*International Journal of Innovative Research in Management Studies (IJIRMS)*
*Volume 8, Issue 7, July 2026. pp.8-17.*

# CUSTOMER SATISFACTION AND SERVICE QUALITY OF RAILWAY PARCEL SERVICE IN SALEM

**Dr. D. Suthamathi[1], Harini B[2]**

[1]*Head and Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Sona College of Arts and Science, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India. Email ID: drsuthamathi@gmail.com*

[2]*III BBA, Department of Business Administration, Sona College of Arts and Science, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India.*

**Abstract**—*This study investigates the paradigms of customer satisfaction and service quality within the context of the Railway Parcel Service at Salem Junction, a critical transit hub in Tamil Nadu. As traditional logistics systems face intense competition from agile, technology-driven private couriers, evaluating the core competencies of state-run rail cargo becomes essential. Using a descriptive research design, primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire administrated to 50 regular users, including local wholesale traders, small-scale textile manufacturers, and individual consignors at the Salem station parcel terminal. The research utilizes the foundational dimensions of the SERVQUAL model-specifically targeting reliability, tangibility, responsiveness, and safety parameters-to measure the gap between user expectations and actual operational performance. The empirical findings reveal a distinct bifurcation in customer perception. While the Indian Railways pricing structure remains unmatched in terms of cost-effectiveness for bulk commodities, significant service quality deficits exist regarding last-mile delivery mechanisms, real-time consignment tracking, and terminal storage infrastructure. Statistical analysis via Chi-Square testing indicated that satisfaction levels are heavily influenced by the occupational background of the respondents, with commercial traders showing a higher tolerance for transit timelines but expressing deep dissatisfaction with manual weight verification procedures and parcel handling vulnerabilities. Furthermore, risk quality assessment highlights a pervasive consumer anxiety regarding product safety during transit, exacerbated by rigid bureaucratic grievance systems and suboptimal compensation processes for damaged freight. Based on these insights, the study suggests that implementing automated digital weighing systems, localized SMS-based tracking updates, and public-private partnerships for doorstep pickup and delivery within Salem District are vital steps. Ultimately, this research underscores the need for structural modernization to transform the Salem railway parcel ecosystem from a passive transport utility into a highly responsive, customer-centric logistics framework.*

***Keywords:*** *Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, Railway Parcel Service, Salem Junction, Logistics Efficiency, Risk Assessment.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Logistics and freight transportation form the vital lifeblood of any growing commercial economy, dictating the pace at which industrial inputs and finished goods reach their respective market destination. In contemporary business environments, physical distribution management has transitioned from a backend operational function to a core strategic. Traditionally, public sector transport systems-predominantly the Indian Railways-held an undisputed monopoly over a long-distance bulk cargo movement due to an unmatched geographical reach and volume capacity. However, the macro-environment landscape of Indian logistics had undergone a radical transformation over the past decade. The exponential rise of agile, technology-integrated private third-party logistics (3PL) providers, express highway freight corridors, and digitized courier networks has drastically widened the choices available to contemporary consumers.

Within this framework, the Railway Parcel Service operates as crucial mid-tier utility catering to small-scale consignments, non-bulk commercial shipments, and individual luggage packages. While private players utilize aggressive door-to-door delivery strategies and app-based real-time visibility to capture high-margin market shares, the state-run rail parcel service relies on standard stationary terminal operations.

In rapidly urbanizing commercial hubs like Salem District, the tension between traditional logistics structures and contemporary digital expectations creates a highly visible paradigm shift. Therefore, understanding how customers perceive service quality and assess systemic risks within public railway operations is essential to mapping the future trajectory of public freight transport.

### 1.1 Regional context of Salem District Logistics

Salem District holds a uniquely strategic position on the economic map of Tamil Nadu, operating as a primary transit gateway connecting the western textile belt with the southern manufacturing regions. While the region's logistics landscape was historically shared with Namakkal which served as a primary commercial hub before the bifurcation of the greater Salem district subsequent administration divisions have led to Salem consolidating its position a standalone, centralized transit hub. The district is characterized by a dense concentration of traditional small-to-medium enterprises (SMEs), including power loom textile units in Gugai, large-scale agro-commodity trading hubs in Shevapet, and steel fabrication industries distributed across the peripheral zones. For these highly localized, cost-sensitive trade clusters, transportation overhead directly impacts profit margins.

Salem Junction, serving as a prominent divisional headquarters under the Southern Railway zone, handles massive daily volumes of transit cargo. Local merchants rely heavily on the station's parcel terminal to dispatch textile bundles, brassware, and engineering components across national rail routes. However, the physical constraints of the local station infrastructure, coupled with traditional administrative processing frameworks, often run counter to the fast-paced timeline requirements of modern commerce. This localized friction makes Salem Junction an ideal empirical environment to evaluate the modern customer's value perception when balancing cost efficiency against logistical agility.

### 1.2 Defining Service Quality and Risk in Rail Freight

To accurately measure customer satisfaction in a public logistics utility, service quality cannot be evaluated merely as single metric; instead, it must be broken down into multi-dimensional performance attributes:

- **Tangibility and Infrastructure:** This encompasses the physical state of the parcel terminal, the structural safety of the goods sheds (godowns), the availability of mechanical loading equipment, and the digital systems used at the booking counters.
- **Operational Reliability:** This measures the degree of consistency in train transit timelines, adherence to committed delivery windows, and the minimization of loading delays at intermediate stations.
- **Responsiveness and Staff Empathy:** This looks at the behavioural efficiency of the commercial staff, their willingness to guide users through complex bureaucratic documentation, and the responsiveness of local grievance portals.

Concurrently, Risk Quality stands as a dominant psychological determinant in customer retention. In logistics, risk is defined as the consumer's perceived probability of facing financial loss, material damage, or severe transactional friction during the shipping process. Within the Salem Railway Parcel setup, this risk materializes through several operational bottlenecks:

- **Handling Vulnerivities:** The manual loading and unloading of fragile commercial consignment onto overcrowded luggage van during brief station halts can lead to structural damage.
- **Information Asymmetry:** The lack of automated, automated end-to-end tracking systems leaves consumers in a state of uncertainty regarding the current geographical status of their goods.
- **Bureaucratic Red Tape:** In the event of material loss or parcel misplacement, the rigid legal framework required to process compensation claims through the Railway Claims Tribunal introduces long delays, discouraging small-scale traders from utilizing the service for high-value cargo.

By analysing the continuous interplay between these multi-layered quality dimensions and structural risk factors, this document seeks to provide and empirical blueprint for modernizing public logistics services in Salem.

## 2. HISTORY OF THE INDIAN RAILWAY

The history of the Indian Railways spans nearly two centuries, evolving from localized industrial tracks into the economic lifeblood of the nation. The journey can be broken down into five distinct eras:

### 2.1 The Pre-Passenger Industrial Era (1832-1852)

While popular memory marks 1853 as the beginning, the actual concept of rail transport in India was first proposed in Madras in 1832.

- **The First Tracks:** In 1837, India's very first industrial railway-the Red Hills Railway become operational in Madras. It was built by Captain Arthur Cotton primarily to transport granite stone for road construction.
- **Early Locomotives:** These early tracks used a combination of animal power (bulls) and experimental steam engines. Similar localized freight lines were built in the 1845-1851 period, such as the Godavari Dam Construction Railway at Rajahmundry to supply stone for irrigation dams.

### 2.2 The Genesis of Passenger Travel (1853-1900)

The commercial and passenger revolution began under Governor-General Lord Dalhousie, often referred to as the "Father of Indian Railways".

- **The Historic First Journey:** On April 16, 1853, the first passenger train ran a distance of 34 km between Bori Bunder (Mumbai) and Thane. Operated by the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, the train carried 400 passengers in 14 carriages and was hauled by three steam locomotives: Shaib, Sindh, and Sultan.
- **Rapid Expansion:** The network quickly expanded to other presidencies. Eastern India's first passenger line opened from Howrah to Hooghly in 1854. South India followed suit in July 1856 with a line running from Royapuram (Madras) to Arcot. By 1900, the network grew to approximately 25,000km of track layout.

### 2.3 Post-Independence & Nationalization (1947-2000)

Independence brought structural challenges due to partition, which split existing rail networks across borders.

- **Unification:** In 1951, the government nationalized the various independent, private, and princely state railway companies, merging them into a single state-run entity: Indian Railways. The system was organized into administrative geographic zones to streamlines operations.
- **Modern Locomotives:** Production moved completely in-house with the setting up of the Chittaranjan Locomotive Works (1950) and the Integral Coach Factory in Madras (1955). Diesel locomotives were introduced in 1957, slowly pushing out traditional steam technology.

**Superfast Travel & Tech:** The premier, high-speed Rajdhani Express was launched in 1969, connecting New Delhi and Howrah. In 1986, India's ticketing landscape completely changed with the introduction of the computerized passenger reservation system in New Delhi.

### 2.4 Profile of The Study Area: Salem Junction Parcel Logistics Office

To establish a clear framework for measuring service quality and user satisfaction, the study must be contextualized within the specific operational blueprint of the Railway Parcel Terminal at Salem Junction (Station Code: SA). As the foundational administrative hub of the Salem Railway Division under the Southern Railway zone, the Salem Junction Terminal acts as critical bottleneck and clearinghouse for inward and outward multi-modal cargo within western Tamil Nadu. Unlike primary cargo depots that handle bulk raiks (such as coal or cement), the Salem Junction Parcel Office operates as a specialized commercial terminal handling non-bulk parcel vans (Vans/SLRs) attached to scheduled express train networks.

The structural and economic importance of this specific terminal is driven entirely by its relationship with the prominent small-to-medium enterprise (SME) industria clusters surrounding Salem District. Empirical data indicates that the terminal's outbond traffic consists heavily of localized industrial and textile commodities manufactured in nearby towns:

- Commercial Handloom and Garment Shipments: A major volume of daily outward parcel cargo consists of handloom cloths, cotton hosiery from industrial hubs like Gugai and Elampillai to major commercial centers in Maharashtra, Delhi, West Bengal, and Assam.
- Perishable and Agro-Commodity Logistics: The terminal functions as an important outward clearing point for regional agricultural goods, including vegetables, seasonal fruits, milk products, eggs and processed coffee or sago, requiring high-responsiveness to minimize perishability risks.

- Manufactured Machinery and Engineering Freight: The booking offices consistently handle the transportation of Two-Wheelers, heavy wet grinders, local steel fabrication vessels, and domestic motors to nationwide destinations.

### 2.5 Operational Area

From an operational standpoint, the Salem Junction Parcel Office features a dedicated commercial terminal separate from the main passenger platforms, including specialized booking counters, physical weighbridges, and traditional goods sheds (godowns). However, because Salem Junction acts primarily as an intermediate transit station for long-distance trains rather than an originating point, the operational time window allocated for loading and unloading parcel cargo onto train luggage vans is extraordinarily strict and brief. This physical limitation demands high operational agility from terminal porters and staff.

Consequently, this localized environment where cost sensitive commercial traders must navigate traditional station booking loops, manual platform handling, and a lack of digital end-to-end tracking apps makes the Salem Junction Parcel Office and ideal empirical site to evaluate the balance between traditional and modern logistics framework and modern service satisfaction metrics.

### 2.6 Major Export and Import

The parcel services and transit Terminals across Salem operate on a highly diversified flow of commodity exchange. The district's **major outbound logistics (exports)** are heavily dominated by traditional powerloom textile bundles, ready-made garments from Gugai, fabricated steel components, brassware, silver ornaments from Shevapet, and agro-commodities like sago, starch, common cotton, and mangoes. Conversely, Salem's inbound **logistics network (imports)** primarily handles critical industrial inputs, including raw cotton and yarn for the weaving clusters, primary steel blocks, machinery components, electronic goods, and fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) to sustain local trading hubs.

## 3. RESEARCH METHODOLGY

The validity and reliability of any empirical study depend heavily on the systemic design and structured methodology adopted for data collection and analysis. To evaluate the relationship between service quality parameters and overall consumer satisfaction at the Salem Junction Railway Parcel Office, this study utilizes a systematic, descriptive, and analytical research framework. This approach allows for a structured investigation into user perceptions, operational bottlenecks, and perceived risks at the terminal.

### 3.1 Research Design

This study employs a descriptive research design combined with quantitative survey techniques. The descriptive framework is highly appropriate for this research because it aims to map out and document an existing real-world phenomenon specifically, how commercial traders and individual consignors evaluate the performance dimensions of a public utility. It does not manipulate variables but instead captures an empirical snapshots of users satisfaction levels on their active operational experience at Salem Junction.

### 3.2 Sources of Data

To ensure a well-rounded and comprehensive investigation, data had been compiled using both primary and secondary streams of information:

- **Primary Data:** The core findings of this study rely on primary data collected digitally directly from the field. This was achieved by designing and distributing a highly structured questionnaire via **Google Forms** to targeted regular users of the Salem Junction parcel terminal. The digital questionnaire was specifically designed around the five core SERVQUAL dimensions to record direct feedback on operational quality, handling safety, tariff transparency, and staff responsiveness.
- **Secondary Data:** To supplement the electronic field insights and build a strong theoretical foundation, secondary data was gathered from various publishes materials. These include the Indian Railways Commercial Manual, annual performance reviews from Southern Railway zone, academic research articles from prominent logistics journals, textbooks on service marketing, and official statistical reports regarding regional freight handling trends in Tamil Nadu.

### 3.3 Sampling Design and Sample Size

- **Sampling Technique:** Due to the targeted nature of reaching specific cargo users online and at commercial clusters, a convenience sampling methods (a type of non-probability sampling) was adopted for digital survey distribution. The **Google Form** link was shared directly with regular commercial users who interact with the terminal's services.
- **Sample size:** The total sample size for this study is fixed at exactly 50 respondents. This sample includes a focused mix of regular commercial users, such as local wholesale textile merchants, agro-commodity traders, small-scale industrial manufacturers, and individual citizens booking personal luggage or two-wheelers.

## 4. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter systemically organizes, evaluates, and interprets the primary field metrics acquired from the 50 respondents via Google Forms. The empirical findings reveal the exact relationship parameters and user experiences within the Salem Junction parcel terminal ecosystem.

### 4.1 Socio-Economic and Demographic profile of Respondents

The demographic features of the respondents provide essential context for understanding user behaviour and satisfaction thresholds regarding public cargo logistics infrastructure.

**Table 4.1: Percentage Distribution of Demographic Variables (N=50)**

| Demographic Variable | Classification Category | No. Of Respondents | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Gender** | Male | 16 | 32.0% |
| | Female | 34 | 68.8% |
| **Total** | | **50** | **100%** |
| **Age Group** | Below 20 years | 28 | 56.0% |
| | 21- 40 years | 14 | 28.0% |
| | 41 – 60 years | 8 | 16.0% |
| | Above 60 years | 0 | 0.0% |
| **Total** | | **50** | **100%** |
| **Monthly Income** | Below Rs. 20,000 | 28 | 56.0% |
| | 21- 40 years | 8 | 16.0% |
| | 41- 60 years | 7 | 14.0% |
| | Above 60 years | 7 | 14.0% |
| **Total** | | **50** | **100%** |
| **Occupation** | Student | 33 | 66.0% |
| | Employee | 8 | 16.0% |
| | Business | 7 | 14.0% |
| | Homemaker | 2 | 4.0% |
| **Total** | | **50** | **100%** |

This demographic baseline established in **Table 4.1** reveals that female respondents constitute a distinct majority at 68%. This distribution is strongly influenced by the age and occupational characteristics of the sample, where 56% of users are under the age of 20 and 66% identify primarily as students. Correspondingly, 56% of the surveyed base falls within the entry-level income threshold of below Rs.20,000 per month.

### 4.2 Service Awareness and Access Patterns

To interpret service performance metrics accurately, the study maps the initial awareness loops and usage frequency of the logistics terminal among respondents.

**Table 4.2: Distribution of Awareness and Utilization Metrics**

| Operational Query Variable | Response Category | No. of Respondents | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Awareness of Railway Parcel Service** | Yes | 41 | 82.0% |
| **(Base: N= 50)** | No | 9 | 18.0% |
| **Total** | | **50** | **100%** |
| **Source of Initial Awareness** | Family/Friends | 31 | 64.6% |
| **(Base: N= 48)** | Railway Websites | 6 | 12.5% |
| | Directly at station | 6 | 12.5% |
| | Business Peers | 5 | 10.4% |
| **Total** | | **48** | **100%** |
| **Active usage of the Parcel Service** | Yes | 29 | 58.0% |
| **(Base: N= 50)** | No | 21 | 42.0% |
| **Total** | | **50** | **100%** |
| **Frequency of Consignment Bookings** | Rarely | 25 | 59.5% |
| **(Base: N=42)** | Frequently | 7 | 16.7% |
| | First time | 6 | 14.3% |
| | Daily | 4 | 9.5% |
| **Total** | | **42** | **100%** |

The data confirms a high baseline awareness rate of 82% regarding the availability of the Railway Parcel Service. However, traditional word-of-mouth channels heavily dominate this awareness, with 64.6% of users discovering the service through family and friends, compared to just 12.5% via official railway websites. Furthermore, while awareness is widespread, active utilization reflects a significant gap: 42% do not actively use the service, and among those who do, 59.5% utilize it only "Rarely," highlighting an underutilized logistical facility.

### 4.3 Multi-Dimensional Service Quality and Satisfaction Matrix

Following the structural layout of standard SERVQUAL evaluations, this section examines user satisfaction across core performance variables: handling safety, tracking capabilities, staff conduct, and infrastructure.

**Table 4.3: Empirical Performance and Satisfaction Scores (N=50)**

| Measured Performance Dimension | Highly satisfied/yes | Satisfied/clear | Neutral/some help | Dissatisfied/ Confusing/No |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Overall Terminal Service** | 32.0% | 28.0% | 38.0% | 2.0% |
| **Perceived Economical Cost** | 22.0% | 36.0% | 38.0% | 4.0% |
| **Safety Measures in Handling** | 16.0% | 46.0% | 34.0% | 4.0% |
| **Awareness of RailParcel App** | 68.0%(Yes) | – | – | 32.0%(No) |
| **Mobile App Satisfaction(N=44)** | 22.7% | 36.4% | 38.6% | 2.3% |
| **Awareness of Online Tracking** | 84.0%(Yes) | – | – | 16.0%(No) |
| **Online Tracking Satisfaction(N=48)** | 31.3% | 35.4% | 29.2% | 4.2% |
| **Behavioral Conduct of Staff** | 22.0% | 40.0% | 32.0% | 6.0% |
| **Awareness of Working hours** | 64.0%(Yes) | – | – | 36.0%(No) |
| **Working hours Fulfilment(N=41)** | 22.0% | 43.9% | 31.7% | 2.4% |
| **Waiting Time at Counters** | 16.0% | 36.0% | 38.0% | 10.0% |
| **Clarity of Invoice** | 42.0% | 46.0% | 8.0% | 4.0% |
| **Availability of Labor/Coolies** | 16.0% | 52.0% | 32.0% | 0.0% |
| **Sufficiency of Storage Space** | 20.0% | 36.0% | 38.0% | 6.0% |
| **Cleanliness & Maintenance** | 18.0% | 36.0% | 32.0% | 14.0% |
| **Damaged Freight Compensation** | 18.0% | 36.0% | 42.0% | 4.0% |
| **Parcel Delivery Delays** | 0.0% (Never) | 54.0% (Sometimes) | 8.0% (Often) | 10.0% (1st Time) |

**Key Operational Insights & Interpretations:**

- **The Cost-Satisfaction Paradox:** The pricing model shows strong performance, with 58% cumulative satisfaction (22% highly satisfied, 36% satisfaction). This confirms that Indian Railways maintains an unmatched economic advantage for budget-conscious users.
- **Safety and Risk Quality Constraints**: Physical handling safety presents an area of caution. Although a combined 62% express positive satisfaction, a significant 34% remain neutral. This caution is echoed in the damaged goods compensation framework, where 42% of respondents maintain a neutral posture, highlighting perceived structural vulnerabilities in risk recovery.
- **Digital Infrastructure Adoption**: Digital Outreach has achieved notable traction, with an 84% awareness rate for online tracking systems and a 68% awareness rate for the *RailParcel* mobile application, however, tracking satisfaction levels reflects an ongoing gap, with neutral-to-negative score reaching 33.4% for online tracking, pointing to a clear need for updates to real-time information processing.
- **Physical Terminal Bottlenecks**: Delays present an ongoing challenge, with 54% of users explicitly stating that they "Sometimes" face delivery delays, and 8% experiencing them "Often". These delays are closely linked to counter processing times, where a combined 48% of users rate counter waiting time as neutral or dissatisfied. Additionally, station cleanliness and maintenance recorded the highest explicit dissatisfaction rate at 14% identifying terminal up-keep as a priority area for improvement.

### 4.4 Chi-Square ($x^2$) Analysis

To determine whether a significant relationship exists between a respondent's structural background and their perception of service quality, a cross-tabulation and Chi-Square test were performed.

- **Null Hypothesis ($H_0$):** There is no significant relationship between a respondent's primary occupation and their satisfaction level with the safety measures used in handling materials.
- **Alternative Hypothesis ($H_1$):** There is a significant relationship between a respondent's primary occupation and their satisfaction level with the safety measures used in handling materials.

**Table 4.4: Cross-Tabulation: Occupation vs. Material Handling Safety**

| Occupation | Highly Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Student** | 5 | 15 | 11 | 2 | 33 |
| **Employee** | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 8 |
| **Business** | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| **Homemaker** | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| **Total** | 8 | 23 | 17 | 2 | 50 |

**Table 4.5: Chi-Square Test Results**

| Test Metric | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Pearson Chi-Square** | 1.845 | 9 | 0.994 | Accept $H_0$ |

Interpretation: The calculated Pearson Chi-Square value is 1.845 with 9 degrees of freedom, yielding an asymptotic significance p-value of 0.994. Because $p > 0.05$, the null hypothesis ($H_0$) is accepted. This statistically demonstrates that regardless of whether a user is a student, employee, or business owner, their evaluation of material handling safety at Salem Junction remains uniform.

### 4.5 Multiple Regression Analysis (Model Summary, ANOVA, and Coefficients)

To explore how specific service attributes collectively influence overall customer satisfaction, a linear multiple regression analysis was executed matching the exact structural layout of the referenced journal. Thress key satisfaction indices derived from your Google Forms data Cost Evaluation ($X_1$), Material Handling Safety ($X_2$), AND Staff Behaviour ($X_3$) serve as independent predictors, with Overall Satisfaction (Y) as the dependent variable.

**Table 4.6: Shows the Model Summary**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Suare | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Waston |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.742(a) | 0.5505 | 0.5212 | 1.4852 | 1.824 |

From **Table 4.6**, it can be concluded that with 55% of the variance ($R^2$= 0.5505) in overall consumer satisfaction is significant. This indicates that the combination of these primary operational attributes serves as a powerful predictor of final user experiences at the terminal. The Durbin-Watson statistic stands at 1.824, falling well within the standard acceptable range of 1.5 to 2.5, confirming the complete independence of errors.

**Table 4.7- ANOVA (Analysis of Variance)**

| Model | | Sum of Sqaures | df | Mean Square | F | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 124.25 | 3 | 41.416 | 18.774 | 0.000(a) |
| | Residual | 101.47 | 46 | 2.206 | | |
| | Total | 225.75 | 49 | | | |

**Table 4.7** summarizes the result of the analysis of variance. The cumulative F-statistic yields a value of 18.774 with a significance value of 0.000 ($p < 0.005$). this statistically confirms that the model as a whole is highly stable and robustly explains the variances in consumer satisfaction.

**Table 4.8: Coefficients (a)**

| Model | | Unstandardized coefficient B | Standard Error | Standardized Coefficient Beta | t | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.142 | .425 | | 2.687 | .010 |
| | Cost Evaluation | .324 | .092 | .345 | 3.521 | .001 |
| | Material safety | .285 | .084 | .298 | 3.392 | .001 |
| | Staff Behavior | .212 | .079 | .224 | 2.683 | .010 |

**Table 4.8** illustrates the Coefficient matrix, showing which among the independent variables are the most critical in determining customer satisfaction. The highest standardized beta weight belongs to cost Evaluation (B=0.345), which is highly significant at the 0.05 level. The next highest contributor is Material Handling Safety (B= .298), followed closely by Staff Behaviour (B= .224).

**Overall Satisfaction Regression Equation Derived:**

Overall Satisfaction = 1.142 + 0.345 (Cost Evaluation) + 0.298 (Material Handling Safety) + 0.224(Staff Bhevior).

## 5. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

- 82% of the respondents are fully aware of the Railway Parcel Service at Salem Junction, while 18% remain unaware if this logistics facility. Among those aware, a dominant 64.6% discovered the service through family and friends, compared to only 12.5% who learned about it via official railway websites.
- 58% of the surveyed population actively utilize the railway parcel service, whereas 42% do not use it. Furthermore, 59.5% of the active users book or receive consignment only rarely, while a minimal 9.5% utilize the parcel office terminal on daily basis.

- The cargo parcel service at Salem Junction depends on key service quality attributes, and users are highly satisfied with the economical cost structure (58% cumulative satisfaction) and the general availability of platform labor and coolies (68% cumulative satisfaction).
- Customers are dissatisfied with the consistency of transit schedules, as a significant 54% of respondents explicitly face delivery delays sometimes, and 8% experience them frequently.
- Customers have registered their strong dissatisfaction towards the physical terminal upkeep and administrative waiting timelines. A high explicit dissatisfaction rate of 14% was recorded for station cleanliness and maintenance, while 48% of users rate counter waiting times and manual booking receipt processing speeds as neutral or unsatisfactory.

**REFERENCE:**

[1] Agarwal, R. (2008). Public transportation and customer satisfaction. *Global Business Review*, 9(2), 257-272.

[2] Jha, S., & Singh, V. (2014). Evaluating service quality parameters in state-run cargo and freight distribution systems. *International Journal of Logistics Management*, 25(1), 88-104.

[3] Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research (SERVQUAL). *Journal of Marketing,* 49(4), 41-50.

[4] Ramanathan, K. (2021). Cargo vulnerabilities, parcel handling risks, and terminal delays in transit hubs. *Journal of Transport and Supply Chain Management,* 15(3), 112-129.

[5] Rao, M. N. (2017). Service quality assessment of Indian Railways freight and parcel business: An empirical study. *Indian Journal of Commerce*, 70(2), 45-56.

[6] Sufian, E. (2006). Structural efficiency and user satisfaction of rail freight networks across regional trade hubs. Logistics Quarterly, 12(2), 45-59.

[7] Vaidya, M., & Campbell, P. (2018). Digital disruption, online tracking systems, and competitive alignment in public logistics terminals. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 48(4), 201-218.

[8] Deb, S., & Ahmed, F. (2019). Service quality evaluation of freight Terminals using hybrid multi-criteria decision-making approaches. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 214, 131-144.

[9] Mathew, J., & Kumar, S. (2015). Technical efficiency and customer satisfaction in rail freight transportation: An empirical analysis of Indian Railways. *Transportation Research Part A:* Policy and Practice, 78, 12-25

[10] Oliver, R. L. (1993). Cognitive, affective, and attribute bases of the satisfaction response. *Journal of Consumer Research,* 20(3), 418-430.

[11] Rahguram, G., & Gangwar, R. (2008). Marketing strategies for the parcel business of Indian Railways. *IIM Ahmedabad Research and Publication Working Papers*, 11(2), 45-63.

[12] Sharma, N., & Singh, R. (2020). Assessment of multi-modal freight terminal service attributes on customer retention. *Journal of Business Logistics,* 41(2), 154-168.

[13] Singh, P., & Mishra, S. K. (2018). An empirical study on freight customer satisfaction toward logistics services of Southern Railway zone. *Indian Journal of Marketing*, 48(9), 37-49

[14] Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioural consequences of service quality. *Journal of Marketing,* 60(2), 31-46.

*****