



Consumer Perception Regarding Dominos in Sirsa City

¹Dr. Amit Kumar, ²Dr. Sushil Kumar

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration,
Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa Haryana (India),

²Professor, Jagannath University Delhi NCR, Bahadurgarh

Abstract – The fast-food industry in India has proficient rapid growth in recent years, with exclusive rapid service restaurants such as Domino's playing a important role in determining changing food consumption patterns. Consumer perception is a crucial factor that affects brand preference, purchase decisions, and customer reliability in this reasonable market. The current study aims to assess the consumers perception regarding Domino's in Sirsa City, with detailed focus on demographic variables such as gender, age, education, occupation, income, and frequency of visits. Primary data were collected from 120 respondents using a structured questionnaire. Statistical tools including percentage analysis and ANOVA are used to interpret the data The study delivers valuable insights into consumer behavior in a tier-2 city and deals practical consequences for Domino's to expand customer satisfaction and strengthen its market position in Sirsa City.

Keywords - Perception, Consumers, Behaviour.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the fast-food and quick service restaurant (QSR) industry has observed extensive growth in India due to growth, changing lifestyles, growing throwaway income and a growing preference for appropriate food choices. Between the fast-food brands working in India, Domino's Pizza has familiar a strong occurrence through its emphasis on rapid delivery, reasonable pricing suitable to Indian tastes. toward such brands is important for sustaining competitiveness and attaining long-term success for understanding consumer perception. "Consumer perception indicates to the way individuals understand and measure a brand based on their experiences, expectations and personal tastes. In the fast-food sector, perception is influenced by factors such as food quality, price, service efficiency, brand image, and suitability. These factors play a critical role in decisive customer satisfaction and repeat purchase behaviour". Moreover, demographic characteristics such as age, income, education and occupation can ominously affect how consumers recognize and respond to a brand. "Sirsa City, being a emerging urban center with a growing student and youth population, presents a suitable context for studying consumer perception of fast-food brands like Domino's. Despite the increasing popularity of Domino's in tier-2 cities, inadequate research has been steered to understand consumer perception at the local level". Therefore, this study pursues to observe the perception of consumers toward Domino's in Sirsa City and examine the influence of demographic factors on their perceptions.

II. Literature Review

"Several studies reveal that consumers associate fast food with convenience and time savings, particularly in urban areas and among younger populations (Jalil et al., 2012). Fast food brands, including pizza chains, are assessed not just on taste but on value for money, variety, and consistency (Ali et al., 2019). For Indian consumers, factors like taste preferences, fusion offerings (Indianized

menus) and affordability further shape perception". Research by Ryu et al. (2012) designates that service quality, food quality and physical environment are key drivers that affect overall perception in restaurant settings. For Domino's, which heavily markets delivery speed and pizza customization, service reliability often concludes repeat patronage (Christopher et al., 2018). A study by Choudhary & Sharma (2017) on fast food in North Indian cities initiate that promotional offers, combo deals and perceived value significantly boosted consumer satisfaction. Domino's has frequently leveraged price deals to position itself as affordable yet quality-oriented, influencing consumer perception positively.

"Demographic characteristics such as age, income, occupation, and education affect fast food perception. Younger consumers (students and working youth) often highlight higher acceptance and frequency of visits due to lifestyle compatibility and rapid service preference (Singh & Chandra, 2015). Income levels shape frequency and type of purchase with higher income groups discovering premium menu options (Panwar, 2020).

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Objective of the Study:

To study the Consumers Perception Regarding Dominos

3.2 Sample Size: 120

3.3 Sampling Area: Sirsa

3.4 Statistical Tool: Descriptive Statistics, ANOVA



Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 4.1 Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	48	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Female	72	60.0	60.0	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	100.0	

The gender-wise distribution of the respondents shows that out of the total 120 participants, 48 respondents (40%) are male and 72 respondents (60%) are female. This indicates that females constitute the majority of the sample. The cumulative percentage reaches 40% with male respondents and 100% after including female respondents, confirming that the entire sample is accounted for.

Table 4.2 Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	below 20	25	20.8	20.8	20.8
	20-30	89	74.2	74.2	95.0
	30-40	4	3.3	3.3	98.3
	40-50	1	.8	.8	99.2
	Above 50	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	100.0	

The table 4.2 shows the age-wise distribution of the respondents indicates that the majority belong to the 20–30 years age group, comprising 89 respondents (74.2%) of the total sample. This is followed by respondents below 20 years of age, accounting for 25 respondents (20.8%). A very small proportion of respondents fall within the higher age categories, with 4 respondents (3.3%) in the 30–40 age group, and only 1 respondent each (0.8%) in the 40–50 and above 50 age groups.

Table 4.3 Locality

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Rural	64	53.3	53.3	53.3
	Urban	53	44.2	44.2	97.5
	Semi- Urban	3	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.3 indicates that locality-wise distribution of the respondents reveals that a majority of the participants are from rural areas, accounting for 64 respondents (53.3%). This is followed by urban respondents, who make up 53 respondents (44.2%) of the total sample. Only a small proportion of respondents, 3 individuals (2.5%), belong to semi-urban areas.

Table 4.4 Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10+2	15	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Graduate	48	40.0	40.0	52.5
	Post Graduate	57	47.5	47.5	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	100.0	

The table 4.4 shows the educational qualification of the respondents shows that nearly half of the participants are postgraduates, with 57 respondents (47.5%), indicating a highly educated sample. This is followed by graduates, who constitute 48 respondents (40%). A smaller proportion of the respondents, 15 individuals (12.5%), have completed their education up to the 10+2 level. The cumulative percentage reveals that 87.5% of the respondents possess at least a graduate-level education.

Table 4.5 Occupation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Self Occupier	12	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Job	10	8.3	8.3	18.3
	Student	96	80.0	80.0	98.3
	Others	2	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	100.0	

The table 4.5 shows that the vast majority of respondents are students, who make up 80% (96 out of 120) of the sample, indicating that the study population is largely student-based. Self-occupiers account for 10% (12 respondents), while those in jobs represent 8.3% (10 respondents), showing relatively small proportions of employed participants. A very small fraction, 1.7% (2 respondents), falls into the category others.



Table 4.6 Monthly income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below 20000	31	25.8	25.8	25.8
	20000- 30000	49	40.8	40.8	66.7
	30000- 40000	19	15.8	15.8	82.5
	40000- 50000	12	10.0	10.0	92.5
	Above 50000	9	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	100.0	

The table 4.6 indicates that the largest proportion of respondents falls within the ₹20,000–30,000 monthly income range, accounting for 40.8% (49 respondents). This is followed by those earning below ₹20,000, who make up 25.8% (31 respondents), suggesting that a substantial share of the sample belongs to lower-income groups. Respondents earning ₹30,000–40,000 constitute 15.8% (19 respondents), while 10% (12 respondents) fall in the ₹40,000–50,000 category. A smaller proportion, 7.5% (9 respondents), reports a monthly income above ₹50,000. Overall, the cumulative percentages show that about two-thirds of the respondents (66.7%) earn ₹30,000

or less per month, indicating that the sample is predominantly composed of individuals with low to middle income levels.

Table 4.7 Time comes in Dominos

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Daily	13	10.8	10.8	10.8
	Weekly	21	17.5	17.5	28.3
	Half Monthly	29	24.2	24.2	52.5
	Monthly	57	47.5	47.5	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	100.0	

The table 4.7 shows that most respondents visit or order from Domino's on a monthly basis, accounting for 47.5% (57 respondents), indicating that Domino's is used occasionally rather than very frequently by a large share of customers. This is followed by half-monthly visits, reported by 24.2% (29 respondents), suggesting moderate engagement with the brand. Weekly customers make up 17.5% (21 respondents), while only 10.8% (13 respondents) report ordering from Domino's daily, representing the smallest group. Overall, the cumulative percentages indicate that more than half of the respondents (52.5%) order from Domino's at least once every half month, reflecting a generally regular but not daily consumption pattern.

Table 4.8 ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Between Groups	9.062	35	.259	1.102	.352
	Within Groups	19.738	84	.235		
	Total	28.800	119			
Age	Between Groups	15.789	35	.451	1.574	.047
	Within Groups	24.077	84	.287		
	Total	39.867	119			
Locality	Between Groups	12.146	35	.347	1.223	.226
	Within Groups	23.845	84	.284		
	Total	35.992	119			
Education	Between Groups	15.102	35	.431	.859	.687
	Within Groups	42.198	84	.502		
	Total	57.300	119			
Occupation	Between Groups	16.506	35	.472	1.133	.316



	Within Groups	34.961	84	.416		
	Total	51.467	119			
Monthly income	Between Groups	39.040	35	1.115	.736	.844
	Within Groups	127.285	84	1.515		
	Total	166.325	119			
Time comes in Dominos	Between Groups	33.040	35	.944	.825	.734
	Within Groups	96.126	84	1.144		
	Total	129.167	119			

The ANOVA results indicate that age is the only demographic variable that shows a statistically significant difference among the groups, with an F value of 1.574 and a significance value of 0.047, which is less than the 0.05 level. This suggests that respondents' perceptions or behaviors related to the study variable differ significantly across different age groups. In contrast, gender (Sig. = 0.352), locality (Sig. = 0.226), education (Sig. = 0.687), occupation (Sig. = 0.316), monthly income (Sig. = 0.844), and time of visit to Domino's (Sig. = 0.734) do not show statistically significant differences, as their significance values are greater than 0.05. Overall, the findings imply that among the selected demographic factors, age plays a meaningful role, while the other variables do not have a significant influence on the outcome under study.

IV. CONCLUSION

"The study concludes that age is the only demographic factor that has a significant impact on consumers' perception of Domino's in Sirsa City. This specifies that perceptions and behavioural responses toward Domino's vary across different age groups, underlining the importance of age-specific preferences and expectations in the fast-food sector. On the other hand, variables such as gender, locality, education, occupation, monthly income and frequency of visits do not show a significant influence on consumer perception, suggesting a relatively uniform perception of Domino's across these groups. Overall, it is concluded that Domino's enjoys broad acceptance among diverse demographic segments in Sirsa City, while age-based differences should be carefully deliberated by the company to better tailor its marketing strategies and service offerings".

REFERENCES

1. Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). Marketing management (15th ed.). Pearson Education.
2. Schiffman, L. G., & Kanuk, L. L. (2014). Consumer behavior (11th ed.). Pearson Education.
3. Solomon, M. R. (2018). Consumer behavior: Buying, having, and being (12th ed.). Pearson Education.
4. Ryu, K., Lee, H. R., & Kim, W. G. (2012). The influence of the quality of the physical environment, food, and service on restaurant image, customer perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 24(2), 200–223.
5. Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., & Gremler, D. D. (2018). Services marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
6. Jalil, A., Fikry, A., & Zainuddin, N. (2012). Fast food consumption: A study on consumer behavior. *Asian Social Science*, 8(4), 59–64.
7. Ali, J., Kapoor, S., & Moorthy, J. (2019). Buying behavior of consumers for food products in an emerging economy. *British Food Journal*, 121(5), 1160–1175.
8. Choudhary, S., & Sharma, M. (2017). Consumer perception towards fast food in India. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 3(6), 451–455.
9. Singh, R., & Chandra, R. (2015). Consumer buying behavior towards fast food products. *International Journal of Management Research & Business Strategy*, 4(2), 1–10.
10. Panwar, D. (2020). Impact of demographic variables on fast food consumption behavior. *Journal of Business and Management*, 22(3), 45–52.
11. Christopher, M., Payne, A., & Ballantyne, D. (2013). Relationship marketing. Routledge.
12. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
13. Gupta, S., & Duggal, S. (2020). A study on consumer satisfaction towards fast food restaurants. *International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management*, 11(4), 33–38.



14. Kumar, S., & Bhatnagar, D. (2017). Consumer perception towards branded fast food outlets. *International Journal of Marketing and Technology*, 7(6), 45–52.
15. Belch, G. E., & Belch, M. A. (2018). *Advertising and promotion: An integrated marketing communications perspective* (11th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
16. Hoyer, W. D., MacInnis, D. J., & Pieters, R. (2016). *Consumer behavior* (6th ed.). Cengage Learning.
17. Lovelock, C., & Wirtz, J. (2016). *Services marketing: People, technology, strategy* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
18. Kaur, P., & Singh, R. (2019). A study on factors influencing customer satisfaction in fast food restaurants. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 6(5), 120–126.
19. Malhotra, N. K., & Dash, S. (2016). *Marketing research: An applied orientation* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.
20. Armstrong, G., Adam, S., Denize, S., & Kotler, P. (2017). *Principles of marketing* (6th ed.). Pearson Australia.