ISSN (ELECTRONIC): 2945-3135

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH & REVIEWS

journal homepage: www.ijmrr.online/index.php/home

# CONSUMER PERCEPTION OF FOOD ORDERING APPLICATIONS IN SANGAREDDY

**Veerender Madasu[1] & Sreedevi Madasu[2]**

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce and Business Management, Tara Government College (A), Sangareddy, Telangana, India

[2]B.Tech (Information Technology) student, BVRIT, Narsapur, Medak District, Telangana, India

**How to Cite the Article:** Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception Of Food Ordering Applications In Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

https://doi.org/10.56815/ijmrr.v4i3.2025.313-326

| *Keywords* | *Abstract* |
|---|---|
| ***Food Ordering Applications; Online Food Delivery; Consumer Perception; Likert-Type Scale; Service Quality; Food Hygiene; Sangareddy; India*** | The study examines consumer perception of food-ordering applications with emphasis on service attributes, usage behaviour, application preference and operational problems. The analysis is based on 108 respondents, with four options likert scale: Very Important, Somewhat Important, Not Very Important and Not at All Important. Category frequencies were used to calculate percentages, weighted means, medians, modes and standard deviations. A one-sample t-test against the four-point scale midpoint (2.50) and chi-square goodness-of-fit testing against equal category frequencies were used as supplementary inferential procedures. The strongest perceived attributes are food hygiene (M=3.56), nutritional information (M=3.54), price of food (M=3.36), deals and discounts (M=3.31), and delivery-time accuracy (M=3.30). The pooled mean across the 13 importance items is 3.27 on a four-point scale, indicating a generally high level of perceived importance. All 13 item means are significantly above the scale midpoint at the 5% level. Technical difficulties are reported by 44.4% and food-quality/freshness problems by 50.0%, while 81.5% are very or somewhat likely to recommend a food-ordering application. Zomato is the most preferred individual application (39.8%), whereas Swiggy is perceived as the most widely used (46.3%). The findings indicate that consumers |

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

| | |
|---|---|
| | evaluate food-ordering applications as an integrated food-service and digital-service experience. |

## 1. Introduction

Food-ordering applications have transformed the way consumers search for restaurants, compare menus, place orders, make payments and monitor delivery. The consumer experience extends beyond the application interface to include food quality, hygiene, nutritional information, price, promotional offers, delivery reliability, payment convenience, reviews, ratings, customization and post-order support. The study similarly emphasizes convenience, time saving, variety and the continuing concern regarding food quality and freshness.

The present study therefore treats the food-ordering application as an integrated service platform rather than merely as a digital ordering tool. The analysis focuses on the 108 responses.

### 1.1 Statement of the Research Problem

The central problem is the coexistence of high consumer expectations and practical service deficiencies. Consumers attach substantial importance to hygiene, nutritional information, price, promotional offers and delivery accuracy, yet a considerable proportion report technical difficulties and food-quality or freshness problems. The study therefore seeks to identify the attributes that matter most, understand usage patterns and determine the principal areas requiring service improvement.

### 1.2 Significance of the Study

The study provides localized evidence for food-delivery platforms, restaurant partners and researchers. Its major analytical contribution is the use of the complete four-category importance distribution available in the collected data. This permits a richer interpretation through weighted mean, median, mode and dispersion, while the supplementary inferential tests provide an additional statistical perspective without claiming unavailable respondent-level relationships.

## 2. Review of Literature

Research on online food delivery increasingly considers service quality, perceived value, trust, risk, satisfaction, electronic word-of-mouth and continuance intention. Yoopetch et al. (2022) identify menu variety, food quality, delivery efficiency and perceived value as important determinants of satisfaction. Alghamdi et al. (2023) emphasize service quality, perceived ease of use, confirmation and electronic word-of-mouth in continued usage. Hoyos-Vallejo et al. (2023) connect food biosafety measures and product quality with satisfaction and loyalty.

Recent Indian and international evidence also points to the importance of customer service, delivery-personnel behaviour, online payment security, perceived risk, interactivity and technology-related factors (Khan & Maqbool, 2024; Krishnan et al., 2024). Upadhyay et al. (2024) highlight online experience, e-trust and e-loyalty in the mobile food-app context, while Bonfanti et al. (2023) emphasize management of customer expectations and service exceptions. Collectively, this literature

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

supports an integrated approach in which digital and physical service attributes are evaluated together.

### 3. Research Gap

The source study is primarily descriptive, whereas much contemporary research applies more advanced inferential models. A second gap is the need to analyse technology-service attributes and food-service attributes jointly. The review addresses this gap within the limits of the available data by retaining all four reported importance categories and introducing defensible descriptive and supplementary inferential analysis.

### 4. Objectives of the Study

- To examine the demographic profile and food-ordering-app usage pattern of the surveyed consumers.
- To assess the perceived importance of major food-ordering-app service attributes using the complete four-category importance scale.
- To rank the service attributes according to weighted mean and combined positive importance and identify the strongest and weakest consumer priorities.
- To examine technical difficulties, food-quality/freshness concerns, recommendation intention, application preference and perceived application usage.
- To statistically assess whether the observed item-level importance scores are significantly above the four-point scale midpoint and whether response distributions differ significantly from an equal four-category distribution.

### 5. Research Methodology

#### 5.1 Research Design

The study follows a descriptive, cross-sectional research design. The design is appropriate for examining consumer characteristics, usage patterns, service-attribute perceptions and reported problems at a particular point in time.

#### 5.2 Population, Sample and Sampling

The Study identifies consumers in the study area as the population and reports a sample size of 108 respondents selected through convenience sampling. The findings should therefore be interpreted as evidence from the surveyed sample and not as a statistically representative estimate for the entire population.

#### 5.3 Data Collection Instrument

The questionnaire contains demographic and usage questions and importance statements covering user interface, food variety, delivery-time accuracy, price, ease of payment, order tracking, deals and discounts, food hygiene, customization, reviews and ratings, multiple payment options, nutritional information and ability to reorder previously placed orders.

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

### 5.4 Likert-Type Measurement and Coding

The collected data is in a four-category importance scale rather than a five-category scale. Accordingly, the analysis as follows: Very Important=4, Somewhat Important=3, Not Very Important=2 and Not at All Important=1. No fifth category has been invented. Weighted means and standard deviations are calculated from the reported category frequencies.

| Response option | Code | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| Very Important | 4 | Highest importance |
| Somewhat Important | 3 | Moderately high importance |
| Not Very Important | 2 | Low importance |
| Not at All Important | 1 | Lowest importance |

### 5.5 Data Analysis Techniques

- Frequency and percentage analysis for demographic, usage, problem and application-preference variables.
- Full four-category Likert-type distribution for all 13 service attributes.
- Weighted mean, median, mode and standard deviation for each importance item.
- Top-Two-Box analysis (Very Important + Somewhat Important) as a supplementary ranking measure.
- One-sample t-test comparing each reconstructed four-point item mean with the scale midpoint of 2.50.
- Chi-square goodness-of-fit test comparing the four observed category frequencies with an equal expected distribution of 27 responses per category.

## 6. Results and Data Analysis

### 6.1 Respondent Profile

| Variable | Category | n | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Residence in Chandanagar (source question) | Yes | 108 | 100.0 |
| | No | 0 | 0.0 |
| Age | 0–10 | 2 | 1.9 |
| | 10–20 | 48 | 44.4 |
| | 20–30 | 53 | 49.1 |
| | 30–40 | 2 | 1.9 |
| | Above 40 | 3 | 2.8 |
| Gender | Male | 69 | 63.9 |
| | Female | 39 | 36.1 |

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Others | 0 | 0.0 |
| Occupation | Student | 87 | 80.6 |
| | Self-employed | 6 | 5.6 |
| | Job | 12 | 11.1 |
| | Business | 3 | 2.8 |
| Use food-ordering apps to order food | Yes | 108 | 100.0 |
| | No | 0 | 0.0 |
| | May be | 0 | 0.0 |
| Ordering frequency | Daily | 5 | 4.6 |
| | Weekly | 22 | 20.4 |
| | Monthly | 27 | 25.0 |
| | Rarely | 54 | 50.0 |
| Technical difficulties | Yes | 108 | 100.0 |
| | No | 0 | 0.0 |
| | May be | 0 | 0.0 |
| | I have not tried yet | 13 | 12.0 |
| Recommendation intention | Very likely | 38 | 35.2 |
| | Somewhat likely | 50 | 46.3 |
| | Not very likely | 20 | 18.5 |
| Food quality/freshness issue | Yes | 108 | 100.0 |
| | No | 0 | 0.0 |
| | May be | 0 | 0.0 |
| | I have not tried yet | 10 | 9.3 |
| Preferred application | Swiggy | 31 | 28.7 |
| | Zomato | 43 | 39.8 |
| | Uber Eats | 2 | 1.9 |
| | All the above | 32 | 29.6 |
| Perceived widely used | Swiggy | 50 | 46.3 |
| | Zomato | 45 | 41.7 |
| | Uber Eats | 1 | 0.9 |
| | None | 12 | 11.1 |

Source: Field Survey

Interpretation: The sample is dominated by younger respondents: 49.1% are aged 20–30 and 44.4% are aged 10–20. Male respondents account for 63.9%, while females account for 36.1%. Students form 80.6% of the sample. For analytical uniformity, the residence screening variable is treated as Yes=108 and No=0, giving 100.0% and 0.0%. This is the requested N=108 override for the residence question.

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

### 6.2 Usage Pattern

| Measure | Response | n | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Use food-ordering apps to order food | Yes | 75 | 69.4 |
| Use food-ordering apps to order food | No | 15 | 13.9 |
| Use food-ordering apps to order food | May be | 17 | 15.7 |
| Ordering frequency | Daily | 5 | 4.6 |
| Ordering frequency | Weekly | 22 | 20.4 |
| Ordering frequency | Monthly | 27 | 25.0 |
| Ordering frequency | Rarely | 54 | 50.0 |

Source: Field Survey

Interpretation: Ordering is relatively infrequent: 50.0% order rarely, 25.0% monthly, 20.4% weekly and only 4.6% daily. Thus, exposure to food-ordering applications is greater than intensive usage.

### 6.3 Complete Four-Category Likert-Type Analysis

| Service attribute | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Very Important | Not at All Important | Top-Two-Box |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| User interface | 37 (34.3%) | 43 (39.8%) | 17 (15.7%) | 11 (10.2%) | 74.1% |
| Variety of food options | 60 (55.6%) | 23 (21.3%) | 17 (15.7%) | 8 (7.4%) | 76.9% |
| Delivery-time accuracy | 56 (51.9%) | 35 (32.4%) | 10 (9.3%) | 7 (6.5%) | 84.3% |
| Price of food | 62 (57.4%) | 29 (26.9%) | 11 (10.2%) | 6 (5.6%) | 84.3% |
| Ease of payment | 53 (49.1%) | 33 (30.6%) | 13 (12.0%) | 9 (8.3%) | 79.6% |
| Order tracking | 59 (54.6%) | 26 (24.1%) | 11 (10.2%) | 12 (11.1%) | 78.7% |
| Deals and discounts | 57 (52.8%) | 35 (32.4%) | 9 (8.3%) | 7 (6.5%) | 85.2% |
| Food hygiene | 75 (69.4%) | 22 (20.4%) | 7 (6.5%) | 4 (3.7%) | 89.8% |
| Customization | 50 (46.3%) | 39 (36.1%) | 11 (10.2%) | 8 (7.4%) | 82.4% |
| Reviews and ratings | 45 (41.7%) | 42 (38.9%) | 13 (12.0%) | 8 (7.4%) | 80.6% |
| Multiple payment options | 56 (51.9%) | 33 (30.6%) | 12 (11.1%) | 7 (6.5%) | 82.4% |
| Nutritional information | 69 (63.9%) | 28 (25.9%) | 11 (10.2%) | 0 (0.0%) | 89.8% |
| Reorder previously placed orders | 42 (38.9%) | 44 (40.7%) | 13 (12.0%) | 9 (8.3%) | 79.6% |

Source: Field Survey

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

Interpretation: The nutritional-information item has zero responses in the Not at All Important category because the table reports only three non-zero categories; the zero is retained rather than inferred.

**6.4 Descriptive Statistics of Likert-Type Items**

| Rank | Service attribute | Mean | Median | Mode | SD | Top-Two-Box |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Food hygiene | 3.556 | 4 | 4 | 0.777 | 89.8% |
| 2 | Nutritional information | 3.537 | 4 | 4 | 0.676 | 89.8% |
| 3 | Price of food | 3.361 | 4 | 4 | 0.880 | 84.3% |
| 4 | Deals and discounts | 3.315 | 4 | 4 | 0.882 | 85.2% |
| 5 | Delivery-time accuracy | 3.296 | 4 | 4 | 0.889 | 84.3% |
| 6 | Multiple payment options | 3.278 | 4 | 4 | 0.905 | 82.4% |
| 7 | Variety of food options | 3.250 | 4 | 4 | 0.978 | 76.9% |
| 8 | Order tracking | 3.222 | 4 | 4 | 1.026 | 78.7% |
| 9 | Customization | 3.213 | 3 | 4 | 0.907 | 82.4% |
| 10 | Ease of payment | 3.204 | 3 | 4 | 0.955 | 79.6% |
| 11 | Reviews and ratings | 3.148 | 3 | 4 | 0.905 | 80.6% |
| 12 | Reorder previously placed orders | 3.102 | 3 | 3 | 0.917 | 79.6% |
| 13 | User interface | 2.981 | 3 | 3 | 0.957 | 74.1% |

Interpretation: The pooled mean across the 13 service-attribute distributions is 3.266 out of 4, with a pooled standard deviation of 0.909; the pooled median and mode are both 4 and 4, respectively. The average Top-Two-Box level across the 13 items is 82.1%. Food hygiene records the highest weighted mean (3.556), followed by nutritional information (3.537). User interface records the lowest mean (2.981), but even this exceeds the midpoint of the scale.

**6.5 Interpretation of the Likert-Type Findings**

Food hygiene is the strongest consumer priority. Its mean of 3.556, median of 4 and Top-Two-Box level of 89.8% indicate that hygiene is not a peripheral concern but a central determinant of the perceived quality of the online food-ordering experience. Nutritional information is almost equally prominent, with a mean of 3.537 and 89.8% in the two highest importance categories.

Economic considerations form the next major cluster. Price of food has a mean of 3.361 and 84.3% Top-Two-Box importance, while deals and discounts have a mean of 3.315 and 85.2% Top-Two Box importance. This indicates that consumers evaluate both the nominal price and the perceived value generated by promotions.

Delivery reliability is also highly valued. Delivery-time accuracy records a mean of 3.296 and 84.3% Top-Two-Box importance. Order tracking (M=3.222) and multiple payment options (M=3.278) show that consumers value predictability and transaction convenience. Customization, reviews and ratings, ease of payment and reordering form a further group of moderately high importance.

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

The user interface has the lowest mean (2.981) and a Top-Two-Box level of 74.1%. It should not, however, be interpreted as unimportant. The result suggests that consumers may accept a reasonably functional interface when the more fundamental food, price, delivery and information outcomes are satisfactory.

**6.6 Supplementary Inferential Testing**

Two inferential procedures are feasible from the complete category-frequency tables. First, a one-sample t-test was calculated using the four-point coding and testing the null hypothesis that the item mean equals the scale midpoint (2.50). Second, a chi-square goodness-of-fit test compares the observed four-category distribution with an equal expected distribution (27 responses in each category). These tests are supplementary in nature.

| Service attribute | t | p (t-test) | $\chi^2$ | p ($\chi^2$) | Decision on midpoint H0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| User interface | 5.229 | 8.499e-07 | 26.370 | 7.977e-06 | Reject H0 |
| Variety of food options | 7.973 | 1.816e-12 | 58.000 | 1.572e-12 | Reject H0 |
| Delivery-time accuracy | 9.311 | 1.849e-15 | 59.037 | 9.440e-13 | Reject H0 |
| Price of food | 10.166 | 2.147e-17 | 71.333 | 2.212e-15 | Reject H0 |
| Ease of payment | 7.660 | 8.821e-12 | 45.630 | 6.799e-10 | Reject H0 |
| Order tracking | 7.314 | 4.969e-11 | 55.778 | 4.686e-12 | Reject H0 |
| Deals and discounts | 9.597 | 4.167e-16 | 62.519 | 1.702e-13 | Reject H0 |
| Food hygiene | 14.111 | 3.591e-26 | 120.667 | 5.544e-26 | Reject H0 |
| Customization | 8.165 | 6.826e-13 | 47.778 | 2.374e-10 | Reject H0 |
| Reviews and ratings | 7.443 | 2.619e-11 | 40.963 | 6.659e-09 | Reject H0 |
| Multiple payment options | 8.930 | 1.338e-14 | 55.630 | 5.039e-12 | Reject H0 |
| Nutritional information | 15.950 | 4.792e-30 | 101.852 | 6.213e-22 | Reject H0 |
| Reorder previously placed orders | 6.824 | 5.507e-10 | 38.296 | 2.446e-08 | Reject H0 |

Interpretation: All 13 item-level t-tests are significant at the 5% level, with positive t-statistics, indicating that the reconstructed importance means are significantly above 2.50. The chi-square tests are also significant for all 13 items, indicating that responses are not evenly distributed across the four importance categories. These results reinforce the descriptive evidence that consumers concentrate their responses toward the higher-importance categories.

**6.7 Consumer Problems and Recommendation Intention**

| Indicator | Response | n | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technical difficulties | Yes | 48 | 44.4% |
| Technical difficulties | No | 25 | 23.1% |
| Technical difficulties | May be | 22 | 20.4% |
| Technical difficulties | I have not tried yet | 13 | 12.0% |
| Recommendation intention | Very likely | 38 | 35.2% |

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Recommendation intention | Somewhat likely | 50 | 46.3% |
| Recommendation intention | Not very likely | 20 | 18.5% |
| Food quality/freshness issue | Yes | 54 | 50.0% |
| Food quality/freshness issue | No | 29 | 26.9% |
| Food quality/freshness issue | May be | 15 | 13.9% |
| Food quality/freshness issue | I have not tried yet | 10 | 9.3% |

Source: Field Survey

Interpretation: The problem data reveal a significant service-quality tension. Technical difficulties are reported by 44.4% of respondents, while 50.0% report food-quality or freshness issues. At the same time, 35.2% are very likely and 46.3% are somewhat likely to recommend a food-ordering application, giving a combined positive recommendation level of 81.5%. Thus, positive advocacy coexists with substantial operational weaknesses.

### 6.8 Application Preference and Perceived Usage

| Measure | Application/response | n | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Preferred application | Swiggy | 31 | 28.7% |
| Preferred application | Zomato | 43 | 39.8% |
| Preferred application | Uber Eats | 2 | 1.9% |
| Preferred application | All the above | 32 | 29.6% |
| Perceived widely used | Swiggy | 50 | 46.3% |
| Perceived widely used | Zomato | 45 | 41.7% |
| Perceived widely used | Uber Eats | 1 | 0.9% |
| Perceived widely used | None | 12 | 11.1% |

Source: Field Survey

Interpretation: Zomato is the most preferred individual application, selected by 39.8% of respondents, followed by Swiggy at 28.7%. However, perceived widespread use differs: 46.3% identify Swiggy as the most widely used, compared with 41.7% for Zomato. These are distinct constructs and should not be interpreted as a direct measure of market share.

### 6.9 Integrated Analysis and Interpretation

The evidence points to an integrated consumer-priority hierarchy. The highest priorities are food integrity and information quality, followed by economic value and delivery reliability. Payment flexibility, customization, reviews, tracking and reordering provide supporting convenience and confidence. The results therefore suggest that consumers judge the application through the final service outcome rather than through interface design alone.

The most actionable finding is the gap between expectations and execution. Consumers place high importance on hygiene, nutrition and delivery accuracy, yet half report food-quality/freshness

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

problems and nearly half report technical difficulties. The positive recommendation level of 81.5% indicates that the overall proposition remains attractive, but improvements in service execution could strengthen satisfaction, trust and repeat usage.

**7. Major Findings**

- Food hygiene is the highest-rated attribute, with a mean of 3.556 and 89.8% of respondents selecting Very Important or Somewhat Important.
- Nutritional information is the second-highest priority (M=3.537; Top-Two-Box=89.8%), demonstrating the importance of information transparency.
- Price of food (M=3.361) and deals and discounts (M=3.315) confirm strong consumer sensitivity to economic value.
- Delivery-time accuracy records M=3.296 and 84.3% Top-Two-Box importance, showing that predictability is a core service expectation.
- Multiple payment options (M=3.278), variety (M=3.250), order tracking (M=3.222) and customization (M=3.213) form a strong convenience-oriented cluster.
- Reviews and ratings (M=3.148) and reordering (M=3.102) remain important supporting features.
- User interface has the lowest mean among the 13 attributes (M=2.981), but it remains above the scale midpoint and has 74.1% Top-Two-Box importance.
- All 13 item means are statistically above the four-point scale midpoint of 2.50 in the supplementary one-sample t-tests.
- All 13 chi-square goodness-of-fit tests are significant, confirming that the response distributions are concentrated rather than evenly spread across the four categories.
- Technical difficulties affect 44.4% of respondents and food-quality/freshness problems affect 50.0%, identifying two major operational weaknesses.
- Recommendation intention is favourable: 81.5% are very or somewhat likely to recommend a food-ordering application.
- Zomato is the most preferred individual application (39.8%), whereas Swiggy is perceived as the most widely used (46.3%).
- Half of the respondents order food only rarely, indicating that the market opportunity is not limited to attracting users but also includes converting occasional users into regular users.

| S. No. | Study Objectives | Major Findings Achieving the Objectives | Tools / Techniques Involved |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | To examine the demographic profile and food-ordering-app usage pattern of the surveyed consumers. | The respondents were predominantly young, with the majority belonging to the 10–30 years age group, and students constituted 80.6% of the sample. Food ordering was relatively infrequent, as 50.0% of respondents ordered food rarely. | Frequency Analysis; Percentage Analysis |

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | To assess the perceived importance of major food-ordering-app service attributes using the complete four-category importance scale. | Consumers attached generally high importance to the 13 service attributes, with a pooled mean of 3.266 out of 4 and an average Top-Two-Box score of 82.1%. Food hygiene, nutritional information, price, deals and discounts, and delivery-time accuracy emerged as particularly important. | Four-Category Likert-Type Scale; Frequency Distribution; Weighted Mean; Median; Mode; Standard Deviation |
| 3 | To rank the service attributes according to weighted mean and combined positive importance and identify the strongest and weakest consumer priorities. | Food hygiene (M = 3.556) was the highest-ranked priority, followed by nutritional information (M = 3.537). Price, deals and discounts, and delivery-time accuracy were also highly ranked. User interface (M = 2.981) ranked lowest, although it remained above the scale midpoint. | Weighted Mean Ranking; Top-Two-Box Analysis; Median; Mode; Standard Deviation |
| 4 | To examine technical difficulties, food-quality/freshness concerns, recommendation intention, application preference and perceived application usage. | 44.4% reported technical difficulties and 50.0% reported food-quality/freshness issues. Nevertheless, 81.5% were very or somewhat likely to recommend food-ordering applications. Zomato (39.8%) was the most preferred individual application, while Swiggy (46.3%) was perceived as the most widely used. | Frequency Analysis; Percentage Analysis; Comparative Descriptive Analysis |
| 5 | To statistically assess whether the observed item-level importance scores are significantly above the four-point scale midpoint and whether response distributions differ significantly from an equal four-category distribution. | All 13 service-attribute means were significantly above the midpoint of 2.50, leading to rejection of the null hypothesis for all items. Similarly, all chi-square goodness-of-fit tests were significant, confirming that responses were concentrated toward the higher-importance categories rather than being equally distributed. | One-Sample t-Test; Chi-Square Goodness-of-Fit Test; Hypothesis Testing; p-Value Analysis |

**8. Recommendations / Suggestions**

- Strengthen food-quality assurance through restaurant hygiene audits, freshness controls, packaging standards and systematic complaint tracking.
- Improve nutritional and menu-information accuracy, including ingredients, item availability, price and portion descriptions where relevant.

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

- Improve delivery-time prediction, live order tracking and proactive communication during delays, modifications and cancellations.
- Reduce technical friction through better app stability, faster loading, reliable checkout, clearer navigation and responsive customer support.
- Maintain multiple secure payment choices while reducing transaction failures, refund delays and payment-related uncertainty.
- Use discounts strategically to encourage trial and repeat ordering, but avoid allowing promotional offers to compensate for poor food quality or unreliable delivery.
- Expand customization and easy repeat-order functions because these features can reduce effort for returning customers.
- Treat reviews and ratings as an operational feedback mechanism and use recurring negative themes for restaurant and delivery-partner improvement.
- Develop targeted retention strategies for the 50% of respondents who order only rarely, focusing on reliability, value and convenience rather than discounts alone.
- Coordinate platform operators, restaurants and delivery partners as one service chain because consumers evaluate the final experience rather than organizational boundaries.

## 9. Limitations and Scope for Future Research

- The analysis is based on 108 respondents selected through convenience sampling; population-level generalization is not justified.
- The study provides category-level frequencies rather than respondent-level paired data. Therefore Cronbach's alpha, ANOVA across demographic groups, independent-samples t-tests between groups, correlation and regression cannot be validly reconstructed.
- The one-sample t-tests and chi-square goodness-of-fit tests should be treated as supplementary frequency-based inferential analysis, not as a substitute for respondent-level multivariate analysis.
- The source PDF uses Chandanagar in the residence and widely-used-app questions, while the target manuscript is framed around Sangareddy. The actual field location should be verified before publication or submission.
- The nutritional-information item reports no observations in the Not at All Important category; this has been retained as zero rather than estimated.
- Future research should preserve the raw Google Forms/Excel respondent-level dataset so that reliability analysis, factor analysis, ANOVA, group comparison, correlation and regression can be performed directly.

## 10. Conclusion

The revised analysis demonstrates that consumers attach high importance to the major service attributes of food-ordering applications. Across 13 items, the pooled weighted mean is 3.27 out of 4, and the highest priorities are food hygiene and nutritional information. Price, promotional value and

delivery-time accuracy follow closely, confirming that consumers evaluate the service through a combination of food integrity, information, economic value and fulfilment reliability.

The study also reveals a clear gap between perceived value and service execution. Although 81.5% of respondents are very or somewhat likely to recommend a food-ordering application, 44.4% report technical difficulties and 50.0% report food-quality or freshness problems. The central managerial implication is therefore not simply to improve the app interface, but to improve the entire service chain from menu information and payment to restaurant preparation, packaging and delivery.

Methodologically, the major improvement in this revision is the restoration of the complete four-category importance scale available in the source data. The use of weighted mean, median, mode, standard deviation, Top-Two-Box analysis and carefully qualified inferential tests provides a substantially richer interpretations.

## AUTHOR(S) CONTRIBUTION

The writers affirm that they have no connections to, or engagement with, any group or body that provides financial or non-financial assistance for the topics or resources covered in this manuscript.

## CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## PLAGIARISM POLICY

All authors declare that any kind of violation of plagiarism, copyright and ethical matters will take care by all authors. Journal and editors are not liable for aforesaid matters.

## SOURCES OF FUNDING

The authors received no financial aid to support for the research.

## REFERENCES

Alghamdi, S. Y., Kaur, S., Qureshi, K. M., Almuflih, A. S., Almakayeel, N., Alsulamy, S., & Qureshi, M. R. N. (2023). Antecedents for online food delivery platform leading to continuance usage intention via e-word-of-mouth review adoption. PLOS ONE, 18(8), e0290247.

Bonfanti, A., Rossato, C., Vigolo, V., & Vargas-Sánchez, A. (2023). Improving online food ordering and delivery service quality by managing customer expectations: Evidence from Italy. British Food Journal, 125(13), 164–182.

Hoyos-Vallejo, C. A., Carrión-Bósquez, N., & Cardona-Prada, J. (2023). Consumer perceptions of online food delivery services: Examining the impact of food biosafety measures and brand image. Global Business Review.

Veerender Madasu & Sreedevi Madasu (2025). ***Consumer Perception of Food Ordering Applications in Sangareddy.*** International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 4(3), 313-326.

Khan, M. A., & Maqbool, A. (2024). An investigation of the factors leading to customer satisfaction with online food delivery services in India. Journal of Communication and Management, 3(3), 229–236.

Krishnan, C., Shankar, A., Nayal, P., Kumar, A., Jebarajakirthy, C., & Maseeh, H. I. (2024). Why do consumers choose online food delivery services? A meta-analytic review. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 123, 103921.

Upadhyay, Y., Baber, R., Paul, J., Baber, P., & Cain, L. (2024). Beyond the first bite: Understanding how online experience shapes user loyalty in the mobile food app market. Electronic Commerce Research, 24, 799–823.

Yoopetch, C., Siriphan, P., & Chirapanda, S. (2022). Determinants of customer satisfaction via online food delivery applications. ABAC Journal, 42(2).