IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Generation Z Consumer's Preferences For Online Food Ordering Application In Vadodara: A Study Of Swiggy Vs Zomato.

[1]Jimit Yadav, [2]Aachal Jain, [3]Dr. Jayprakash Lamoria

[1]Student – Faculty of Management Studies – Parul University, [2] Student – Faculty of Management Studies – Parul University, [3]Professor - Faculty of Management Studies – Parul University
Vadodara, India

Abstract: This study examines Generation Z's preferences for online food ordering platforms, focusing on Swiggy and Zomato in Vadodara. Key factors analyzed include pricing, discounts, promotional offers, delivery speed, hygiene, safety measures, and value for money. Data was collected from 324 respondents and analyzed using Chi-Square and ANOVA tests. Results indicate that pricing and promo codes significantly influence platform preference, while factors like hygiene, delivery speed, and gender show no strong association. Income levels impact perceptions of timeliness and promotional offers but not hygiene concerns. The study suggests that Swiggy and Zomato should enhance pricing strategies, personalized promotions, and delivery efficiency to better meet Generation Z's expectations.

Keywords: Generation Z, online food ordering, Swiggy, Zomato, consumer preferences, pricing, discounts, promotional offers, delivery speed, hygiene, value for money

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1Background

The rapid growth of digital technology and smartphone penetration has transformed consumer behavior, making online food delivery platforms like Swiggy and Zomato increasingly popular in India. These platforms offer convenience, diverse food options, and efficient service, making them the preferred choice for many consumers. Generation Z, known for its digital-first mindset, plays a crucial role in this market. This tech-savvy group values speed, convenience, and personalized experiences when choosing food delivery services. In Vadodara, a growing tier-2 city, the adoption of online food ordering has risen, especially among young consumers influenced by social media, peer reviews, and digital convenience. This study examines the key factors driving Generation Z's preferences for Swiggy and Zomato in Vadodara, including pricing, delivery time, user experience, and customer service. Understanding these factors will help food delivery platforms tailor their services, enhance customer satisfaction, and maintain a competitive edge in India's evolving online food delivery market.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Online food delivery platforms like Swiggy and Zomato have become essential for Gen Z consumers, who prioritize convenience and digital accessibility. However, limited research exists on what influences their platform preference, particularly in tier-2 cities like Vadodara. With increasing competition, understanding key factors such as user experience, pricing, discounts, and delivery time is crucial for retaining this tech-savvy demographic. This study explores Gen Z's preferences in Vadodara, offering insights to help Swiggy and Zomato enhance their services, improve customer satisfaction, and strengthen brand loyalty.

2.1 Objectives

1. To identify the key factors influencing Generation Z's preferences for online food ordering applications.
2. To measure the importance of key factors influencing Generation Z's online food ordering application preferences.
3. To examine the key factors shaping Generation Z's choice between Swiggy and Zomato.

2.2 Hypotheses

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant association between pricing and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant association between pricing and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant association between discounts and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant association between discounts and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant association between delivery speed and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant association between delivery speed and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant association between gender and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant association between gender and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significance difference amongs different inome levels and timeliness delivery
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant difference in timeliness of delivery among different income levels.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significance difference amongs different inome levels and safety and hygine
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant difference insafety and hygine among different income levels.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significance difference amongs different inome levels and Availability of promo codes.
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant difference in Availability of promocodes among different income levels.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Consumer Behavior of Generation Z Tech-Savviness and Digital Native Characteristics Generation Z has grown up with digital technology, making them a key demographic for businesses operating in the online space. Studies show that this generation is highly comfortable with mobile technology and prefers apps that offer seamless, fast, and convenient experiences (Francis & Hoefel, 2018). Generation Z is known to value personalized interactions and expect brands to be highly responsive to their needs, often favoring businesses that offer real-time engagement and convenience over traditional methods of service (Turner, 2015).

Generation Z's Decision-Making Process According to Priporas et al. (2017), Generation Z consumers are highly influenced by peer reviews, social media, and online recommendations. Trust in online reviews and brand transparency is critical to their decision-making process. They are also more price-sensitive compared to previous generations and look for discounts and promotional offers as significant factors in their purchasing decisions.

Online Food Delivery Platforms: A Growing Market Evolution of Food Delivery Services The global food delivery market has seen a major transformation in the past decade due to the rise of mobile applications like Swiggy and Zomato (Statista, 2021). These platforms offer consumers the ability to browse menus, read reviews, track deliveries, and receive real-time updates, making food ordering more accessible and efficient (Kimes, 2011). The ease of use and technological innovation behind these platforms has played a pivotal role in their growing adoption, especially among younger consumers.

Indian Market Context: Swiggy vs. Zomato Swiggy and Zomato dominate the Indian food delivery landscape. Zomato started as a restaurant review platform and evolved into a food delivery service, while Swiggy was built exclusively around food delivery from the beginning. According to Poojara (2020), Zomato appeals to a broader demographic due to its restaurant reviews and variety, while Swiggy is often perceived as more reliable in terms of logistics and delivery speed. Both platforms regularly use discounts and loyalty programs to attract and retain users.

Factors Influencing Consumer Preferences for Food Delivery Apps User Experience (UX) In online food ordering, the quality of the user experience (UX) is crucial. According to Lee et al. (2019), an intuitive, fast, and visually appealing user interface significantly impacts customer satisfaction and retention. Generation Z, in particular, values apps that are user-friendly and responsive, with minimal friction in navigation and payment processes (Balakrishnan & Kumar, 2021). The UX of Swiggy and Zomato includes features like push notifications, live tracking, and personalized offers, which cater specifically to tech-savvy consumers like Gen Z.

Pricing and Discounts One of the most compelling factors influencing online food orders is pricing and discounts. Generation Z, being highly price-sensitive, often chooses the platform offering the best deals at a given time (Priporas et al., 2017). Both Swiggy and Zomato engage in aggressive discounting strategies, offering exclusive deals during festivals, weekends, and with loyalty programs (Singh, 2021).

Delivery Speed and Reliability Studies show that prompt delivery is a key determinant of customer satisfaction in food delivery services. A study by Nanda et al. (2018) found that delays in delivery time are one of the most frequent complaints among users. Generation Z consumers, who are accustomed to instant gratification in digital experiences, tend to be particularly dissatisfied with slow delivery times. Swiggy, in particular, has invested heavily in logistics to reduce delivery time, which is a crucial competitive advantage over Zomato (Roy, 2020).

Customer Service and Complaint Resolution Efficient customer service and the quick resolution of complaints also influence customer preferences. According to Liu & Lee (2016), platforms that respond promptly to customer inquiries and resolve issues related to wrong orders, late deliveries, or refunds tend to build stronger loyalty. Both Swiggy and Zomato have invested in customer service improvements, although consumer reviews show mixed experiences (Poojara, 2020).

Regional Context: Online Food Delivery in Tier-2 Cities

Vadodara's Growing Online Food Ordering Market While metros like Mumbai and Delhi dominate the food delivery market, tier-2 cities like Vadodara are seeing rapid growth in online food delivery adoption (RedSeer, 2019). The city's rising middle-class population, increased internet penetration, and changing consumption patterns have contributed to the growth of platforms like Swiggy and Zomato (Bhargava, 2021). However, consumer preferences in these cities may vary from those in larger metros due to different socio-economic factors.

Generation Z in Vadodara Vadodara's Generation Z is increasingly adopting online food ordering due to its convenience, particularly in educational institutions and among young professionals. Research on consumer behavior in tier-2 cities suggests that this demographic values promotions, affordability, and variety (Mahapatra, 2019). Understanding these preferences is crucial for food delivery services looking to expand their market presence in regions like Vadodara.

Theoretical Framework Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) The Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989) is relevant to understanding Generation Z's acceptance of online food delivery platforms. According to this model, perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness are key determinants of whether consumers will adopt a new technology. Studies like that of Kaushik & Rahman (2019) suggest that Generation Z's adoption of Swiggy and Zomato can be explained through TAM, where ease of navigation and perceived convenience drive usage.

Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty Models Several models of customer satisfaction and loyalty are applicable in analyzing Swiggy and Zomato's ability to retain Generation Z users. Parasuraman et al.'s (1988) SERVQUAL model, which measures service quality, could be employed to assess the quality dimensions that impact customer satisfaction, such as reliability, assurance, and empathy in food delivery services.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Study Design

This study has employed a quantitative (Exploratory) research design focused on descriptive and comparative analysis. The aim is to systematically assess and compare Generation Z consumer preferences for online food ordering applications, specifically Swiggy and Zomato, in Vadodara.

4.2 Data Collection

Primary Data: Collected directly from Generation Z consumers through structured questionnaires to understand their preferences, experiences, and satisfaction levels with Swiggy and Zomato.
Secondary Data: Secondary data have been collected through literature as mentioned in the references to support this research.

4.3 Sampling Techniques

- **Population:** The target population for this study consists of Generation Z consumers aged 18-30 years residing in Vadodara.
- **Sample Size:** The Study will target a sample size of approximately 350+ participants for a survey to ensure the statistical analysis.
- **Sampling Method:** Non-probability convenience sampling.

V. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

SPSS software was used for statistical analysis, including ANOVA and Chi-Square tests to examine variations in consumer confidence based on location, gender, and age.

5.1Results and Discussion

5.1.1Age Group:

Age Group	Respondents	Percentage
18–24	124	38.04%
25–30	141	43.25%
Above 30	61	18.71%
Grand Total	326	

The table shows that most respondents are aged 25–30 (43.25%), followed by 18–24 (38.04%), and 18.71% are above 30. This highlights a focus on young adults, providing insights into their food delivery preferences.

5.1.2 Gender:

Gender	Respondents	Percentage
Female	161	49.39%
Male	122	37.42%
Others	10	3.07%
Prefer not to say	33	10.12%
Grand Total	326	

The table shows the gender distribution of respondents, with females (49.39%) being the largest group, followed by males (37.42%). Additionally, 3.07% identify as others, and 10.12% chose not to disclose. This diversity allows for a balanced analysis of gender influence on food delivery preferences.

5.1.3Occupation:

Occupation	Respondents	Percentage
Business Owner	95	29.14%
Employed	101	30.98%
Student	86	26.38%
Unemployed	44	13.50%
Grand Total	326	

The table shows respondents' occupations, with employed individuals (30.98%) being the largest group, followed by business owners (29.14%), students (26.38%), and unemployed (13.50%). This helps analyze how professional backgrounds influence food delivery choices.

5.1.4 Income Level:

Income	Respondents	Percentage
25000 – 50000	106	32.52%
50000-100000	114	34.97%
Above 100000	13	3.99%
Below 25000	93	28.53%
Grand Total	326	

The table shows respondents' income distribution, with most earning ₹50,000–1,00,000 (34.97%), followed by ₹25,000–50,000 (32.52%). About 28.53% earn below ₹25,000, and 3.99% earn above ₹1,00,000. This helps analyze income influence on food ordering preferences.

5.1.5Application Usage:

Count of Which platform do you use more frequently?	Respondents	Percentage
Both equally	72	22.09%
Swiggy	117	35.89%
Zomato	137	42.02%
Grand Total	326	

The table shows platform preferences, with Zomato (42.02%) leading, followed by Swiggy (35.89%), and 22.09% using both equally. This highlights Zomato's slight edge while indicating strong competition.

5.2 HYPOTHESIS TESTING

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant association between Value for money and affordability and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant association between Value for money and affordability and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.

Value-for-money meal combos and affordable options12 * Which platform do you use more frequently? Crosstabulation

Count

		Which platform do you use more frequently?			
		1	2	3	Total
Value-for-money meal combos and affordable options12	1	12	7	27	46
	2	20	27	34	81
	3	13	25	47	85
	4	12	22	36	70
	5	12	13	19	44
Total		69	94	163	326

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.058[a]	8	.261
Likelihood Ratio	10.735	8	.217
Linear-by-Linear Association	.009	1	.926
N of Valid Cases	326		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.31.

Interpretation:

Based on the Chi-Square test results, the **p-value (0.261) is greater than 0.05**, meaning we **fail to reject the null hypothesis (H_0)**.This indicates that **there is no significant association between Value for Money and Affordability and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato**.
In other words, affordability does not play a statistically significant role in influencing their platform choice.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant association between discounts and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant association between discounts and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.

Availability of promo codes4 * Which platform do you use more frequently? Crosstabulation

Count

		Which platform do you use more frequently?			
		1	2	3	Total
Availability of promo codes4	1	9	14	24	47
	2	14	18	39	71
	3	22	27	42	91
	4	13	30	37	80
	5	11	5	21	37
Total		69	94	163	326

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.364[a]	8	.313
Likelihood Ratio	9.852	8	.276
Linear-by-Linear Association	.200	1	.655
N of Valid Cases	326		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.83.

Interpretation:

The Chi-Square test results show that the **Pearson Chi-Square value is 9.364** with **8 degrees of freedom (df)** and a **p-value of 0.313**. Since the **p-value (0.313) is greater than 0.05**, we **fail to reject the null hypothesis (H_0)**. This means that **there is no significant association between discounts and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato**. In other words, discounts do not statistically influence their choice of food delivery platform.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant association between delivery speed and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant association between delivery speed and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.

Timeliness of delivery5 * Which platform do you use more frequently? Crosstabulation

Count

		Which platform do you use more frequently?			
		1	2	3	Total
Timeliness of delivery5	1	11	12	25	48
	2	11	24	47	82
	3	19	29	39	87
	4	19	21	34	74
	5	9	8	18	35
Total					326

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.412[a]	8	.601
Likelihood Ratio	6.692	8	.570
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.471	1	.225
N of Valid Cases	326		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.41.

Interpretation:

The Chi-Square test results show that the **Pearson Chi-Square value is 6.412** with **8 degrees of freedom (df)** and a **p-value of 0.601**. Since the **p-value (0.601) is greater than 0.05**, we **fail to reject the null hypothesis (H_0)**. This means that **there is no significant association between delivery speed and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato**. In other words, delivery speed does not statistically influence their choice of food delivery platform.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant association between gender and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant association between gender and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato.

What is your gender? * Which platform do you use more frequently? Crosstabulation

Count

		Which platform do you use more frequently?			
		1	2	3	Total
What is your gender?	1	32	57	86	175
	2	31	23	62	116
	3	0	0	2	2
	4	6	14	13	33
Total		69	94	163	326

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.787[a]	6	.067
Likelihood Ratio	12.622	6	.049
Linear-by-Linear Association	.296	1	.586
N of Valid Cases	326		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .42.

Interpretation:

The **Pearson Chi-Square value is 11.787** with **6 degrees of freedom (df)** and a **p-value of 0.067**. Since the **p-value (0.067) is greater than 0.05**, we **fail to reject the null hypothesis (H_0)**. This means that **there is no significant association between gender and Generation Z's preference for Swiggy or Zomato**. In other words, gender does not statistically influence their choice of food delivery platform.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significance difference amongs different inome levels and timeliness delivery

H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant difference in timeliness of delivery among different income levels.

Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Timeliness of delivery5	Based on Mean	1.422	3	322	.236
	Based on Median	1.125	3	322	.339
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.125	3	315.500	.339
	Based on trimmed mean	1.469	3	322	.223

Descriptives

Timeliness of delivery5

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	112	2.74	1.279	.121	2.50	2.98	1	5
2	99	2.85	1.190	.120	2.61	3.09	1	5
3	20	3.80	1.240	.277	3.22	4.38	1	5
4	95	2.94	1.109	.114	2.71	3.16	1	5
Total	326	2.90	1.221	.068	2.76	3.03	1	5

ANOVA

Timeliness of delivery5

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	19.415	3	6.472	4.481	.004
Within Groups	465.039	322	1.444		
Total	484.454	325			

Interpretation:

The **ANOVA table** shows that the **F-value is 4.481** with a **p-value (Sig.) of 0.004**.

Since the **p-value (0.004) is less than 0.05**, we **reject the null hypothesis (H_0)** and accept the **alternative hypothesis (H_1)**. This means that **there is a significant difference in the perception of timeliness of delivery among different income levels**. Income groups have statistically different opinions on how timely the delivery service is.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significance difference amongs different inome levels and safety and hygine
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant difference insafety and hygine among different income levels.

Descriptives

Hygiene and safety measures18

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	112	2.99	1.219	.115	2.76	3.22	1	5
2	99	2.78	1.258	.126	2.53	3.03	1	5
3	20	3.55	1.191	.266	2.99	4.11	1	5
4	95	3.06	1.295	.133	2.80	3.33	1	5
Total	326	2.98	1.260	.070	2.84	3.12	1	5

Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Hygiene and safety measures18	Based on Mean	.143	3	322	.934
	Based on Median	.117	3	322	.950
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.117	3	319.023	.950
	Based on trimmed mean	.156	3	322	.926

ANOVA

Hygiene and safety measures18

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	11.216	3	3.739	2.385	.069
Within Groups	504.673	322	1.567		
Total	515.890	325			

Interpretation :

The **ANOVA table** shows that the **F-value is 2.385** with a **p-value (Sig.) of 0.069**.

Since the **p-value (0.069) is greater than 0.05**, we **fail to reject the null hypothesis (H_0)**. This means that **there is no significant difference in the perception of safety and hygiene among different income levels**. Income groups do not have statistically different opinions on safety and hygiene measures.

H_0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significance difference amongs different inome levels and Availability of promo codes
H_1 (Alternate Hypothesis): There is a significant difference in Availability of promocodes among different income levels.

Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Availability of promo codes4	Based on Mean	1.141	3	322	.332
	Based on Median	.904	3	322	.439
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.904	3	318.681	.439
	Based on trimmed mean	1.176	3	322	.319

Descriptives

Availability of promo codes4

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	112	2.83	1.294	.122	2.59	3.07	1	5
2	99	2.89	1.160	.117	2.66	3.12	1	5
3	20	3.70	1.081	.242	3.19	4.21	2	5
4	95	3.05	1.188	.122	2.81	3.29	1	5
Total	326	2.97	1.224	.068	2.83	3.10	1	5

ANOVA

Availability of promo codes4

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	14.137	3	4.712	3.212	.023
Within Groups	472.491	322	1.467		
Total	486.629	325			

Interpretation:

The **ANOVA table** shows that the **F-value is 3.212** with a **p-value (Sig.) of 0.023**.

Since the **p-value (0.023) is less than 0.05**, we **reject the null hypothesis (H_0)** and accept the **alternative hypothesis (H_1)**. This means that **there is a significant difference in the perception of the availability of promo codes among different income levels**. Different income groups have varying opinions on the availability of promo codes.

VI. FINDINGS

- Zomato has a slight preference among Generation Z consumers, but a significant portion still uses both platforms interchangeably.
- Value for money, discounts, and delivery speed are not significant determinants of preference, suggesting that factors like brand perception, ease of use, and customer experience may be more critical.
- Higher-income consumers have higher expectations for delivery timeliness, while lower-income consumers are more likely to be influenced by promo codes and discounts.
- Hygiene and safety measures are perceived similarly across income levels, indicating that both platforms provide relatively equal standards in this area.

REFERENCES

[1] Balakrishnan, J., & Kumar, D. (2021). Consumer Perceptions of Online Food Delivery Applications in India. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services.

[2] Bhargava, Y. (2021). Food Delivery in Tier-2 Cities: An Emerging Market. Indian Economic Review.

[3] Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology. MIS Quarterly.

[4] Francis, T., & Hoefel, F. (2018). 'True Gen': Generation Z and Its Implications for Companies. McKinsey & Company.

[5] Kaushik, S., & Rahman, M. (2019). Adoption of Digital Food Ordering Systems: A Study Based on the Technology Acceptance Model. International Journal of Hospitality Management.

[6] Kimes, S. E. (2011). Customer Perceptions of Online Food Ordering. Cornell Hospitality Report.

[7] Lee, K. Y., Lee, K., & Lee, D. (2019). Factors Affecting Customer Satisfaction in Food Delivery Apps: User Experience and Design Perspective. International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction.

[8] Liu, Y., & Lee, J. (2016). Customer Service in Online Food Delivery Platforms: Expectations vs. Reality. Journal of Service Research.

[9] Mahapatra, S. (2019). Consumer Behavior in Tier-2 Cities: An Analysis. Journal of Consumer Marketing.

[10] Nanda, A., Banerjee, R., & Ghosh, P. (2018). Exploring the Factors Impacting Consumer Satisfaction in Online Food Delivery Services. Management Science Letters.

[11] Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., & Berry, L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. Journal of Retailing.

[12] Poojara, A. (2020). Competition in Indian Food Delivery Services: A Comparative Analysis of Swiggy and Zomato. Economic Times.

[13] Priporas, C. V., Stylos, N., & Fotiadis, A. K. (2017). Generation Z Consumers' Expectations of Interactions in Smart Retailing: A Future Agenda. Computers in Human Behavior.

[14] Roy, S. (2020). Logistics and Consumer Experience in Online Food Delivery: A Comparative Study of Swiggy and Zomato. Journal of Marketing Management.

[15] Singh, A. (2021). Impact of Discounts and Promotions on Customer Loyalty in Online Food Delivery. Indian Journal of Marketing.

[16] Statista (2021). Online Food Delivery in India - Market Overview and Growth Trends. Statista Market Report.

[17] Turner, A. (2015). Generation Z: Technology and Social Interests. Journal of Consumer Research.