CONSUMER ATTITUDE AND SATISFACTION BY ONLINE APPLICATION FOR READY-TO-EAT FOOD DELIVERY SERVICE IN JABODETABEK

R.R. Ajeng Pratiwi Indah Kusumarini[1*], Anna Fariyanti[2], Netti Tinaprilla[2]

[1]Master Science of Agribusiness, IPB University, Bogor 16680, Indonesia
[2]Department of Agribusiness, IPB University, Bogor 16680, Indonesia

[*]E-mail: ajengpratiwi55@gmail.com

Abstract

Because of the Covid-19 pandemic, public consumption has become dynamic, aided by more sophisticated technology such as GoFood and GrabFood. This study intends to examine how consumers make decisions about what to buy, their attitudes toward it, and their overall contentment. It also examines whether there are any appreciable attitudes and satisfaction differences between customers of GrabFood and GoFood. This study's design was cross-sectional with a single data collection, and both qualitative and quantitative analysis were used. The Slovin method was employed to select 100 respondents for this study, and each region was divided according to the sampling quota. Consumer purchasing decisions were examined using a descriptive analysis method. In this study, the Consumer Satisfaction Index (CSI) analysis was performed to examine consumer attitudes and satisfaction utilizing Fishbein Multiattribute Analysis. For the difference test, the nonparametric Mann-Whitney was used. The study's findings revealed five distinct buying processes, and the GrabFood and GoFood applications' values for customer attitudes were 193.88 and 193.86 points, respectively. Consumers of GoFood and GrabFood have similar attitudes and levels of satisfaction. GoFood and GrabFood had CSI scores of 79.24 percent and 78.16 percent, respectively, indicating that customers were happy with their products.

Keywords: consumer attitude, consumer satisfaction index, fishbein multi-attribute, mann-whitney, online application

Sikap dan Kepuasan Pelanggan Aplikasi Daring pada Layanan Antar Makanan Siap Saji di Jabodetabek

Abstrak

Karena pandemi Covid-19, konsumsi masyarakat menjadi dinamis, dibantu oleh teknologi yang lebih canggih seperti GoFood dan GrabFood. Studi ini bertujuan untuk menguji bagaimana konsumen membuat keputusan tentang apa yang akan dibeli, sikap terhadapnya, dan kepuasan secara keseluruhan. Hal ini juga menguji apakah ada perbedaan sikap dan kepuasan yang cukup besar antara pelanggan GrabFood dan GoFood. Desain penelitian ini adalah *cross-sectional* dengan pengumpulan data tunggal, dan analisis kualitatif dan kuantitatif digunakan. Metode Slovin digunakan untuk memilih 100 responden untuk penelitian ini, dan setiap wilayah dibagi sesuai dengan kuota sampling. Keputusan pembelian konsumen diteliti dengan menggunakan metode analisis deskriptif. Dalam penelitian ini, analisis *Consumer Satisfaction Index* (CSI) dilakukan untuk menguji sikap dan kepuasan konsumen dengan menggunakan *Fishbein Multiattribute Analysis*. Untuk uji beda digunakan Mann-Whitney. Penelitian mengungkapkan lima proses pembelian yang berbeda, dan nilai aplikasi GrabFood dan GoFood untuk sikap pelanggan masing-masing adalah 193,88 dan 193,86 poin. Konsumen GoFood dan GrabFood memiliki sikap dan tingkat kepuasan yang sama. GoFood dan GrabFood memiliki skor CSI masing-masing sebesar 79,24 persen dan 78,16 persen, yang menunjukkan bahwa pelanggan puas.

Kata kunci: aplikasi daring, indeks kepuasan konsumen, mann-whitney, multiatribut fishbein, sikap konsumen

INTRODUCTION

The introduction of PSBB at a large scale has an impact on people's mobility. Residents of an area suspected of being polluted or infected with are prohibited from engaging in certain activities under the PSBB protocol. (Qian & Jiang, 2020; Ratcliffe, 2020). This regulation restricts residents from mobilizing anywhere except to buy necessities in convenience stores (Rahwanto et al., 2020; Taufik & Ayuningtyas, 2020). Based on data from Sea Insights, 45 percent of business actors are more active in selling online applications to change their sales strategy amid the pandemic, following the trend of online shopping (Nicola et al., 2020; Niles et al., 2020).

During the Covid-19 pandemic, people increasingly use online applications to shop

(Ezizwita & Sukma, 2021; Nurbaya, Mursaha, & Chandra, 2020). GoFood and GrabFood applications have begun to spread and operate actively in big cities in Indonesia. Gojek and Grab were initially a breakthrough in online-based transportation innovation that became special among the public (Kartika, 2020). Over time, people have started to adapt to a new normal lifestyle during the pandemic. This lifestyle makes people want fast, practical food, especially guaranteed cleanliness. In addition, Gojek and Grab's presence helps people stay at home safely during the pandemic.

There were large transactions in ready-to-eat through the GoFood application of US$2 billion or equivalent to Rp28 trillion and GrabFood of US$5.9 billion or equivalent to Rp83 trillion in 2020 (Setyowati, 2021). This picture is a huge number when compared to transactions in other fields. It is prominent because Indonesia is yet in a state of pandemics, and money continues to revolve in the online culinary area. This significant transaction value is also supported by the Covid-19 virus coupled with economic growth factors, urbanization, and the use of smartphones in Indonesia. The cause of consumers using online applications, especially GoFood and GrabFood, is supported by promos from these applications. As a result, the price of food that appears is lower than buying directly at offline stores. Additionally, by using these apps, customers may order food quickly and conveniently from stores without expending additional effort or time. (Kartika, 2020).

According to Schiffman and Kanuk (1997), an individual's happiness, dislikes, and agreement with an object are all reflected in their attitude, which is a reflection of their sentiments (inner feelings). Attitude is also defined as an overall evaluation that allows people to respond regarding the thing given (Engel, Blackwell, & Minard, 1995). Attitudes can describe consumer confidence in an attribute and the benefits of the object (Ha & Janda, 2012). The mindset of consumers is crucial for marketers since it can impact their business. A person's perception of a product's performance (or results) in comparison to their expectations or desired expectations is reflected in their level of satisfaction (Kotler & Keller, 2006). According to another definition, customer satisfaction is an assessment made after a purchase in which opinions on the performance of competing goods and services are made in order to meet or surpass expectations (Oliver, 1981). Evaluating services can be associated with expectations and satisfaction (Barata, 2003). Consumer satisfaction will provide many benefits if the level of satisfaction is high. This can benefit the company because it leads to consumer loyalty in the long term. On the contrary, if consumers are dissatisfied with the product, they will stop buying and may spread negative reviews about the product to others, which can harm the company (Paojiyah, 2018).

It is essential to examine the attitude and satisfaction of consumers as evaluation parameters for the company to identify variables to maintain and improve so that customers are happy and satisfied. In a competitive market, consumer satisfaction analysis is critical. This includes identifying the type of services and product quality to improve and finding out what services and products to maintain and enhance. These two applications have different features despite having the same use and respective reliability. With their respective advantages, this research attempted to measure the importance of the existing attributes in the applications and how the application's performance meets consumer needs.

The current study made an effort to fill in the gaps in the issues with online applications based on the background described above. This included identifying the decision-making process, examining consumer attitudes and satisfaction, and examining the discrepancy between attitudes and satisfaction toward consumers' apps. The purpose of this study was to identify the characteristics, attitudes, and satisfaction levels of GoFood and GrabFood customers as well as any discrepancies between their attitudes and levels of satisfaction.

METHODS

In the regions of Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi, this research was carried out (Jabodetabek). The research area was chosen based on data showing an increase in online application users there during the Covid-19 pandemic. In order to collect the data, online surveys were distributed in March 2021 using the Google Form platform.

Both primary and secondary data were utilized in this study. Results of the questionnaires were used to gather preliminary data. To enhance and support the source data, secondary data were gathered from a number of institutions, including regional data (Dukcapil) for DKI Jakarta and West Java as well as other relevant literature. In the past, reference materials, journals, papers, and the internet relevant to the study's goals were also examined.

Determination of the sample is carried out using the Slovin method. The following data were obtained based on consumer data in the five Jabodetabek areas (Data on period August - September 2020), that is: DKI Jakarta (11,063,324 people); Bogor City (4,966,621 people); Depok City (1,457,745 people); Tangerang City (1,742,604 people); Bekasi City (3,431,480 people), and total (22,661,774 people) (Dukcapil, 2020).

The number of sample respondents used in this study was determined based on the Slovin formula so that the number of respondents for each region would be:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Note: n = Sample size; N = Total population in the Greater Jakarta and Bodebek Area; E = Rate of error (error) in sampling (10%).

Based on the Slovin formula, the number of respondents that will be used in this study is as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} = \frac{22.661.774}{1+22.661.774(0,1)^2} = \frac{22.661.774}{226.617,71} = 100$$

Next, the number of respondents from each region is divided using quota sampling, where each region will have a different number of respondents. The respondents from each region were as follows: 49 from DKI Jakarta, 22 from Bogor, 6 from Depok, 8 from Tangerang, and 15 from Bekasi. The criteria of the respondents themselves are those who live in Jabodetabek, have purchased food through the GoFood and GrabFood applications, and are at least 17 years old.

A statistic known as descriptive analysis is used to examine data by outlining or summarizing the knowledge gained without trying to draw any universally recognized conclusions or generalizations. In order to characterize and analyze customer characteristics when making purchases using online applications, this study use descriptive analysis (Sugiyono, 2005).

Research (Schiffman & Kanuk, 1997) reveals that a person's attitude toward an object, such as a product, has many attributes. Fishbein, Hill, and Ajzen (1977) use models that are of interest to consumer research because these models explain consumer attitudes in choosing product attributes and consumer beliefs about products (Simamora, 2004). Fishbein's multi-attribute model in this study is used to measure consumer attitudes towards the attributes of existing online

applications. The formulation of the Fishbein model is:

$$A_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (b_i.e_i)$$

Note: A_0= Attitude towards object; b_i= Confidence level below the online application has attribute I ; e_i = Evaluation of importance to attribute I; n = Number of prominent attributes.

The Consumer Satisfaction Index (CSI) method measures the overall level of consumer satisfaction with an approach that considers the expectations and performance of the product or service attributes. This study limits the calculation of consumer satisfaction using a measure of satisfaction: the level of performance minus the level of expectation (Barata, 2003; Simamora, 2001). There are four steps in calculating the Consumer Satisfaction Index (CSI) (Aritonang, 2005):

1) Determine the Mean Expectation Score (MES) and Mean Performance Score (MPS). This value is scaled from the average level of expectation and performance.

$$MES = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} Yi}{n} \, and$$

$$MPS = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} Xi}{n}$$

Note: n = number of respondents; Yi = expected value of attribute – i; Xi = attribute performance value – i.

2) Create Weighted Factor (WF) and create Weighted Score (WS): WF value is obtained from the percentage of MES value per attribute to the total MPS of all attributes, and WS is obtained by multiplying WF and MES.

$$WSi = WFi \; x \; MPS$$

3) Calculate the Weighted Total (WT) by adding the Weighted Score of all variables.
4) Determine the CSI value by dividing WT by the nominal scale used as follows:

$$CSI = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} WSi}{5} \; x \; 100 \; \%$$

Note: P = number of attribute expectations; 5 = number of scales used.

Descriptive analysis was used to process the questionnaires after validity and reliability tests. The resulting Likert scale value will then be processed using the Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI) for customer satisfaction and the

Fishbein Multi-attribute for customer attitudes. The Mann-Whitney test was also employed at the conclusion of the study to look for any significant differences between the two consumer groups. Finally, the SPSS 25 version was used to run the three quantitative analyses.

One technique for nonparametric statistical testing is the Mann-Whitney test. If there are no presumptions regarding the distribution of the population's parameters or other variables, a nonparametric test is a statistical process used to evaluate hypotheses (Webster, 1998). Nonparametric methods can also be used to analyze data in the social sciences. There are 12 samples used in the small Mann-Whitney Test (n_1 or $n_2 \leq 20$). The formula used in the Mann-Whitney Test is as follows:

$$U1 = n1.n1 + \frac{n2\,(n2+1)}{2} - \sum R2$$

$$U2 = n1.n2 + \frac{n1\,(n1+1)}{2} - \sum R1$$

Note: U_1 = Test statistic U1; U_2 = Test statistic U2; R_1 = Total sample rank 1; R_2 = Total sample rank 2; n_1 = Number of sample members 1; n_2 = Number of sample members 2.

The hypotheses of this study are as follows:
Ho: The two populations are identical (or not significantly different).
Hi: The two populations are not identical (the data are significantly different).

The interpretation of the Mann-Whitney test results is as follows: (1) Ho is accepted or Hi is rejected of the probability > 0.05, indicating that there is no significant difference between attitudes and satisfaction of GoFood and GrabFood consumers; and (2) Ho is rejected or Hi is accepted if probability < 0.05, indicating that there is a significant difference between attitudes and satisfaction of GoFood and GrabFood consumers.

RESULT

Respondent Characteristics

The number of respondents in this study was 100, who were obtained using a questionnaire through the Google Form Survey platform. The characteristics of consumers studied include age, gender, marital status, educational status, occupation, income, and expenses. The research results regarding the respondents' characteristics can be seen in Table 1.

Most respondents in this study were unmarried. Most are high school graduates or currently pursuing higher education. The questionnaire results regarding marital status were correlated with the age range, where most of the respondents from this study come from productive and young age groups. There was a relationship between the level of income and the type of work. A person's position or income can affect his decision-making. It was also found that the higher the position or level of a person's job, the higher the range or price a person sets to buy something.

Table 1 Characteristics of online application consumer respondents

Characteristics		Total (People)
Age	17-20	46
	21-30	38
	31-40	4
	41-50	12
Gender	Men	31
	Women	69
Marital status	Single	81
	Married	19
Highest education	High School	53
	Diploma	2
	Bachelor	36
	Master	9
Occupation	Student	50
	Housewife	7
	Entrepreneur	5
	Private employees	22
	Other	16
Individual net income after tax (monthly)	< Rp 2.500.000	73
	RP 2.500.001 - Rp 5.000.000	7
	Rp 5.000.001 - Rp 7.500.000	3
	Rp 7.500.001 - Rp 10.000.000	5
	> Rp 10.000.000	12
Average monthly expenditure for individual food consumption	< Rp 1.500.000	66
	Rp 1.500.001 - Rp 3.000.000	15
	Rp 3.000.001 - Rp 5.000.000	10
	Rp 5.000.001 - Rp 7.000.000	5
	> Rp 7.000.000	4

Source: Data collection by researchers

The Process of Purchasing Ready-to-eat through Online Application

Finding out how to make a decision to buy is a fundamental psychological process that is crucial for customers to grasp (Kotler & Keller, 2006). The five steps of the buying process that consumers go through include need identification, information search, alternative evaluation, purchase decisions, and post-purchase behavior.

Consumer motivation. One hundred respondents were asked to select the top three features consumers believe are the most important factors in purchasing ready-to-eat food via online applications. One hundred respondents were asked to select the top three features they believe are essential in purchasing ready-to-eat food via online applications. According to respondents, the top three motivations were as follows: 76 individuals buy because of the application's marketing. Furthermore, consumers perceived practicability because they did not need to buy food directly thanks to the convenience of online applications, particularly in pandemic situations that restrict people's mobility. Lastly, the motivation that encourages respondents to buy is the feeling of hunger.

Consumer information source. Consumers begin looking for knowledge when they believe their wants can be addressed by purchasing and consuming a product (Sumarwan, 2011). The findings of this study's questionnaire reveal several actors or sources of information that respondents refer to when purchasing ready-to-eat meals via online applications. A total of 79 people got their information from themselves, while the rest got it from their relatives and friends. When buying and eating ready-to-eat food through online applications, consumers know what brand or type of food they desire. This shows that the consumer has internal strength in knowing about a product, which will be considered later when looking for information sources.

Type of purchasing. At this stage, consumers are divided into two types of purchases: planned and unplanned. This study found that 18 respondents planned their purchases, whereas 82 others made purchases unplanned or depending on the situation. A question is provided about who executes the purchase of ready-to-eat food on an online application during the pandemic. The results show that the majority of respondents (91 people) executed purchases themselves, 6 respondents cited family members, and 3 other respondents said a friend did the execution.

Post-purchasing. Based on respondents' evaluation of the purchase, whether or not satisfied after purchasing ready-to-eat food through online applications, 97 people felt satisfied and would repeat purchase the same food. As many as 3 respondents were unsatisfied because they said the food did not taste the same as when eating on the spot (in a live store). They prefer ordering and eating directly at the store than ordering using an application and would not make a repeat purchase. This can jeopardize the consumer's trust in the restaurant or seller. When the consumer is dissatisfied after consuming the product, there is a possibility that they will not repurchase and may turn to another manufacturer. Consequently, this endangers the market share of the producer.

Consumer Attitude

Attitudes were assessed by comparing 12 attributed of the online applications they had used, GoFood and GrabFood. The results of consumer attitude scores towards online applications show that GrabFood scored higher than GoFood even though the final attitude score is almost the same, only differing by 0.02. The GrabFood application does have its charm because it offers many discount coupons that can draw consumers' attention. The GoFood application also provides discount coupons but is not as flexible as the GrabFood application. The following are the results of the respondent's attitude assessment shown in Table 2.

When comparing the two groups, several attributes on GoFood have a higher attitude score than GrabFood. In the following features, GoFood has the highest score compared to GrabFood:

Driver behavior showed an attitude score of 16,93. Consumers reported that GoFood drivers were polite when delivering food to the consumer. So consumers felt respected as buyers and users of the GoFood application.

Driver cleanliness showed an attitude score of 17,64. Consumers reported the driver looking clean and tidy when delivering food. This is one of the consumer concerns as they would feel safe knowing the driver was neat and clean.

Payment features earned an attitude score of 17,70. The payment features on GoFood were

considered more varied than what was offered on GrabFood. GoFood offers various means of payment, and the types of credit cards offered are also more varied than GrabFood.

Discovery of the destination location obtained an attitude score of 18,32. GoFood application has a more accurate map than GrabFood. This makes it easier for drivers to find delivery locations. Consumers do not need to give directions to the delivery location because the map in the application has detected it well.

Conditions of food delivered showed an attitude score of 18,58. The food the driver delivers is still in good condition and fast. Even though it was raining at the delivery time, the driver willingly delivered food. This makes consumers even more appreciative of the driver for making sacrifices, and the condition of the food being delivered is still warm and good.

Delivery timelines showed an attitude score of 15,79. Because the map on the GoFood application is more accurate, the GoFood server has a more stable system than GrabFood. It allows GoFood to make travel or delivery estimates more accurate because they align better with the actual situation.

The following are the attributes of the GrabFood application with higher scores than GoFood:

Food prices obtained an attitude score of 12.82. This score is low compared to GrabFood. Because GoFood rarely offers significant discounts, consumers are less interested in using the application. Also, the food price is higher than that in the GrabFood application.

Delivery fee earned an attitude score of 12.50. The delivery fee provided by the server is a little higher. However, GoFood provides an introductory rate for GoFood Partners.

Promotions earned an attitude score of 13.70. GoFood rarely offers coupons for discounts as compared to GrabFood. Not all restaurants on GoFood have coupons on GoFood. The discount coupons are only for GoFood partners and those whose restaurants are in a particular section of GoFood' kitchen together'.

Drivers following instructions obtained an attitude score of 18.10. GoFood drivers are still less responsive than GrabFood drivers. This is a separate assessment for consumers because of carrying out instructions or notes given by consumers.

Table 2 Ready-to-eat consumer attitude assessment based on online applications

Atribute	Evaluation Score/ Importance(ei)	Trust Score (bi)			
			GoFood		GrabFood
		(bi)	(ei)(bi)= (A$_o$)	(bi)	(ei)(bi)= (A$_o$)
Food prices	4.33	2.96	12.82	3.07	13.29
Shipping cost	4.25	2.94	12.50	3.21	13.64
Promotion given	4.15	3.3	13.70	3.61	14.98
Driver behavior	4.06	4.17	16.93	4.04	16.40
Driver cleanliness	4.26	4.14	17.64	4.06	17.30
Driver performs instructions	4.23	4.28	18.10	4.38	18.53
Payment features offered	4.05	4.37	17.70	4.13	16.73
Chat column features	4.12	4.38	18.05	4.38	18.05
Destination location discovery by driver	4.24	4.32	18.32	4.12	17.47
Food condition	4.31	4.31	18.58	4.2	18.10
Delivery accuracy	3.88	4.07	15.79	4.02	15.60
Delivery speed	3.79	3.63	13.76	3.64	13.80
Total ∑eibi			193.86		193.88

Source: Data processing by researchers

Table 3 Satisfaction of ready-to-eat consumers by application

Attribute	Mean Expectation Score (MES)	Mean Performance Score (MPS)		Weighted Factor (WF)	Weighted Score (WS)	
		Performance				
	Expectation	GoFood	GrabFood		Go Food	Grab Food
Food prices	3.74	3.24	3.29	7.04	22.80	23.15
Shipping Cost	3.97	3.28	3.36	7.47	24.50	25.10
Promotion given	4.23	3.08	3.74	7.96	24.51	29.77
Driver behavior	4.55	4.22	3.99	8.56	36.13	34.16
Driver cleanliness	4.67	4.18	4.01	8.79	36.73	35.23
Driver performs instruction	4.64	4.22	4.12	8.73	36.84	35.97
Payment featured offered	4.6	4.23	4.1	8.65	36.61	35.48
Chat column features	4.56	4.23	4.12	8.58	36.29	35.35
Destionation location discovery by driver	4.64	4.25	4.11	8.73	37.10	35.88
Food condition	4.68	4.3	4.2	8.81	37.86	36.98
Delivery accuracy	4.61	4.13	4.01	8.67	35.82	34.78
Delivery speed	4.26	3.87	3.61	8.02	31.02	28.93
Total MES	53.15					
Weighted Total (WT)	GoFood	396.21				
	GrabFood	390.78				
Consumer Satisfaction Index (CSI)	GoFood	79.24%	SATISFIED			
	GrabFood	78.16%	SATISFIED			

Source: Data processing by researchers

Delivery time speed showed an attitude score of 13.76. This value is slightly lower compared to GrabFood. Several factors cause this, including common unexpected things like traffic jams, rain, and the possibility of an error in the GoFood system that can also cause errors in delivery time estimates.

Consumer Satisfaction

The satisfaction index can be used by companies such as GoFood and GrabFood to measure how satisfied consumers are when consuming products/services the company provides. Table 3 presents the results of the level of consumer satisfaction toward online applications for ready-to-eat.

Based on the calculation results in Table 3, the consumer satisfaction index for GoFood and GrabFood as online applications for fast food delivery services show index values of 79.24 percent and 78.16 percent, respectively. The size of the satisfaction index is included in this criterion, and respondents are satisfied because they are on a scale range of 60 percent to 80 percent. The assessment of these criteria indicates that the performance levels of the GoFood and GrabFood applications follow what consumers want when compared with their expectations for online-based fast food delivery services.The word "satisfied" in the assessment indicates that there is a possibility that the consumer will have a sufficient level of loyalty

and stay as a consumer for a long time. This can be input on how companies should improve their performances so that companies can keep consumers on their applications and expand their existing market share. Companies should also look for strategies for maintaining current performance so that it does not go down. As for the way to increase consumer satisfaction, the company should be able to improve the attributes considered lacking by consumers, such as food prices, shipping costs, promotions/discount coupons, and speed of time in food delivery.

When comparing the two applications, several attributes on GoFood have higher satisfaction scores than GrabFood. The following features score higher score in GoFood compared to GrabFood:

Driver behavior achieved a score of 36.13. The behavior of GoFood drivers is considered more friendly and polite to consumers.

Driver cleanliness achieved a value of 36.73. GoFood drivers are considered neater and cleaner and often tidy up and update their driver attributes.

Drivers following instructions showed a score of 36.84. GoFood drivers are considered capable and follow instructions more often than GrabFood, which often shows negative responses (e.g., anger) when buyers ask for help.

Payment features achieved a score of 36.61. The payment options offered by GoFood are very diverse and varied. This especially is more convenient for buyers without a credit card.

Chat feature showed a value of 36.29. The chat column feature is considered more communicative and makes it easier for consumers with more diverse automated chat features.

Location discovery by drivers achieved a score of 37.10. Because map access from GoFood's superior servers allows drivers to find locations more easily and accurately.

On-time delivery achieved a score of 35.82. Supported by access to good and latest maps, drivers can be more updated about road conditions so that the system can make more precise estimates of actual conditions.

Delivery time speed achieved a score of 31.02. Similar to accuracy, drivers are also informed of alternative routes to make delivery easier.

On the other hand, attributes in GrabFood that are superior to GoFood, including:

Food prices achieved a score of 23.15. Buyers feel that the price of food on GoFood is lower than GrabFood. This is influenced by the original price of the food, which must be added with additional costs for using the application.

Delivery fee showed a score of 25.10. GoFood shipping costs are known to be cheaper, and it offers more discounts compared to GrabFood.

Promotion achieved a value of 29.77. The promotions given by GoFood turned out to be more significant, resulting in bigger discounts.

Different Tests on Attitudes and Consumer Satisfaction on Online Application

After the data was obtained through the questionnaire, it was tested for validity and reliability. A validity test is measured to test whether a questionnaire is valid or not. When the value of the r count is higher than the value of the r table (0.361), the questionnaire items are considered valid. In this test, 20 respondents were included. The test of 12 question attributes shows that all 12 attributes are valid. Next, the reliability test was conducted to measure the level of consistency and stability of the questionnaire.

Table 4 GoFood and GrabFood consumer attitude ratings

Ranks				
	Online application	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
Attitude score	GoFood	12	12,92	155,00
	GrabFood	12	12,08	145,00
	Total	24		

Source: Data processing by researchers

The reliability test measures the consistency of repeated measurements. A questionnaire is reliable if the reliability test results in the Cronbach's Alpha value above 0.7. In this questionnaire, the attributes in the questionnaire questions include all variables with 12 attributes on GoFood and GrabFood.

Mann-Whitney test is used to examine if there is a significant difference between two variables, in this case, the consumer attitudes and satisfaction of GoFood and GrabFood. The produced data can be seen in Table 4, which shows the ratings on the attitudes of consumers of the GoFood and GrabFood applications through the app.

In Table 4, the ranking results show that the mean value for consumer attitudes using the GoFood is greater than the mean value for consumer attitudes using the GrabFood, with the mean value of 12.92 and 12.08. This means that the level of consumer preference for GoFood is higher than that for GrabFood.

Data were analyzed to see the significance of attitudes between the applications. Based on the Mann-Whitney test analysis results, the value of Exact sig is obtained. The Sig (2-tailed) value is 0,773 or the probability is above 0,05 (0.773 > 0.05). Therefore, Ho is accepted, meaning that there is no significant difference in consumer attitudes between GoFood and GrabFood. In other words, consumers show similar preferences and liking in accessing and using both applications.

Table 5 GoFood and GrabFood online application consumer satisfaction ratings

Ranks				
	Online application	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Consumer Satisfaction	GoFood	12	14,33	172,00
	GrabFood	12	10,67	128,00
	Total	24		

Source: Data processing by researchers

In terms of consumer satisfaction, ratings result of GoFood and GrabFood can be seen in Table 5.

In Table 5, the ranking results show that the mean value of consumer satisfaction with GoFood is greater than that of GrabFood with a mean value of 14.33 to 10.67. This indicates that the level of satisfaction with the services provided by GoFood is higher than the services provided by GrabFood. Based on the results of the Mann-Whitney test, the value of Exact sig is obtained. The Sig (2-tailed) value is 0,204 or probability of above 0.05 (0.204 > 0.05). Therefore, Ho is accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference in consumer satisfaction between GoFood and GrabFood. This means that consumers are similarly satisfied with GoFood and GrabFood online applications.

DISCUSSION

People's desire to live healthy and limited space are the main factors in making decisions to use online applications. The community accepts the GoFood and GrabFood applications well, and even this application also helps business actors grow back from the decline in purchasing power at the beginning of the pandemic. There are other factors consumers have taken into consideration since the pandemic, including practicality, cleanliness, and speed of delivery (Shabrina, 2018). This research is in line with Nurhasana et al. (2021) that the use of online applications is increasing because of the application's security that can be accounted for and affordable costs. Both applications carry out a 7P marketing mix that affects consumer satisfaction, including product, price, place, promotion, people, process, and physical evidence. Even so, partially only products that are proven to significantly affect consumer satisfaction (Farida, Tarmizi, & November, 2016).

Previous research has found several factors influencing consumer purchasing decisions, attitudes, and satisfaction. The consideration of consumers buying a product online (Nurmadina, 2016) is to follow trends and want to look different as well as a practical impression when buying online rather than offline stores. Factors that influence product purchasing decisions are physical and environmental. Another research found that the absence of a relationship between income and age did not correlate with consumers' attitudes towards online shopping (Hermawan, 2017; Hertaswari, 2016). However, Hertaswari (2016) also found that gender can influence but depends on the type of goods

purchased by consumers. Purchase decisions were also found to be influenced by service quality, price, and product quality (Arifin & Rachmadi, 2021; Ikram, 2021; Pinaraswati & Farida, 2021; Ruus et al., 2021)

For the attitude test, the GrabFood application does have its own because this application offers many discount coupons that can grab the consumers' attention. The GoFood application also provides discount coupons but not as much and is as flexible as the GrabFood application. Both applications are shown to grab consumer attention. Consumers reported the highest attitudinal score in the condition of the food delivered by the GoFood driver. This may happen because GoFood drivers deliver food carefully, ensuring it reaches consumers in good condition and does not harm the consumer. The condition of the food can greatly affect consumer evaluation of the service. When they receive food that is not fresh or something like gravy or oil is spilled, this can harm the consumer and make them lose their appetite. In addition, good food conditions can make consumers directly assess the performance of the application driver. In turn, it directly impacts consumer perception of the application. Therefore, this aspect is crucial to note.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Rahmawati (2020), in which the use of online applications during the pandemic attracts consumers as it offers many benefits, including ease of access, practicality, and more affordable prices. Another research also shows that purchasing intention, subjective norm, behavior control perception, and attitude influence consumers to buy something (Ariansyah, Najib, & Munandar, 2020).

The assessment of satisfaction criteria indicates that the expectations and performance levels of GoFood and GrabFood services are consistent. Consumers' expectations are fulfilled by the actual services they receive from the online-based ready-to-eat delivery services. Customer attitude is also one of the elements to measure satisfaction (Novita & Wijaya, 2021). When the customer's attitude is negative after consuming food through an online application, the consumer becomes dissatisfied with the online application (Al Amin et al., 2020).

The concept of consumer satisfaction is an emotional or cognitive response from someone whose definition of satisfaction is almost related to the emotional response (Ngoc & Uyen, 2015; Suhari, Sri, Redjeki, & Handoko. 2012). Several attributes must be considered to influence

consumer satisfaction in virtual settings, namely convenience, design of online sites, informativeness, security, and communication which significantly influence the consequences of consumer satisfaction (Chiu & Cho, 2019; Ishak, 2012). Not much different from previous research, research conducted by Raudios et al. (2012) found that variables affecting consumer satisfaction, especially in online buying and selling forums, include trust, service, assurance, and empathy.

In line with research conducted by Harahap (2018), additional user features such as attractive visual and graphic designs can attract consumers to visit websites or online applications and, in turn, encourage consumers to buy online. When consumers perceive that an application has benefits to facilitate their activities, they will have a positive attitude towards it (Kang & Namkung, 2019). The design of the application features is the most influential variable in consumer satisfaction and is significant among all factors. When consumers perceive an online food delivery application as easy to use, consumers will be satisfied (Makanyeza, 2017). There is also a significant positive influence of consumer income on consumer social relations (Zabalegui et al., 2013). Also, a connection between work and social needs can affect consumers (Bavel et al., 2020; Son et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2020). Social support can be through help from family and friends (Amalia & Rahmatika, 2020).

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on this research, there are four conclusions drawn. The buying decision process involves five stages. First, consumers identify problems (e.g., hunger), and motivation to buy emerges after seeing advertisements from applications supported by the practicality offered. Next, from these desires, consumers look for sources of information from the internet and media. When buying, some consumers impulsively buy while others buy according to plan. Also, not all consumers buy for themselves, but some also buy for others. Finally, after buying, consumers evaluate their satisfaction. In the present study, 97 respondents were satisfied and wanted to repurchase via the application instead of buying it directly. Furthermore, consumer attitudes toward GrabFood are better than GoFood. However, there is no significant difference in consumer attitudes and satisfaction between GoFood and GrabFood. At the end of the study, consumer satisfaction after using GoFood services is higher than GrabFood.

This research has several limitations. First, it only involved 100 respondents whose research results cannot be generalized and represent the population. Second, data was taken from the environment around the researcher, which may cause bias in the findings. Third, the definition of satisfaction that is the difference between performance and expectations.

Based on the results of the study, there are several suggestions given. First, GrabFood can improve driver behavior and cleanliness, payment options, location databases servers, and delivery estimates accuracy. Second, GoFood should review price, shipping costs, promotions, and delivery speed. This also has an impact on consumer satisfaction. Third, suggestions for the two applications to improve performance are: (1) The price displayed on the application should adjust to the existing market conditions so that it can reach broader consumers, (2) Shipping costs should be applied per kilometer so that the shipping costs are not too high when ordering nearby, (3) Promotions should be given with a clear deadline and a reminder so that consumers will not miss them, and (4) Remind drivers to keep prioritizing credibility, integrity, and hard work to provide the best service.

REFERENCES

Al Amin, M., Arefin, M. S., Sultana, N., Islam, M. ., Jahan, L., & Akhtar, A. (2020). Evaluating the customers' dining attitudes, e-satisfaction and continuance intention toward Mobile Food Ordering Apps (MFOAs): Evidence from Bangladesh. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, *30*(2), 211–229. doi: 10.1108/EJMBE-04-2020-0066

Amalia, A., & Rahmatika, R. (2020). Peran dukungan sosial bagi kesejahteraan psikologis family caregiver orang dengan skizofrenia (Ods) rawat jalan. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga Dan Konsumen*, *13*(2), 228–238. doi: 10.24156/jikk.2020.13.3.228

Ariansyah, A., Najib, M., & Munandar, J. M. (2020). Faktor-faktor yang memengaruhi niat konsumen untuk membeli produk melalui e-commerce. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Organisasi*, *11*(2), 83–90. doi: 10.29244/jmo.v11i2.32170

Arifin, R., & Rachmadi, K. R. (2021). Analisis e-service quality, harga, dan e-promotion terhadap e-customer satisfaction pada konsumen Grabfood selama pandemi Covid-19 di Kota Malang. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, *3*(2), 133–151.

Aritonang, R. L. (2005). *Kepuasan pelanggan*. Jakarta (ID): Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Barata, A. A. (2003). *Dasar - dasar pelayanan prima* (R. L. Toruan (ed.)). Jakarta (ID): PT Elex Media Komputindo.

Bavel, J. J. V., Baicker, K., Boggio, P. S., Capraro, V., Cichocka, A., Cikara, M., Crockett, M. J., Crum, A. J., Douglas, K. M., Druckman, J. N., Drury, J., Dube, O., Ellemers, N., Finkel, E. J., Fowler, J. H., Gelfand, M., Han, S., Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J., … Willer, R. (2020). Using social and behavioural science to support Covid-19 pandemic response. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *4*(5), 460–471. doi: 10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z

Chiu, W., & Cho, H. (2019). The effect of perceived brand leadership on consumers' satisfaction and repurchase intention on e-commerce website. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*. doi: 10.1108/APJML-10-2018-0403

Dukcapil. (2020). *Berapa kepadatan penduduk DKI Jakarta saat ini?* retrieved from http://statistik.jakarta.go.id/berapa-kepadatan-penduduk-dki-jakarta-saat-ini/

Engel, J., Blackwell, R., & Minard, P. (1995). *Consumer behavior* (the 8th ed). Dryden Press.

Ezizwita, & Sukma, T. (2021). Dampak pandemi Covid-19 terhadap bisnis kulinerdan strategi beradaptasi di era new normal. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis Dharma Andalas*, *23*(1), 51–63.

Farida, I., Tarmizi, A., & November, Y. (2016). Analisis pengaruh bauran pemasaran 7P terhadap kepuasan pelanggan pengguna gojek online. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen Dan Bisnis (JRMB) Fakultas Ekonomi UNIAT*, *1*(1), 31–40. doi: 10.36226/jrmb.v1i1.8

Fishbein, M., Hill, R. J., & Ajzen, I. (1977). Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. *Contemporary Sociology*, *6*(2), 244. doi: 10.2307/2065853

Ha, H., & Janda, S. (2012). Predicting consumers intentions to purchase energy-efficient products. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. doi: 10.1108/07363761211274974

Harahap, D. A. (2018). Perilaku belanja online di Indonesia: Studi kasus. *JRMSI - Jurnal Riset Manajemen Sains Indonesia*, *9*(2), 193–213. doi: 10.21009/jrmsi.009.2.02

Hermawan, H. (2017). Sikap konsumen terhadap belanja online. *WACANA, Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Komunikasi*, *16*(1), 136. doi: 10.32509/wacana.v16i1.6

Hertaswari, O. L. (2016). *Pengaruh perbedaan sikap konsumen terhadap gadget online shop dan fashion online shop pada minat beli ulang konsumen dilihat dari gender, usia, dan perilaku*. Universitas Sanata Dharma Yogyakarta.

Ikram, M. M. (2021). Keputusan Penggunaan layanan GoFood selama pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, *9*(2). doi: 10.37641/jimkes.v9i2.467

Ishak, A. (2012). Analisis kepuasan pelanggan dalam belanja online sebuah stufi tentang penyebab (Antecedents) dan konsekuensi (consequents). *Jurnal Siasat Bisnis*, *16*(2), 141–154. https://posmetropadang.co.id/guru-honorer-swasta-merasa-dianaktirkan/

Kang, J. W., & Namkung, Y. (2019). The role of personalization on continuance intention in food delivery mobile apps: A privacy calculus perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *31*(2), 734–752. doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-12-2017-0783

Kartika, N. E. (2020). Fitur aplikasi gojek favorit konsumen pada saat pandemi Covid-19 di Kota Bandung. *Jurnal Communio : Jurnal Jurusan Ilmu Komunikasi*, *9*(2), 1680–1695. doi: 10.35508/jikom.v9i2.2922

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2006). *Marketing management*. New York (US): In *Organization* (Twelfth ed). Prentice Hall.

Makanyeza, C. (2017). Determinants of consumers' intention to adopt mobile banking service in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*. doi: 10.1108/IJBM-07-2016-0099

Ngoc, K. M., & Uyen, T. T. (2015). Factors affecting guest perceived service quality, product quality, and satisfaction-a study of luxury restaurants in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. *Journal of Advanced Management Science*. doi: 10.12720/joams.3.4.284-291

Nicola, M., Alsafi, Z., Sohrabi, C., Kerwan, A., Al-Jabir, A., Iosifidis, C., Agha, M., & Agha, R. (2020). The socio-economic implication of the coronavirus pandemic (Covid-19): A Review. *Journal of Surgery*, *78*(January), 185–193. doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2020.04.018

Niles, M. ., Bertmann, F., Belarmino, E. ., Wentworth, T., Biehl, E., & Neff, R. (2020).

The early food insecurity impacts of Covid-19. *Nutrients*, *12*(7), 1–23. https://doi.org/of Covid-19. Nutrients, 12(7), 1–23. doi: 10.3390/nu12072096

Novita, & Wijaya, A. (2021). Anteseden peningkatan penggunaan online food delivery pada masa pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Akuntansi*, *16*(2), 441–452.

Nurbaya, Mursaha, A., & Chandra, W. (2020). Perubahan sistem pelayanan makanan pada usaha kuliner selama masa pandemi Covid-19 dan era kebiasaan baru di Kota Makassar. *Jurnal Kesehatan Manarang*, *6*(October), 61–68. doi: 10.33490/jkm.v6iKhusus.335

Nurhasana, R., Matsuyuki, M., Hasan, C., Shellasih, N. M., Ningtyas, F. R., Fitrinitia, I., Negama, T., & Kuwayama, S. (2021). The socioeconomic conditions of online taxi driver families during the Covid-19 pandemic in Jakarta Greater Area. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen, 14*(3), 216–226. doi: 10.24156/jikk.2021.14.3.216

Nurmadina. (2016). Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi keputusan pembelian secara online. *Intekna*, *16*(1), 82–93.

Oliver, R. I. (1981). Measurement and evaluation of the satisfaction processes in retail settings. *Journal of Retailing*, *57*(3).

Paojiyah, S. (2018). *Analisis kepuasan dan loyalitas konsumen dapoer meneer resto dan coffee shop Kota Serang*. Institut Pertanian Bogo.

Pinaraswati, S. O., & Farida, I. (2021). Analisis Keputusan pembelian fast food berdasarlan kualitas layanan, harga, dan kualitas produk di masa pandemi. *Jurnal Eksekutif*, *18*(2), 267–277.

Qian, M., & Jiang, J. (2020). Covid-19 and social distancing. *Journal of Public Health*. doi: 10.1007/ s10389-020-01321-z.

Rahmawati, L. (2020). Peran e-commerce dalam mendukung ketahanan pangan wilayah Jakarta Saat the role of e-commerce in supporting food security in Jakarta region during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Magister Ketahanan Nasional, Universitas Gadjah Mada*, *8*(2), 11–27.

Rahwanto, E., Komala, R., & Sudaryono. (2020). E-commerce dorong perekonomian indonesia, selama pandemi Covid 19 sebagai entrepreneur modern dan pengaruhnya terhadap bisnis offline. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis (JUMANIS) Produ*

Kewirausahaan, *2*(2), 111–124. doi: 10.47080

Ratcliffe, R. (2020). *First coronavirus cases confirmed in Indonesia amid fears nation is ill-prepared for outbreak*. The Guardian. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/ mar/02/first-coronavirus-cases-confirmed-in-indonesia-amid-fears-nation-is-ill-prepared-for-outbreak

Raudios, Lau, E. A., & Effendi, M. (2016). Analisis kepuasan konsumen pada forum jual beli online busam (Bubuhan Samarinda). *Ekonomia*, *5*(3).

Ruus, R., Tanor, L., & Kumajas, L. (2021). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan dan persepsi harga terhadap loyalitas pelanggan GrabFood: Studi kasus mahasiswa Universitas Negeri Manado Pengguna GrabFood Era Covid-19). *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, *6*(1).

Schiffman, L. G., & Kanuk, L. L. (1997). *Consumer behavior* (6th ed.). New Jersey (US): Prentice Hall.

Setyowati, D. (2021). *Momentuk Works: Transaksi GrabFood Rp 83 T, GoFood Rp 28T pada 2020*. Retrieved from https://katadata.co.id/desysetyowati/digital/ 5ffe62507237e/momentum-works-transaksi-grabfood-rp-83-t-gofood-rp-28-t-pada-2020

Shabrina, F. (2018). *Analisis perilaku konsumen produk nutritional shake mix herbalife di lima rumah nutrisi Kabupaten Bogor*. Institut Pertanian Bogor.

Simamora, B. (2001). *Remarketing for business recovery*. Jakarta (ID): Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Simamora, B. (2004). *Panduan riset perilaku konsumen* (2nd ed.). Jakarta (ID): PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Son, C., Hedge, S., Smith, A., Wang, X., & Sasangohar, F. (2020). Effects of Covid-19 on college students' mental health in the United States: Interview survey study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *22*(9), 1–21. doi: 10.2196/21279

Sugiyono. (2005). *Metode penelitian bisnis*. Jakarta (ID): Bandung Alfabeta 2004.

Suhari, Y., Sri, R., Redjeki, A., & Handoko, T. (2012). Perilaku konsumen online. *Jurnal Teknologi Informasi*, *17*(1), 46–58.

Sumarwan, U. (2011). *Perilaku konsumen: Teori dan penerapannya dalam*

pemasaran (R. Sikumbang (ed.); Kedua). Jakarta (ID): Ghalia Indonesia.

Taufik, & Ayuningtyas, E. (2020). Dampak pandemi Covid-19 terhadap bisnis online dan eksistensi platform online. *Jurnal Pengembangan Wiraswasta*, *22*(01), 21–32.

Webster, A. L. (1998). *Applied statistics for business* (3rd, Revise ed.). New York City (US): McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Yu, H., Li, M., Li, Z., Xiang, W., Yuang, Y., Liu, Y., & Xiong, Z. (2020). Coping style, social support and psychological distress in the general Chinese population in the early stages of Covid-19 epidemic. *BMC Psychiatry*, *20*(1), 1–11. doi: 10.1186/12888-020-02826-3

Zabalegui, A., Cabrera, E., Navarro, M., & Cebria, M. . (2013). Perceived social support and coping strategies in advanced cancer patients. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, *18*(5), 409–420. doi: 10.1177/1744987111424560