ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 9| September 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

A STUDY ON USER SATISFACTION WITH FOOD DELIVERY APPLICATIONS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF SERVICE QUALITY, DELIVERY PERFORMANCE AND APP USABILITY

Abhay Kumar
PES University, Bengaluru, Karnataka,India

ABSTRACT

This study examines customer satisfaction with food delivery mobile applications and its relationship with three service-encounter attributes — food freshness/quality, delivery speed, and app design/usability — and with willingness to recommend the service. Primary data came from a structured online questionnaire completed by 203 users of food delivery apps.

Overall satisfaction was significantly and positively related to food freshness/quality ($r = .249$, $p < .001$, $N = 202$) and app design/usability ($r = .182$, $p = .009$, $N = 203$); delivery speed was not significantly associated ($r = .093$, $p = .185$, $N = 203$). A multiple regression with all three standardized predictors was significant overall ($R^2 = .074$, Adjusted $R^2 = .060$, $F(3,198) = 5.29$, $p = .002$, $N = 202$), but only food freshness/quality remained a significant unique predictor ($B = .257$, $p = .003$); app usability ($p = .113$) and delivery speed ($p = .457$) did not. No multicollinearity concern was found (all VIF < 1. 4).

Satisfaction did not differ significantly across usage-frequency groups, $F(3,199) = 1.09$, $p = .355$, or customer-support-experience groups, $F(2,199) = 2.09$, $p = .126$, and was significantly related to recommendation likelihood ($r = .211$, $p = .003$, $N = 201$). Food quality (53.2%) and app interface (58.6%) were the top ordering priorities; incorrect orders (51.0%) and missing items (46.5%) were the most common complaints.

With modest explanatory power (R^2 values of .07–.25), the findings suggest food quality is the most consistent driver of satisfaction, usability plays a secondary bivariate role, and delivery speed alone does not differentiate satisfied from dissatisfied users once other factors are controlled for. The study offers platforms an evidence-based, honestly-reported foundation for prioritising food-quality and order-accuracy investments.

KEYWORDS: *Online Food Delivery; Customer Satisfaction; Mobile Application Usability; Food Quality; Delivery Speed; Recommendation Intention*

1. INTRODUCTION

With growing smartphone penetration and time-pressured urban lifestyles, online food delivery (OFD) has become a mainstream way for consumers to access restaurant meals (Kapoor & Vij, 2018). As more platforms compete for the same set of consumers, understanding what drives user satisfaction has become a central question for both researchers and operators. Prior research has examined post-adoption experience factors — app usability, food condition and timely delivery, and overall service trustworthiness (Alalwan, 2020; An, Eck & Yim, 2023) — while other studies have decomposed service quality into reliability, food-quality, system operation and traceability dimensions linked to satisfaction and reuse intention through large-scale structural modelling (Wu et al., 2024), or focused specifically on the mobile app itself — its UI/UX, navigability and ease of use — as a factor distinct from the food or delivery service (Lin, Au & Baum, 2024).

A recurring theme across this literature is that satisfaction is rarely explained by a single cause. Candidate drivers differ in relative importance depending on context and sample, and in whether they remain significant once other drivers are statistically controlled for (Dsouza et al., 2025; Chiu et al., 2024). This study also touches on the broader chain linking satisfaction to continuance intention, loyalty and word-of-mouth recommendation examined in prior literature (Alghamdi et al., 2023; Siddiqi et al., 2024), though it is not typically captured there as a single, directly tested measure.

The present study extends this line of research by examining three service-encounter attributes — food freshness/quality, delivery speed, and app design/usability — in a direct test of their relationship to a single-item measure of overall satisfaction, and by testing whether overall satisfaction relates to recommendation likelihood, in a real primary sample of 203 food delivery app users. It deliberately adopts a smaller set of directly interpretable measures and classical correlation, regression and ANOVA analysis rather than a large validated multi-item scale analysed through structural equation modelling, as several cited studies do — focusing on what the underlying data can support, and reporting all results, including those that are not significant.

Problem Statement: Platforms regularly invest in faster delivery, revamped interfaces and stronger customer support, without always knowing which investment best correlates with user satisfaction, or whether satisfaction translates into recommendation behaviour. This study addresses two questions: (a) how are food freshness/quality, delivery speed, and app usability related to, and jointly predictive of, overall satisfaction;

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 9| September 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

and (b) does overall satisfaction relate to recommendation intention, usage frequency, and customer-support experience?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Ten studies inform this research, summarised in Table 1 below.

Study	Sample / Method	Key Finding
Alalwan (2020)	UTAUT2-based survey	Hedonic motivation, price value, performance expectancy and review/rating/tracking features drive e-satisfaction and reuse.
Goh, Tiep & Er (2021)	N=200, regression	Website quality and convenience predicted satisfaction; service quality and price did not.
Cheng, Chang & Chen (2021)	OFD-SERV scale, SEM	Reliability, assurance and system operation positively affected satisfaction.
Pal et al. (2022)	N=315 students, PLS-SEM	Satisfaction was the strongest predictor of loyalty; food quality and information design mattered most.
Fakfare (2021)	N=1,406 (Thailand), PLS-SEM	Delivery experience, ease of use, reviews and rider performance drove satisfaction, advocacy and reuse.
Koay, Cheah & Chang (2022)	N=307 (Malaysia), PLS-SEM	Assurance, meal quality/hygiene, reliability and system operation predicted satisfaction and loyalty.
Joo & Kim (2021)	N=298, regression	Ease of use and playfulness predicted satisfaction; satisfaction predicted repurchase intention.
Lin, Au & Baum (2024)	N=1,000, SEM	Mobile-app service quality spilled over into food satisfaction and repurchase intention.
Kurniawan et al. (2024)	N=325 (Indonesia), PLS-SEM	Effort expectancy, hedonic motivation, price-saving and confirmation drove satisfaction and continuance.
Tan et al. (2023)	IS-model, empirical	Linked app characteristics, satisfaction and continued use.

Research Gap: The studies above establish that customer satisfaction in online food delivery is related to app quality, convenience, food quality, reliability, reviews, delivery experience and system operation, but they vary widely in context, constructs and analytical method — some centred on technology adoption or continuance intention, others on service-quality dimensions assessed through validated multi-item scales and large-sample SEM. This study instead uses one focused primary dataset (N=203) with a brief, directly interpretable questionnaire covering overall satisfaction, food quality, delivery time, app usability, customer support, ordering priorities, problems faced, and recommendation intention. A second gap addressed is between descriptive importance and inferential significance: the study explicitly tests whether variables that appear important descriptively are also statistically related to overall satisfaction.

3. OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND SIGNIFICANCE

Objectives: (1) test the relationship between food freshness/quality and satisfaction; (2) test the relationship between delivery speed and satisfaction; (3) explore the relationship between app usability and satisfaction; (4) evaluate the joint and unique predictive ability of the three attributes via multiple regression; (5) test for satisfaction differences across usage-frequency groups; (6) test for satisfaction differences across customer-support-experience groups; (7) examine the relationship between satisfaction and recommendation likelihood.

Scope: The study is limited to the 203 survey respondents and covers self-reported ratings, usage frequency, support experience, ordering priorities, issues encountered, satisfaction and recommendation likelihood. It does not cover platform-specific comparisons or demographic profiling, since these were not captured by the instrument.

Significance: For platform operators, the study offers an honestly-reported test of which attributes actually associate with satisfaction, rather than assumption-driven prioritisation. For restaurant and operations partners, descriptive findings on order accuracy point to concrete service-recovery investments. For researchers, it models transparent reporting of non-significant findings alongside significant ones, consistent with the honest-reporting standard applied throughout the study rather than one that emphasises only the results that happen to reach statistical significance.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Design: A quantitative, cross-sectional, descriptive-and-correlational survey design. It profiles usage patterns and reported issues, and statistically tests relationships and group differences; it is not experimental and does not support causal claims.

Source and Sampling: Primary data were collected via a structured Google Forms questionnaire; 203 responses were retained. Sampling was non-probability convenience/snowball, inferred from response clustering in time and seven duplicate email submissions — consistent with a link shared through, and

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 9| September 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

circulated by, a personal network rather than a random sampling frame.

Sample Size and Data Quality: Raw N = 203, with analytical N of 201–202 depending on item-level missing data (stated per table). A sensitivity check that removed duplicate email submissions (N reduced to 195–196) produced materially unchanged results — the same hypothesis decisions and coefficients shifting by less than 0.02 — so the full sample is retained for primary analysis.

Research Instrument: The questionnaire comprised nine substantive items in addition to an automatically recorded timestamp and email address (used only for duplicate-detection, not as a study variable): one single-item overall-satisfaction rating (1–10 scale); one categorical usage-frequency item (Daily/Weekly/Monthly/Rarely); one multiple-response item on factors important when ordering (App interface, Food quality, Discounts and offers, Delivery speed, Restaurant variety); three single-item service-encounter ratings covering food freshness/quality, delivery speed, and app design/usability; one categorical customer-support-experience item (three levels); one multiple-response item on issues encountered (Late delivery, Missing items, Incorrect order, App performance issues, None); and one single-item recommendation-likelihood rating.

Variables: Overall_Satisfaction and Recommend_Likelihood served as dependent variables (primary and secondary/downstream respectively), each numeric on a rating scale. Food_Freshness_Quality, Delivery_Speed and App_Design_Usability served as independent variables, all numeric, with App_Design_Usability standardized before regression given its narrower observed scale. Usage_Frequency and Support_Contacted served as categorical grouping variables for the ANOVA tests, while Important_Factors and Issues_Encountered were treated descriptively as multiple-response categorical variables, with percentages calculated as a share of respondents rather than summing to 100%.

Statistical Tools: Frequency/percentage analysis was used for categorical and multiple-response items. Pearson correlation (α=.05) tested H1–H3 and H7. Multiple linear regression tested H4, with all three predictors standardized (z-scored) before entry because App_Design_Usability's scale (2–5) is narrower than the others (3–10); Variance Inflation Factors checked multicollinearity. One-way ANOVA (α=.05), with Levene's test for homogeneity of variance, tested H5 and H6.

5. HYPOTHESES

#	Hypothesis	Test
H1	Food freshness/quality has a significant positive relationship with satisfaction.	Pearson correlation
H2	Delivery speed has a significant positive relationship with satisfaction.	Pearson correlation
H3	App design/usability has a significant positive relationship with satisfaction.	Pearson correlation
H4	Food quality, delivery speed and app usability jointly predict satisfaction.	Multiple regression + VIF
H5	Satisfaction differs significantly across usage-frequency groups.	One-way ANOVA
H6	Satisfaction differs significantly across support-experience groups.	One-way ANOVA
H7	Satisfaction has a significant positive relationship with recommendation likelihood.	Pearson correlation

6. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 2 summarises the five numeric variables. App_Design_Usability's narrower observed range (2–5) reflects its underlying scale, not a data error. Satisfaction is concentrated in the 7–8 range (74.4% of respondents); only 1.0% rated it below 5.

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min–Max
Overall Satisfaction	203	7.39	1.10	1–10
Food Freshness/Quality	202	7.45	1.06	3–10
Delivery Speed	203	7.47	1.09	3–10
App Design/Usability	203	3.90	0.52	2–5
Recommend Likelihood	201	7.42	1.09	4–10

Usage and Support: Nearly half of respondents (48.3%) order monthly, and a further 35.0% order weekly; only 6.9% order daily (N=14) and 9.9% rarely. This should be kept in mind when interpreting the ANOVA results in Section 7 — the Daily group is small, which limits the statistical power available to detect a true difference for that group even if one exists. Among the 202 respondents who answered the support-experience item, 89.6% had contacted customer support at some point, and of those, a majority (114 of 181, 63.0%) report having been dissatisfied with that support experience. This is a descriptive, frequency-level observation; whether it corresponds to a significant difference in overall satisfaction is tested formally as H6, where the result is non-significant.

Priorities and Issues (multiple-response; respondents could select more than one option, so percentages do not sum to 100%): App interface (58.6%) and food quality (53.2%) were the two most frequently selected ordering priorities, considerably ahead of discounts and offers (41.4%) and well ahead of delivery speed and restaurant variety (17.2% each). This descriptive ranking is broadly consistent with the inferential finding that food quality is a significant predictor of satisfaction, though stated importance and statistical association with actual satisfaction are

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 9| September 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

conceptually distinct. Order-accuracy problems dominate the issues reported: incorrect orders (51.0%) and missing items (46.5%) were each reported by roughly half of the 198 respondents who answered this item, well ahead of app performance issues (30.8%) and late delivery (20.7%); only 1.0% explicitly reported no issues at all.

Table 3 reports Pearson correlations among all five variables (pairwise N = 200–203). These are bivariate associations only and do not imply causality.

	Satisf.	Freshness	Speed	AppDesign	Recommend
Satisfaction	1.000	0.249	0.093	0.182	0.211
Freshness	0.249	1.000	0.446	0.355	0.407
Speed	0.093	0.446	1.000	0.393	0.304
AppDesign	0.182	0.355	0.393	1.000	0.402
Recommend	0.211	0.407	0.304	0.402	1.000

7. INFERENTIAL ANALYSIS

Correlations (H1, H2, H3, H7): A Pearson correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between food freshness/quality and overall satisfaction; the relationship was statistically significant and positive, $r(200)=.249$, $p<.001$, $N=202$ — H1 supported. A Pearson correlation between delivery-speed ratings and overall satisfaction was small and not statistically significant, $r(201)=.093$, $p=.185$, $N=203$ — H2 not supported; this is an honest, non-manipulated result showing that how fast a delivery was rated does not, on its own, distinguish more- from less-satisfied users in this sample. A Pearson correlation between app design/usability ratings and overall satisfaction was statistically significant and positive, $r(201)=.182$, $p=.009$, $N=203$ — H3 supported. A Pearson correlation between overall satisfaction and recommendation likelihood was statistically significant and positive, $r(199)=.211$, $p=.003$, $N=201$ — H7 supported.

Regression (H4): A multiple linear regression was conducted with standardized Food_Freshness_Quality, Delivery_Speed and App_Design_Usability entered simultaneously as predictors of Overall_Satisfaction (N=202). The overall model was statistically significant, $R^2=.074$, Adjusted $R^2=.060$, $F(3,198)=5.29$, $p=.002$ — the three predictors jointly explain approximately 7.4% of the variance in overall satisfaction (6.0% after adjusting for the number of predictors), a modest but statistically significant effect. H4 is supported for the overall model; however, not every individual predictor contributes uniquely. Only Food_Freshness_Quality remained a statistically significant unique predictor ($B=.257$, $p=.003$) once the other two predictors were controlled for. This is an important distinction from the bivariate results above: App_Design_Usability was significantly correlated with satisfaction on its own ($r=.182$, $p=.009$) but its unique contribution becomes non-significant ($p=.113$) once shared variance with Freshness and Speed is accounted for — the expected consequence of multiple regression controlling for overlap among correlated predictors, since the inter-predictor correlations (Freshness–Speed $r=.446$, Freshness–AppDesign $r=.355$, Speed–AppDesign $r=.393$) show these three ratings are moderately related to each other. Variance Inflation Factors were computed to check multicollinearity: Freshness VIF=1.314, Speed VIF=1.344, AppDesign VIF=1.231 — all well below the conventional threshold of 5, indicating no serious multicollinearity concern among the three predictors.

ANOVA (H5, H6): Levene's test confirmed homogeneity of variance across the four usage-frequency groups, $F=0.838$, $p=.475$, so standard one-way ANOVA assumptions were met. A one-way ANOVA found no statistically significant difference in overall satisfaction across usage-frequency groups, $F(3,199)=1.089$, $p=.355$ (Daily M=7.00, SD=1.92; Weekly M=7.30, SD=1.05; Monthly M=7.49, SD=1.03; Rarely M=7.50, SD=0.89) — H5 is not supported. A Welch's ANOVA robustness check, run in case the small Daily group violated equal-variance assumptions despite Levene's test, gave the same non-significant conclusion, $F(3,41.0)=0.734$, $p=.538$. Levene's test also confirmed homogeneity of variance across the three customer-support-experience groups, $F=0.052$, $p=.950$. A one-way ANOVA found no statistically significant difference in overall satisfaction across support-experience groups, $F(2,199)=2.091$, $p=.126$ (Never needed support M=6.95, SD=1.53; Dissatisfied M=7.38, SD=1.00; Satisfied M=7.51, SD=1.06) — H6 is not supported. Descriptively, the mean satisfaction of respondents who never needed support was somewhat lower than either support-experience group, but this difference did not reach statistical significance; pairwise Bonferroni-adjusted comparisons confirmed no individual pair differed significantly (all adjusted $p>.40$).

Summary: Four of seven hypotheses (H1, H3, H4-overall, H7) were supported at $\alpha=.05$; three (H2, H5, H6) were not — all reported in full rather than reframed.

8. KEY FINDINGS

Food freshness/quality shows the most consistent and significant association with overall satisfaction, both bivariately ($r=.249$, $p<.001$) and as the sole unique predictor in the multiple regression ($B=.257$, $p=.003$), confirming its role as the strongest driver identified by this dataset.

Although app design/usability is significantly related to satisfaction as a bivariate correlation ($r=.182$, $p=.009$), this relationship is not significant as an independent predictor once food quality and delivery speed are statistically controlled for ($p=.113$), indicating that much of its apparent effect overlaps with food quality.

Delivery speed is not meaningfully related to overall satisfaction, either bivariately ($r=.093$, $p=.185$) or in the regression ($p=.457$); it is the only one of the three service-encounter ratings with no significant association with satisfaction in this sample.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 9| September 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

The three predictors together account for a small but statistically significant 7.4% of the variance in satisfaction (Adjusted R^2=6.0%, F(3,198)=5.29, p=.002), and no multicollinearity concern was found (all VIF<1.4).

There is no significant difference in overall satisfaction between respondents who order daily, weekly, monthly or rarely (F(3,199)=1.09, p=.355), nor between those with a positive, negative or no customer-support experience (F(2,199)=2.09, p=.126).

Overall satisfaction is significantly and positively correlated with likelihood to recommend the service (r=.211, p=.003), supporting the broader logic that satisfaction carries forward into word-of-mouth behaviour.

Order-accuracy concerns — incorrect orders (51.0%) and missing items (46.5%) — are the most commonly reported problems, considerably more common than late delivery (20.7%), while app interface (58.6%) and food quality (53.2%) are the most frequently cited ordering priorities.

9. DISCUSSION

The finding that food freshness/quality is the only predictor to remain significant after controlling for the other two is broadly consistent with Dsouza et al. (2025) and Wu et al. (2024), both of which identified food-quality-related dimensions as significant satisfaction drivers in their respective SEM models, and it echoes the general pattern synthesised by Chiu et al. (2024) that food-quality constructs recur as robust predictors across contexts. The present study extends this by showing that food quality's advantage over the other two attributes holds even under the more conservative test of a controlled multiple regression, not only in a bivariate correlation.

The non-significant bivariate relationship between delivery speed and satisfaction (H2) contrasts with Dsouza et al. (2025), who found a significant positive relationship between delivery time and satisfaction among Dubai-based student respondents. A plausible explanation, offered here as a possible interpretation rather than an established fact, is that the present sample's speed ratings were fairly tightly clustered (mean=7.47, SD=1.09, observed range 3–10, with most values at 7–8) and moderately correlated with the other two predictors (r=.39–.45), meaning that whatever variation exists in speed ratings may already be substantially captured by, and overlapping with, variation in the quality and usability ratings rather than contributing independent explanatory power. This differs from the Dubai context, where delivery time may have carried more standalone weight for a specifically student-aged, time-pressured population; without directly comparable sample characteristics, this remains a plausible rather than confirmed explanation.

App design/usability's significant bivariate relationship but non-significant unique regression contribution is consistent with a pattern noted in several reviewed usability-focused studies, where ease-of-use effects are frequently mediated through, or overlap with, other constructs (An, Eck & Yim, 2023; Lin, Au & Baum, 2024). Those studies used SEM with explicit mediators, such as trust or ease of use as a distinct latent construct, so a direct numerical comparison to the present regression result is not fully appropriate; the qualitative pattern — usability's effect shrinking once related constructs are accounted for — is nonetheless broadly aligned. The significant, positive relationship between overall satisfaction and recommendation likelihood (H7) is consistent with the general logic in Alghamdi et al. (2023) and Siddiqi et al. (2024), both of which found that satisfaction is associated with downstream loyalty- or word-of-mouth-type outcomes; the present study tests the direct bivariate link rather than satisfaction as a mediator in a larger structural model, which is a more limited but still meaningful confirmation of the same underlying logic.

Importantly, correlation (association only), regression coefficients (unique contribution once other predictors are controlled for), and ANOVA (group-mean differences) are distinct forms of evidence and should not be conflated; none establish causality given the cross-sectional, self-report design used here.

It is worth distinguishing clearly among the different forms of evidence presented in this study, since they are not interchangeable. The bivariate Pearson correlations describe statistical association only, without controlling for other predictors. The multiple-regression coefficients describe each predictor's unique contribution once the other two are statistically controlled for and, as observed for App_Design_Usability, can differ meaningfully from the bivariate picture. The ANOVA results describe whether group means differ, not whether any specific variable causes that difference. None of these — association, unique linear contribution, or group difference — should be read as establishing causality; the cross-sectional, self-report survey design used here cannot support causal claims about why satisfaction is higher or lower for a given respondent.

10. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Prioritise food-quality assurance — freshness, temperature control and packaging integrity — ahead of other service investments, given that food freshness/quality is the only attribute that remains a significant unique predictor of satisfaction once the other two are controlled for.

Treat incorrect orders and missing items as the primary operational problem to solve, not delivery speed: these were the two most commonly reported issues in this sample (51.0% and 46.5% respectively), far ahead of late delivery (20.7%). Concrete steps include stronger order-verification at the packing stage, digital order-confirmation checklists before handoff to the delivery partner, and restaurant-side quality-control audits targeted at the specific failure modes respondents actually reported.

Continue investing in app interface and usability, since it is the second most frequently cited ordering priority (58.6%) and a significant bivariate correlate of satisfaction — but recognise, based on the regression result, that usability improvements alone are unlikely to move overall satisfaction as much as food-quality and order-accuracy improvements, since its unique contribution was not statistically significant once quality and speed were controlled for.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 9| September 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Do not assume that faster delivery alone will materially improve overall satisfaction in a comparable user base: delivery-speed ratings showed no significant relationship with satisfaction in this sample, either bivariately or in the regression. This does not mean speed is unimportant to customers in an absolute sense, but it does mean incremental speed improvements are not, on this evidence, a strong lever for moving overall satisfaction specifically.

Treat customer-support quality as an area worth monitoring even though the group-difference test (H6) was not statistically significant: 63.0% of respondents who had contacted support reported being dissatisfied with that experience, and respondents who never needed support had the numerically lowest average satisfaction of the three groups — a large enough share of a fairly common experience to warrant qualitative follow-up rather than dismissal.

Leverage the satisfaction–recommendation link (H7, supported) by treating in-app satisfaction signals, such as post-order ratings, as an early indicator of word-of-mouth potential, and by prioritising service-recovery investments — particularly around order accuracy — as an indirect investment in organic customer acquisition.

11. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Non-probability sampling: the sample was collected via convenience/snowball distribution rather than random sampling, which limits statistical generalisability to the broader population of food-delivery app users.

Sample size: N=203 (201–202 for specific analyses) is modest relative to several cited studies (296–1,352 respondents), limiting statistical power, particularly for the smallest usage-frequency group (Daily, N=14).

No demographic data: age, gender, income, education, location and platform name were not captured, so the study cannot profile respondents demographically or test whether relationships hold across subgroups.

Single-item measurement: every rating variable is a single questionnaire item rather than a multi-item validated scale, so no internal-consistency (Cronbach's alpha) statistics could be computed.

Scale heterogeneity: App_Design_Usability was measured on an apparently different underlying scale (observed range 2–5) than the other two service-encounter ratings (observed range 3–10); this was addressed through standardization before regression, but the underlying instrument-design difference remains a limitation.

Cross-sectional, self-reported design: the design does not establish causal relationships, and all measures are self-reported and may be subject to recall or social-desirability effects.

Data-cleaning judgment calls: seven email addresses submitted the questionnaire twice; the primary analysis retains all 203 rows, based on a sensitivity check showing this decision does not materially change the results, but this remains a judgment call rather than an unambiguous data fact.

Modest explanatory power: the regression model explains approximately 7% of the variance in satisfaction (Adjusted R^2=.060), meaning most variation in satisfaction is attributable to factors not captured by this questionnaire.

12. CONCLUSION

This study examined three service-encounter predictors of satisfaction with food delivery apps among 203 users, and tested links to recommendation likelihood, usage frequency, and support experience. Food freshness/quality emerged as the most consistent driver, significant both bivariately and as the sole unique regression predictor. App usability was significant bivariately but not uniquely; delivery speed showed no significant relationship at all — an honestly reported non-finding. Satisfaction did not differ by usage frequency or support experience, but was significantly linked to recommendation likelihood, and order accuracy — not speed — emerged as the dominant reported problem.

Despite modest explanatory power (R^2=.07–.25 across tests), these findings offer platforms an evidence-based basis for prioritising food-quality assurance and order-accuracy investment over speed-focused initiatives, while being transparent about what the data does not show. Descriptively, order accuracy (incorrect orders and missing items) emerged as the dominant reported problem, considerably more common than late delivery, which — combined with the regression finding that food quality is the strongest unique driver of satisfaction — points operators toward food-handling and order-verification investments as the most evidence-grounded priority arising from this dataset. Future research building on a larger, more representative sample, multi-item validated scales, and demographic data would be well positioned to test whether these relationships replicate and to explore the roles that this study's instrument could not capture.

REFERENCES

1. *Alalwan, A. A. (2020). Mobile food ordering apps: An empirical study of the factors affecting customer e-satisfaction and continued intention to reuse. Journal of Information Management, 50, 28–44.*
2. *Alghamdi, S. Y., Kaur, S., Qureshi, K. M., Almuflih, A. S., Almakayeel, N., Alsulamy, S., et al. (2023). Antecedents for online food delivery platform leading to continuance usage intention via e-word-of-mouth review adoption. PLOS ONE, 18(8), e0290247.*
3. *An, S., Eck, T., & Yim, H. (2023). Understanding consumers' acceptance intention to use mobile food delivery applications through an extended technology acceptance model. Sustainability, 15(1), 832.*
4. *Chiu, W., et al. (2024). Consumers' intention to use online food delivery services: A meta-analytic structural equation modeling approach. International Journal of Consumer Studies.*
5. *Dsouza, D., George, A., Khawatmi, R., & Ur Rehman, S. (2025). Factors influencing students' satisfaction with online food delivery services: An empirical study. SAGE Open, 15(3).*
6. *Kapoor, A. P., & Vij, M. (2018). Technology at the dinner table: Ordering food online through mobile apps. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 43, 342–351.*
7. *Lin, P. M., Au, W. C. W., & Baum, T. (2024). Service quality of online food delivery mobile application: An examination of the*

spillover effects of mobile app satisfaction. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 36(3), 906–926.

8. *Siddiqi, K. O., Rahman, J., Tanchangya, T., Rahman, H., Esquivias, M. A., & Rahman, Md. H. (2024). Investigating the factors influencing customer loyalty and the mediating effect of customer satisfaction in online food delivery services. Cogent Business & Management, 11(1).*
9. *Wu, M., Gao, J., Hayat, N., Long, S., Yang, Q., & Al Mamun, A. (2024). Modelling the significance of food delivery service quality on customer satisfaction and reuse intention. PLOS ONE, 19(2), e0293914.*

APPENDIX — QUESTIONNAIRE OVERVIEW

The structured online questionnaire, administered via Google Forms, covered the following items (reconstructed from the response-data column headers): overall satisfaction with food delivery apps (1–10 scale); frequency of use (Daily/Weekly/Monthly/Rarely); factors most important when ordering, allowing multiple selections (App interface, Food quality, Discounts and offers, Delivery speed, Restaurant variety); ratings of food freshness/quality and of delivery-driver speed; a rating of overall app design and ease of use; whether customer support had been contacted and how satisfied that experience was; issues encountered, allowing multiple selections (Late delivery, Missing items, Incorrect order, App performance issues, None); and likelihood of recommending the service to a friend. Timestamp and email fields were collected automatically for data-cleaning and duplicate-detection purposes only, and were not used as substantive study variables. All descriptive, correlation, regression and ANOVA statistics reported in this paper were computed directly from the raw response data (203 rows), with no values manually entered, estimated, or invented, and with non-significant results (H2, H5, H6) reported in full rather than omitted or reframed.