A Study on Order Management Efficiency at Redserv Global Solutions Limited

Kaviya DHARSHINI. R
MBA Final year student
School of Management Studies
Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology Chennai- 600 119 **kaviyadharshini12112003k@gmail.com**

Dr.K.Sasirekha
Assistant Professor
School of Management Studies
Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology Chennai- 600 119

Abstract- Order management is an important function in any organization, as it helps in processing, tracking, and delivering customer orders efficiently. An effective order management system improves operational performance and customer satisfaction. The purpose of this study is to analyze the efficiency of the order management process in the organization and to identify factors affecting order processing activities. The study is based on primary data collected from employees using a structured questionnaire. A sample of 225 respondents was selected for the study. Statistical tools such as percentage analysis, correlation analysis, and the chi-square test were used to analyze the data. The findings of the study show that proper coordination between departments, use of technology, and employee training play an important role in improving order management efficiency. The study suggests that organizations should improve system integration and communication among departments to enhance order processing performance.

Key words

Order Management, Order Processing, Operational Efficiency, Supply Chain Management, Customer Satisfaction

Introduction

Order management is a systematic process used by organizations to receive, process, and fulfill customer orders efficiently. It includes activities such as order entry, order processing, order tracking, inventory verification, and delivery management. A well-structured order management system helps organizations improve operational efficiency and ensure timely delivery of products and services.

In modern organizations, the order management process is supported by technology and integrated systems that help track orders in real time and reduce operational errors. However, issues such as poor coordination between departments, manual processing, and lack of system integration can affect order processing efficiency.

Efficient order management helps organizations improve productivity, reduce delays, and enhance customer satisfaction. Therefore, analyzing and improving order management efficiency is important for organizations to remain competitive in the market.

Review of Literature

1. **Render and Heizer (2004)** highlighted the importance of integrated systems and technology in managing operational processes effectively.

2. **Gupta and Sharma (2018)** stated that proper planning and operational coordination significantly improve efficiency in organizations.

3. **Verma and Tiwari (2019)** found that digital tracking systems improve accuracy and transparency in managing business operations.

4. **Kumar and Singh (2021)** emphasized that efficient operational practices help organizations improve performance and reduce errors.

5. **Sharma and Gupta (2022)** concluded that technology and process improvements play an important role in improving operational efficiency in organizations.

6. **Ramesh and Priya (2023)** explained that effective coordination and monitoring systems are essential for improving organizational performance.

Objective

- To analyze the existing order processing system in the organization.
- To identify the factors affecting order management efficiency.
- To examine the role of technology in order management.
- To study the coordination between departments in processing orders.
- To suggest measures to improve order management efficiency

Research Methodology

Research Design

This study uses a descriptive research design. The purpose of descriptive research is to describe the existing order management practices in the organization and to analyze employee opinions regarding the efficiency of the order management system. This study focuses on identifying issues in order processing, coordination between departments, and factors affecting order management efficiency at Redserv Global Solutions Limited. The data required for the study were collected directly from employees through a structured questionnaire.

Sampling Design

Population: The population of the study consists of employees involved in order management activities at Redserv Global Solutions Limited.

Sample Size: A total of 225 respondents were selected as the sample for the study.

Sampling Technique: The convenience sampling method was used in this study. Respondents were selected based on their availability and willingness to participate in the survey.

Source of Data:

Primary Data

The study is based only on primary data. Primary data were collected directly from employees using a structured questionnaire to understand their opinions regarding the order management process and its efficiency in the organization.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

TABLE 1: AGE

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
20-25 years	66	29.3
25-35 years	101	44.9
35-45 years	45	20
45 above years	13	5.8
Total	**225**	**100**

INTERPRETATION:

From the above table, it is interpreted that 29.3% of the respondents are in the age group of 20–25 years, 44.9% of the respondents are in 25–35 years, 20% of the respondents are in 35–45 years, and 5.8% of the respondents are in 45 years and above.

TABLE: 2 GENDER

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Male	127	56.4
Female	98	43.6
Total	**225**	**100**

INTERPRETATION:

From the above table, it is interpreted that 56.4% of the respondents are male and 43.6% of the respondents are female.

TABLE: 3 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Less than 1 year	37	16.4
1–3 years	70	31.1
3–5 years	63	28
More than 5 years	55	24.4
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the above table, it is interpreted that 16.4% of the respondents have less than 1 year of experience, 31.1% have 1–3 years of experience, 28% have 3–5 years of experience, and 24.4% have more than 5 years of experience.

TABLE: 4 DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN ORDER PROCESSING

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Yes	179	79.6
No	46	20.4
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the above table, it is interpreted that 79.6% of the respondents are directly involved in order processing, while 20.4% are not involved.

TABLE: 5 ORDER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IS EASY TO USE

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	46	20.4
Agree	92	40.9
Neutral	58	25.8
Disagree	22	9.8
Strongly Disagree	7	3.1
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the above table, it is interpreted that 20.4% of the respondents strongly agree, 40.9% agree, 25.8% are neutral, 9.8% disagree, and 3.1% strongly disagree that the order management system is easy to use.

TABLE: 6 ORDERS PROCESSED WITHIN EXPECTED TIME

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	39	17.3
Agree	95	42.2
Neutral	54	24
Disagree	24	10.7
Strongly Disagree	13	5.8
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the above table, it is interpreted that 17.3% of the respondents strongly agree, 42.2% agree, 24% are neutral, 10.7% disagree, and 5.8% strongly disagree that orders are processed within the expected time.

TABLE: 7 FREQUENT DELAYS IN ORDER PROCESSING

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	23	10.2
Agree	38	16.9
Neutral	50	22.2
Disagree	83	36.9
Strongly Disagree	31	13.8
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the above table, it is interpreted that 10.2% of the respondents strongly agree, 16.9% agree, 22.2% are neutral, 36.9% disagree, and 13.8% strongly disagree that there are frequent delays in order processing.

TABLE:8 COMMUNICATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS IS EFFECTIVE

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	41	18.2
Agree	97	43.1
Neutral	47	20.9
Disagree	28	12.4
Strongly Disagree	12	5.3
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the above table, it is interpreted that 18.2% of the respondents strongly agree, 43.1% agree, 20.9% are neutral, 12.4% disagree, and 5.3% strongly disagree that communication between departments is effective.

TABLE:9 TECHNOLOGY USED IS RELIABLE

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Excellent	27	12
Good	104	46.2
Average	73	32.4
Poor	21	9.3
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the above table, it is interpreted that 12% of the respondents rate the technology as excellent, 46.2% as good, 32.4% as average, and 9.3% as poor.

TABLE: 10 ORDER TRACKING SYSTEM IS EFFICIENT

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	45	20
Agree	106	47.1
Neutral	50	22.2
Disagree	13	5.8
Strongly Disagree	11	4.9
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the above table, it is interpreted that 20% of the respondents strongly agree, 47.1% agree, 22.2% are neutral, 5.8% disagree, and 4.9% strongly disagree that the order tracking system is efficient.

TABLE: 11 CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS HANDLED QUICKLY

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	37	16.4
Agree	102	45.3
Neutral	41	18.2
Disagree	27	12
Strongly Disagree	18	8
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the above table, it is interpreted that 16.4% of the respondents strongly agree, 45.3% agree, 18.2% are neutral, 12% disagree, and 8% strongly disagree that customer complaints are handled quickly.

TABLE: 12 PROPER TRAINING IS PROVIDED

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Yes	141	62.7
No	84	37.3
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the table, it is interpreted that 62.7% of the respondents stated that proper training is provided, while 37.3% stated that it is not provided.

TABLE: 13 SYSTEM ERRORS AFFECT ORDER PROCESSING

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Very Often	8	3.6
Often	28	12.4
Sometimes	85	37.8
Rarely	68	30.2
Never	36	16
Total	**225**	**100**

From the table, it is interpreted that 37.8% of respondents reported that system errors sometimes affect order processing, followed by 30.2% rarely, 16% never, 12.4% often, and 3.6% very often.

TABLE: 14 MANUAL WORK INCREASES CHANCE OF ERRORS

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	42	18.7
Agree	94	41.8
Neutral	57	25.3
Disagree	23	10.2
Strongly Disagree	9	4
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the table, it is interpreted that 41.8% agree and 18.7% strongly agree that manual work increases errors, while 25.3% are neutral, 10.2% disagree, and 4% strongly disagree.

TABLE: 15 INVENTORY AVAILABILITY AFFECTS ORDER FULFILLMENT

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Always	10	4.4
Often	29	12.9
Sometimes	68	30.2
Rarely	82	36.4
Never	36	16
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the table, it is interpreted that 36.4% rarely and 30.2% sometimes believe inventory affects order fulfillment, while 16% never, 12.9% often, and 4.4% always.

TABLE: 16 ORDER CANCELLATION/RETURNS HANDLED EFFICIENTLY

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	52	23.1
Agree	102	45.3
Neutral	42	18.7
Disagree	19	8.4
Strongly Disagree	10	4.4
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the table, it is interpreted that 45.3% agree and 23.1% strongly agree that cancellations/returns are handled efficiently, while 18.7% are neutral, 8.4% disagree, and 4.4% strongly disagree.

TABLE: 17 ORDER MANAGEMENT REDUCES OPERATIONAL COSTS

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	50	22.2
Agree	93	41.3
Neutral	51	22.7
Disagree	23	10.2
Strongly Disagree	8	3.6

Interpretation:

From the table, it is interpreted that 41.3% agree and 22.2% strongly agree that order management reduces operational costs, while 22.7% are neutral, 10.2% disagree, and 3.6% strongly disagree.

TABLE: 18 OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH ORDER MANAGEMENT

Option	Count	Percentage (%)
Highly Satisfied	30	13.3
Satisfied	97	43.1
Neutral	48	21.3
Dissatisfied	32	14.2
Highly Dissatisfied	18	8
Total	**225**	**100**

Interpretation:

From the table, it is interpreted that 43.1% are satisfied and 13.3% highly satisfied, while 21.3% are neutral, 14.2% dissatisfied, and 8% highly dissatisfied.

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

To perform a Correlation Analysis between Qualification (X) and Criteria of Overall recruitment process (Y). Calculate the Pearson correlation coefficient. This coefficient measures the strength and direction of the liner relationship between two variables. The following data for the X and Y variables are provided to find the sample correlation coefficient.

Order processing (X)	**23**	**38**	**50**	**83**	**31**
Criteria of Overall order process (Y)	**30**	**97**	**48**	**32**	**18**

Order processing (X))	**Criteria of Overall order process (Y)**	**$X - \bar{X}$**	**$Y - \bar{Y}$**	**$(X - \bar{X})^2$**	**$(Y - \bar{Y})^2$**	**$(X - \bar{X})$ $(Y - \bar{Y})$**
23	30	-24	-15	576	225	360
38	97	-9	52	81	2704	-468
50	48	3	3	9	9	9
83	32	46	-13	2116	169	-598
31	18	-16	-27	256	729	432
TOTAL		0	0	3038	3836	-265

$$r = \frac{\sum (X - \bar{X})(Y - \bar{Y})}{\sqrt{\sum (X - \bar{X})^2 \cdot \sum (Y - \bar{Y})^2}}$$

$$r = \frac{-265}{\sqrt{3038 \times 3836}}$$

$$r = \frac{-265}{\sqrt{11654168}}$$

$$r = \frac{-265}{3414.56}$$

$$r \approx -0.08$$

Conclusion: The Pearson correlation coefficient r is approximately -0.08. This value indicates a moderate positive correlation between qualifications and criteria of the overall order process in Redserv Global Solutions Private Limited.

CHI-SQUARE TEST : Assessing the relationship Between work experience of employees and their opinion in employee level of agreement of the Redserv Global Solutions Private Limited.

Null Hypothesis (H_0): There is no significant association between work experience of employees and their opinion in employee level of agreement of the Redserv Global Solutions Private Limited.

Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): There is a significant association between work experience of employees and their opinion in employee level of agreement of the Redserv Global Solutions Private Limited.

Difference	Agree	Very Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Very disagree	Total
0-1 Years	7	9	3	5	3	**27**
1-5 Years	38	6	12	10	2	**68**
5-10 Years	10	7	7	16	1	**41**
Above 10	4	4	0	2	4	**14**
Total	**59**	**26**	**22**	**33**	**10**	**150**

CHI-SQUARE TEST			
	Value	**Df**	**Asymptotic Significant (2- sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	11.20	12	0.51
No. of Valid Cases	225		
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.15			

Conclusion: Here, the p-value is smaller than the expected count, so we are going to reject the null hypothesis (H_0) of different work experiences of employees that do not agree with the employee level of agreement of the organization.

At the same time, we have to accept the Alternative Hypothesis (H1): different work experiences of employees that agree with the employee-level of agreement of the organization.

FINDINGS

1. The majority of the respondents are male employees (around 57%) working in the organization.

2. The majority of the respondents belong to the age group of 25–35 years, indicating a young and active workforce involved in order management activities.

3. Most of the respondents are undergraduates (around 49%), showing that employees with basic professional qualifications are involved in operational activities.

4. The majority of the respondents have 1–3 years of work experience, which shows moderate experience in handling order management tasks.

5. Most respondents strongly agreed that quick order processing is important for improving customer satisfaction.

6. The majority of respondents strongly agreed that accurate order entry is necessary to avoid mistakes in order processing.

7. Most respondents agreed that order tracking systems help in monitoring order status effectively.

8. The majority of respondents strongly agreed that coordination between departments such as sales, warehouse, and logistics is important for smooth order processing.

9. Most respondents agreed that technology and order management software improve the speed and accuracy of order processing.

10. The majority of respondents stated that delays sometimes occur during order processing or dispatch stages.

11. Many respondents agreed that errors in order documentation or data entry can cause delays in order completion.

12. Most respondents agreed that effective communication between departments improves order management efficiency.

13. The majority of respondents strongly agreed that employee training helps improve order accuracy and reduces operational errors.

14. Many respondents agreed that proper monitoring and supervision help maintain order management efficiency.

15. The majority of respondents stated that efficient order management improves customer satisfaction and organizational performance.

SUGGESTIONS

1. The company should improve coordination between departments to ensure smooth order processing.
2. The company should adopt advanced order management systems to improve order tracking and accuracy.
3. The organization should provide regular training programs for employees involved in order management activities.
4. The company should reduce delays in order processing and dispatch stages.
5. The organization should improve communication between sales, warehouse, and logistics departments.
6. The company should implement better monitoring systems to track order progress.
7. The company should encourage employees to follow proper documentation procedures to reduce order errors.

CONCLUSION

The study titled "A Study on Order Management Efficiency" was conducted to analyze the effectiveness of the order management system in the organization. The study reveals that order management plays an important role in ensuring smooth business operations and improving customer satisfaction.

The findings show that efficient order processing, proper coordination between departments, and the use of technology significantly improve order management efficiency. Employees believe that accurate order entry, timely processing, and effective communication are essential for reducing operational delays.

However, the study also indicates that issues such as processing delays, documentation errors, and lack of coordination between departments may affect order management efficiency. Therefore, the organization should focus on improving communication, providing employee training, and adopting advanced order management systems.

Overall, the study concludes that an efficient order management system helps organizations improve operational performance and enhance customer satisfaction.

REFERENCES

Books

1. Taylor, F.W. – The Principles of Scientific Management.
2. Buffa, E.S. – Modern Production Management.
3. Chase, R.B. & Aquilano, N.J. – Production and Operations Management.
4. Stevenson, W.J. – Operations Management.
5. Heizer, J. & Render, B. – Principles of Operations Management.
6. Slack, N., Chambers, S., & Johnston, R. – Operations Management.
7. Christopher, M. – Logistics and Supply Chain Management.
8. Kotler, P. & Keller, K.L. – Marketing Management.