



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

## Customers Perception on Online Food Delivery: A Case study of Telangana State

**Dr. Durga Prasad Vali**

Assistant Professor( C), Dept. of Commerce

University PG College, Secunderabad, Paradise, TS, India

### Abstract:

Internet technology has its influence on almost every sector. Day to day activities of human beings is incomplete without the internet technology. We are depending on smart phones for many major tasks we do every day. Today in every single minute thousands of android applications are being downloaded from the Google play store. Over the last couple of years internet and mobile phones became integral part of human life. Today online food delivery applications are rapidly increasing. Slowly these platforms are expanding to all the major cities of the state. Due to the increasing demand and competition these food delivery platforms are giving more offers and other benefits to the consumers. This research paper aims to discuss the most preferred online food delivery service by consumers and to examine how food delivery services are satisfied their consumers. The area of the study is Telangana state. 210 respondents were selected based on simple random sampling method. The study concludes that online food delivery services are working as a bridge between hotel business and consumers. They make people life's easy and people also depending on online food delivery services.

**Key Words:** Online food delivery, Zomato, restaurants, online consumers.

### Introduction:

The growth of digital India is changing the lifestyle of urban people. The revolution of internet has completely changed every sectors. E-commerce service providers get into food industries also. Food is one of the basic need of every human daily lives. Present days hotels and restaurants are playing dual role in their services, which means offline service like table services and another one is online service. In metro cities like Hyderabad, Bangalore, Delhi and Chennai have more number of online food delivery sources and restaurants have their own online or doorstep delivery services.

“Like any other sector of the industry food sector is also affected by the technology and digital revolution. It has changed the ordering and delivering services. It has also contributed to the changes in consumer preferences” (Lavesh Raj-2019). Given the option of online food ordering service, customers browse the required food items from their preferred restaurants which is time-saving as well as cost-effective. The other beauty of this service is that is available throughout the day (Raghavendra Rao. R. 2021).

In India there are many online food delivery services are working. Zomato is most used online food delivery application. Zomato earlier worked as the name of ‘Foodiebay’. Zomato provides its services almost in 25 countries. In India we have there are major food delivery services like Zomato, Swiggy, Uber eats, Foodpanda, Amazon Food and TravelKhana and etc. but in India most of the consumers are preferred Zomato and Swiggy.

Recent days means after the pandemic some people almost depend on these services because ordered food in online is turns into their daily habits. Travelers, bachelors and hostellers have started ordering food in online for time saving and enjoying the food.

Online food delivery services have some consumer’s friendly features there are push notifications, provide details of delivery agents, Rewards, Discounts, Simple payment method, Cashback and your food delivery GPS tracking and many other.

The prime intention of this study is to identify the customer’s perception on online food delivery services in Telangana.

### **Review of literature:**

Raghavendra Rao. R. (2021) in his study “A study on consumer satisfaction and perception towards food delivery services of zomato with references to Hyderabad city” observed that female were more satisfied with the quality of food, male were more concerned with the overall satisfaction of the food delivery app. The study also shows other web food delivery apps have better offers and schemes than Zomato.

Dsouza Prima Frederick, Sachin and Parappagoudar (2021) in their study “SWOC analysis of Zomato – A case of online food delivery services” indicates that Zomato’s Digital marketing strategy will have to keep advancing. Both large and small restaurants complain they are gradually being forced into accepting terms and conditions to the aggregators. The study also found usage of these types of services could minimize home cooking.

Dain Novita and NurulHusna (2020) in their study “The influence factors of consumer behavioral intention towards online food delivery services” reveals that online food delivery service price is more expensive than to the offline price. But online food delivery is time saver and easily influence people. Online food delivery influences their consumer’s attitude that lead to their behavioral intention to used online food service.

Lavesh Raj (2019) in his study “Discounts offered by food delivery Apps and buying pattern of consumers” found that at present food delivery services are provides more number of offers and discounts to the existing customers to enhance their experience. The study also found that huge discounts and different services offered by the online food delivery apps have a significant impact on the lifetime value and the buying behavior of customers.

### Statement of the problem:

We can get everything easily because of mobile applications. Mobile applications are make everything is possible in business sectors. Every business sectors are flow with new trends and turns their business as digitalizing. That’s why Food industry also getting more profit by using online food delivery services. After the pandemic days some habits are never get changed there are online food order is one of them. Therefore, it felt necessary to have an in-depth study on “Customers perception on online food delivery: A Case study of Telangana State”.

### Objectives:

1. To study the socio-characteristics of the respondents.
2. To study the most preferred online food delivery service by consumers.
3. To examine how food delivery services are satisfied their consumers.
4. To study the how food delivery services are influenced their consumers to buy the foods on online.

### Research methodology:

To assess the Customers perception on online food delivery has adopted a descriptive research design. The study based on the collection of primary data and qualitative research method was adopted. 210 respondents were selected based on simple random sampling method. Collection of primary data through a structures questionnaire. The data is analyzed through SPSS Software.

### Data Analysis:

**Table 1- Gender**

| Gender | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|-----------|------------|
| Male   | 128       | 61%        |
| Female | 82        | 39%        |
| Total  | 210       | 100%       |

From the above table we can assert the gender of the respondents. Above table indicates that out of 210 respondents. 128 (61%) respondents were male and 82 (39%) respondents were female.

**Table 2- Age group**

| Age group | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 15 to 20  | 08        | 3.8%       |
| 21 to 25  | 52        | 24.8%      |
| 26 to 30  | 66        | 31.4%      |
| 31 to 35  | 60        | 28.6%      |
| Above 35  | 24        | 11.4%      |
| Total     | 210       | 100%       |

It can be verified from the above table that 31.4 percent (N=66) respondents were belonged to 26 to 30 years of age group followed by 31 to 35 years of age group (28.6%, N=60). Whereas 24.8 percent (N=52) respondents were belonged to 21 to 15 years of age group, 11.4 percent (N=24) respondents were belonged above 35 years and only 3.8 percent were belonged to 15 to 20 years of age group.

**Table 3- Education**

| Education            | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Primary or Secondary | 04        | 1.9%       |
| PU                   | 18        | 8.6%       |
| Degree               | 78        | 37.1%      |
| Master Degree        | 90        | 42.9%      |
| Others               | 20        | 9.5%       |
| Total                | 210       | 100%       |

It can be verified from the above table about education qualification of the respondents. It shows that most of the respondents (42.9%, N=90) were belonged to Master degree, followed by Degree (37.1%, N=78). Whereas 9.5 percent were belonged to others, 8.6 percent were PU and only 1.9 percent (N=04) were primary and secondary level of education category.

**Table 4- Occupation**

| Occupation        | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Student           | 30        | 14.3%      |
| Government sector | 46        | 21.9%      |
| Private sector    | 50        | 23.8%      |
| Self-employee     | 40        | 19%        |
| Business          | 16        | 7.6%       |
| Un-employee       | 16        | 7.6%       |
| Home Maker        | 12        | 5.7%       |
| Total             | 210       | 100%       |

From the above table it indicates the occupation of the respondents. Above table reveals that majority of the respondents (23.8%) were worked in private sector, followed by Government sector (21.9%, N=46). Whereas 19 percent (N=40) were self-employees, 14.3 percent were Students, 7.6 percent respondents were doing business and Unemployed and only 5.7 percent (N=12) were Home makers.

**Table 5 – Marital status**

| Marital status | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------|-----------|------------|
| Married        | 76        | 36.2%      |
| Unmarried      | 134       | 63.8%      |
| Total          | 210       | 100%       |

It is evident from the above table 5 that more than half of the respondents (63.8%, N=134) were Unmarried and only 36.2 percent were married.

**Table 6 – Preference of Online food**

| Opinion   | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Yes       | 158       | 75.2%      |
| No        | 00        | 00         |
| Sometimes | 52        | 24.8%      |
| Total     | 210       | 100%       |

It is observed from the table 6 about the preference of online food among the selected respondents. Above table shows that three fourth of the respondents (75.2%, N=158) opined that they order food online from different sources and 24.8 percent (N=52) of the respondents said Sometimes order online food.

**Table 7- most used online food delivery sites by respondent**

| Opinion   | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Zomato    | 108       | 51.4%      |
| Swiggy    | 102       | 48.6%      |
| Uber eats | 24        | 11.4%      |
| FoodPanda | 18        | 8.6%       |
| Others    | 20        | 9.5%       |

Table 7 reveals that more than half of the respondents (51.4%, N=108) prefer Zomato to order food, followed by Swiggy (48.6%, N=102). Whereas 11.4 percent were using uber eats, 9.5 percent were using others sites and only 8.6 percent were using foodpanda to order food in online.

**Table 8- best online food delivery site**

| Opinion    | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| Zomato     | 100       | 47.6%      |
| Swiggy     | 86        | 41%        |
| Uber eats  | 12        | 5.7%       |
| Food panda | 6         | 2.9%       |
| Others     | 6         | 2.9%       |
| Total      | 210       | 100%       |

It is observed from the table 8 about the best online food delivery sites according to selected respondents. Above table shows that 47.6 percent (N=100) opined that Zomato is the best online food delivery service, followed by

Swiggy (41%, N=86), Uber eats 5.7 percent were (N=12) and only 2.9 percent said foodpanda and other online food delivery sites are best.

The above table analysis shows that majority of the respondents opined that Zomato is the best online food delivery site, because Zomato has its service almost in every district of Telangana State. Zomato has been working for 12 years in India so it has own and regular users. It has different types of membership also, when you have gold membership on Zomato you can get up to 40% of discounts on your orders.

**Total 9- how often respondents ordered food in online**

| Opinion      | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Regularly    | 92        | 43.8%      |
| Occasionally | 66        | 31.4%      |
| Rarely       | 52        | 24.8%      |
| Never        | 0         | 0%         |
| Total        | 210       | 100%       |

From the above table it can assert that 43.8 percent (N=92) respondents were regularly ordered food on online, followed by occasionally (31.4%, N=66). Whereas 24.8 percent (N=52) respondents were rarely ordered and No one said Never.

**Table 10- preferred time to order food on online**

| Preferred time | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------|-----------|------------|
| Morning        | 74        | 35.2%      |
| Afternoon      | 82        | 39%        |
| Evening        | 72        | 34.3%      |
| Night          | 54        | 25.7%      |

The above table shows that 39 percent (N=82) of the respondents were order food in online at afternoon. 35.2 percent (N=74) of the respondents order online food at morning, 34.3 percent (N=72) order at evening and only 25.7 percent (N=54) order at Night time.

**Table 11- preferred meals for order from online food delivery sites**

| Opinion       | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| For breakfast | 58        | 27.6%      |
| For Lunch     | 90        | 42.9%      |
| For Snacks    | 86        | 41%        |
| For Dinner    | 62        | 29.5%      |

The above table exhibits that preferred meals order from online food delivery sites. It shows that 42.9 percent (N=90) of the respondent's order lunch, followed by for snacks (41%, N=86). Whereas 29.5 percent (N=62) order dinner and 27.6 percent (N=58) order breakfast.

**Table 12- liked suggested hotels by the online delivery sites**

| Opinion | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 168       | 80%        |
| No      | 42        | 20%        |
| Total   | 210       | 100%       |

The above table indicates that 80 percent (N=168) of the respondents liked the suggested hotels by online food delivery sites and only 20 percent of the respondents don't like the suggested hotels.

To examine how food delivery services are satisfied their consumers is one of the objective of our study. So, above table shows that majority of the respondents liked the suggestions of online delivery sites. Which means online delivery sites are working as users friendly.

**Table 13 – see the reviews of the restaurants and hotel before ordering the food**

| Opinion   | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Yes       | 152       | 72.4%      |
| No        | 28        | 13.3%      |
| Sometimes | 30        | 14.3%      |
| Total     | 210       | 100%       |

The above table portrays the reviews of the restaurants and hotels before ordering the food. There are 152 respondents (72.4%) prefer to see the reviews of the hotels or restaurants, followed by Sometimes (14.3%, N=30) and only 13.3 percent of the respondents said they never see the reviews of the hotels before ordering the food.

Every consumers or customers can't believe blindly on any online purchasing, that's why most of the respondents said they saw the reviews of restaurant and hotels before ordering the food. This is one of the great feature of the online food delivery sites they have every restaurants rates and consumer's reviews about food, restaurants, packaging and visual evidence also.

**Table 14- has craziness about tastes new food which is suggested by the online food delivery sites**

| Opinion   | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Yes       | 128       | 61%        |
| No        | 26        | 12.4%      |
| Sometimes | 56        | 26.7%      |
| Total     | 210       | 100%       |

As shown in the above table more than half of the respondents (61%, N=128) said they has craziness about tasting new food which is suggested by the online food delivery sites, followed by Sometimes (26.7%, N=56) and only 12.4 percent of the respondents said no.

**Table 15- 24X7 online food service**

| Opinion | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 138       | 65.7%      |
| No      | 72        | 34.3%      |
| Total   | 210       | 100%       |

The above table presents the 24X7 online food delivery services in their places. Above table shows that 65.7 percent (N=138) of the respondents have 24X7 online food service at their palce and 34.3 percent (N=2) said they didn't have it.

**Table 16-can easily finds favorite restaurants on online food delivery sites**

| Opinion | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 158       | 75.2%      |
| No      | 52        | 24.8%      |
| Total   | 210       | 100%       |

It can be verified from the above table that more than three fourth of the respondents (75.2%, N=158) can easily find favorite restaurants on online food delivery sites and 24.8 percent were said no.

**Table 17- opinion about online delivery agent service**

| Opinion       | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Very Likely   | 78        | 37.1%      |
| Likely        | 62        | 29.5%      |
| Average       | 50        | 23.8%      |
| Unlikely      | 08        | 3.8%       |
| Very Unlikely | 12        | 5.7%       |
| Total         | 210       | 100%       |

It is observed from the table 17 about services of delivery agent. It shows that 37.1 percent (N=78) of the respondents like very much about the services of delivery agent, followed by likely (29.5%, N=62). Whereas 23.8 percent were opined average, 5.7 percent were opined very unlikely and only 3.8 percent were opined unlikely.

**Table 18- Bad experience about online food delivery**

| Opinion    | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| Many times | 20        | 9.5%       |
| Sometimes  | 80        | 38.1%      |
| Never      | 110       | 52.4%      |
| Total      | 210       | 100%       |

Table 18 reveals that majority of the respondents (52.4%, N=110) said they never had any bad experience about online food delivery, followed by sometimes (38.1%, N=80) and only 9.5 percent (N=20) of the respondents had bad experience from online food delivery services many times.



**Table 19- Opinion about the price differences in restaurants/hotel**

| Opinion            | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| Too much variation | 88        | 41.9%      |
| Little variation   | 76        | 36.2%      |
| Its Same           | 32        | 15.2%      |
| Didn't observed    | 14        | 6.7%       |
| Total              | 210       | 100%       |

The result presented in the above table indicates that 41.9 percent (N=88) of the respondents opined that prices of food is too much variations, followed by little variation (36.2%, N=76). Whereas 15.2 percent (N=32) said prices are same and only 6.7 percent were said didn't observed.

According to this study it has nothing to do with the prices offered by restaurants. So, the prices of food on online food delivery sites decided from the restaurants aggregators, food delivery sites are only presenting the restaurants as a choice for their users.

**Table 20- claiming offer and discounts on online food delivery**

| Opinion | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes     | 162       | 77.1%      |
| No      | 48        | 22.9%      |
| Total   | 210       | 100%       |

The result in table 20 stated about the claiming offers and discounts on online food delivery sites. Above table shows that more than three fourth (77.1%, N=162) of the respondents claim offers and discounts and 22.9 percent (N=48) never claim it.

These days everyone has very good knowledge about online purchasing. Every purchasing or every soft transaction they can easily access the discounts coupons of online food delivery apps, like Gpay, Flipkart, Phonepay sites are gives some coupons for every transaction. Thus users can easily claiming there offers on online food delivery sites.

**Table 21- How much money spent for online food in a week**

| Spending money | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------|-----------|------------|
| Below 500      | 44        | 21%        |
| 500-1000       | 82        | 39%        |
| 1000-1500      | 62        | 29.5%      |
| Above 1500     | 22        | 10.4%      |
| Total          | 210       | 100%       |

The result in the table 21 stated that most of the respondents (39%, N=82) spending 500 to 1000 rupees in a week for online food, followed by 1000 to 1500 (29.5%, N=62). Whereas 21 percent (N=44) were spending below 500 and only 10.4 percent (N=22) were spending above 1500 rupees in a week.

**Table 22- more concern to order food on online**

| Opinion    | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| Quality    | 116       | 55.2%      |
| Timeliness | 68        | 32.4%      |
| Packaging  | 46        | 21.9%      |
| Total      | 210       | 100%       |

As shown in the above table more than half of the respondents (55.2%, N=116) were more concerned about quality of the service by the online food delivery sites, followed by timeliness (32.4%, N=68) and only 21.9 percent (N=46) were concern about packaging of the food.

**Table 23- writes review after receiving the delivery**

| Opinion      | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Always       | 76        | 36.2%      |
| Occasionally | 78        | 37.1%      |
| Rarely       | 40        | 19%        |
| Never        | 16        | 7.6%       |
| Total        | 210       | 100%       |

From the above table we can assert that majority of the respondents (37.1%, N=78) said they occasionally write reviews after receiving the food, followed by Always (36.2%, N=76). Whereas 19 percent (N=40) said they rarely write reviews and only 7.6 percent (N=16) said Never write a reviews on online food delivery sites.

**Table 24- Opinion about online food delivery sites**

| Opinion                           | Very good      | Good           | Average        | Poor          | Very poor    |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Quality of the package            | 134<br>(63.8%) | 52<br>(24.7%)  | 24<br>(11.4%)  | 24<br>(11.4%) | 00<br>(00%)  |
| Quality of the delivery           | 108<br>(51.4%) | 72<br>(34.2%)  | 18<br>(8.5%)   | 12<br>(5.7%)  | 00<br>(00%)  |
| Time maintenance of the delivery  | 54<br>(25.7%)  | 114<br>(54.2%) | 28<br>(13.3%)  | 4<br>(1.9%)   | 10<br>(4.7%) |
| Behavior of the delivery agents   | 32<br>(15.2%)  | 58<br>(27.6%)  | 102<br>(48.5%) | 00<br>(00%)   | 18<br>(8.5%) |
| Suggested restaurants             | 104<br>(49.5%) | 56<br>(26.6%)  | 32<br>(15.3%)  | 18<br>(8.5%)  | 00<br>(00%)  |
| Suggested foods                   | 98<br>(46.7%)  | 66<br>(31.4%)  | 28<br>(13.3%)  | 18<br>(8.5%)  | 00<br>(00%)  |
| Covering the area                 | 92<br>(43.8%)  | 64<br>(30.4%)  | 12<br>(5.7%)   | 36<br>(17.1%) | 06<br>(2.8%) |
| Options of well knows restaurants | 98             | 68             | 26             | 14            | 04           |

|                       |                |               |                |               |             |
|-----------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|
|                       | (46.7%)        | (32.3%)       | (12.3%)        | (6.7%)        | (1.9%)      |
| Discounts and coupons | 100<br>(47.6%) | 50<br>(23.8%) | 40<br>(19.04%) | 20<br>(9.5%)  | 00<br>(00%) |
| Delivery charges      | 40<br>(19.04%) | 42<br>(20%)   | 100<br>(47.6%) | 28<br>(13.3%) | 00<br>(00%) |

We observed that in the above table respondent's opinion on online food delivery sites. 63.8 percent (N=134) were opined that the quality of the packaging of the food is very good followed by Good (24.7%, N=52). Whereas 11.4 percent of the respondents opined average and poor and no one opined quality of packaging is very poor.

More than half of the respondents (51.4%, N=108) said quality of the online food delivery is very good followed by Good. Whereas 8.5 percent were said Average, 5.7 percent were said Poor and no one opined quality of the delivery is very poor.

The above table shows that 54.2 percent of the respondents opined time maintenance of the online food delivery is Good followed by very good (25.7%, N=54). Whereas 13.3 percent opined average, 8.5 percent were opined Poor and no one opined very poor.

It can be assert from the above table near half of the respondents opined behavior of the delivery agents is average followed by good (27.6%, N=58). Whereas 15.2 percent of the respondents opined Very good and 8.5 percent were opined very poor and no one opined poor.

It is evident from the above table 49.5 percent (N=104) of the respondents opined suggested restaurants by the online food delivery sites are very good followed by Good (26.6%, N=56). Whereas 15.3 percent were opined average, 8.5 percent were opined poor and no one opined very poor.

The above table shows 46.7 percent (N=98) of the respondents were opined suggested food are very good by the online food delivery sites followed by Good (31.4%, N=66). Whereas 13.3 percent were said average and 8.5 percent were said poor and no one opined very poor.

It is evident from the above table 43.8 percent (N=92) of the respondents were opined covering the are from online food delivery sites is very good followed by good (30.4%, N=64). Whereas 17.1 percent were opined Poor, 5.7 percent were opined average and 2.8 percent were opined very poor.

46.7 percent (N=98) of the respondents were opined options of well knows restaurants which is given by online food delivery sites are very good followed by good (32.3%, N=68). Whereas 12.3 percent were opined average, 6.7 percent were said poor and 1.9 percent were said very poor.

Out of the 210 respondents, 100 respondents (47.6%) were opined discounts and coupons which is given by online food delivery sites are very good, 50 respondents (23.8%) were opined good, 40 (19.04%) respondents were opined average, 20 respondents were opined poor and no one opined very poor.

It is observed from the above table 47.6 percent of the respondents were said delivery charges of the online food delivery is average followed by good (20%, N=42). Whereas 19.04% percent were opined very good, 13.3 percent were opined poor and no one opined very poor.

### **Conclusion:**

The main purpose of this study is to know the consumers perception on online food delivery sites. Because online food delivery services are getting more popular in Telangana State. These sites make people lives very easy and they can get everything as their need and mood on just in a click. The result shows that 39 percent of the respondents spent 1000 to 1500 rupees in a week on online food delivery services. The study shows Zomato and Swiggy doing very good service in Telangana that's why nearly half of the respondents said Zomato and Swiggy are the best online food delivery sites. The study also shows that online food delivery site's features like delivery, packaging, timeliness, discounts and covering the area are very good and good.

### **References:**

- Lavesh Raj (2019), Discounts offered by food delivery Apps and buying pattern of consumers, *Delhi School of Managemngt*, Retrieved from articles customers perception on online food delivery on August 18, 2022.
- Raghavendra Rao. R. (2021), A study on consumer satisfaction and perception towards food delivery services of zomato with references to Hyderabad city, *Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(3), PP-29-42 on September 02, 2022.
- Dsouza Prima Frederick, Sachin and Parappagoudar (2021), SWOC analysis of Zomato – A case of online food delivery services, *International Research Journal Technology and science*, on August 19, 2022.
- Dain Novita and NurulHusna (2020), The influence factors of consumer behavioral intention towards online food delivery services, *Journal TECHNOBIZ*, 3(2), PP-4—42.