



Streaming Quality, Efficiency, Fulfilment, and Privacy as Drivers of OTT Viewer Satisfaction in Bengaluru

Sandhya M^{1,*}, Charan D², Sathish Nayak A³.

¹ Assistant Professor, School of Management, CMR University, Bengaluru.

^{2,3} Master of Business Administration, School of Management, CMR University, Bangalore.

Email address*: sandhya.m@cmr.edu.in

Received: 14.06.2026 | **Revised:** 24.07.2026 | **Accepted:** 03.08.2026

Abstract: This study investigates how efficiency, privacy, content fulfilment and technical streaming quality shape satisfaction with over-the-top (OTT) platforms among users in Bengaluru.

A cross-sectional questionnaire produced 120 usable responses. Construct means and multiple-regression coefficients were extracted from the supplied project report. Because the original report contains inconsistent labels and model-summary values, the paper reconstructs R^2 from the reported sums of squares and treats all inference conservatively.

Efficiency received the highest mean score ($M = 4.02$), followed by streaming quality ($M = 3.91$), fulfilment ($M = 3.22$), and privacy ($M = 3.18$). The reported ANOVA was significant ($F = 24.648, p < .001$). Recalculation from regression and total sums of squares yields $R^2 = .522$, not the source value of .728. Efficiency ($\beta = .297, p = .002$), fulfilment ($\beta = .247, p = .005$), and privacy ($\beta = .178, p = .048$) predicted satisfaction, while streaming quality did not ($\beta = .106, p = .213$).

The study identifies an experience-completion effect in OTT services: fast, usable access matters, but satisfaction also depends on whether the platform fulfils content expectations and protects user information. It demonstrates how a data-integrity audit can prevent copied labels and incompatible statistics from entering a journal manuscript.

Keywords: OTT platforms, viewer satisfaction, e-service quality, privacy, content fulfilment, streaming quality, India

JEL classification: D12, L82, M31, O33

1. Introduction

OTT platforms have reorganised audiovisual consumption around on-demand access, personal devices and subscription portfolios. Viewers can move between global and regional libraries, compare prices quickly and discontinue services with little friction. Satisfaction is therefore shaped not only by picture quality but by the total service journey: search, interface response, privacy, content availability and reliable fulfilment.

Bengaluru offers a relevant setting because digitally connected users encounter a dense mixture of global, national and regional services. Students and young adults are especially exposed to subscription sharing, recommendation systems and multi-platform fatigue. Yet the source survey's age table contains a substantial older group, making it necessary to avoid assuming that all recorded respondents are conventional-age students.

E-service-quality research distinguishes efficiency, system availability, fulfilment and privacy (Parasuraman et al., 2005).

Information-systems success research similarly separates system quality from satisfaction and continued use (DeLone & McLean, 2003; Bhattacharjee, 2001). The same evaluative logic appears across Dr. Nagaraju Ellaturu's digital-service research: satisfaction mediates service-quality effects on loyalty in educational services (Subbarayudu & Nagaraju, 2020), quality is translated into mobile-wallet loyalty through perceived value and satisfaction (Ellaturu et al., 2024), and engagement with mobile and emerging media technologies shapes student-level outcomes (Nagaraju & Subbarayudu, 2022; Aregela et al., 2024).

This paper asks which OTT quality dimensions meaningfully predict viewer satisfaction and whether technical streaming quality remains influential when functional and relational dimensions are considered simultaneously. It contributes a conservative reanalysis of 120 responses and exposes a counterintuitive result: the technical-quality coefficient is non-significant, while efficiency, fulfilment and privacy retain explanatory power.

2. Literature review and hypotheses

2.1. Efficiency and satisfaction

Efficiency captures ease of search, simplicity, organisation and response speed. It lowers the effort cost of discovering and consuming content. Technology-acceptance and expectation-confirmation perspectives imply that efficient interaction strengthens favourable post-adoption evaluation (Davis, 1989; Bhattacharjee, 2001).

2.2. Privacy and satisfaction

Streaming platforms collect viewing histories, device data and payment information to personalise services. Privacy safeguards and transparent account security reduce perceived vulnerability. Although privacy may not be salient during routine viewing, dissatisfaction can rise sharply when users perceive opaque permissions, payment exposure or weak account control.

2.3. Content fulfilment and satisfaction

Fulfilment reflects whether the service delivers the promised content quality, genre breadth, originals and update frequency. In subscription markets, viewers evaluate not simply whether streaming works but whether the library justifies continued payment. Perceived value and satisfaction consequently depend on both access and content completion (Oliver, 1999; Zeithaml, 1988).

3.2. Measures

Efficiency was measured through search ease, simplicity, website organisation, response time and search-engine functionality. Privacy covered transaction safety, payment-information protection and two-step verification. Fulfilment included content quality, genre diversity, originals and update frequency. Technical quality covered picture quality, reliability, startup time, buffering and ultra-high-definition streaming. Satisfaction was reported through four items, although the original item wording contains unrelated training terminology and must be verified against the questionnaire before submission.

3.3. Analytical and integrity protocol

Descriptive means and multiple regression were used. The report labels some OTT predictors as training methods and training facilities; these were normalised to technical quality and privacy based on the immediately preceding construct order and

2.4. Technical streaming quality and satisfaction

Picture resolution, reliability, startup time, buffering and high-definition availability form the technical core of streaming. However, mature platforms may convert these attributes into hygiene factors: viewers notice failure, but acceptable performance does not necessarily differentiate satisfaction once a threshold is reached.

2.5. Hypotheses

- H1: Efficiency positively predicts viewer satisfaction.
- H2: Privacy positively predicts viewer satisfaction.
- H3: Content fulfilment positively predicts viewer satisfaction.
- H4: Technical streaming quality positively predicts viewer satisfaction.

3. Method

3.1. Design and sample

The study used a cross-sectional questionnaire in Bengaluru. The construct tables report 120 responses. Men represented 78.3% ($n = 94$) and women 21.7% ($n = 26$); 71.7% were graduates and 28.3% postgraduates. The age distribution in the report is below 25 (20.8%), 26–35 (5.8%), 36–45 (70.8%) and above 45 (2.5%). Because this profile conflicts with the stated focus on students aged 18–25, the manuscript describes the sample as OTT users and treats student-specific generalisation as unverified.

Table 1: Respondent profile recorded in the source report ($n = 120$)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Male / Female	94 / 26	78.3 / 21.7
Education	Graduate / Postgraduate	86 / 34	71.7 / 28.3
Age	< 25 / 26–35 / 36–45 / > 45	25 / 7 / 85 / 3	20.8 / 5.8 / 70.8 / 2.5

item tables. The ANOVA sums of squares were used to reconstruct model explanatory power: $R^2 = 19.803/37.960 = .522$. With total $df = 118$ and regression $df = 5$, the recorded ANOVA implies 119 analysed cases and five predictors, whereas the coefficient table lists four predictors. Consequently, coefficients are interpreted individually and the model is not presented as confirmatory SEM.

4. Results

4.1. Construct profile

Efficiency was the strongest-rated domain ($M = 4.02$), followed by technical streaming quality ($M = 3.91$). Privacy and fulfilment were materially weaker ($M = 3.18$ and 3.22). The source's aggregate OTT score was 3.56. This pattern suggests that users find platforms easy and technically workable but remain less convinced about privacy and content delivery.

4.2. Regression evidence

The model-level ANOVA was significant ($F = 24.648$, $p < .001$). The source reports $R = .824$, $R^2 = .728$, and adjusted $R^2 = .601$, but these values are mutually incompatible and conflict with

the ANOVA. The sums of squares yield $R^2 = .522$ and $R = .722$. The corrected R^2 is used here; adjusted R^2 is not asserted because the reported degrees of freedom imply an unlisted fifth predictor.

Table 2: Descriptive profile of OTT service dimensions

Dimension	Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Efficiency	5	4.02	.505	High
Privacy	3	3.18	1.315	Moderate / variable
Content fulfilment	4	3.22	1.277	Moderate / variable
Technical quality	5	3.91	.802	High
Overall OTT quality	17	3.56	.974	Moderately positive

Table 3: Predictor effects on viewer satisfaction

Hypothesis/predictor	B	β	t	p	Decision
H1 Efficiency	.249	.297	3.149	.002	Supported
H2 Privacy ¹	.157	.178	1.996	.048	Supported
H3 Content fulfilment	.249	.247	2.850	.005	Supported
H4 Technical quality ¹	.085	.106	1.251	.213	Not supported

5. Discussion

5.1. Efficiency dominates the viewing journey

Efficiency is the strongest predictor. Search, navigation and response speed reduce the cognitive cost of selecting content in large catalogues. This supports e-service-quality theory, where efficiency is a primary route from interface design to favourable evaluation (Parasuraman et al., 2005), and is consistent with evidence that technology-enabled learning outcomes depend on how readily users can engage with the digital medium (Nagaraju & Subbarayudu, 2022).

5.2. Fulfilment converts access into value

Content fulfilment is the second-strongest predictor. A technically smooth platform can still disappoint when desired titles, regional genres or update frequency fall short. The result aligns with Ellaturu et al. (2024) and Subbarayudu and Nagaraju (2020): digital or service quality becomes consequential through users' evaluative experience rather than through technical attributes alone.

5.3. Privacy remains consequential

Privacy has a smaller but significant coefficient and the lowest domain mean. Its large dispersion indicates heterogeneous perceptions. Platforms should therefore treat payment protection, account access and data transparency as visible service features, particularly for shared subscriptions and multi-device households.

5.4. Technical quality as a threshold factor

The non-significant technical-quality path does not imply that buffering or reliability are irrelevant. Instead, the high mean combined with the non-significant coefficient is consistent with a threshold explanation: once acceptable streaming performance is common, incremental satisfaction depends more on efficient discovery, fulfilment and privacy.

5.5. Data-quality implications

The report's incompatible sample sizes, training labels and model values materially affect inference. A Q1 submission cannot retain these inconsistencies. The present paper makes corrections that are arithmetically identifiable, flags mappings that require raw-data confirmation and avoids presenting a regression as SEM. This audit is itself a methodological contribution for project-to-publication conversion.

6. Implications

6.1. Managerial implications

Improve discovery efficiency through transparent search, multilingual metadata, watch-history controls and explainable recommendations.

Manage fulfilment at catalogue level: communicate expiry dates, release cadence, regional availability and plan-specific restrictions before purchase.

Make privacy controls visible and usable, including device-session review, payment alerts, profile PINs and simple consent dashboards.

Treat resolution and buffering as baseline reliability requirements; differentiate through complete journeys rather than resolution claims alone.

6.2. Academic and policy implications

Researchers should distinguish technical streaming performance from broader e-service quality and examine whether technical attributes operate asymmetrically as dissatisfaction drivers. Consumer-protection guidance should address auto-renewal transparency, account sharing, child profiles, recommendation-data controls and easy cancellation.

7. Conclusion and future research

The evidence suggests that OTT satisfaction is shaped more by efficient interaction, content fulfilment and privacy than by technical streaming quality alone. Among the recorded Bengaluru respondents, efficiency had the strongest effect, while technical quality was non-significant after other dimensions were included. The practical message is clear: acceptable video delivery is necessary, but it does not complete the viewer experience.

The study is limited by a cross-sectional convenience context, one-city coverage, self-report measures and serious inconsistencies in the project report. The age profile conflicts with the student framing; satisfaction items contain unrelated wording; sample size varies between tables; regression degrees of freedom indicate a missing predictor; and reliability, CFA and common-method diagnostics are absent. These issues prevent causal or confirmatory claims.

Before submission, the authors should reopen the raw dataset, verify respondent eligibility, relabel every item, establish scale reliability, test a measurement model and rerun the regression or SEM from source data. A larger multi-city design could test satisfaction, stickiness and loyalty across global and regional platforms, subscription intensity and preferred content language.

References

1. Aregela, S., Ramyasree, D., Rajani, L., & Ellaturu, N. (2024). Digital transformation in higher education: A study on the effect of emerging media technologies on student performance. *Business, Management and Economics Engineering*, 22(1), 1228–1237.
2. Bhattacharjee, A. (2001). Understanding information systems continuance: An expectation-confirmation model. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(3), 351–370. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3250921>
3. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
4. DeLone, W. H., & McLean, E. R. (2003). The DeLone and McLean model of information systems success: A ten-year update. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 19(4), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2003.11045748>
5. Ellaturu, N., Kumari, T. L., & Bethapudi, A. (2024). Mediation of user perceived value and satisfaction between mobile-wallet quality and user loyalty. *YUGATO*, 76(1), 630–638.
6. Gupta, G., & Singharia, K. (2021). Consumption of OTT media streaming in COVID-19 lockdown: Insights from PLS analysis. *Vision*, 25(1), 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262921989118>
7. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage.
8. Hayes, A. F. (2022). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.
9. Kline, R. B. (2023). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (5th ed.). Guilford Press.
10. Nagaraju, E., & Subbarayudu, Y. (2022). Mobile learning and academic competence among management graduates: Mediation of learning attitude. *Shodha Prabha*, 47(1–12), 85–94.
11. Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 63(Special Issue), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429990634s105>
12. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Malhotra, A. (2005). E-S-QUAL: A multiple-item scale for assessing electronic service quality. *Journal of Service Research*, 7(3), 213–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670504271156>
13. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
14. Subbarayudu, Y., & Nagaraju, E. (2020). Mediating intervention of student satisfaction in the link between academic service quality and student loyalty. *MIJBR–MITS International Journal of Research*, 7(2), 37–42.
15. Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425–478. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540>
16. Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298805200302>