



## Customer Satisfaction Survey

**Report on Static Unit - Food Plaza (FP) at Chhapra**



---

ISO 9001: 2015 Certificate Number: 112008041

ISO 27001:2013 Certificate Number: 162012004

FTCCI Membership No. C-6511 MRSI Membership No. C-72

MSME Certificate Number UDYAM:TS-20-0002595

DATAWISE® is a registered Trademark of Datawise Services Private Limited (Trademark No: 4247105)

dATTAb® is a registered Trademark of Datawise Services Private Limited (Trademark No. 2361614)

SatisACTual® is a registered Trademark of Datawise Services Private Limited (Trademark No.5018144)



---

The material in this report is confidential and the property of **DATAWISE®**. This report has been prepared specifically for the use of the Indian Railway Catering and Tourism Corporation (IRCTC). This report provides information on the approach and methodology adopted for this assignment based on the TOR provided, our analysis of the survey findings, our conclusions, and recommendations. **DATAWISE®** shall not be liable if this report is used in any manner other than the purpose for which it is intended. Any copying or duplicating in any manner or use of this material by any third person or party, without the explicit written permission of **DATAWISE®**, is strictly prohibited and shall be liable for legal action

---

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>SUMMARY FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	GENDER.....	3
3.2	AGE GROUPS.....	4
3.3	TYPE OF FOOD .....	5
3.4	PURPOSE OF VISIT.....	6
<b>4</b>	<b>DETAILED ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1	OVERALL RATING .....	7
4.2	QUALITY OF FOOD & PACKAGING.....	12
4.3	QUANTITY OF FOOD.....	16
4.4	HYGIENE .....	20
4.5	MENU VARIETY.....	24
4.6	STAFF BEHAVIOUR .....	28
4.7	AVAILABILITY.....	32
4.8	SERVICE TIME .....	34
<b>5</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>ANNEXURE 1: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY (STATIC UNITS).....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>ANNEXURE 2: METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>40</b>



## Table of Figures

FIGURE 1: DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY GENDER .....	3
FIGURE 2: DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE GROUPS .....	4
FIGURE 3: DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY TYPE OF FOOD PREFERRED.....	5
FIGURE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY PURPOSE OF VISIT TO RESTAURANT .....	6
FIGURE 5: OVERALL RATING OF THE UNIT .....	7
FIGURE 6: GENDER-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF OVERALL RATING.....	8
FIGURE 7: AGE-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF OVERALL RATING .....	9
FIGURE 8: FOOD PREFERENCES-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF OVERALL RATING .....	10
FIGURE 9: QUALITY OF FOOD & PACKAGING RATING .....	12
FIGURE 10: GENDER-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF QUALITY OF FOOD RATING .....	13
FIGURE 11:AGE-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF QUALITY OF FOOD RATING .....	14
FIGURE 12: TYPE OF FOOD-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF QUALITY OF FOOD RATING .....	15
FIGURE 13: QUANTITY OF FOOD.....	16
FIGURE 14: GENDER-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF QUANTITY OF FOOD RATING .....	17
FIGURE 15: AGE-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF QUANTITY OF FOOD RATING .....	18
FIGURE 16: FOOD PREFERENCES-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF QUANTITY OF FOOD RATING .....	19
FIGURE 17: RATING ON HYGIENE.....	20
FIGURE 18: GENDER-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF HYGIENE RATING .....	21
FIGURE 19: AGE-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF HYGIENE RATING .....	22
FIGURE 20: FOOD PREFERENCE-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF HYGIENE RATING.....	23
FIGURE 21: MENU VARIETY RATING .....	24
FIGURE 22: GENDER-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF MENU VARIETY RATING .....	25
FIGURE 23: AGE-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF MENU VARIETY RATING .....	26
FIGURE 24: FOOD PREFERENCES-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF MENU VARIETY RATING.....	27
FIGURE 25: STAFF BEHAVIOUR RATING .....	28
FIGURE 26: GENDER-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF BEHAVIOUR RATING.....	29
FIGURE 27: AGE-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF BEHAVIOUR RATING .....	30
FIGURE 28: FOOD PREFERENCES WISE DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF BEHAVIOUR RATING .....	31
FIGURE 29: AVAILABILITY RATING .....	32
FIGURE 30: GENDER-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF AVAILABILITY RATING.....	32
FIGURE 31: AGE-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF AVAILABILITY RATING .....	33
FIGURE 32: OVERALL SERVICE TIME DISTRIBUTION .....	34



## Abbreviations

**EL** Executive Lounge

**FFU** Fast Food Units

**FP** Food Plaza

**IRCTC** The Indian Railway Catering and Tourism Corporation

**JA** Jan Aahaar Units

**RR** Refreshment Units

## **1 Overview**

The Indian Railway Catering and Tourism Corporation (IRCTC) is interested in determining the levels of satisfaction amongst its customers for both Static units (food serving units at railway stations), as well as mobile units (food being served inside trains).

For this purpose, surveys have been designed to be administered to customers at the point of purchase or consumption to collect feedback across various parameters such as Overall rating, Quality of Food, Quantity of Food, Hygiene, Variety of Food, Staff Behaviour, Availability of specific items, and Service time.

This report is prepared as an analysis of the survey of a Static Unit at the station Chhapra at Food Plaza (FP) unit type that was conducted from 16 Dec 2025 to 30 Dec 2025. A total of 101 surveys were conducted.

## **2 Introduction and Background**

IRCTC has asked for conducting Customer Satisfaction Surveys at around 500 static food units across the country. These static food units are broadly divided into the following types:

- Food Plazas (FP)
- Refreshment Rooms (RR)
- Fast Food Units (FFU)
- Jan Aahar Units (JA)
- Executive Lounges EL)

Data is collected using a survey instrument that asks feedback on a 5 point Likert scale with responses ranging from Excellent (5 points), to Bad (1 point). Wherever a specific experience is not encountered by a respondent, the service is indicated as “Not Applicable”. (refer to Annexure 1: Questionnaire for Customer Satisfaction Surveys)

Specific quotas are set depending on the type of Static unit, as follows:

Type of Static unit	Quota
Executive Lounge (EL)	30
Fast Food Unit (FFU)	50
Food Plaza (FP)	100
Refreshment Room (RR)	100
Jan Ahaar (JA)	50




Data was collected using a standard data collection methodology where Field Enumerators were deployed across each Static unit. In order to ensure uniformity of data collection and response, a standard training was provided to each Field Enumerator to familiarize them with the requirements of the Survey, and to ensure that quality norms were being achieved. A detailed methodology for data collection and analysis is provided in Annexure 2 to this report.

## 3 Summary Findings

This section highlights the key demographic parameters of the survey carried out for the Food Plaza (FP) at Chhapra.

### 3.1 Gender

This graph presents the demographic breakdown of survey respondents by gender.



*Figure 1: Distribution of respondents by Gender*

The distribution shows 76% male respondents and 24% female respondents.

## 3.2 Age Groups

The following graph represents the age-wise distribution of respondents across different age groups based on the survey conducted.




Figure 2: Distribution of respondents by Age Groups

The age distribution of respondents is segmented into four age brackets: 18-25 years, 26-40 years, 41-60 years and 61 years and above. The percentage of respondents surveyed in each age group are:

The respondent base is predominantly millennials, with the 26-40 years age group forming the largest segment at 54%. This is followed by respondents from 18-25, 41-60 years. Participation from the age group(s) 41-60 (16%) years is comparatively limited, indicating lower engagement levels. No responses have been recorded from the 61 and above years age group, indicating the need for further data collection in this segment.

### 3.3 Type of Food

The dietary preferences of customers, segmented into Vegetarian, Non-Vegetarian, Eggitarian, Satvik/Jain, and Vegan options.




Figure 3: Distribution of respondents by Type of Food preferred

The analysis reveals that Vegetarian emerge as the most preferred options, accounting for 92.08% of the responses. This is followed by Non-Vegetarian (eggs and all types of meat), Eggitarian (Vegetarian but eat egg & egg products) with 6.93%. No responses were recorded for Satvik / Jain, Vegan.

### 3.4 Purpose of Visit

This graph illustrates the primary reasons customers visit the railway restaurant/static unit.




Figure 4: Distribution of respondents by purpose of visit to Restaurant

A significant proportion of customers (45%) visit the restaurant waiting to receive a relative/friend, driving the highest footfall. Secondary visit purposes include before boarding to train (3%), specifically for dining (20%), after the train journey (33%).



## 4 Detailed Analysis

This section provides a detailed analysis of the survey responses across the 8 dimensions against which the survey responses were collected. Each of the responses have been analysed at an overall level, and then further examined at a gender-wise, age-wise, and food-preference level, since our understanding is that there are differences in satisfaction level that can be observed at these levels of granularity.

### 4.1 Overall Rating

For the overall rating section, the ratings for each parameter have been further benchmarked against the overall rating to provide an indication of which parameters are performing better than the overall benchmark.

The data indicates that customers rated their overall experience with a mean score of **4.22** out of 5.




(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 5: Overall rating of the Unit



The below graph represents the gender wise distribution of overall rating.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 6: Gender-wise distribution of Overall Rating

Overall satisfaction is primarily driven by Staff Behaviour (Male: 4.21, Female: 4.42) and Value for Money (Male: 4.21, Female: 4.38). Conversely, Resturant Temperature emerges as the lowest-rated attribute, with an average score of 4.22 (Male: 4.21, Female: 4.23), indicating a clear opportunity for targeted improvement.



The below graph represents the age wise distribution of overall rating.




(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 7: Age-wise distribution of Overall Rating

Customer satisfaction is highest with Staff Behaviour (Average Score: 4.26) and Value for Money (Average Score: 4.25). For Staff Behaviour, satisfaction remains consistently strong across age groups: 18–25 years (4.50), 26–40 years (4.16), 41–60 years (4.13), 61+ years (0.00). Age-wise satisfaction drivers vary across cohorts. Customers aged 18–25 years rate Hygiene, Variety, Staff Behaviour, Value for Money highest. Customers aged 26–40 years value Staff Behaviour. Customers aged 41–60 years prefer Variety. No valid responses were recorded for customers aged 61 years and above. Conversely, Quantity of Food emerges as the lowest-rated attribute with an average score of 4.21, highlighting an opportunity for targeted improvement initiatives to elevate overall satisfaction.



The below is the graph representing the distribution of overall rating based on Food Type Preference of customers.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 8: Food preferences-wise distribution of overall rating

Customer satisfaction is highest for Staff Behaviour (Average Score: 4.26) and Value for Money (Average Score: 4.25). For Staff Behaviour, satisfaction by food preference is as follows: Vegetarian (4.27), Non-Vegetarian (4.00), Eggitarian (5.00), Satvik / Jain (0.00). Customer preferences exhibit variation across food types. Vegetarian customers rate Staff Behaviour highest. Non-Vegetarian customers prioritize Overall Satisfaction, Quality of Food, Quality of Packaging, Quantity of Food, Hygiene, Variety, Staff Behaviour, Value for Money, Restaurant Temperature, Sufficient Seating, Quality of Seating. Eggitarian customers lean toward Overall Satisfaction, Quality of Food, Hygiene, Variety, Staff Behaviour, Value for Money, Restaurant Temperature, Sufficient Seating, Quality of Seating. Conversely, Quantity of Food records the lowest satisfaction levels with an average score of 4.21, indicating an opportunity for improvement. No responses were recorded from customers preferring Satvik / Jain, limiting food-type-based comparative analysis.



IRCTCCustomer Satisfaction Survey Report





## 4.2 Quality of Food & Packaging

The Quality of Food & Packaging section evaluates customer perceptions regarding food preparation, temperature, freshness, and packaging standards.

Average rating for food preparation is 4.29, food temperature is 4.30, freshness is 4.30, and packaging quality is 4.28.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 9: Quality of Food & Packaging rating

Average rating for food preparation is 4.29, food temperature is 4.30, freshness is 4.30, and packaging quality is 4.28.



The graph below represents the gender wise distribution of rating for Quality of Food & Packaging.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 10: Gender-wise distribution of Quality of Food Rating

Within Quality of Packaging, customer satisfaction is primarily driven by Food Temperature (Male: 4.25, Female: 4.46). Conversely, Packaging Quality emerges as the least-rated packaging attribute, with an average score of 4.28 (Male: 4.23, Female: 4.46), indicating an opportunity for improvement.



The graph below shows age group wise distribution of Quality of Food & Packaging.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 11: Age-wise Distribution of Quality of Food Rating

Overall customer satisfaction is driven primarily by Food Temperature, Freshness (Average Score: 4.30). For Food Temperature, Freshness, age-wise satisfaction levels are observed as follows: 18–25 years (4.53), 26–40 years (4.20), 41–60 years (4.19), 61+ years (0.00). Customer preferences exhibit variation across age segments. Customers aged 18–25 rate Food Temperature, Freshness highest. Customers aged 26–40 prioritize Food Preparation. Customers aged 41–60 lean toward Packaging Quality. No valid responses were recorded for customers aged 61 and above. This divergence indicates age-specific drivers of satisfaction. Conversely, Packaging Quality records the lowest satisfaction levels with an average score of 4.28, indicating an opportunity for targeted improvement.



The below graph represents the distribution of Quality of Food & Packaging based on Food Preference Type by customers.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 12: type of Food-wise distribution of Quality of Food Rating

Within Food Quality and Packaging dimensions, customer satisfaction is highest for Food Temperature, Freshness (Average Score: 4.30). For Food Temperature, Freshness, satisfaction by food preference is as follows: Vegetarian (4.31), Non-Vegetarian (4.00), Eggitarian (5.00), Satvik / Jain (0.00). Preferences within food quality and packaging attributes vary by food type. Vegetarian customers rate Food Temperature, Freshness highest. Non-Vegetarian customers prioritize Food Preparation, Food Temperature, Freshness, Packaging Quality. Eggitarian customers rate Food Preparation, Food Temperature, Freshness, Packaging Quality. Conversely, Packaging Quality records the lowest satisfaction levels with an average score of 4.28, indicating an opportunity for improvement within food quality and packaging. No responses were recorded from Satvik / Jain customers, limiting food-type-based comparison for food quality and packaging.



### 4.3 Quantity of Food

The average rating for sufficient meal quantity is 4.28, while the availability of other items received an average rating of 4.18.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 13: Quantity of Food

The average rating for sufficient meal quantity is 4.28, while the availability of other items received an average rating of 4.18.



The graph below shows the gender wise distribution of ratings for Quantity of Food served.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)


Figure 14: Gender-wise distribution of Quantity of Food rating

Both male and female customers are highly satisfied with Sufficient Meal Quantity, Availability of other items.

Across quantity-related parameters, customer satisfaction is led by Sufficient Meal Quantity (Male: 4.2, Female: 4.5), followed by Availability of other items (Male: 4.2, Female: 4.5).The relatively lower-rated parameter is Availability of other items, with an average score of 4.2, indicating scope for targeted improvement.



The graph below shows the gender wise distribution of ratings for Quantity of Food served.




(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 15: Age-wise distribution of Quantity of Food rating

Customer satisfaction around Menu Variety is driven primarily by Choice Available with an average score of 4.40. Age-wise ratings for this attribute indicate: 18–25 (4.42), 26–40 (4.40), 41–60 (4.33), 61+ (0.00). Menu variety preferences display age-driven segmentation. Customers aged 18–25 show stronger preference for Variety in Thali. In contrast, customers aged 26–40, 41–60 demonstrate higher satisfaction with Choice Available. Variety in Thali records comparatively lower satisfaction with an average score of 4.22, highlighting a clear opportunity to enhance menu variety perception. No responses were recorded from customers aged 61 or more years.



The below graph represents the distribution of customer ratings for Quantity of Food based their Food Type Preference.




(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 16: Food preferences-wise distribution of Quantity of Food rating



## 4.4 Hygiene

The Hygiene section assesses customer perceptions across various factors, including cutlery, food trays, availability of tissues and sanitizers, cleanliness of furniture and counters, and washroom/hand sink hygiene.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)


Figure 17: Rating on Hygiene

The average overall ratings for attributes of hygiene are:

- Cutlery: 4.29
- Food Tray: 4.33
- Tissue/Napkins/Liquid Soaps/Sanitizers: 4.17
- Cleanliness of Furniture and Counters: 4.24
- Cleanliness of Washroom/Hand Sink: 4.19



The graph below shows gender wise distribution of ratings of hygiene factors.




(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 18: Gender-wise distribution of Hygiene rating

**Male respondents** rate Cutlery (4.33), Food Tray (4.36) most favorably, while female respondents assign stronger evaluations to Tissue/ Napkins/ Liquid soaps/ Sanitizer (4.27), Cleanliness of furniture and counters (4.46), Cleanliness of Washroom / Hand sinks (4.27), indicating hygiene priorities across genders.

The graph below demonstrates the age-wise distribution of ratings for Hygiene:




(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 19: Age-wise distribution of Hygiene rating

Hygiene-related satisfaction is strongest for Food Tray (Average Score: 4.33), followed by Cutlery (Average Score: 4.29). Performance on Food Tray remains consistently acceptable across age cohorts: 18–25 years (4.44), 26–40 years (4.24), 41–60 years (4.17), 61+ years (0.00). Conversely, Tissue/ Napkins/ Liquid soaps/ Sanitizer records comparatively lower hygiene satisfaction (Average Score: 4.17), representing an area that requires corrective action. No feedback was recorded from customers aged 61 or more years.



The below graph represents the distribution of customer rating of Hygiene based on their food type preference.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)


Figure 20: Food preference-wise distribution of Hygiene rating

Within hygiene dimensions, customer satisfaction is strongest for Cleanliness of furniture and counters (Average Score: 3.35) followed by Food Tray (Average Score: 3.34). For Cleanliness of furniture and counters, satisfaction by food preference is as follows: Vegetarian (4.24), Non-Vegetarian (4.14), Eggitarian (5.00), Satvik / Jain (0.00). Preferences within hygiene dimensions vary by food type. Vegetarian customers rate Food Tray highest. Non-Vegetarian customers prioritize Cleanliness of furniture and counters, Cleanliness of Washroom / Hand sinks. Eggitarian customers lean toward Cutlery, Food Tray, Tissue/ Napkins/ Liquid soaps/ Sanitizer, Cleanliness of furniture and counters, Cleanliness of Washroom / Hand sinks. Conversely, Tissue/ Napkins/ Liquid soaps/ Sanitizer registers the lowest satisfaction levels with an average score of 3.29, highlighting an area of improvement. No responses were recorded from Satvik / Jain customers.



## 4.5 Menu Variety

The Menu Variety section evaluates customer perceptions regarding the variety offered in thalis and the range of choices available.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)


Figure 21: Menu Variety rating

The average rating for:

- Variety in Thali: 4.22
- Choice Availability: 4.40



The graph below shows gender wise distribution of ratings for Menu variety.




(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 22: Gender-wise distribution of Menu Variety rating

Within Menu Variety, customer satisfaction is shaped by both evaluated attributes. Choice Available demonstrates relatively stronger performance, with male respondents rating it at 4.37 and female respondents at 4.67. Conversely, Variety in Thali records comparatively lower satisfaction, with an average score of 4.22, indicating scope for targeted improvement within the Menu Variety offering.



The following graph shows the distribution of ratings on Menu Variety by Age groups:




(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 23: Age-wise distribution of Menu Variety rating

Customer satisfaction around Menu Variety is driven primarily by Choice Available with an average score of 4.40. Age-wise ratings for this attribute indicate: 18–25 (4.42), 26–40 (4.40), 41–60 (4.33), 61+ (0.00). Menu variety preferences display age-driven segmentation. Customers aged 18–25 show stronger preference for Variety in Thali. In contrast, customers aged 26–40, 41–60 demonstrate higher satisfaction with Choice Available. Variety in Thali records comparatively lower satisfaction with an average score of 4.22, highlighting a clear opportunity to enhance menu variety perception. No responses were recorded from customers aged 61 or more years.



The below graph represents the menu variety rating based on the customers' food type preference.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 24: Food preferences-wise distribution of Menu Variety rating



## 4.6 Staff Behaviour

The Staff Behaviour evaluates customer perceptions across key service dimensions, including politeness, responsiveness, staff appearance, clarity in explaining menu options, timeliness of food service, and handling of extra requests.




(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 25: Staff Behaviour rating

The average rating of these factors are as follows:

- Politeness: 4.41
- Responsiveness: 4.41
- Staff Appearance: 4.41
- Explanation of Menu Options: 4.41
- Timely Food Service: 4.41
- Handling of Extra Requests: 4.44

The graph below, represents the gender wise distribution of ratings for Staff Behaviour.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 26: Gender-wise distribution of Staff Behaviour rating

Within Staff Behaviour, customer satisfaction is primarily driven by Met extra requests (Male: 4.43, Female: 4.5) and Politeness (Male: 4.34, Female: 4.63). Conversely, Politeness emerges as the least-rated staff behaviour attribute, with an average score of 4.41 (Male: 4.34, Female: 4.63), indicating a clear opportunity for targeted improvement.



The below graph represents age group wise distribution of ratings of Staff Behaviour.




(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 27: Age-wise distribution of Staff Behaviour rating

Customer perception of staff behaviour is strongest for Met extra requests (Average Score: 4.44), followed by Politeness, Responsiveness, Staff Appearance, Explained Menu options, Food given timely (Average Score: 4.41). For Met extra requests, performance remains consistently positive across age cohorts: 18–25 years (4.36), 26–40 years (4.54), 41–60 years (4.00), 61+ years (0.00). Conversely, Politeness, Responsiveness, Staff Appearance, Explained Menu options, Food given timely registers comparatively lower staff behaviour ratings (Average Score: 4.41), indicating a potential service delivery gap that may impact overall customer experience. No staff behaviour feedback was recorded from customers aged 61 or more years, constraining age-wise comparison of staff performance.



The below graph represents the distribution of customer ratings for Staff behaviour based on their food type preferences.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 28: Food preferences wise distribution of Staff Behaviour rating

Within staff behaviour dimensions, customer experience is most positively influenced by Met extra requests (Average Score: 4.44), followed by Politeness, Responsiveness, Staff Appearance, Explained Menu options, Food given timely (Average Score: 4.41). For Met extra requests, ratings by food preference indicate: Vegetarian (4.47), Non-Vegetarian (4.33), Eggitarian (0.00), Satvik / Jain (0.00). Perceptions of staff behaviour vary across food preference groups. Vegetarian customers respond most positively to Met extra requests. Non-Vegetarian customers highest rated on Politeness, Responsiveness, Staff Appearance, Explained Menu options, Food given timely. Eggitarian customers show stronger alignment with Politeness, Responsiveness, Staff Appearance, Explained Menu options, Food given timely. This indicates that staff behaviour drivers are not uniform across customer segments. Conversely, Politeness, Responsiveness, Staff Appearance, Explained Menu options, Food given timely receives the lowest ratings with an average score of 4.41, highlighting a behavioural execution gap requiring focused attention. No responses were recorded from Satvik / Jain customers.



## 4.7 Availability


The Availability section assesses customer perceptions regarding access to service facilities, including the menu card/rate list, complaint and suggestion book, POS machine, and issuance of bills. The highest-rated attribute is the issuance of bills, with an average score of 4.52. Overall, availability performance is good, indicating that service infrastructure is functioning adequately.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 29: Availability rating

The graph below shows the gender-wise distribution of ratings for Availability Factors.



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 30: Gender-wise distribution of Availability rating



Within Availability, customer satisfaction is primarily driven by Issuance of Bill (Male: 4.52, Female: 4.53) and POS Machine (Male: 4.49, Female: 4.61). Conversely, Menu Card / Rate List emerges as the least-rated availability attribute, with an average score of 4.5 (Male: 4.47, Female: 4.63), indicating a clear opportunity for operational improvement.

The following graph shows the age-wise distribution of rating on availability factors:




(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 31: Age-wise distribution of Availability rating



## 4.8 Service Time

The average service time is:



(all scores on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 indicates, Excellent, and 1 indicates Bad)

Figure 32: Overall Service Time distribution



## 5 Conclusion

### Strength Areas Driving Satisfaction

Across dimensions, Quality of Packaging, Hygiene, Menu Choice Availability, and POS/Billing efficiency consistently emerge as top-performing drivers. These act as core hygiene and trust enablers and should be protected as non-negotiable service standards.

### Value Perception and Staff Behaviour as Key Gaps

Value for Money, Politeness, Staff Appearance, and Food Tray hygiene repeatedly score lower, indicating execution gaps rather than systemic failures. These represent high-impact, low-investment improvement opportunities.

### Operational Availability Is Functional but Not Differentiated

While POS machines and billing processes perform well, visibility and accessibility of menu cards and complaint mechanisms lag behind, pointing to missed opportunities in transparency and customer feedback loops.



## 6 Annexure 1: Questionnaire for Customer Satisfaction Survey (Static Units)

### Passenger Details

Station Name	
Unit Type	
First Name	Last Name
Address	
PNR No.	
Mobile Number	
Email ID	

### Section A: Respondent Details

#### A1. Purpose of Visit to Restaurant

Have arrived after Train Journey	
Will undertake Train Journey after visit	
Came here while waiting to receive a relative/friend/colleague	
Came here for eating purpose	

#### A2. Gender

Male	
Female	
Transgender	

#### A3. Your Age

18 – 25 years	
26 – 40 years	
41 – 60 years	
61 or more years	

#### A4. What kind of food did you have?

Vegetarian	
Satvik / Jain	
Vegan	
Non-Vegetarian (eggs and all types of meat)	
Eggitarian (Vegetarian but eat egg & egg products)	



### Section B: Rating Experience

**Instructions:**

In the next few questions, we would request you to rate your satisfaction/dissatisfaction with various attributes.

The last column "**Not Applicable (NA)**" is to be ticked if it does not apply in your case (you may not have had the opportunity to experience this service/meal).

Please **TICK (✓)** only **one box** in your choice. Request you to **rate all questions**.

#### **Section B: Overall Rating**

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Bad	N/A
Overall Satisfaction with food and services						
Quality of food and beverages served						
Quality of Packaging of the food & beverages served						
Quantity of food and beverages served						
Hygiene Level						
Variety in Menu						
Staff Behavior						
Value for Money						
Restaurant Temperature (Hot/Cold/Normal)						
Sufficient number of chairs and tables						
Quality of chairs						

### Section B1:QUALITY OF FOOD & PACKAGING

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Bad	N/A
Food Preparation (Properly cooked)						
Temperature of Food & Beverages (Hot/Cold/Normal)						
Freshness of Food						
Packaging Quality						



### SECTION B2: QUANTITY OF FOOD

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Bad	N/A
Sufficient Quantity of meal – Thali / Combos, Snacks, Desserts						
Availability of salt, pepper, and sugar etc.						

### SECTION C: HYGIENE

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Bad	N/A
Cutlery						
Food Tray						
Availability of Tissue/Napkins/Liquid soaps/Sanitizer						
Cleanliness of chairs, tables, floors, serving counters						
Cleanliness of Washroom / Hand sinks						

### SECTION D: MENU VARIETY

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Bad	N/A
Variety in Thali / Combos, North/South Indian, Chinese, Continental, Snacks, Dessert, Beverages						
Choice of Only Roti / Rice / Chowmein / Thali / Meal Combos						

### SECTION E: STAFF BEHAVIOUR

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Bad	N/A
Polite						
Responsiveness						
Staff Appearance						



Explained Menu / Options						
Food Timely Given						
Met Extra Requests (like extra wrapping layer, tissues)						

### SECTION F: AVAILABILITY

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Average	Bad	N/A
Menu Card / Rate List						
Complaint / Suggestion Book						
POS Machine						
Issuance of Bill						

### SECTION G: SERVICE TIME

Please tell us how much time it took for the Restaurant to serve your meal.

< 10 minutes	
10–20 minutes	
>20 minutes	

### SECTION H

Please give us suggestions that you think could help us in improving the quality of food and refreshment related services:

---



---



---



---



---



## 7 Annexure 2: Methodology

### *Data Collection*

An enumerator was deployed with a survey instrument that was designed to capture the data electronically at the Static Unit at the specified railway stations. An enumerator was required to be present at the Railway Station at a time preceding a major meal time, such as breakfast, lunch, or dinner.

The completion of such surveys was intimated to the zonal point of contact at IRCTC prior to the commencement of surveys.

Should the Static unit be closed or unavailable (due to construction or any such activities), the survey would be rescheduled to another time, or intimated to the zonal point of contact for alternatives.

Each enumerator is required to mark his presence through the application that would capture both the geotag as well as timestamp to indicate the time of survey. If the number of respondents were available to meet the targeted quota at the time of the survey, the surveys would be completed in the same round.

If the number of people at the Static unit were inadequate to cover the quota, a subsequent visit was planned to achieve the quota.

### *Quality Check*

An online, real time check was performed simultaneously to monitor the number of surveys that were being conducted. Field supervisors were required to co-ordinate with the enumerators

Subsequent to the completion of the surveys for each static unit, quality reviews are performed for several issues:

- Any partially completed surveys were rejected.
- Checks were performed for speeding (surveys being completed too fast)
- Checks were performed for robotic responses (survey responses that were not showing any significant variance to questions).

Any shortfall in quota after completion of these checks and rejection of such surveys was intimated to the enumerators so that he/she would undertake additional surveys to meet the quota.



### *Raw data*

Raw data was subsequently transformed into the format that is required by IRCTC for reporting purposes, for ease of review and access. Whereas data was collected for about 95 dimensions, eventual data reporting was for 50 dimensions. Data was reordered by Station Name and type of unit for ease of review.

### *Scoring*

IRCTC provided a specific scoring mechanism across 9 parameters, on a scale of 1 to 5, as follows:

1. Food Quality and Service Standards
  - Quality of Food and Beverages Served
  - Food Preparation and Freshness
  - Variety – Thali/Combos, Snacks, Beverages
  - Value for Money for Catering Services
2. Assessment of Unit and Overall Experience
  - Staff – Politeness and Responsiveness
  - Overall Hygiene Level of Service
  - Sufficient Sitting Availability
  - Overall Cleanliness of Unit
  - Overall Satisfaction with Food and Services

Responses were graded by Station name and Static Unit type against each of these 9 parameters and provided in a tabular form.

### *Analysis*

Data analysis has been carried out at three levels:

- A macro analysis that summarises the outcomes of each Static unit survey on terms such as Gender, Age, food preferences and purpose of visit.
- A detailed analysis of Overall rating (11 parameters), Quality of Food and Packaging (4 parameters), Quantity of Food (2 parameters), Hygiene (5 parameters), Menu Variety (2 parameters), Staff Behaviour (6 parameters), Availability of services (4 parameters), and Service Time (1 parameter).
- A further deep dive for each of the above 8 parameters was carried out to examine if there were any discernable differences in satisfaction levels based on demographic patterns such as Gender, Age and Food Preferences.

**DATAWISE®** offers a suite of products and solutions suited to the needs of various situations and industries. Solutions provided for one customer are not necessarily suitable for others, and readers are advised to use their own judgment regarding the suitability of these solutions to their business needs.

**DATAWISE®**'s business analysis services support the full spectrum of clients' needs with services directed mainly at helping companies discover opportunities for improvement through use of analytical capabilities. We offer analytical services in the following areas:

**Strategic Analytics:** Alignment of strategic intent with actual work, requiring strategic analytics to answer key decision support questions such as whether to enter into a new segment of business

or not, whether to reach new customers or not, and other go, no-go decisions.

**Behavioral Analytics:** Assistance in determining the 'why' and 'how' of a customer behavior (rather than the 'what') in order to ensure that marketing plans yield the desired results through capturing customer events and actions over time and using these stored interactions to determine typical behavior and deviations from that behavior.

**Tactical Analytics:** Tactical analytics models that we deploy are typically short-term in nature, and are focused on answering immediate questions rather than aligning to a longer term goal.

**Predictive Analytics:** We created complex multi-dimensional models that collate data generated from several interaction points to create models that enable the prediction of future events to help identify both risks and opportunities.

**DATAWISE®** has also developed proprietary analytics models DATTAB™, CREST™, SatisACTual, and OPTLIOX™ catering to specific customer needs.



• Houston • London • Connecticut • Hyderabad • Delhi • Bengaluru