly prioritizing this attribute. Technical workshops (3.2%) and training meetings (3.8%) were less emphasized across all respondent groups. Statistical analysis using Pearson Chi-Square

($p < 0.001$) revealed significant differences in preferences among the groups. These insights underscore MYK Laticrete's dominance in post-sales services while also highlighting opportunities for improvement in technical training and workshops to address varying customer needs

International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)
Volume: 09 Issue: 02 | Feb - 2025 SJIF Rating: 8.448 ISSN: 2582-3930

9. Which brand provides the best schemes/ rewards in the industry?

			9. Which brand provides the best schemes/ rewards in the industry?												Total
				Asian Paints	Mapei	MYK Laticrete	MYK Laticrete, Mapei	MYK Laticrete, Roff	Other	Others	Roff	Roff	Roff, Kerakoll	Weber	
Type	Applicator		52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
			100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Architect		0	0	1	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	28
			0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	89.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer		0	2	5	32	1	3	3	19	7	0	1	3	76
			0.0%	2.6%	6.6%	42.1%	1.3%	3.9%	3.9%	25.0%	9.2%	0.0%	1.3%	3.9%	100.0%
Total			52	2	6	57	1	3	3	20	7	1	1	3	156
			33.3%	1.3%	3.8%	36.5%	0.6%	1.9%	1.9%	12.8%	4.5%	0.6%	0.6%	1.9%	100.0%

	Value	df	
Pearson Chi-Square	191.399[a]	22	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	228.247	22	0.000
N of Valid Cases	156		

a. A total of 28 cells (77.8%) have expected counts less than 5, with the minimum expected count being 0.18. The survey evaluates which brand offers the most attractive schemes or rewards in the industry, based on feedback from applicators, architects, and dealers. **Asian Paints** is the top choice for 33.3% of respondents, with all its support coming from applicators (100%), highlighting a strong preference within this group. **MYK Laticrete** follows closely as the second most preferred brand, securing 36.5% of the total votes, with strong backing from architects (89.3%) and notable support from dealers (42.1%), establishing it as a leading option in these categories. The **"Others"** category accounts for 12.8% of responses, with 25% dealer preference, suggesting that alternative brands are also offering competitive schemes. **Roff** holds a smaller share at 4.5%, but shows some recognition among dealers (9.2%).

The **Pearson Chi-Square** statistic (191.399, $p = 0.000$) indicates a statistically significant difference in brand preferences among the different respondent groups

10. Which is the most preferred brand among Architects?

			11. Which is the most preferred brand among Architects?															Total
				Better performance	Good quality	Good relation with brand	Kerakoll, Weber	Mapei	MYK Laticrete	MYK Laticrete, Kerakoll, Others	MYK Laticrete, Others	MYK Laticrete, Roff	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Asian Paints	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Others	Others	Roff	V-Bond is providing good quality and preferable by Architects.	Weber	
Type	Applicator		52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
			100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Architect		0	17	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	28
			0.0%	60.7%	32.1%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer		0	0	0	0	1	5	55	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	0	5	76
			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	6.6%	72.4%	1.3%	2.6%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	3.9%	1.3%	0.0%	6.6%	100.0%
Total			52	17	9	1	1	5	55	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	5	156
			33.3%	10.9%	5.8%	0.6%	0.6%	3.2%	35.3%	0.6%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	1.9%	0.6%	0.6%	3.2%	100.0%

	Value	df	
Pearson Chi-Square	312.000[a]	30	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	319.751	30	0.000
N of Valid Cases	156		

a. A total of 40 cells (83.3%) have expected counts less than 5, with the minimum expected count being 18.

The survey investigates the most preferred brand among architects, based on perceptions from applicators, architects, and dealers. **MYK Laticrete** leads as the most favored brand, capturing 35.3% of overall preferences, with strong support from dealers (72.4%) and architects (60.7%), reflecting a high level of trust in its performance. Factors such as **"Better performance"** (10.9%) and **"Good quality"** (5.8%) also influence preferences, with 32.1% of architects emphasizing good quality as a critical factor in their brand choices. **Roff** (1.9%) and **Weber** (3.2%) hold a minor share, primarily backed by dealers.

The **Pearson Chi-Square** value (312.000, $p = 0.000$) indicates a significant variation in brand preferences across the different respondent groups. Furthermore, 83.3% of cells have expected counts below 5, suggesting some underrepresented responses. Overall, **MYK Laticrete** emerges as the dominant brand among architects and dealers, with performance and quality being key drivers of preference influence preferences. Other brands have limited recognition in this category

11. Which brands are you happy with the services provided by the local sales team?

			12. Which brands are you happy with the services provided by the local sales team?													Total
				Asian Paints	Mapei	Mapei, Kerakoll, Others	MYK Laticrete	MYK Laticrete, Others	MYK Laticrete, Roff	MYK Laticrete, Roff, Others	Others	Roff	Roff	Roff, Weber	Weber	
Type	Applicator		52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
			100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Architect		0	0	1	0	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	28
			0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	89.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer		0	1	5	1	38	2	2	1	16	6	0	1	3	76
			0.0%	1.3%	6.6%	1.3%	50.0%	2.6%	2.6%	1.3%	21.1%	7.9%	0.0%	1.3%	3.9%	100.0%
Total			52	1	6	1	63	2	2	1	17	6	1	1	3	156
			33.3%	0.6%	3.8%	0.6%	40.4%	1.3%	1.3%	0.6%	10.9%	3.8%	0.6%	0.6%	1.9%	100.0%

a. A total of 31 cells (79.5%) have expected counts less than 5, with the minimum expected count being 0.18. The survey assesses satisfaction levels with the services provided by local sales teams across different brands. **MYK Laticrete** stands out with the highest overall satisfaction rate at 40.4%, supported by 89.3% of architects and 50% of dealers, reflecting its strong market presence and effective sales team performance. The **"Others"** category (10.9%) and **Roff** (3.8%) also received some recognition, primarily from dealers. **Mapei** accounted for 3.8% of the responses, with 6.6% of dealers expressing satisfaction. In contrast, **Asian Paints**, **Weber**, and combined brand categories received minimal responses, indicating limited satisfaction or engagement with their local sales teams.

The **Pearson Chi-Square** statistic (183.505, $p = 0.000$) reveals a significant difference in satisfaction levels across the respondent groups. Additionally, 79.5% of cells have expected counts below 5, suggesting data sparsity in certain categories. Overall, **MYK Laticrete** dominates satisfaction ratings among both architects and dealers, while other brands show varying levels of satisfaction, with some respondents indicating preference for multiple brands.

International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)
Volume: 09 Issue: 02 | Feb - 2025 SJIF Rating: 8.448 ISSN: 2582-3930

12. How frequently do teams from the brands you deal with, visit?

		13. How frequently do teams from the brands you deal with, visit?				Total
			Monthly	Other	Weekly	
Type	Applicator	52	0	0	0	52
		100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Architect	0	26	0	2	28
		0.0%	92.9%	0.0%	7.1%	100.0%
	Dealer	1	37	6	32	76
		1.3%	48.7%	7.9%	42.1%	100.0%
Total		53	63	6	34	156
		34.0%	40.4%	3.8%	21.8%	100.0%

1e21	Value	Df	
Pearson Chi-Square	176.273	6	0.0000
Likelihood Ratio	209.210	6	0.0000
N of Valid Cases	156		

The table illustrates the frequency of visits from brand teams across three respondent groups—Applicators, Architects, and Dealers. **Applicators** reported the highest consistency, with **100%** indicating monthly visits, highlighting strong and regular engagement. In contrast, **Architects** predominantly cited **"Other"** frequencies (**92.9%**), with only **7.1%** mentioning weekly visits, suggesting irregular or less structured interactions. **Dealers** displayed a more varied pattern, with **48.7%** reporting monthly visits and **42.1%** noting weekly visits, indicating a higher level of engagement compared to Architects.

On the whole, **monthly visits** constituted the largest proportion at **40.4%**, followed by **weekly visits** at **21.8%**, while the **"Other"** category made up **3.8%** of responses. The **Pearson Chi-Square** result ($p < 0.001$) indicates a statistically significant difference in visitation frequencies across the respondent groups.

This data highlights that **Applicators** benefit from consistent brand team engagement, **Architects** experience infrequent interactions, and **Dealers** enjoy a balanced mix of visits. These insights are valuable for optimizing brand outreach strategies, ensuring each group receives engagement tailored to their specific needs.

13. Which brand does the best promotional activities?

		14. Which brand does the best promotional activities?							Total
			Asian Paints	Mapei	MYK Laticrete	Others	Roff	Weber	
Type	Applicator	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
		100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Architect	0	0	1	26	0	1	0	28
		0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	92.9%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer	2	2	5	49	7	8	3	76
		2.6%	2.6%	6.6%	64.5%	9.2%	10.5%	3.9%	100.0%
Total		54	2	6	75	7	9	3	156
		34.6%	1.3%	3.8%	48.1%	4.5%	5.8%	1.9%	100.0%

The table presents the perceptions of **Applicators**, **Architects**, and **Dealers** regarding the most effective promotional activities by various brands. **MYK Laticrete** emerges as the clear leader, capturing **48.1%** of overall responses, with overwhelming support from **Architects (92.9%)** and **Dealers (64.5%)**, reflecting its strong promotional strategies and market presence. **Roff** holds the second position with **5.8%** of total responses, showing a notable preference among **Dealers (10.5%)**.

Other brands like **Asian Paints (1.3%)**, **Mapei (3.8%)**, and **Weber (1.9%)** received minimal recognition, indicating limited visibility or less impactful promotional activities. Interestingly, **Applicators** exclusively favored the **"Others"** category, suggesting their inclination towards unlisted brands or unique promotional approaches not captured in mainstream data.

The **Pearson Chi-Square** value ($p < 0.001$) indicates a statistically significant difference in brand preferences across the respondent groups. This data emphasizes **MYK Laticrete's** dominance in promotional effectiveness, while also highlighting opportunities for other brands to enhance their marketing efforts to better engage and attract a broader range of respondents.

14. What kind of promotional activities for Masons is getting done frequently by brands?

			15. What kind of promotional activities for Masons is getting done frequently by brands?															
				Architect meet through Association	Exhibition	Foreign Tour	Gift Items for Mason	Gift Items for Mason & Architects	In house presentation	In Shop meeting	KIT Meeting	Most effective:- Any One of above or other	Nakka Meeting	None	Others	Promotional Items at er (Poster/ Dangler/ Table TOP etc)	Site Visit & Sampling	Tour	Total
Type	Applicator		52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
			100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Architect		0	7	5	3	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	28
			0.0%	25.0%	17.9%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dealer		1	0	0	0	9	4	0	19	16	11	8	2	0	5	0	1	76
			1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	5.3%	0.0%	25.0%	21.1%	14.5%	10.5%	2.6%	0.0%	6.6%	0.0%	1.3%	100.0%
Total			53	7	5	3	9	4	6	19	16	11	8	2	1	5	6	1	156
			34.0%	4.5%	3.2%	1.9%	5.8%	2.6%	3.8%	12.2%	10.3%	7.1%	5.1%	1.3%	0.6%	3.2%	3.8%	0.6%	100.0%

	Value	df	
Pearson Chi-Square	307.043[a]	30	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	309.829	30	0.000
N of Valid Cases	156		

a. **40 cells (83.3%)** have expected counts less than 5, with the minimum expected count being **0.18**. The table details the types of **promotional activities** conducted for masons by various brands, segmented by respondent groups—**Applicators**, **Architects**, and **Dealers**. **Applicators** reported **no specific activities (100%)**, highlighting a significant gap in promotional engagement directed at this group. In contrast, **Architects** identified **"Exhibitions" (25.0%)** and **"In-house presentations" (21.4%)** as the most common promotional efforts. **Dealers** emphasized **"In-shop meetings" (25.0%)**, followed by **"KIT meetings" (21.1%)**, and promotional items such as **posters or danglers (12.2%)**.

Across all groups, **"In-shop meetings"** were the most frequent activity (**12.2%**), followed by **"KIT meetings" (10.3%)** and other initiatives like distributing **gift items or promotional materials (6.4%)**. The **Pearson Chi-Square** value ($p < 0.001$) indicates statistically significant differences in responses among the groups, reflecting varied promotional strategies targeting different stakeholders.

This analysis highlights the need for brands to **diversify and enhance** their promotional activities, particularly to better engage **masons** through targeted initiatives—especially among **Applicators**, where promotional outreach appears lacking.

Discussion of Findings

The study reveals that **MYK Laticrete** consistently dominates in various aspects, including brand preference, satisfaction with services, promotional effectiveness, and premium perception. It holds a significant market share among **architects** and **dealers**, with **architects (92.9%)** and **dealers (64.5%)** favoring the brand due to its strong performance and effective promotional strategies. Conversely, **applicators** showed less engagement with major brands, often selecting the **"Others"** category, indicating a preference for unlisted or localized brands. Additionally, brands like **Roff**, **Mapei**, and **Weber** showed limited recognition, pointing to the need for more targeted marketing efforts.

The frequency of brand team visits varied significantly across respondent groups. **Applicators** reported **100%** monthly visits, highlighting strong and consistent engagement. In contrast, **architects** experienced irregular interactions, with **92.9%** indicating "Other" frequencies and only **7.1%** reporting weekly visits. **Dealers** enjoyed a balanced mix, with **48.7%** receiving monthly visits and **42.1%** weekly visits. This suggests that while dealers and applicators benefit from consistent brand engagement, architects are comparatively underserved, impacting their brand loyalty and perception.

Promotional activities targeting **masons** also exhibited disparities. **Applicators** reported no specific activities directed at them (**100%**), highlighting a significant gap in promotional outreach. In contrast, **architects** preferred **"Exhibitions" (25.0%)** and **"In-house presentations" (21.4%)**, while **dealers** valued **"In-shop meetings" (25.0%)** and **"KIT meetings" (21.1%)**. The **Pearson Chi-Square tests** across different analyses consistently revealed significant variations in responses, confirming the need for differentiated strategies tailored to the specific preferences and expectations of each respondent group.

Implications of the study

The dominance of **MYK Laticrete** across various metrics suggests that brands need to study its strategies in areas like promotional activities, sales support, and product quality to understand its success. Companies struggling with lower brand recognition, such as **Mapei** and **Weber**, should invest in improving their **brand awareness**, particularly among **dealers** and **architects**, who significantly influence purchasing decisions. **Applicators'** preference for unlisted brands also signals an opportunity for these companies to introduce tailored products and localized marketing strategies to penetrate this segment.

The irregular engagement with **architects** suggests an untapped opportunity for brands to strengthen their relationships with this influential group. Since architects prioritize product quality, innovation, and sustainability, brands should increase the frequency and quality of their interactions with architects through targeted events such as **technical workshops**, **exclusive exhibitions**, and **personalized presentations**. This could improve brand loyalty and drive more brand recommendations in construction projects.

The lack of promotional activities for **applicators** indicates a critical gap that brands need to address. Since applicators play a vital role in the practical use of building materials, their satisfaction and familiarity with a brand can influence broader market adoption. Companies should focus on **engaging applicators** through activities like **hands-on training sessions**, **product demonstrations**, and **reward schemes**..

Conclusion

The research study provides a comprehensive understanding of the perceptions and preferences of dealers, architects, and applicators in the Hyderabad market concerning tile adhesive products. The findings underscore the critical role of brand reputation, product quality, and effective service delivery in influencing decision-making across these stakeholder groups. MYK Laticrete emerged as a dominant player, consistently recognized for its strong distribution network, reliable product quality, and support infrastructure, positioning it as a benchmark in the industry. The challenges faced by competitors like Kerakoll and Mapei, particularly in terms of limited availability and inadequate promotional efforts, highlight the need for strategic improvements to address market gaps. The study further reveals the significance of sustainability and eco-friendliness, particularly among architects, emphasizing an evolving preference for innovative and environmentally conscious solutions. Applicators' emphasis on ease of application and durability further reinforces the need for brands to prioritize technical support and user-friendly products.

The statistical analyses, including chi-square tests, demonstrate significant relationships between factors like dealer satisfaction, brand awareness, and service quality, pointing to areas where companies can optimize their market strategies. For companies operating in the Hyderabad market, the study highlights a growing demand for personalized engagement, whether through tailored incentives for dealers, targeted training for applicators, or enhanced outreach to architects. These findings not only provide actionable insights for building material companies to refine their offerings but also underscore the importance of aligning with emerging trends, such as sustainability and innovative marketing approaches, to achieve competitive advantage. By leveraging these insights, companies can foster stronger stakeholder relationships, enhance brand equity, and expand their market share in the increasingly competitive Hyderabad market.

References and bibliography

M Sachdeva "Strategic Issues in Marketing of Consumer and Technology Products: Dealer Satisfaction Survey – Implication for Enhancing Channel Relationship." *Asian Journal of Management Research*, Vol. 8, Issue 3, Article 011. Available at: https://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:ajmr&volume=8&issue=3&article=011.

K Rajamani, RS Lekshmi, A Ravi "A Study on the Dealers' Opinion about the Effect of GST with Reference to Cement Industry." *Asian Journal of Management Research*, Vol. 8, Issue 3, Article 011. Available at: https://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:ajmr&volume=8&issue=3&article=011.

Lekshmi, R. S., & Rajamani, K. (2018). "A Study on the Dealers' Opinion about the Effect of GST with Reference to Cement Industry." *International Research Journal of Business and Management*, 11(5), 60–65. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Lekshmi-R-S-2/publication/340952965_A_Study_on_the_Dealer%27s_Opinion_about_the_Effect_of_GST_with_Reference_to_Cement_Industry/links/5ea73cf0299bf112561418c2/A-Study-on-the-Dealers-Opinion-about-the-Effect-of-GST-with-Reference-to-Cement-Industry.pdf

Gohel, B., Yadav, V., & Vidani, J. (2023). "Enhancing Dealer Satisfaction: Assessing Durability and Business Support of LG Products in Ahmedabad." *Journal of Advanced Research in Service Management*, 6(2), 9–18. Available at: https://adrjournalshouse.com/index.php/Journal-ServiceManagement/article/view/1789

Belagali, R. (2017). "A Study on 'Factors Influencing Dealer's Buying Behaviour Towards Sadanand PVC Pvt. Ltd'." *Master of Business Administration Project Report*, Visvesvaraya Technological University, Belagavi. Available at:

https://www.studocu.com/in/document/veer-narmad-south-gujarat-university/bachelor-of-business-management/wtr-2-project/48546489

Porathukaran Luiz, B. (2020). "Sales Promotion and Satisfaction of Dealers: A Case of Havells India Ltd." *Master's Thesis*, Silesian University in Opava, School of Business Administration in Karvina. Available at: https://theses.cz/id/fvl2at/?lang=en

Kariappa, A., & Maharoof, A. (2016). "A Study on Dealer Satisfaction with Special Reference to ACC CEMENTS Limited." *International Journal of Engineering Research and Modern Education (IJERME)*, 1(1), 704–708. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2973702

Kumar, N., Scheer, L. K., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (1995). "The Effects of Perceived Interdependence on Dealer Attitudes." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 32(3), 348–356. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/3151986