

Exploring the urban geography of online grocery shopping in Romania: trends and transformations

Mariana Nae, Liliana Dumitrache*

Faculty of Geography, University of Bucharest, Romania

Abstract: The rapid rise of digital platforms is reshaping how urban residents access and consume food, marking a significant shift from traditional grocery shopping to online retail experiences. In Romania, this transformation is particularly evident in the Bucharest Region, where online grocery services are projected to generate over \$599 million in revenue by the end of 2025. This study examines how digital grocery platforms mediate consumer experiences, shape food choices, and engage with sustainability in an increasingly platformized food landscape. Drawing on a content analysis of 380 user-generated social media reviews, our research uncovers two key themes. First, ‘shopping with an app’ presents delivery experiences, consumer trust, loyalty, and peer recommendations. Second, ‘monetary values and quality-of-benefits’ describe food preferences that are guided by external product cues such as price, brand, and packaging. This research contributes to the understanding of consumer behaviour in a digital marketplace, specifically how user-generated content and the app experience influence purchasing decisions and perceptions of value. Beyond these patterns, the study also examines how sustainability is integrated into the digital grocery experience, highlighting practices such as eco-friendly packaging and local sourcing. By tracing the shift from physical carts to digital clicks, this research offers insights into the evolving relationship between technology, consumption, and sustainability in urban Romania, contributing to broader debates on digital foodscapes and responsible consumption.

Key Words: *platform-based food, online grocery shopping, delivery, reviews, recommendations, Bucharest Region, Romania*

Article Info: Received: March 30, 2025; Revised: November 3, 2025; Accepted: November 20, 2025; Online: November 30, 2025.

Introduction

Most domains of our lives, including housing, transportation, education, health, and leisure, have become increasingly mediated by digital platforms. Food delivery is a

* **Corresponding author**

Address: Faculty of Geography, University of Bucharest, 010041 Bucharest
Phone: +4 021 315 30 74 | Email: liliana.dumitrache@unibuc.ro

©2025 Human Geographies; The authors



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. DOI:10.5719/hgeo.2025.192.4

phenomenon of rapid digitalisation in Romania. Online apps and interactive maps enable us to locate restaurants, order home deliveries, and promote alternative food markets. Their prevalence is associated with the high degree of digitalisation in Romania among European countries, with 94% of Internet users (percentage of the population aged 16-74 accessing the Internet), and the increased presence of e-shoppers (55% percentage of the population aged 16-74 who bought goods or services online) (Weltevreden, 2024). In 2024, Romanians spent \$33.6 billion in physical grocery stores, 46% more than a year ago, and \$319 million in online grocery retail, 28.8% less than the previous year (USDA, FAS report, 2024).

Traditional retailers began developing new online business models to improve their services (online shopping, home delivery, and click-and-collect) and gain a competitive advantage. Food delivery platforms have gained significant popularity in Romania, with projected revenues expected to reach \$599.76 million by 2025 (Statista, 2025). Platform-based food delivery is rapidly developing in many cities within the country. The success of food apps, the promotion of online grocery shopping, and the integration of digital tools into everyday practices are certain. The digital platform (DP) is capable of adapting to multiple environments, encompassing a range of agencies, from corporations (such as retail platforms) to public entities (such as e-governance platforms), and a combination of both. However, to date, in Romania, we should consider that retail platforms, as digital marketplaces, would be an interesting case to explore. This is an exploratory study with a qualitative research design.

Adopting an e-shopping-as-social-practice approach, based on two e-grocery retailers' cases, and using both inductive and deductive methods, thematic analysis was applied to examine motivations and preferences for online shopping, as well as the ascription of meanings to shopping behaviour. In this paper, we will build on social practice theory to focus on two emerging themes: 'shopping delivery with an app' and 'monetary values and quality-of-benefits'.

Digital platformization and consumption retail transformation

Digital platforms (DPs) are shaping our inhabited places and mundane lives. A significant amount of inquiry has emerged within the broader field of platform urbanism studies over the past decade. The notion of 'platform urbanism' is a mixed concept that spans various areas of research, encompassing urbanisation, tech companies, business models, and the distribution of data-driven services.

Considered an emergent mode of smart city development (Stehlin et al., 2020) or an evolution of smart cities where digitally enabled socio-technical assemblages create new forms of social intermediation (Caprotti et al., 2022), platform urbanism has captured the attention of urban scholars. Geographers paid attention to the process of the 'platformization of cities' as it details the consequences of digital technologies over the production of new spaces incorporated into a corpus of debates on the 'digital turn' (Ash et al., 2018). In doing so, they have addressed new critical ways of researching the digitalisation of contemporary society, taking into account the rise of big data algorithms (Kitchin, 2013), proposing new approaches in framing the 'digital turn' (Ash et al., 2018), or highlighting frames such as follow the digital by searching on the everydayness of the digital (Liu, 2024).

Geographers have paid particular attention to platform urbanism due to its spatiality across boundaries at various local, regional, and national scales, even though these platforms are grounded in the urban materiality and infrastructure of cities. From this

perspective, the nexus between the materiality of spaces and the heterogeneity of economic activities and practices, converted into code lines, data flows, and commensurable data, requires further exploration. Geographic research generally highlights the impact platform economies have on a wide range of aspects of domains of life, including housing (Cocola-Gant & Cago, 2021; Spangler, 2020), the downturn of traditional retail (Dolega & Lord, 2020; Kickert et al., 2020), mobility regimes patterns (Pollio, 2021), behaviour changes and social environment (Bissell, 2020), and consumption and retail (Hardaker, 2025). Berg & Henrriksson (2020) explored how online grocery shopping influences mobility practices and the choice of transport mode. The authors argued that online grocery shopping can be associated with a certain privileged lifestyle and a better quality of life.

The pervasive connection of platformization has impacted the spatial configuration of contemporary society, particularly in digitally mediated production spaces. From this perspective, platform studies have emerged in multidisciplinary fields. For instance, environmentalists focused on food and packaging waste (Allen et al., 2021; Li et al., 2020; Talamini et al., 2022; Song et al., 2018), urban planners raised critical questions about governance (Palgan et al., 2021; Stehlin et al., 2020), and specialists in transportation economics emphasised the distribution of e-groceries and issues of city planning (Björger et al., 2021). While authors have built a critique on this topic (Datta & Odendaal, 2019; Luque-Ayala & Marvin, 2015; Hardaker & Appel, 2025) or discussed the paucity of a robust comparative perspective (Törnberg & Söderström, 2025), others have argued that platforms have implications in terms of the productive relations and social arrangements (Graham, 2020; Sadowski, 2021) and shifts in the labour force (Jesnes et al., 2024). The grocery retail transformation landscape remains a fruitful area for further exploration from the perspective of platform economies.

Food and grocery retail transformation landscapes

The food and grocery retail sector has become a challenging topic in the logistics and management of cities worldwide. Competition in the retail food market has increased in recent years; therefore, grocery delivery services have found alternative solutions to face pressure and demand. The retail landscape was rapidly reshaped by digitalisation and the growth of e-commerce, enabling shifts in consumer behaviour from a mix of in-store and online shopping.

The rise of e-grocery platforms has introduced logistical challenges in ensuring the timely and efficient delivery of perishable goods (Iwan et al., 2021; Tudisco et al., 2025). Scholars focused on the features of the transition from traditional and physical shopping to online platforms, giving rise to the e-grocery model offering variety and personalised shopping experiences (Shetty et al., 2022) or to the factors driving the frequent usage of online services, particularly online grocery shopping, online restaurant delivery, and e-shopping (Jamal et al., 2025). Additionally, logistical costs are a sensitive issue in grocery management. Grocers adopt flexible delivery options and leverage technology platforms to manage orders efficiently (Hübner et al., 2016).

Lagorio and Pinto (2021) conducted a systematic literature review, highlighting the gaps in the literature regarding the role of supply chain and logistics in the food and grocery retail sector. The authors stressed several issues, such as the vehicle routing problem (i.e. distribution of food and grocery products from supply points to demand points), consumer behaviours, e-grocery (i.e. every physical or virtual grocery store that includes food and grocery items), food waste, packaging and materials and supply chain risks (i.e. the food and grocery supply chain evaluation to diminish vulnerability). The study investigated e-grocery sustainability in greater detail, finding that it can be more environmentally friendly

than traditional shopping but raises concerns about delivery emissions, working conditions, and packaging waste. For instance, Bjørgen et al. (2021) suggested potential strategies for incorporating the last-mile distribution of e-groceries into city planning, such as raising city logistics and freight as a strategic issue in city mobility planning and urban policies, integrating transportation and land use planning, promoting soft travel modes, establishing local mobility hubs, or consolidating deliveries.

Online food provisioning services and large retailers are interconnected. Large retailers use their existing infrastructure for online grocery delivery and click-and-collect services, while specialised services focus on-demand delivery. Online food provisioning services have been categorised in the literature over the past two decades (Shim et al., 2001; Alfnes et al., 2024) into: large retailers that operate both in-store and online; independent stores; online-only stores; and AFNs. The AFNs are networks from farmers' markets and community-supported agriculture to urban agriculture. Oncini et al. (2020) discussed the potential implications of food platforms as a new business model and the changes in labour market relations between producers and platform owners. They classified food platforms in food pipelines as digital mirrors of traditional brick-and-mortar stores, online-only food shops, and limited digital efforts by direct-sales companies and AFNs. Two categories are added: window platforms that offer an online space to promote products in exchange for a subscription fee, and hybrid platforms that connect producers and consumers, with internal selection on the former to ensure that their offer aligns with the company's principles.

Food delivery platforms landscape in Romania: a short overview

The retail landscape in former socialist countries, such as Romania, was characterised by the growth of large retailers, leading to a massive restructuring of urban space, decentralised governance, and a shift in the traditional functions of inner cities (Nae & Turnock, 2011; Kühne & Dumitrache, 2025). Following the 1989 period, large-format modern retail (supermarkets and hypermarkets) emerged, leading to the decline of small shops, increased inconsistency in land-use regulation, and the establishment of new consumer culture patterns.

The modernisation of the retail sector also led to the development of e-groceries. Although the share of the online Romanian market is low compared to Western European countries, the case of Romania is interesting to explore in terms of changes in retail landscapes. The number of consumers ordering online products and services has increased in recent years. The e-commerce market in Romania is ranked third in Central and Eastern Europe, after Poland and the Czech Republic, with an estimated value of 11.7 billion Euros (Weltevreden, 2024). Nevertheless, the share of online shopping remained low on the Romanian market compared to Western European countries (Stanciu et al., 2019). The topic of e-groceries and online shopping in Romania has gained popularity in the past decade. While studies have focused on the logistics and management of such delivery services (Stanciu, 2014; Munteanu, 2015; Onete et al., 2016), there is limited understanding of user experiences with apps and social media.

The structure of the retail food market in Romania (brick and mortar) is mainly focused on the following sales: hypermarkets of over 2,500 sq. m (25,000 sq. ft) with food and non-food products, supermarkets, ranging from 400 to 2,500 sq. m, wholesalers type Cash & Carry, with various product in warehouse format (such as Metro and Selgros), and discount shops as small supermarkets with low-cost products (USDA, 2018). The market remains dominated by physical retail, with opportunities for expansion into online shopping. Food retail stores in the local online market appeared in 2010. The Carrefour and Delhaize

groups developed B2C commerce, with Metro Cash & Carry and Carrefour. New players arrived in 2014, including MegaImage, eMAG, and Selgros-Mega Market.

The local offline market is dominated by 10 large players, almost all of whom are leading class, while only two large companies operate in the exclusively online grocery market, such as Freshful and Sezamo. According to the latest data, Freshful had a revenue of US\$47 million in 2024, followed by retailers Carrefour and Mega Image (Online Grocery Industry in Romania, 2017-2029).

Freshful is a 100% online-first Romanian company founded in 2021 by eMAG Group Romania, offering food and beverage products from local partners and producers. eMAG is the largest online retailer in Romania and the most-visited retail website. The grocery is available in the Bucharest metropolitan area, offering a range of over 18,000 products, providing a one-stop shop for fresh products from local producers and Romanian farmers, along with an important selection of bio and eco products.

Sezamo is an e-grocery company part of the European Rohlik group and has been growing rapidly since 2021, with operations in Austria, Germany, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. The company was launched in Romania in 2022 under the Sezamo brand, offering clients eco-friendly options and supporting local suppliers. The e-grocery segment also evolved through customer base expansion, product diversification, and a focus on benefits such as service quality, time savings, and cost efficiency. Freshful company registered a 119% increase in sales in 2023, 29.6 million products delivered, and nearly 900,000 orders placed, while Sezamo also reported a doubling in the last year. Most of this market is concentrated in Bucharest and the Ilfov Region, which accounted for more than 5% of total retail revenue, and the estimated delivery area represented about 20% of the total national market (Palade, 2024).

Building on previous research, this paper presents findings from a qualitative analysis of online users who purchase products from two popular e-grocery platforms in Romania: Freshful and Sezamo. The focus was on the following research questions: 1) What are the characteristics of the online grocery market? and 2) what are the delivery experiences, preferences, and motivations of online users? Building on the social practice theory, we will focus on themes connected to the experience of deliveries and examine the meanings they ascribe to their online e-grocery shopping. The social practice theory explains how people's everyday practices are connected through variegated relationships with social worlds, how individuals are engaged in their tasks during daily routines, and how practices are sensitive to social changes (Warde, 2005; Halkier et al., 2011). This research contributes to the literature in several ways, addressing gaps by providing an overview of the factors influencing online grocery shopping, based on reviews of social apps.

Materials and Methods

The two e-grocery retailers are prominent in Romania and have been active on the market since 2021, with optimistic growth forecasts. The study relied on netnography (Kozinets, 2002) to understand shoppers' experiences as expressed through reviews, using information from online forums. Users' experiences are organic, and their shopping behaviour is easy to understand. For anonymity purposes, we used the letters A and B, respectively. The two e-groceries show slight differences in digital traffic, according to SimilarWeb (www.similarweb.com). The digital platform provides a series of indicators (total visits, average visit duration, pages per visit) to rate traffic and engagement. For example, the total visits indicator via social media is frequently used to gauge audience size.

The retailer A reached 217.6 K in July 2025 and 245.1 K in August, while retailer B registered increases to 538.3 K in July 2025 and 614.7 K in August (Table 1).

Table 1. Total visits per month for A and B e-groceries

e-Groceries retailer	Total visits per month			Average visit duration (minutes and seconds)	Pages per visit
	June 2025	July 2025	August 2025	August 2025	August 2025
A	144.2 K	217.6 K	245.1 K	3. 57	5.61
B	469.8 K	538.3 K	614.7 K	3. 15	3.6

Source: Data from the SimilarWeb tool

To construct the database of reviews, we ran keyword searches in Romanian on Google.com and Yahoo.com between December 2023 and January 2025: ‘online food shopping’, ‘grocery shopping online’, ‘Freshful online’, and ‘Sezamo grocery’. To understand the experiences and motivations of online grocery shoppers, we manually compiled a Word file containing 380 online reviews from digital platforms, blogs, and Reddit apps. Our corpus data is formed on different topics related to opinions, recommendations, offers, and prices for e-groceries in our case study (Table 2).

Table 2. Corpus data (topics of the posts)

Topics of the post on social applications	Number of posts written (two years ago)	Number of posts written (seven months ago)
<i>Opinions, comparisons between two e-grocery stores</i>	23	93
<i>Recommendations</i>	35	
<i>Offers and prices</i>		24
Topics of the post on blogs		
<i>Time delay and advantages</i>	34	
<i>Expenses of placing orders at the e-grocery B</i>	13	
<i>Expenses at the e-grocery B in two years</i>	20	
<i>I placed my first order at B</i>	6	
<i>Where do you shop to get the best deal?</i>		87
<i>Where do you do your shopping?</i>		45

A qualitative design was adopted for this research. Qualitative data analysis was conducted using thematic analysis, combining deductive and inductive approaches. Thematic analysis is considered an analytical and flexible method that could offer an accessible form of data analysis, describing patterns across qualitative data. It is considered a flexible method that does not require a consistent, detailed theoretical framework (such as grounded theory or phenomenological epistemology) to gain, describe, and understand everyday people’s experiences. The thematic analysis can be used across different theoretical frameworks (essentialist and constructivist approaches) to reflect reality and to uncover its surface (Braun & Clarke, 2014).

The research questions for this study were addressed within a paradigmatic framework of interpretivism. We focused on an interpretive and reflexive approach to examine the attitudes, experiences, and motivations of e-shoppers. The process of coding and theme

development is flexible, analytical, and reflexive, combining inductive and deductive approaches. Through the inductive approach, the themes identified are derived from the data (bottom-up), where the coding process is not fitted to a pre-existing coding scheme and is considered data-driven (Patton, 1990).

Using the inductive approach, we read and re-read the collected reviews for themes related to e-grocery shopping and sought to focus on a particular feature in coding the data. The deductive approach is theoretically explicit, applied in a top-down manner, and considered analyst-driven. Thematic analysis involves a reflexive approach, which is a time-consuming, iterative process. We analysed, organised, and structured corpus data through the following stages: familiarisation with the data, generating initial codes, generating themes, reviewing potential themes, defining and naming the themes, analysis, and interpretation.

A coding framework was manually created, and the corpus was analysed to identify emerging themes. The corpus data was translated into English. Part of the textual and thematic analysis was conducted using the open-source web-based application Voyant Tools v.2.4 (voyant-tools.org) (Sinclair & Rockwell, 2016). The essence of the theme lay in its ability to capture something important across the entire data set.

Overall, the research identified several cases, including life situations, everyday activities, needs, and mobility practices. In our case, ‘shopping with an app’ and ‘monetary values and quality-of-benefits’ represent salient themes in understanding the meanings and experiences of e-shoppers in the context of digital foodscapes.

Results and Discussion

In this analysis, we describe certain tendencies and themes related to users’ experience with product delivery and focus on the meanings they ascribe to their online e-grocery shopping. The first theme, ‘shopping delivery with an app’, generally refers to using mobile applications to browse food and products, find deals, and order deliveries. Throughout the data, it is apparent that the element of ‘shopping delivery with an app’ is supported by intent to save time, share shopping experiences, and make recommendations. Secondly, the role of benefits is undeniable, as lower prices, loyalty points or discounts can be a significant incentive for online shopping. Additionally, some product/brands are only available online, not in physical stores (Table 3).

The range of grocery shopping opportunities varied depending on the client’s daily experiences, living, and working conditions; for example, groceries can be delivered at home or to the office (workspace). Some users ordered a certain type of product, organic fruits and vegetables, delivered on a predetermined weekly basis. The number of delivered products can range from 10 to 128. Delivery time windows affect client satisfaction and logistics efficiency.

Table 3. Themes and subthemes identified in online reviews of users

Domain	Theme	Subtheme
Role of e-groceries in food access	Shopping delivery with an app	Delivery experiences, time delays, and peer recommendations
Role of benefits	Monetary values and quality-of-benefits	External product cues such as price, brand, switching intention, and packaging

In the corpus data, there are references to a critical slot time of 15-30 minutes. The application generally provides delivery orders within 3 hours or at the scheduled time. The option to reduce the delivery time interval to 15 minutes incurs a fee, whereas the standard one-hour interval is free if customers place an order of at least 300 RON (approximately 60 Euros). Posts claimed that more than 35% of customers at retailer A choose the 15-minute interval.

In addition, to highlight the dynamics and changes in shopping behaviour (according to the social theory framework), we split the corpus into two groups: posts written later (two years ago) and posts written earlier (seven months before this manuscript was written). To provide further insights into shopping and delivery, we synthesise (not exhaustively) the main advantages and disadvantages derived from corpus data (Table 4).

Shopping apps usually serve as additional sales channels alongside physical retailers, offering benefits for customers and retailers and creating greater exposure for consumers who see the app icon. Main features in shopping apps include comparison lists, loyalty programs, product-finding tools, live chat, product validity checks, and shipment tracking. In general, posts about shopping app features express satisfaction and appreciation (very user-friendly and pleasant to navigate) and provide additional product information (full descriptions, country of origin, and expiration date). People are more likely to shop online if they can find a large diversity of products.

The website layouts of both e-groceries feature interesting galleries of user interface and graphic elements. For retailer A, the prototype site is divided into four bar menus (Category, Inspirations, Brands, Recipes, Save Food) and nine submenus (Over 17,000 products, all in one place; Discounts on weekly shopping; Local brands; Fruits and vegetables; Grocery store; Meat and fish; Dairy products and eggs; Bakery and Pastry, Good to know (section SGR).

The website layout of retailer B is split into six bar menus: (Offers, Save Me, News, Recipes, Inspirations, Voucher), and with more personalised submenus (Crazy Discounts Week; Discount Pet Shop; Seasonal Goodies; Voucher Deals (up -50% discounts); You get rid of roads; ECO-breakfast; 100% taste, 0% compromises; Show Starters; You get rid of queues; Last pieces in stock; Baked here in our kitchen; More time for parents; We bring for you!). To attract shoppers, both grocery store websites featured an interactive food shopping inspiration aisle. The Interactive food shopping inspiration provides an online aisle design to help shoppers discover products and meal ideas that align with their shopping marketing goals.

Table 4. Main advantages and disadvantages of shopping delivery in the case of retailers A and B

Advantages	
A	B
Good delivery time and prices	Free delivery on orders with a voucher
Customer service quality	Good experience with customer relations
The organic sector is more varied	Fair quality - price ratio
Promotion of recycled packages	Promotion of recycled packages
Disadvantages	
A	B
More expensive than physical retailers	Warehouse management issues with fresh fruits and vegetables

The aisle is designed to be fun and interactive, including new product features, crowd-sourced kitchen tips provided through video clips (video clip entitled *Recipe with B*), tips to go to the market and shop (*Let's go to market with B*; *Happy veggies from Angela*; *Follow the story of vegetables from the ECO Garden*).

The preferences of users expressed in postings from two years ago highlight a certain homogeneous positive reaction and satisfaction delivery to e-groceries in that case (quoted here with the letters A and B):

I have 15 orders from A, and all the products have been good'. 'We always buy through A. All the products are ok; they are super punctual and have some great promotions, because they don't really miss deliveries, and if they do, they always reward you (they were 10 minutes late once). I've been ordering from them for a long time; generally, they are OK, but when I encounter a problem with a product's quality, I bring it to their attention, and they give me a voucher or something. 90% of the time, I'm satisfied!

They have had positive experiences, including reduced costs and time savings.

They come to me too quickly. Last time I had a delivery after 9:00 and they came at 8:30'. (I order from them quite often, I always choose delivery around noon, and so far, only one order has arrived about 30 minutes after the selected interval; I was called beforehand to be informed that the courier was late.

The infrastructure available where customers live or work significantly impacts their mobility practices by determining accessibility and shaping daily logistics. A city with a dense layout and good public transit might allow for different mobility practices than a sprawling city with less robust public transportation. Bucharest, with its radial, concentric layout, would be an advantage in some cases. While some lived on the outskirts of the city, others lived in the city centre. In this perspective, a similar positive delivery experience is concerned with retailer B:

I can write the same thing about B. I had good experiences; they always arrive within the stated time frame. I live in Ilfov, on the outskirts of Bucharest, and the products are as in the picture, a great variety of vegetables and fruits. I have been ordering from them weekly since they appeared. 'I have been using B for some time, and I am really satisfied with the delivery, packaging, quality, and completeness of the products ordered. The courier in my area is really professional. He calls me within a week of delivering an order to give me feedback. So, at the moment, I have nothing to complain about.

Posts sustained the idea that there was no difference between the two groceries in terms of delivery time, variety of products, and promotions, while others claimed some nuances in terms of needs, costs, and diversity of products:

They may be similar. I have to admit they "bought" us with some gift baskets about two years ago, along with great meat promotions.

It depends on what you want from them. A has a lot of things that B doesn't, but it's also more expensive (not by much, since B isn't cheap either). The fresh vegetables and fruits are always impeccable, though. B seems to have more offers, better products, and a larger variety. It still has flaws in vegetables and fruits, but it's the only place I've found a watermelon that isn't bland or watery. If you also have a subscription/voucher (Genius), you get some extra discounts, but not enough to make it worth it. As for delivery, both are impeccable. It comes with the bags,

takes the bags you don't need anymore, and it's still perfectly packaged. It's very rarely late. Personally, I vary depending on what I need in the house. Both are worth it if you want something more special or want to eat a lot of fresh products.

Also, users offer useful insights into delivery experiences, stating that it is not a preference between two grocery stores but rather an alternative, a choice driven by promotions.

I alternate them depending on promotions. As a plus for me at B: partial payment with voucher card (and at A you can pay with vouchers, but only with that card, if you don't have all the money on the vouchers, you can't pay the difference with another card). As a plus for A (where I have a Premium card): two orders without a monthly minimum (good for emergencies), integration with Helpnet (the same order can also contain A and pharmacy products), and returnable bags. That being said, I've been ordering from them since they launched, and I choose the one with the better offers when I need them. Both offer very good customer support when problems arise, respect deliveries, and can run good promotions.

The same similarity echoed from these posts, in terms of delivery time and market competition:

'We are oscillating between A and B. Both offer delivery time options, and at B, you get free shipping for lower amounts. Overall, I find the services comparable, both being in the price segment slightly above the average hypermarket. It's good that there is competition, which means decent services at reasonable prices. The consumer wins.

Other posts stated preferences for one of two e-groceries, expressing assertive feelings. Assertive language helps users clearly communicate their preferences, fostering more confidence in grocery shopping. In general, assertive language is framed on 'I' statements and is based on mutual respect: *(A is the number one for me! B is always the best! I highly recommend A! For me, B is the best! Try A, they seemed much more serious to me!)*.

Further, the analysis focuses on posts written earlier (seven months before this article was written), when we observed a more *polarised situation* in terms of experience delivery, monetary values, quality of benefits (functional value), and purchase intention. A more careful attitude, disappointments, criticism and sad experiences are highlighted in terms of the welcome package and offers claims regarding the catchy dependence of clients to the delivery services, or advices to be more independent and self-taught in consuming behaviour when it comes to some recurrent issues in delivering products (such as missing promotional gifts, false advertising and delivery time frame delays).

Also, we all know that at the beginning, services are good, but as they become mainstream, they lose benefits.

Like any international e-commerce business, the first year is perfect: low prices to destroy the competition, then good luck, guys!

Dissatisfaction with any aspect of the consumption experience may lead to various outcomes, including expressing discontent and complaining. Negative reactions are mostly about delays and the quality of products delivered, such as fruits and vegetables, resulting

from factors including improper temperature control during transport, physical damage, or unsuitable handling. Paradoxical situations are often criticised in the comments (self-interest versus collective action). This a common observation about human behavior where a apathy or inaction often prevails unless an issue directly affects an individual; in general, people don't bother to complain, express a feeling of uncritical satisfaction and complacency (*'we don't do it when it doesn't affect us'*) or they experience greater satisfaction from shopping when they can use a voucher with benefits and discounts (*'they enjoy the voucher - if they write on the chat and it is given to them'*).

The issue of delayed frames is common to both retailers. The delay is generally reported to be 15-30 minutes.

I'm talking about dozens of delays, so it's actually a rarity when they arrive on time - and I've tried all the traffic options.

Criticism and concerns are also expressed in terms of customer service, the quality of fresh products, and the inadequacy of pictures posted on the site, as well as the issues related to the stock products:

Their customer service (B) is a bad joke; they will never help you with anything beyond a small voucher to use on another order. Besides that, the products were very often old or not exactly what was presented on the site.

With us, the recurring problem is the quality of the fresh products; most of the time, they send 2, 3, or 4 pictures of spoiled fruit or vegetables, ready to be thrown away. I understand when it's a pre-packaged casserole, but I also received individually selected peppers of... questionable quality (I'm surprised they didn't crush in my hand because they were so spoiled!). And that's right, I give you a voucher every time, but it would be great to receive the products I need in good condition!.

And the second, less common problem is: I order something that appears to be in stock, and the delivery arrives without it because "it was no longer in stock". I've had this happen a few times with things I needed urgently.

The time slot matters in many cases; usually, clients receive copy-paste messages in the chat with apologies. For retailer B, some orders are late (a post mentioned maybe 1 out of 5), but customer service is organised, delivery employees are polite, and they announce if they are late and apologise. Also, positive reactions are accurately reported regarding findings and locations, and where the drivers are not expected to receive supplementary instructions from clients, in contrast to certain situations, such as with other delivery people or courier companies.

Nevertheless, the main issue with e-groceries is the delivery of perishable products and the associated time delays, according to our findings. Both companies envisaged marketing strategies and competitive advantages. For example, in the case of retailer A, fruits and vegetables have a 20% basket penetration rate, with the other top categories being dairy, refrigerated products, bakery, and pastry products. Retailer B has a range of 18,000 products, with nine out of ten orders containing at least one fruit or vegetable, and the company sold over 700 tons of fruit and vegetables in the first six months of 2023. Products that are in demand are constantly monitored. Also, both companies have targets of doubling sales (Palade, 2024).

Purchasing food online is embedded in a nexus of social and cultural practices, such as eating, storing, packing, and time management, because consumption and shopping are

structured and reproduced within this interlinked set. Social imagery plays an undeniable role in food production, delivery, and consumption, with digital food becoming a routine of our lives (Lewis, 2018; Dumitrache & Nae, 2023). The computer, the mobile phone, and the app are actively involved in producing, reproducing, and changing practices. It is a dynamic relationship between technologies and people, following a script by design (open the app, navigate, choose the products, click, and carts!).

People usually appreciate the site's organisation (very user-friendly and pleasant to navigate) and its detailed product information (full descriptions, country of origin, expiration date, etc.). Thematic groupings of products in dedicated listings, along with options like 'Save the product' for products whose expiration date is closer to the current date (with discounts), are also presented. The platform's role is to mediate and optimise access to food and products. It is worth noting that the line script is prone to errors and bugs.

Negative comments relate to delivery failures. Reviews highlighted the possibility of errors in deliveries (bugs in applications, software glitches leading to mismanaged orders, and inaccurate tracking), in case the products did not match the description and pictures on screens, especially when it comes to perishable products such as fruits and vegetables:

'... I click on green apples, and I got almost spoiled red apples. A lot of false advertising. I say the same thing - when it comes to fresh fruits and vegetables, I'm bad, I have countless complaints. Either mouldy, or flaky, or absolutely tasteless, even though the product page praises them as "sweet and juicy"!

'The service has always been OK, the prices also, but the vegetables and fruits are horrible: green tomatoes, Romanian onions on the website, and made in Poland when they arrive!)

Over 20 orders on B! Every time I ordered vegetables or fruit, they were always OK, except once I didn't receive some tomatoes because the warehouse people forgot to include them in the order. Honestly, I have no problems with them, and the quality-price ratio is very good!

A shopping app is characterised by functional value, allowing shoppers to carry out their activities and showing its effectiveness and utilitarian benefits. Shopping apps can provide personalised content and recommendations, and positively impact consumer behaviour (Sinemus et al., 2025). Similarly, posts highlighted the functional value of apps, ease of use, and security (with a user-friendly interface and easy navigation).

The monetary and added-value theme also envisaged time savings, brands, and packaging. Digital platforms are particularly convenient with specialised organic supermarkets, providing products of high standards, usually specific products with high prices or brands that are available only online:

'I have been ordering monthly from A, because they have brands that you can't find anywhere in stores, like Orogel or Alnatura organic vegetables or frozen fruits in cardboard boxes'; M&S is another company that you can only find at A. There are so many unique brands and cool things to try, and I became addicted!

Platform shopping involves more planning and organisation in consumption, greater matching to reduce packaging, and easy access to quality food and products at sustainable prices. Some e-shoppers expressed interest in food packaging and food waste, and in achieving social or environmental goals.

Now they also have a promotion with recyclable bottles for 1 RON. It's good that I got rid of the lines at Lidl, and I don't have to carry them around with me anymore'; They also have promotions at SGR. I'll give you 1 RON / recycled package.

I've never had any problems; they've always been really beautiful and generally good-tasting. Including the ones from Save Me, where I dared to order, were up to expectations!

I've been using them since they appeared: 1-2 orders a week. I'm very satisfied. I also recycle SGR with them. I have no problems with the products, and they are very receptive to feedback and mistakes in orders.

To conserve natural resources and lower the environmental impact of food production, companies turned to food waste and upcycling. Upcycling is a process that transforms surplus or by-products from the food production process into new, high-quality products. For instance, retailer B already collaborates with eight local and international brands that produce upcycled products, offering over 50. On the application, it will be found in the Upcycled category, and the products will be marked with an "Upcycled" badge. The price and time savings are important in shaping consumer behaviour:

I care. I want to shop at the lowest possible prices, but without eating the Proxi range.

Yes, I don't want to waste one hour or so shopping at Carrefour or Auchan

Yes, I prefer to pay extra for this service.

Purchase behaviour is embedded in psychological constructs that depend on the social-temporal nature of practices. Online grocery shoppers are less price-sensitive and more concerned with brand and quantity (Chu et al. 2008), or prioritise convenience and time-saving by switching to online grocery shopping (Elms et al. 2016).

Switching to online grocery shopping behaviour is considered a flip side of loyalty (perceived as loyalty with positive outcomes for the retailer and negative outcomes for customers who leave). Shoppers tend to start grocery shopping at an online store within the same chain as their preferred offline store, but as their online grocery shopping experience improves, they begin to look for other online offers. Empirical studies demonstrated that low customer service, high perceived prices, technical issues, and low-quality delivered products are related factors that can push online grocery shoppers to switch away from a retailer (Singh & Rosengren, 2020).

The same practices were observed among the customers in this case. Several posts claimed that they switched to B and chose A:

I deleted the app and chose A; even for B, the services were good at the beginning, but there have been management issues lately.

But for some time now I've been switching to A and I've been amazed by how superior it is to B, they're actually better at everything. As for the organic sector, it's even better than B; they add new products weekly; try checking their product catalogue!.

Another tendency in shopping behaviour and preferences is observed when people choose alternative shopping options – online groceries or brick-and-mortar stores – in response to different promotions or due to the advantages offered by the proximity of supermarkets. They usually do most of their weekly grocery shopping at supermarkets (Tandon et al., 2021).

E-groceries business development is associated with the phases of local validation and diffusion, such as advocacy and commercial purposes, which appear to thrive in the

marketplace. In this context, social media posts and blogs of our data often highlight successful stories or experiences shared in a diary (*‘How was my first shopping experience with A grocery store?’*) or detailed information about the advantages of shopping (*‘How much I spent on B in a year of placing orders?’*), promotion of local farmers’ foods (*‘I ordered from A, the online supermarket that tries to offer products from local producers’*), and the exclusiveness in sharing shopping experiences (*‘The best is always one!’*).

The main advantages are listed (slot time picking with *‘delivering orders within 3 hours or at the scheduled time’*), fee returns in case of mistake deliveries (*‘your money back guaranteed’*; *‘it is big step forward for customer loyalty’*), limiting prices on basic food products (lists with capped prices for a series of 25 products), and expressed hopes that the company will expand (*‘I hope they are expanding very quickly at the national level, just as quickly as, immediately after they solved with Bucharest, they now also cover 85 localities in Ilfov County’*). Interestingly, both platforms are active in recruiting potential customers. The process of creating an account was generally described as straightforward and uncomplicated. They are creating effective visual representations of products to prepare for compelling imagery. Both e-groceries follow the platform’s prototype to mediate and optimise access to shopping and desired products at reasonable prices.

Study limitations. The topic of online grocery shopping is complex; to acquire a more comprehensive understanding of the relationships and trends in the field, a new approach is needed. However, our study advances current understanding of online grocery shopping and aligns with the literature, revealing topics such as attitude, last-mile delivery, perceived time pressure, sustainability, and switching intention (Monoarfa et al., 2024).

The study has limitations in terms of topics and small data coverage (380 reviews). We focused only on two e-grocery retailers, and our corpus was structured around customer reviews posted in a short-term analysis (two years ago at the time the manuscript was written). Determinants of online grocery shopping have become popular in recent years, and few studies have examined this behaviour. Research should investigate the social implications of online shopping, including low levels of social interaction, community cohesion, and a sense of belonging. Future studies may assess the role of policies in promoting equitable access to online services and community-oriented urban planning. Further research is needed to expand knowledge of why and how people approach these platforms from the Food-as-end perspective.

Conclusions

Using a qualitative approach and the social practice theory framework, this paper highlights the characteristics of online shopping in the context of two important e-grocery platforms in Romania. Information, materials, and procedures embodied in these platforms support a better understanding of food as an end in terms of shopping behaviour, built on two features acting as the two sides of the same coin (cultural–symbolic and material).

In this perspective, the paper explored the two-sided relation between the cultural-symbolic feature (*‘shopping delivery with an app’*) and the material one (monetary values and the benefit role). The cultural-symbolic feature is available to a range of online food shops, e-groceries, smartphone technology, chat conversations, preferences for organic products, local production for farmers, and click-and-carts. The material feature enables and stimulates online food shopping (since it is more expensive to buy online than in physical stores, promotional prices are essential).

Monetary values and quality-of-benefits (functional value) affect the purchase intention. Price and quality appear to be decisive factors in the decision-making process for food products. The product attributes are associated with quality and price. In addition, the material feature could be related to costs, delivery time, logistics efficiency, and complexity. Research has demonstrated that faster deliveries increase costs and significantly affect client satisfaction (Tudisco et al., 2020; Gobbo et al., 2022). Also, clients expressed in their posts that they highly value sustainability and pursuing environmentally conscious lifestyles. Some e-shoppers expressed interest in food packaging and food waste, and in achieving social or environmental goals. The consumption choice is oriented towards sustainable food, and 'the Romanian market is growing in demand for sustainable products and eco-friendly packaging, driven by increasing environmental awareness among consumers' (Weltevreden, 2024, 74).

Shopping through digital platforms has not merely the objective to get food, but rather to support sustainable economies; they actively shape practices in specific ways, changing the overall meaning of shopping (easier and quicker shopping procedures, saving time and money, solidarity and engagement with alternative food provisioning, waste food and recycling packaging). Online grocery shoppers are looking for better customer service, on-time delivery for fresh products, and hassle-free navigation.

References

- Alfnes, F., Ardebili, A. T., & Viciunaite, V. (2024). Exploring consumer segments for online food provisioning services: Online supermarkets vs. alternative food networks. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 47, 278–288.
- Allen, J., Piecyk, M., Cherrett, T., Juhari, M. N., McLeod, F., Piotrowska, M., Bates, O., Bektas, T., Cheliotis, K., Friday, A., & Wise, S. (2021). Understanding the transport and CO2 impacts of on-demand meal deliveries: A London case study. *Cities*, 108, 102973.
- Ash, J., Kitchen, R., & Leszczynski, A. (2018). Digital turn, digital geographies? *Progress in Human Geography*, 42(1), 25–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132516664800>.
- Berg, J., & Henriksson, M. (2020). In search of the 'good life': understanding online grocery shopping and everyday mobility as social practices. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 83, 102633.
- Bissell, D. (2020). Affective platform urbanism: Changing habits of digital on-demand consumption. *Geoforum*, 115, 102–110.
- Björger, A., Bjerkan, K. Y., & Hjelkrem, O. A. (2021). E-groceries: Sustainable last mile distribution in city planning. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 87, 100805.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2014). What can 'thematic analysis' offer health and well-being researchers?. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, 9(1), 26152.
- Caprotti, F., Chang, I. I.-C. C., & Joss, S. (2022). Beyond the smart city: A typology of platform urbanism. *Urban Transformations*, 4(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42854-022-00033-9>.
- Chu, J., Chintagunta, P., & Cebollada, J. (2008). Research note—a comparison of within-household price sensitivity across online and offline channels. *Marketing Science*, 27(2), 283–299.
- Cocola-Gant, A., & Gago, A. (2021). Airbnb, buy-to-let investment and tourism-driven displacement: A case study in Lisbon. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 53(7), 1671–1688.

- Datta, A., & Odendaal, N. (2019). Smart cities and the banality of power. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 37(3), 509–527.
- Dolega, L., & Lord, A. (2020). Exploring the geography of retail success and decline: a case study of the Liverpool City Region. *Cities*, 96, 102456.
- Dumitrache, L., & Nae, M. (2023). Romanian food on international plate: exploring communication, recipes, and virtual affect in culinary blogs. *Berichte Geographie und Landeskunde*, 97(1), 54–72. <https://doi.org/10.25162/bgl-2023-0003>.
- Elms, J., de Kervenoael, R., & Hallsworth, A. (2016). Internet or store? An ethnographic study of consumers' internet and store-based grocery shopping practices. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 32, 234–243.
- Gobbo, A. D., Forno, F., & Magnani, N. (2022). Making “good food” more practicable? The reconfiguration of alternative food provisioning in the online world. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 29, 862–871.
- Graham, M. (2020). Regulate, replicate, and resist – The conjunctural geographies of platform urbanism. *Urban Geography*, 41(9), 1548–1553. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2020.1717028>.
- Halkier, B., & Jensen, I. (2011). Methodological challenges in using practice theory in consumption research. Examples from a study on handling nutritional contestation of food production. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 11(1), 101–123.
- Hardaker, S., & Appel, A. (2025). (Retail) platform legitimization through municipal partnerships? *Digital Geography and Society*, 8, 100111.
- Hübner, A. H., Kuhn, H., & Wollenburg, J. (2016). Last mile fulfilment and distribution in omni-channel grocery retailing: A strategic planning framework. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 44(7), 800–824.
- Iwan, S., Nürnberg, M., Jedliński, M., & Kijewska, K. (2021). Efficiency of light electric vehicles in last-mile deliveries – Szczecin case study. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 74, 103215.
- Jamal, S., Li, C., Tiznado-Aitken, I., & Farber, S. (2025). Exploring equity implications of online grocery, online restaurant delivery and e-shopping service usage in a suburban context. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 129, 104398.
- Jesnes, K. (2024). Shifting gears: how platform companies maintain power in app-based food delivery in Norway. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, 29(4), 725–737.
- Kickert, C., Vom Hofe, R., Haas, T., Zhang, W., & Mahato, B. (2020). Spatial dynamics of long-term urban retail decline in three transatlantic cities. *Cities*, 107, 102918.
- Kitchen, R. (2013). Big data and human geography: Opportunities, challenges and risks. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 3(3), 262–267.
- Kozinets, R. V. (2002). The field behind the screen: using netnography for marketing research in online communities. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39(1), 61–72.
- Kühne, O., & Dumitrache, L. (2025). Post-socialist settlement developments—the example of Bucharest. In O. Kühne & L. Dumitrache (Eds.), *Landscape – Tourism – Food* (pp. 25–56). Springer VS, Cham.
- Lagorio, A., & Pinto, R. (2021). Food and grocery retail logistics issues: A systematic literature review. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 87, 100841.
- Lewis, T. (2018). Digital food: from paddock to platform. *Communication Research and Practice*, 4(3), 212–228.
- Li, C., Miroso, M., & Bremer, P. (2020). Review of online food delivery platforms and their impacts on sustainability. *Sustainability*, 12(14), 5528.
- Liu, C. (2024). Follow the digital: methodological thoughts on doing everyday geographies in a digital world. *Digital Geography and Society*, 6, 100079.

- Luque-Ayala, A., & Marvin, S. (2015). Developing a critical understanding of smart urbanism? *Urban Studies*, 52(12), 2105–2116.
- Monaoarfa, T. A., Sumarwan, U., Suroso, A. I., & Wulandari, R. (2024). Uncover the trends, gaps, and main topics on online grocery shopping: bibliometric analysis. *Heliyon*, 10(2), e02587.
- Munteanu, A. R. (2015). Reviewing the performance of organic e-shops in Romania. *Proceedings of the 9th International Management Conference "Management and Innovation for Competitive Advantage"*, Bucharest, Romania.
- Nae, M., & Turnock, D. (2011). The new Bucharest: Two decades of restructuring. *Cities*, 28(2), 206–219.
- Oncini, F., Bozzini, E., Forno, F., & Magnani, N. (2020). Towards food platforms? An analysis of online food provisioning services in Italy. *Geoforum*, 114, 172–180.
- Onete, C. B., Teodorescu, I., & Vasile, V. (2016). Considerations Regarding the Analysis of the Digital Consumer in Romania. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 18(43), 654–662.
- Online Grocery Industry in Romania. (2017–2029). Online Grocery Industry in Romania 2017–2029.
- Palade, A. I. (2024). Piața de e-grocery, pe drumul spre stabilizare [The e-grocery market, on the road to stabilization]. *Revista Progresiv*. <https://revistaprogresiv.ro/analize/tech/piata-de-e-grocery-pe-drumul-spre-stabilizare/>.
- Palgan, Y.-V., Mont, O., & Sulkaloski, S. (2021). Governing the sharing economy: Towards a comprehensive analytical framework of municipal governance. *Cities*, 108, 102994.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Pollio, A. (2021). Uber, airports, and labour at the infrastructural interfaces of platform urbanism. *Geoforum*, 118, 47–55.
- Sadowski, J. (2020). Who owns the future city? Phases of technological urbanism and shifts in sovereignty. *Urban Studies*, 57(11), 2269–2284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098020913427>.
- Shetty, A., Qin, J., Poolla, K., & Varaiya, P. (2022). The value of pooling in last-mile delivery. *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 531–538. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc. 10.1109/CDC51059.2022.9992742.
- Shim, S., Eastlick, M. A., Lotz, S., & Warrington, P. (2001). An online pre-purchase intention model: the role of intention to search. *Journal of Retailing*, 77(3), 397–416.
- Similar Web Tools. (2025). Similarweb: AI-Powered Digital Data Intelligence Solutions. Retrieved September 29, 2025, from Similarweb: AI-Powered Digital Data Intelligence Solutions.
- Sinclair, S., & Rockwell, G. (2016). *Voyant tools*. <http://voyant-tools.org/>.
- Sinemus, K., Zielke, S., & Dobbelstein, T. (2025). Improving consumer satisfaction through shopping app features: A Kano-based approach. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 82, 103759.
- Singh, R., & Rosengren, S. (2020). Why do online grocery shoppers switch? An empirical investigation of drivers of switching in online grocery. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 53, 101962.
- Song, G., Zhang, H., Duan, H., & Xu, M. (2018). Packaging waste from food delivery in China's mega cities. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 130, 226–227.
- Spangler, I. (2020). Hidden value in the platform's Platform: Airbnb, displacement, and the un-homing spatialities of emotional labour. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 45(3), 575–588.
- Stanciu, S. (2014). Could online groceries be an alternative to Romanian food retail? *SEA Practical Application of Science*, 2(3), 441–446.

- Stanciu, S., Vochin, A. O., Sarbu, M.-A., & Bratoveanu, D. B. (2019). Food retail in Romania. market overview. *New Trends in Sustainable Business and Consumption*, 21(13), 778–794.
- Statista. (2025). *Grocery Delivery Market Forecast. Grocery Delivery - Romania*. Retrieved September 18, 2025, from Statista Market Forecast.
- Stehlin, J., Hodson, M., & Mcmeekin, A. (2020). Platform mobilities and the production of urban space: Toward a typology of platformization trajectories. *Environment & Planning A: Economy and Space*, 52(2), 312–330. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X19896801>.
- Talamini, G., Li, W., & Li, X. (2022). From brick-and-mortar to location-less restaurant: The spatial fixing of on-demand food delivery platformization. *Cities*, 128, 103820.
- Tandon, A., Kaur, P., Bhatt, Y., Mäntymäki, M., & Dhir, A. (2021). Why do people purchase from food delivery apps? A consumer value perspective. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 63, 102667.
- Törnberg, P., & Söderström, O. (2025). Comparative platform urbanism: Cities in a world of platforms. *Digital Geography and Society*, 8, 100119.
- Tudisco, V., Ekren, Y. B., & Aktas, E. (2025). Sustainable e-grocery home delivery: An optimization model considering on-demand vehicles. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 201, 110874.
- USDA Foreign Agricultural Service. (2018). *Romania. Retail Food Sector*. <https://www.fas.usda.gov/data/romania-retail-food-sector-2018>.
- USDA Foreign Agricultural Service. (2024). *Romania. Retail Food Sector*. <https://www.fas.usda.gov/data/romania-retail-food-sector-2021>.
- Warde, A. (2005). Consumption and Theories of Practice. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 5(2), 131–153.
- Weltevreden, J. W. J. (2024). *European E-commerce Report 2024*. Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences & Ecommerce Europe.