International Journal of Current Advanced Research

ISSN: O: 2319-6475, ISSN: P: 2319-6505, Impact Factor: 6.614 Available Online at www.journalijcar.org Volume 10; Issue 05 (A); May 2021; Page No.24311-24314 DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijcar.2021.24314.4821



FOODPANDA APPLICATION USERS' BEHAVIOURS WITH FOOD DELIVERY SERVICE

Veerawan Pinchumpholsang¹, Bundit Anuyahong² and Wipanee Pengnate³

¹Business Administration (Managment), Faculty of Business Administration, Rajamangala University of Technology Rattanakosin, Wang Klai Kangwon Campus Prachup Kirikhan, Thailand ^{2,3}English Department, College of General Education and Languages, Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology Bangkok, Thailand

ARTICLE INFO

Article History: Received 6th February, 2021 Received in revised form 15th March, 2021 Accepted 12th April, 2021 Published online 28th May, 2021

Key words:

Foodpanda Service, Foodpanda Service in Prachuap kirikhan province, Foodpanda Application, Foodpanda Delivery Service, Consumer Behaviours, Consumer Satisfaction

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this research were 1) to study and compare Foodpanda application users' behaviours with food delivery service in Prachuap kirikhan province, and 2) to study and compare Foodpanda application users' satisfaction with food delivery service in Prachuap kirikhan province. The research samples were 350 locals in Prachuap kirikhan province who used Foodpanda delivery service derived through Simple Random Sampling technique. The instruments used for collecting the data were the rating-scale and openended questionnaire. Frequency, Mean scores, Standard Deviation and F-Test were used for data analysis. The findings were: 1) the highest rank of the respondents chose Savoury Product (10.29%), Taste (9.98%), Hot product type (9.87%), Box packaging (10.60%), More than 61 Baht for price (10.16%), 26-50 Baht for discount (10.43%), and 11-20 Bath for delivery charge (10.91%); and 2) the satisfaction of Foodpanda application users was at a high level ($\bar{x} = 6.54$).

Copyright©2021 Veerawan Pinchumpholsang et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

The worldwide food delivery market stands at €83 billion, or 4 percent of food sold through restaurants and fast food chains. The most common form of delivery about 90 percent is still the tradition model which the consumers directly place order to restaurant, and most of those orders about 75 percent are still placed by phone. Nevertheless, as in so many other industries, the market was reshaped due to the rise of digital technology. Consumers are habituated to online shopping via websites or applications that provide utmost transparency and convenience. The business of delivering restaurants meals is undergoing rapid change as the coming of new online service platforms which is online On-demand food delivery (Hirschberg, et al., 2016). On-demand food delivery are online services that can be accessed through applications or web portals. On-demand food delivery services partner with local restaurants both full service restaurants (FSRs) and quick service restaurants (QSRs) for food delivery. The service has simplified customers' life by providing all the vital information to make an order at one stop in the applications which includes menu, price list, estimated time of delivery, hours of operation and so on.

In addition, some of applications simply allow the users tracking the location in real time to know the whereabouts of their order and allow to use mobile payment.

The global online On-demand food delivery services will grow at compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 31.76% in year 2017 – 2021. America represents the largest market share more than 40% due to the presence of many players and the high smartphone penetration facilitating the increasing demand for this market. During the forecast period Asia-pacific will grow at a CAGR of 32.61% faster pace than Europe, the Middle East and Africa (Technavio, 2017). China market registered fast growth due to young Chinese the most active users are increasingly ordering food online. The market hit 31.9 billion U.S. dollars in 2017 or about 27% growth over the previous year. Jiang Junxian, director of the China Cuisine Association (CCA) released that the online food delivery market has seen rapid expansion (Liangyu, 2018).

The home food delivery business in Thailand originally started by small local food entrepreneurs, serving Thai daily meal around the neighborhood with monthly price package. The first national food delivery service is provided by fast food chain companies, serving affordable western food like Pizza Hut. As a convenient and timesaving choice, delivery food has been increasing in popularity over the past several decades. Although some local restaurants also offer delivery food, it is

^{*}Corresponding author: Veerawan Pinchumpholsang Business Administration (Managment), Faculty of Business Administration, Rajamangala University of Technology Rattanakosin, Wang Klai Kangwon Campus Prachup Kirikhan, Thailand

only an additional service to increase customer satisfaction, not the main core services or source of revenue. Food delivery service has increased in popularity in Thailand due to its convenience, cost and time saving. Consumers order delivery foods to enjoy the comfort of dinning at their home or office and leverage their time from their hectic schedule. According to a report from the National Food Institution of Thailand, 2015, the market size of food delivery business in Thailand is around \$700 million US dollar, with 3.3% growth rate. The existing numbers of food restaurants that offer delivery service are 3,720 outlets. 92% of these outlets are fragmented and owned by Thai SMEs, accounted for 70% of market value. Most of small delivery food service providers tend to have only online store and be specialize in particular food categories such as seafood, healthy or gourmet. While the rest outlets (8%) are owned by only three food chained companies which own popular many popular brands such as Pizza Hut, The Pizza Company, Oishi, acquire market share up to 30% of market value (Setthethorn, 2011).

Research Purposes

The purposes of this study were:

- 1. To study and compare Foodpanda application users' behaviours with food delivery service in Prachuap kirikhan province, and
- 2. To study and compare Foodpanda application users' satisfaction with food delivery service in Prachuap kirikhan province.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study focused on Foodpanda application users' behaviours with food delivery service which consists of the research samplings of 350 locals in Prachuap kirikhan province derived through Simple Random Sampling technique.

The instruments used for gathering the data were the ratingscale and open-ended questionnaire based on Foodpanda application users' behaviours with food delivery service according to Product, Taste, Product Type, Packaging, Price, Discount and Delivery Charge. The levels of Foodpanda application users' behaviours with food delivery service in Prachuap kirikhan province were used in the questionnaire were ranked as "The highest level", "High level", "Moderate level", "Low level", and "The lowest level". Responses from the questionnaires were subsequently coded. The data of the respondents' coded responses were statistically calculated and analysed. The collected data was analyzed using a computer program. The statistics used for analyzing the data were Frequency, Mean scores, Standard Deviation, and F-Test.

RESULTS

| Product | n | Meet the Requirement | Unmet the Requirement | Appropriate price | Inappropriate price | Fast delivery | Slow delivery | Total (positive) | Total (negative) |
|----------|-----|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Savory | 241 | 10.29 | 5.74 | 8.78 | 2.65 | 5.38 | 2.18 | 7.6417 | 3.5242 |
| Dessert | 50 | 12.96 | 4.46 | 10.76 | 3.68 | 4.20 | 2.06 | 10.0725 | 4.0667 |
| Beverage | 59 | 11.54 | 3.97 | 8.59 | 2.15 | 3.80 | 2.05 | 8.3305 | 2.7232 |
| F-Test | | 4.344*** | 3.825*** | 1.013 | 8.538*** | 5.903*** | .294 | 8.683*** | 5.189*** |
| Sig | | 0.014 | 0.023 | 0.364 | 0.000 | 0.003 | 0.745 | 0.000 | 0.006 |

Table 1 Results of Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Product

Table 1 showed that Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Product had statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in Meet the Requirement, Unmet the Requirement, Inappropriate price, Fast delivery, Total (positive) and Total (negative).

| Table 2 Results of Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Taste |
|--|
|--|

| Taste | n | Meet the Requirement | Unmet the Requirement | Appropriate price | Inappropriate price | Fast delivery | Slow delivery | Total (positive) | Total (negative) |
|--------|-----|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Sour | 38 | 9.97 | 6.84 | 7.63 | 3.18 | 4.74 | 1.71 | 7.16 | 3.91 |
| Sweet | 65 | 13.75 | 7.25 | 10.14 | 3.28 | 3.48 | 1.91 | 9.33 | 4.14 |
| Salty | 17 | 12.00 | 6.76 | 8.06 | 2.88 | 3.06 | 1.94 | 6.92 | 3.86 |
| Spicy | 24 | 11.54 | 6.33 | 10.00 | 4.08 | 3.29 | 1.88 | 8.16 | 4.10 |
| Normal | 206 | 9.98 | 4.57 | 8.91 | 2.28 | 5.79 | 2.34 | 7.98 | 3.06 |
| F-Test | | 5.277*** | 4.833*** | .561 | 7.570*** | 8.604*** | 2.644** | 2.701** | 4.233*** |
| Sig | | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.691 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.034 | 0.031 | 0.002 |

Table 2 showed that Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Taste had statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in Meet the Requirement, Unmet the Requirement, Inappropriate price, Fast delivery, Slow delivery, Total (positive) and Total (negative).

| Table 3 Results of Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Product Type | Table 3 | Results of Foodpand | a application users | ' behaviours and | d satisfaction in Product Type |
|--|---------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
|--|---------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|

| Product Type | n | Meet the Requirement | Unmet the Requirement | Appropriate price | Inappropriate price | Fast delivery | Slow delivery | Total (positive) | Total (negative) |
|-----------------|-----|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| N/A | 114 | 11.33 | 7.23 | 8.76 | 3.51 | 4.53 | 1.77 | 8.20 | 4.17 |
| Hot | 170 | 9.87 | 4.43 | 9.04 | 2.15 | 5.62 | 2.45 | 7.90 | 3.01 |
| Cold | 41 | 13.76 | 7.15 | 9.90 | 3.27 | 3.15 | 2.22 | 8.57 | 4.21 |
| Frappe' | 25 | 11.04 | 2.80 | 8.76 | 2.00 | 5.16 | 1.60 | 8.29 | 2.13 |
| F-Test | | 4.849*** | 11.438*** | 0.157 | 13.803*** | 6.157*** | 6.691*** | 0.395 | 11.355*** |
| Sig | | 0.003 | 0.000 | 0.925 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.756 | 0.000 |

Table 3 showed that Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Product Type had statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in Meet the Requirement, Unmet the Requirement, Inappropriate price, Fast delivery, Slow delivery, Total (positive) and Total (negative).

| | | | 1 | 11 | | | | 0 0 | |
|-----------|-----|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Packaging | n | Meet the Requirement | Unmet the Requirement | Appropriate price | Inappropriate price | Fast deliverv | Slow delivery | Total (positive) | Total (negative) |
| | | | | | | | | u / | |
| Bag | 67 | 11.19 | 6.67 | 10.12 | 3.78 | 4.67 | 3.16 | 8.69 | 4.54 |
| Box | 223 | 10.60 | 5.52 | 8.76 | 2.52 | 5.41 | 1.83 | 7.87 | 3.29 |
| Glass | 60 | 11.60 | 4.35 | 8.83 | 2.25 | 3.50 | 2.18 | 8.34 | 2.93 |
| F-Test | | 0.722 | 3.291** | 0.565 | 12.786*** | 7.060*** | 25.460*** | 1.29 | 10.517*** |
| Sig | | 0.487 | 0.038 | 0.569 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.276 | 0.000 |

Table 4 showed that Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Packaging had statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in Unmet the Requirement, Inappropriate price, Fast delivery, Slow delivery and Total (negative).

Table 5 Results of Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Price

| Price (Baht) | n | Meet the Requirement | Unmet the Requirement | Appropriate price | Inappropriate price | Fast delivery | Slow delivery | Total (positive) | Total (negative) |
|-----------------|-----|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| ≥30 | 31 | 15.00 | 5.81 | 8.03 | 2.26 | 4.29 | 2.10 | 9.41 | 3.39 |
| 31-60 | 116 | 11.05 | 4.31 | 11.28 | 2.73 | 5.15 | 1.96 | 9.03 | 3.00 |
| ≤61 | 203 | 10.16 | 6.21 | 7.90 | 2.77 | 4.93 | 2.26 | 7.38 | 3.75 |
| F-Test | | 8.689*** | 5.217*** | 5.152*** | 0.890 | 0.687 | 1.619 | 9.058*** | 4.138*** |
| Sig | | 0.000 | 0.006 | 0.006 | 0.412 | 0.504 | 0.200 | 0.000 | 0.017 |

Table 5 showed that Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Price had statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in Meet the Requirement, Unmet the Requirement, Appropriate price, Inappropriate price, Fast delivery, Slow delivery, Total (positive) and Total (negative).

| Table 6 Results of Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfad | ction in Price |
|---|----------------|
|---|----------------|

| Discount | n | Meet the Requirement | Unmet the Requirement | Appropriate price | Inappropriate price | Fast delivery | Slow delivery | Total (positive) | Total (negative) |
|----------|-----|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| ≥25 | 110 | 11.36 | 5.64 | 9.55 | 2.45 | 4.91 | 2.27 | 7.41 | 3.45 |
| 26-50 | 230 | 10.43 | 5.30 | 8.74 | 2.78 | 4.87 | 2.04 | 8.19 | 3.38 |
| ≤51 | 10 | 16.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 4.00 | 7.00 | 3.00 | 13.81 | 5.67 |
| F-Test | | 4.463*** | 4.117*** | 0.330 | 3.132** | 1.671*** | 2.798 | 13.657*** | 5.071*** |
| Sig | | 0.012 | 0.017 | 0.719 | 0.045 | 0.190 | 0.062 | 0.000 | 0.007 |

Table 6 showed that Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Discount had statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in Meet the Requirement, Unmet the Requirement, Inappropriate price, Fast delivery, Total (positive) and Total (negative).

 Table 7 Results of Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Delivery Charge

| Delivery Charge (Baht) | n | Meet the Requirement | Unmet the Requirement | Appropriate price | Inappropriate price | Fast delivery | Slow delivery | Total (positive) | Total (negative) |
|------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| ≥ 10 | 39 | 18.26 | 15.44 | 5.13 | 3.26 | 5.15 | 1.97 | 8.41 | 6.89 |
| 11-20 | 241 | 10.91 | 4.16 | 10.59 | 2.93 | 4.78 | 2.08 | 8.77 | 3.06 |
| ≤21 | 70 | 6.70 | 4.79 | 5.86 | 1.63 | 5.40 | 2.44 | 5.63 | 2.97 |
| F-Test | | 58.332*** | 154.106*** | 11.476 | 12.698** | 0.879 | 2.008*** | 19.753*** | 71.060*** |
| Sig | | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.416 | 0.136 | 0.000 | 0.000 |

Table 7 showed that Foodpanda application users' behaviours and satisfaction in Delivery Charge had statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in Meet the Requirement, Unmet the Requirement, Inappropriate price, Slow delivery, Total (positive) and Total (negative).

CONCLUSION

The findings indicated that Foodpanda application users' behaviours with food delivery service in Prachuap kirikhan province were as follows:

- 1. The highest rank of the respondents chose Savory Product (10.29%), Taste (9.98%), Hot product type (9.87%), Box packaging (10.60%), More than 61 Baht for price (10.16%), 26-50 Baht for discount (10.43%), and 11-20 Bath for delivery charge (10.91%); and
- 2. The satisfaction of Foodpanda application users was at a high level ($\bar{x} = 6.54$).

DISCUSSION

The study results showed that delivery charge was a significant predictor of satisfaction for Foodpanda delivery service. This demonstrates that Thai customers seemed to obtain satisfaction from the use of a food delivery app on the basis of price value. Therefore, increasing the level of perceived monetary benefits and the utility of food delivery apps made customers more likely to be satisfied and to adopt food delivery apps before the pandemic. A similar result was found in the mobile food-ordering app context in Alalwan (2020), where the fact that price value plays a critical role in predicting satisfaction is empirically accepted. Conversely, the finding from the during-the-COVID19-pandemic sample failed to confirm the role of price value in forming satisfaction. This indicates that Thai customers' satisfaction with the use of a food delivery app toward such app's adoption during the pandemic is less affected by price value. This may be explained by the fact that the number of COVID-19 cases is increasing every day and that the Thai customers' fear of contracting COVID-19 drives them to try to protect themselves by practicing social distancing. Using food delivery apps to purchase food items is the best way to protect oneself from contracting COVID-19 due to its user convenience and availability. Moreover, restaurants have reduced food prices during the pandemic, which creates higher levels of perceived and actual values for the user. These factors help reduce the customers' perceived cost of using food delivery apps. Therefore, customers are more likely to order their desired food items through food delivery apps regardless of the price value; their satisfaction is likely to be less affected by price value. Chotigo and Kadono (2021) also explained that Thai customers' free-of-charge access to food delivery apps, the more accessible delivery fees,

and the necessity of avoiding crowds and exposure risk during the COVID-19 pandemic reduce the importance of price value when using food delivery apps.

References

- Alalwan, A.A. 2020. Mobile food ordering apps: An empirical study of the factors affecting customer esatisfaction and continued intention to reuse. *Int. J. Inf. Manag.* 2020, 50, 28–44.
- Chotigo, J.; Kadono., Y. 2021. Are there any key factors that encourage food delivery application during the COVID-19 pandemic in Thailand and the role of HRM. Hum. Syst. Manag.
- Hirschberg, C., Rajko, A., Schumacher, T. and Wrulich, M. 2016. The changing market for food delivery. [online] McKinsey & Company. [online] Available at: https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/high-tech/ourinsights/the-changingmarket-for-food-delivery.
- Liangyu. 2018. China's food delivery market grows 23 pct in 2017 Xinhua | English.news.cn. [online] Available at: http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2018-01/21/c_13 6912829. htm.
- Setthethorn, S. 2011. Food delivery business in Thailand. 3-4. Bangkok, Thailand. Retrieved from http://fic.nfi.or.th/webtour/pdf/thfood-mkt.pdf.
- Technavio. 2017. Global Online On-Demand Food Delivery Market to Grow 32 Percent by 2021. [online] Available at: https://www.foodlogistics.com/ technology/pressrelease/20986811/global-online-ondemand-fooddeliverymarket-to-grow-32-percent-by-2021.

How to cite this article:

Veerawan Pinchumpholsang *et al* (2021) 'Foodpanda Application Users' Behaviours With Food Delivery Service', *International Journal of Current Advanced Research*, 10(05), pp. 24311-24314. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijcar.2021.24314.4821
