



A STUDY ON CUSTOMER SATISFACTION TOWARDS TRADITIONAL TAXIS IN SOUTH MUMBAI

Farheen Anwar Hussain Makrani

Ph.D Student in Commerce,

Dr. Kuldeep Shivprasad Sharma

Research Co-ordination, HoD of Commerce,

K.P.B Hinduja College of Commerce.

Abstract

Human life has become much simpler, quicker, and more productive thanks to digitization. One of the biggest and most significant revolutions in human history. Digitization has had an impact on practically all industries, not only the IT sector, as a means of completing tasks swiftly and effectively with the least amount of human interaction. The transportation infrastructure in metropolitan areas has changed significantly over the last ten years. In India's metropolitan and urban cities, taxis have emerged as a key means of transportation among the many others. Taxi services are a private, typically door-to-door service that is mostly provided to the general public at the local level. Horse wagons were the predominant means of transportation in the first decade of the 20th century, but in 1911 Taxi Cabs (conventionally known as Taxis) took their place due to their inefficiency. The study is aimed at identifying customer satisfaction towards Traditional taxis. The study investigated the variables that influenced customer satisfaction based on different parameters. Independent Sample t-test and One-way Anova has been applied for the purpose of statistical analysis of the findings of the research.

Keywords: *Customer Behavior, Metered Taxi, Satisfaction, Transport Industry*

Copyright © 2022 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

Introduction:

A taxi, often known as a taxicab or just a cab, is a kind of hired car with a driver that is employed by one person or a small group of people, frequently for a private ride. A taxicab takes people to and from the destinations of their choice. Urban transportation infrastructure has seen significant alterations over the last ten years. In India's

metropolitan and urban cities, taxis have emerged as one of the most popular ways of transportation. Since people's lifestyles are changing and their disposable income is rising, there is a tremendous rise in the demand for taxi services in India. Nevertheless, due to traffic congestion and taxis' easy accessibility at reasonable prices, people choose to use them for transportation over their own



vehicles. In today's world, the cab industry is essential to our civilization. The most crucial elements, especially for city dwellers who frequently take public transportation or do not own a car. One of the most practical modes of transportation is the taxi. People use cabs to make their lives more convenient, get somewhere more quickly, and more easily.

Objectives of the Study:

- 1) To understand the socio-economic profile of customers using Traditional Taxi services.
- 2) To measure customer satisfaction towards Traditional taxis.

Hypotheses of the Study:

(H₀): There is no significant association between demographic variables (gender, occupation, income) of customers and the level of satisfaction.

(H₁): There is a significant association between demographic variables (gender, occupation, income) of customers and the level of satisfaction.

Research Methodology:

Primary Data:

Primary data was collected by administering online questionnaire. An online link was forwarded to all the respondents and the response was recorded.

Secondary Data:

The secondary data is collected from several sources such as articles from newspapers, online journals, magazines, internet, yojana magazine etc.

Sample Design:

i. Target Population:

The Target Population for the purpose of the study is the customers of Traditional Taxi services.

ii. Sample Selection:

The Sample was selected by adopting Non-Probability Convenience Sampling method.

Limitations of the Study:

- 1) The Study is confined mainly to the traditional taxi customers of South Mumbai, which could not disclose an accurate picture of the entire population.
- 2) Time was a vital impediment because of which depth analysis could not be administered.

Review of Literature:

Sandhu (2019) conducted a study that aimed to differentiate between the traditional taxi market sector and the app-based taxi market segment in order to support the taxi service industry in creating its strategy and customer relationship strategies. While comfort, dependability, and price also have an impact on client satisfaction in the taxi market, this study showed that driver behaviour had a negative correlation with it. The most significant and critical performance indicators according to this study were journey speed, passenger costs, and service quality. In order to give a quick overview of all factors relating to the city's environment, public safety, service quality, mobility patterns, productivity, and levels of congestion and pollution, the report had presented a detailed Impact of Taxi market categories now existing in Nagpur.

Chetanont (2016) observed that the perception of service quality and user satisfaction with public taxi services in Bangkok were both at a high level. Researchers analyse descriptive statistics by frequency, percentage table, standard deviation, and means, and the inferential statistics analysis used T-test, F-test, and One-Way Anova. Other public transportation options besides public taxi services should be done to bring data for analysis and to find

out app. According to the findings, foreign tourists Flexibility, Professionalism and Service Skills, and had a high degree of satisfaction with public taxi Attitudes and Behaviors. services in terms of Reaching Services and

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

Descriptive Statistics:

Gender

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Female | 90 | 64.2 | 64.2 | 64.2 |
| Male | 50 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Comment: The percentage of female respondents is higher than that of male respondents in this sample.

Age

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Under 18 years | 22 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 15.8 |
| 18-25 years | 50 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 51.5 |
| 25-40 years | 58 | 41.4 | 41.4 | 92.9 |
| 40-60 years | 10 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Comment: There are 41.4% respondents in the age group of 25-40 years followed by 35.7% in the age group of 18-25 years.

Marital status

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Unmarried | 96 | 68.6 | 68.6 | 68.6 |
| Married | 44 | 31.4 | 31.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Comment: Majority of the respondents (68.6%) are unmarried.

Qualification

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Higher Secondary | 10 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.1 |
| Undergraduate | 22 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 22.9 |
| Graduate | 60 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 65.8 |
| Postgraduate | 22 | 15.7 | 15.7 | 74.3 |
| Professional | 26 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Comment: 42.9% respondents are graduates followed by 18.5% professionals and 15.7% postgraduates.

Occupation

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Student | 52 | 37.14 | 37.14 | 37.14 |
| Government employee | 24 | 17.14 | 17.14 | 54.28 |
| Self-employed | 8 | 5.71 | 5.71 | 59.99 |
| Business | 20 | 14.28 | 14.28 | 74.27 |
| Housewife | 36 | 25.71 | 25.71 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Comment: Homemakers, students and business people form about 77% of the respondents

Testing of Hypothesis

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no significant association between demographic variables (gender, occupation, income) of customers and the level of satisfaction.

Independent samples t test is used for gender and ANOVA is used for income and occupation.

Group Statistics

| | Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|--------|----|------|----------------|-----------------|
| Satisfaction level with respect to cleanliness of taxi | Female | 82 | 3.15 | .818 | .090 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.48 | .682 | .090 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to space available for luggage | Female | 82 | 3.15 | .904 | .100 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.52 | .731 | .096 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to fare charges | Female | 82 | 3.44 | .995 | .110 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.59 | .773 | .102 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to safety and security | Female | 82 | 3.22 | .903 | .100 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.48 | .822 | .108 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to comfort inside the vehicle | Female | 82 | 3.41 | 1.042 | .115 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.62 | .813 | .107 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to drivers driving ability | Female | 82 | 3.34 | .984 | .109 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.48 | .822 | .108 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to assistance provided by drivers | Female | 82 | 3.27 | .917 | .101 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.59 | .726 | .095 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to appearance of drivers | Female | 82 | 3.27 | 1.043 | .115 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.38 | .933 | .123 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to attitude of driver | Female | 82 | 3.32 | 1.099 | .121 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.38 | .970 | .127 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|----|------|-------|------|
| Satisfaction level with respect to driver's knowledge of route/destination | Female | 82 | 3.29 | .975 | .108 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.66 | .928 | .122 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to lighting and ventilation | Female | 82 | 3.44 | .995 | .110 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.76 | .865 | .114 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to speed of vehicle | Female | 82 | 3.27 | .917 | .101 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.76 | .823 | .108 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to taxi travel time | Female | 82 | 3.49 | 1.021 | .113 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.76 | .823 | .108 |

| Independent Samples Test | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|-------|
| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| | | F | Sig. | t | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Satisfaction level with respect to cleanliness of taxi | Equal variances assumed | .039 | .844 | -2.564 | 138 | .011 | -.336 | .131 | -.596 | -.077 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -2.645 | 134.265 | .009 | -.336 | .127 | -.588 | -.085 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to space available for luggage | Equal variances assumed | .684 | .410 | -2.582 | 138 | .011 | -.371 | .144 | -.655 | -.087 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -2.677 | 135.466 | .008 | -.371 | .139 | -.645 | -.097 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to fare charges | Equal variances assumed | 1.499 | .223 | -.943 | 138 | .347 | -.147 | .156 | -.456 | .162 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.984 | 136.731 | .327 | -.147 | .150 | -.443 | .149 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to safety and security | Equal variances assumed | .008 | .928 | -1.763 | 138 | .080 | -.263 | .149 | -.559 | .032 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.792 | 129.487 | .075 | -.263 | .147 | -.554 | .027 |



| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-------|------|--------|---------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| Satisfaction level with respect to comfort inside the vehicle | Equal variances assumed | 2.531 | .114 | -1.259 | 138 | .210 | -.206 | .164 | -.530 | .118 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.313 | 136.619 | .191 | -.206 | .157 | -.516 | .104 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to drivers driving ability | Equal variances assumed | .863 | .354 | -.895 | 138 | .373 | -.141 | .158 | -.454 | .171 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.923 | 134.156 | .358 | -.141 | .153 | -.444 | .162 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to assistance provided by drivers | Equal variances assumed | .662 | .417 | -2.197 | 138 | .030 | -.318 | .145 | -.604 | -.032 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -2.286 | 136.172 | .024 | -.318 | .139 | -.593 | -.043 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to appearance of drivers | Equal variances assumed | .556 | .457 | -.648 | 138 | .518 | -.111 | .171 | -.450 | .228 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.660 | 130.505 | .510 | -.111 | .168 | -.444 | .222 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to attitude of driver | Equal variances assumed | .718 | .398 | -.346 | 138 | .730 | -.062 | .180 | -.418 | .293 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.354 | 131.282 | .724 | -.062 | .176 | -.410 | .286 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to driver's knowledge of route/destination | Equal variances assumed | .005 | .942 | -2.210 | 138 | .029 | -.362 | .164 | -.687 | -.038 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -2.229 | 126.470 | .028 | -.362 | .163 | -.684 | -.041 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to lighting and ventilation | Equal variances assumed | .798 | .373 | -1.975 | 138 | .050 | -.320 | .162 | -.640 | .000 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -2.023 | 132.178 | .045 | -.320 | .158 | -.632 | -.007 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to | Equal variances assumed | .121 | .728 | -3.250 | 138 | .001 | -.490 | .151 | -.789 | -.192 |



| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-------|------|--------|---------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| speed of vehicle | Equal variances not assumed | | | -3.311 | 130.319 | .001 | -.490 | .148 | -.783 | -.197 |
| Satisfaction level with respect to taxi travel time | Equal variances assumed | 1.738 | .190 | -1.671 | 138 | .097 | -.271 | .162 | -.591 | .050 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.734 | 135.587 | .085 | -.271 | .156 | -.580 | .038 |

ANOVA (with respect to occupation)

| | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Satisfaction level with respect to cleanliness of taxi | Between Groups | 1.821 | 5 | .364 | .590 | .708 |
| | Within Groups | 82.750 | 134 | .618 | | |
| | Total | 84.571 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to space available for luggage | Between Groups | 3.628 | 5 | .726 | .994 | .424 |
| | Within Groups | 97.772 | 134 | .730 | | |
| | Total | 101.400 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to fare charges | Between Groups | 1.736 | 5 | .347 | .411 | .841 |
| | Within Groups | 113.264 | 134 | .845 | | |
| | Total | 115.000 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to safety and security | Between Groups | 8.963 | 5 | 1.793 | 2.453 | .037 |
| | Within Groups | 97.922 | 134 | .731 | | |
| | Total | 106.886 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to comfort inside the vehicle | Between Groups | 4.436 | 5 | .887 | .970 | .439 |
| | Within Groups | 122.564 | 134 | .915 | | |
| | Total | 127.000 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to drivers driving ability | Between Groups | 4.203 | 5 | .841 | .993 | .424 |
| | Within Groups | 113.397 | 134 | .846 | | |
| | Total | 117.600 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to assistance provided by drivers | Between Groups | 6.494 | 5 | 1.299 | 1.830 | .111 |
| | Within Groups | 95.106 | 134 | .710 | | |
| | Total | 101.600 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to appearance of drivers | Between Groups | 6.916 | 5 | 1.383 | 1.412 | .224 |
| | Within Groups | 131.256 | 134 | .980 | | |
| | Total | 138.171 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to attitude of driver | Between Groups | 18.468 | 5 | 3.694 | 3.719 | .003 |
| | Within Groups | 133.075 | 134 | .993 | | |
| | Total | 151.543 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to driver's knowledge of route/destination | Between Groups | 3.437 | 5 | .687 | .725 | .606 |
| | Within Groups | 127.106 | 134 | .949 | | |
| | Total | 130.543 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to lighting and ventilation | Between Groups | 8.986 | 5 | 1.797 | 2.053 | .075 |
| | Within Groups | 117.300 | 134 | .875 | | |
| | Total | 126.286 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to speed of vehicle | Between Groups | 4.380 | 5 | .876 | 1.062 | .384 |
| | Within Groups | 110.506 | 134 | .825 | | |
| | Total | 114.886 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to taxi travel time | Between Groups | 7.786 | 5 | 1.557 | 1.771 | .123 |
| | Within Groups | 117.814 | 134 | .879 | | |
| | Total | 125.600 | 139 | | | |



ANOVA (with respect to income)

| | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Satisfaction level with respect to cleanliness of taxi | Between Groups | 12.431 | 3 | 4.144 | 7.811 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 72.141 | 136 | .530 | | |
| | Total | 84.571 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to space available for luggage | Between Groups | 8.817 | 3 | 2.939 | 4.317 | .006 |
| | Within Groups | 92.583 | 136 | .681 | | |
| | Total | 101.400 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to fare charges | Between Groups | 11.871 | 3 | 3.957 | 5.218 | .002 |
| | Within Groups | 103.129 | 136 | .758 | | |
| | Total | 115.000 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to safety and security | Between Groups | 29.382 | 3 | 9.794 | 17.186 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 77.504 | 136 | .570 | | |
| | Total | 106.886 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to comfort inside the vehicle | Between Groups | 27.062 | 3 | 9.021 | 12.275 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 99.938 | 136 | .735 | | |
| | Total | 127.000 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to drivers driving ability | Between Groups | 19.453 | 3 | 6.484 | 8.985 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 98.147 | 136 | .722 | | |
| | Total | 117.600 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to assistance provided by drivers | Between Groups | 21.072 | 3 | 7.024 | 11.863 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 80.528 | 136 | .592 | | |
| | Total | 101.600 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to appearance of drivers | Between Groups | 24.709 | 3 | 8.236 | 9.872 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 113.462 | 136 | .834 | | |
| | Total | 138.171 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to attitude of driver | Between Groups | 31.622 | 3 | 10.541 | 11.954 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 119.921 | 136 | .882 | | |
| | Total | 151.543 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to driver's knowledge of route/destination | Between Groups | 22.110 | 3 | 7.370 | 9.244 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 108.433 | 136 | .797 | | |
| | Total | 130.543 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to lighting and ventilation | Between Groups | 13.353 | 3 | 4.451 | 5.360 | .002 |
| | Within Groups | 112.933 | 136 | .830 | | |
| | Total | 126.286 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to speed of vehicle | Between Groups | 15.535 | 3 | 5.178 | 7.088 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 99.351 | 136 | .731 | | |
| | Total | 114.886 | 139 | | | |
| Satisfaction level with respect to taxi travel time | Between Groups | 22.820 | 3 | 7.607 | 10.065 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 102.780 | 136 | .756 | | |
| | Total | 125.600 | 139 | | | |

Summary of hypothesis testing:

| Sr. No. | Null Hypothesis | Test used | Significance value | Decision | Conclusion |
|---------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| 1. | H1(a): There is no significant association between the demographic | Independent samples t test for gender | 0.011 < 0.000 for gender | Null hypothesis accepted for occupation and rejected | There is a significant association between the demographic |



| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | variables (gender, income, and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to cleanliness of taxi | ANOVA for income, and occupation | 0.708 > 0.05 for occupation 0.000 < 0.05 for income | for other demographic variables | variables (gender, income) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to cleanliness of taxi |
| | H1(b): There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income, and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to space available for luggage | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income and occupation | 0.011 < 0.05 for gender 0.424 > 0.05 for occupation 0.006 < 0.05 for income | Null hypothesis accepted for occupation and rejected for other demographic variables | There is a significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to space available for luggage |
| | H1 (c): There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to fare charges | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income and occupation | 0.347 > 0.05 for gender 0.841 > 0.05 for occupation 0.002 < 0.05 for income | Null hypothesis accepted for gender and occupation and rejected for income | There is a significant association between income and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to fare charges |
| | H1(d): There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income and occupation | 0.08 > 0.05 for gender 0.037 < 0.05 for occupation 0.000 < 0.05 for income | Null hypothesis accepted for gender and rejected for occupation and income | There is a significant association between the demographic variables (income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | customers with respect to safety and security | | | | customers with respect to safety and security |
| | H1(e) : There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to comfort inside the vehicle | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income and occupation | 0.210> 0.05 for gender 0.439> 0.05 for occupation 0.000< 0.05 for income | Null hypothesis accepted for gender and occupation and rejected for income | There is a significant association between income and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to comfort inside the vehicle |
| | H1(f): There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to drivers driving ability | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income, and occupation | 0.373> 0.05 for gender 0.424> 0.05 for occupation 0.000< 0.05 for income | Null hypothesis accepted for gender and occupation and rejected for income | There is a significant association between income and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to drivers driving ability |
| | H1(g): There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to assistance provided by drivers | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income, and occupation | 0.03< 0.05 for gender 0.111> 0.05 for occupation 0.000< 0.05 for income | Null hypothesis accepted for occupation and rejected for gender and income | There is a significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to assistance provided by drivers |



| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | H1(h): There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to appearance of drivers | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income and occupation | 0.518 > 0.05 for gender 0.224 > 0.05 for occupation 0.000 < 0.05 for income | Null hypothesis accepted for gender and occupation and rejected for income | There is a significant association between income and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to appearance of drivers |
| | H1(i): There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to attitude of driver | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income, and occupation | 0.730 > 0.05 for gender 0.003 < 0.05 for occupation 0.000 < 0.05 for income | Null hypothesis accepted for gender, age and rejected for occupation and income | There is a significant association between the demographic variables (income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to attitude of driver |
| | H1(j): There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to driver's knowledge of route/destination | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income, and occupation | 0.029 < 0.05 for gender 0.026 < 0.05 for age 0.606 > 0.05 for occupation 0.000 < 0.05 for income | Null hypothesis accepted for occupation and rejected for gender, age and income | There is a significant association between the demographic variables (gender and income) and level of satisfaction of customers with respect to driver's knowledge of route/destination |
| | H1(k): There is no significant association between the | Independent samples t test for gender | 0.05 for gender | Null hypothesis accepted for occupation | There is a significant association between |



| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | demographic variables (gender, income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to lighting and ventilation | ANOVA for income and occupation | 0.075>0.05 for occupation 0.002<0.05 for income | and rejected for gender and income | demographic variables (gender and income) and level of satisfaction of customers with respect to lighting and ventilation |
| | H1(l): There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to functioning of booking app | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income and occupation | 0.054>0.05 for gender 0.045<0.05 for occupation 0.002<0.05 for income | Null hypothesis accepted for gender and rejected for occupation and income | There is a significant association between demographic variables (occupation and income) and level of satisfaction of customers with respect to functioning of booking app |
| | H1(m): There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income and occupation) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to speed of vehicle | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income and occupation | 0.001< 0.05 for gender 0.384> 0.05 for occupation 0.000< 0.05 for income | Null hypothesis accepted for occupation and rejected for gender and income | There is a significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income) and the level of satisfaction of customers with respect to speed of vehicle |
| | H1(n): There is no significant association between the demographic variables (gender, income and occupation) and the level of | Independent samples t test for gender ANOVA for income and occupation | 0.097> 0.05 for gender 0.123> 0.05 for occupation | Null hypothesis accepted for gender and occupation and rejected for income | There is a significant association between income and the level of satisfaction of customers with |



| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| | satisfaction of customers with respect to taxi travel time | | $0.000 < 0.05$ for income | | respect to taxi travel time |
|--|--|--|---------------------------|--|-----------------------------|

(a) Satisfaction of customers with online cabs

1. Satisfaction of customers with respect to cleanliness of taxi, assistance provided by drivers, driver's knowledge of route/destination, lighting and ventilation and taxi travel time is more for male respondents as compared to female respondents.
2. Satisfaction of customers with respect to safety and security is self-employed people and highest for business people. Satisfaction of customers with respect to attitude of driver is least for self-employed people and maximum for service people.
3. Satisfaction of customers with respect to cleanliness of taxi, space available for luggage, fare charges and safety and security is least for people with income of Rs. 10-15 lakh and highest for people with income of Rs. 5-10 lakh. Satisfaction of customers with respect to comfort inside the vehicle is least for people with income of Rs. 10-15 lakh and highest for people with income less than Rs. 1 lakh. Satisfaction of customers with respect to drivers driving ability is least for people with income of Rs. 10-15 lakh and highest for people with income of Rs. 5-10 lakh. Satisfaction of customers with respect to assistance provided by drivers is least for people with income of Rs. 10-15 lakh and highest for people with income less than Rs. 1 lakh. Satisfaction of customers with respect to

appearance of drivers and attitude of driver is least for people with income of Rs. 10-15 lakh and highest for people with income of Rs. 1-5 lakh.

Conclusion:

The survey reveals client satisfaction with call taxi services, the elements they consider when choosing a service provider, including cost, comfort, convenience, service quality, and customer care provided. This will be useful information for the service providers in determining how satisfied their customers are with their service and how frequently they use our services. The study revealed that factors such as cleanliness of taxi, assistance provided by drivers, driver's knowledge of route/destination, lighting and ventilation and taxi travel time has been identified to be more satisfying for male customers. India became digital through the process of digitization. Our need for necessities is growing along with the population. Time is running out for us to take action. We work faster and finish less work. Consequently, we digitise our nation. Our efficiency soars and we are able to save time, money, and fuel.

References:

Articles in Journals:

- Si, Y., Guan, H., & Cui, Y. (2019). Research on the Choice Behavior of Taxis and Express Services Based on the SEM-Logit Model. *Sustainability*, 11. doi :10.3390.



Sandhu, S.G. (2019). Impact Assessment of Taxi Services in Nagpur City: A Review. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology*, 7(IV), 1246-1250. doi:10.22214.

Chetanont, S. (2016). Quality Perception of Public Taxi Services towards Satisfaction in Using among Foreign Tourists: The Case Study of Taxis in Bangkok. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 4(8), 499-503. doi: 10.18178/joebm.2016.4.8.442.

Books:

Kothari, R., C. (2004) *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, Jaipur, New Age International Publishers.

Cite This Article:

Makrani F.A.H. & Dr. Sharma K. S., (2023 A Study on Customer Satisfaction towards Traditional Taxis in South Mumbai, Electronic International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, XII, Issue – I(a), Jan-Feb, 2023, 15-28