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Abstract

The UK’s online retail market is currently worth approx. £133bn, and with the evolution of this online marketplace we are beginning to see changes in its delivery systems. Next day delivery and in some cases, same day delivery (within 2 hours) is now being used by a variety of online retailers. This study questions why the marketplace has evolved to include such speed and efficiency in their delivery. It will also determine whether a relationship exists between this trend and the claims being made about the Millennial generation. Millennials are soon to become the largest living generation and the media criticises them for several reasons; one of the most prominent claims about Millennials is that they are ‘impatient’. The study will determine whether it is true that Millennials are generally impatient and whether this is linked to the rise of instant and next day delivery.
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Introduction
The UK’s online retail market is currently worth approx. £133bn, and with the evolution of this online marketplace we are beginning to see changes in its delivery systems. Next day delivery and in some cases, same day delivery (within 2 hours) is now being used by a variety of online retailers (e.g. Amazon, ASOS, Argos etc.). This study will question why the marketplace has evolved to include such speed and efficiency in their delivery. It will also aim to determine whether a relationship exists between this trend and the claims being made about the Millennial generation. Millennials are soon to become the largest living generation and the media appears to criticise them for several reasons; one of the most prominent claims about Millennials is that they are ‘impatient’. The study will aim to discover whether it is true that Millennials are generally impatient and whether this is linked to the rise of instant and next day delivery.

The study will gather information from a range of online shoppers within the UK through the distribution of an online survey. The survey will ask participants about their regular online shopping habits, preferred method of delivery and ask them to explore their reasoning behind their choices.

Studying the behaviours of consumers is always important and is often used to create new and better ways for businesses to provide better service. This study is important because it aims to identify the underlying trends which have caused the online marketplace to evolve in this way. It also aims to reinforce or dismiss general claims being made about one of the largest generations to date. The idea that Millennials are impatient and this behaviour is affecting our society in general is one which deserves further study.
Literature Review

Online Shopping

The internet has become increasingly significant in the marketplace, in 2006 online sales reached $100bn (Cassis, 2007) and by 2016, online retail sales reached £133bn in the UK alone (Moth, 2017). Alongside the increase of sales there is also a significantly high amount of competition within the online marketplace, due to the fact the environment is constantly evolving (Corcoran, 2007). Within the United States a substantial portion of online consumers are college students, it was determined that this demographic were heavy users of the internet in general and have greater access to the internet than most of the population (U.S Department of State, 2002; Kim & LaRose, 2004). It is undeniable that the media and digital technology has become an important part of the younger generation’s lifestyle (Harris Interactive, 2004). Taking this into consideration it is unsurprising that in the U.S, college students spend the most money shopping online (O’Donell and Associates, LLC, 2004). In 2002, they spent $1.4bn online (Roemer, 2003), with apparel ranking as the most popular shopping category; roughly 25% of college students have previously purchased apparel online (Case & King, 2003).

Socio-economic characteristics such as age, gender, education, location and income have all previously been considered in marketing in an attempt to create segmentation (Venkatesh et al., 2003; Bigné et al., 2005). In early studies considering the different attitudes of men and women towards online shopping, it was found that although widespread use of the internet was even between the genders, men were more likely to make online purchases (Allen, 2001; Rodgers & Harris, 2003; Hasan, 2010). It was argued that women were less favourable of online shopping due to the lack of face-to-face social interactions and physical evaluation of
products which are provided by traditional methods of shopping (Cho, 2004; Dittmar et al. 2004). It was further suggested that female users were concerned with the risks of shopping online; making them apprehensive about making online purchases (Garbarino & Strahilevitze, 2004, Hasan, 2010). However, a review of literature found that the data on this subject was inconsistent, with some studies concluding that men were more likely to shop online where others found no significant difference between the genders (Chang, Cheung & Lai, 2005).

As a result of further studies, one of the characteristics which has been dismissed as a defining factor within online shopping is gender; research showed equal use of the internet between both genders (Zhang, 2005; Shin, 2009), as well as an equal level of interest in men and women, providing they had the same level of experience (Chen, 1985; Shashaani, 1997; Kirkpatrick & Cuban, 1998; Wong & Hanafi, 2007). In a study conducted by Hernández et al. (2010), it was concluded that these characteristics had minimal impact on an e-shopper’s behaviour once s/he had acquired a certain level of experience with the technology. It has been suggested that attitudes towards online shopping are more likely shaped by previous experiences; an enjoyable experience may increase satisfaction and lead to further online purchases. This, in turn leads to a greater understanding of the technology (Im et al., 2008; Miyazaki & Fernández, 2001). Whilst socio-economic characteristics may play a role in online purchasing behaviour initially, this is subject to change once the user has gained a greater level of experience. Those who are already familiar with the online shopping process behave differently to those who have little or no experience (Gefen et al., 2003), and those who are experienced all behave in a comparable manner to one another regardless of socio-economic characteristics (Hernández et al., 2010).
Age is also a key socio-economic characteristic which is employed in marketing strategies. Early studies which considered how age affects online engagement suggested that it was easier to learn the necessary computer skills for younger participants (Czara et al., 1989; Hubona & Kennick, 1996). It was further concluded that age is associated with the difficulty of processing stimuli (Morris & Venkatesh, 2000); meaning an older individual is likely to need more time to familiarise themselves with digital technology (Gomez et al., 1986). It should be considered that we may perceive younger people as more capable of understanding this technology simply because they usually possess greater experience interacting with it, in comparison to older generations (Morris & Venkatesh, 2000; Trocchia & Janda, 2000). It has been suggested that older generations are distrusting of the internet due to their lack of experience, in turn they are less willing to adopt new methods of shopping (Hernández et al., 2010). Lack of experience in older users has hindered their participation in online shopping, they consider the process too risky and in some ways, appear to be resistant to change (Trocchia & Janda, 2000). On the other hand, later studies have shown an increase in older individuals actively participating in online shopping (Hernández et al., 2010); it was concluded that age was only a factor of influence in the initial stages of online shopping (McCloskey, 2006), and that with greater levels of experience, age does not have a significant effect upon the e-shopper’s behaviour (Hernández et al., 2010).

**Impatience**

Very little has been written about impatience in terms of its connections to online shopping and the behaviours of online shoppers. Although, the term can be linked to other theories such as instant gratification and impulse purchases. The following literature is based on a
study of theories which are indirectly linked to the idea of impatience and possible feelings of impatience within the online shopper.

Millennials, a generation born between 1974 and 1994, have often been described as impatient. A generation of ‘digital natives’ born to expect 24/7 connectivity and instant gratification in all aspects of their lives. Technological advancements have allowed Millennial consumers access to an abundance of products and services which were unavailable to previous generations. Growing up in this environment ‘Millennials expect a much greater array of product and service selectivity’ (Sweeney, 2006, p.2), meaning Millennials are often frustrated when presented with a selection of limited choices. Sweeney (2006), states that even Millennials themselves are quick to admit they have a lack of tolerance for delays and ‘their desire for speed and efficiency can not be over estimated’ (p.3). It has been concluded that instant gratification is the driving force behind these high expectations. It is reasonable to suggest that the Millennial’s expectation for convenience, speed and efficiency is the result of being born into an increasingly digital world; they have been surrounded by technology their whole lives, the internet itself is instant and convenient in nature.

Roberts (2014) discusses the way in which the UK consumer economy has become increasingly personalised and the normalisation of demanding such a service. Through personalisation ‘the world becomes our world’ (Roberts, 2014, p.19) and we have become overindulgent, driven by this consumer culture. Roberts (2014) describes our socio-economic system as being driven by speed and efficiency, reflecting ‘childlike impulsiveness’ (p. 19); we have become ‘oblivious to long-term consequences’ (p.19) in search of short-term satisfaction. This impulsive attitude is not confined to the business world or the self, it has reached out in mainstream media, education and even charitable organisations. Roberts
(2014) continues to describe how this influence has even reached our political institutions, who are pushing aside complex or time consuming issues and favouring ‘rapid wins’ (p.20); concluding we are now becoming a society ‘ruled by impulse’ (p.20). Currently, all aspects of our lives aim to provide us with immediate satisfaction and we are encouraged to disregard any considerations of future consequences. By focussing on only the immediate outcomes we are invited to ‘remain in a state of permanent childhood’ (Roberts, 2014, p22). We are now accustomed to a system which can satisfy our desires quickly; instead of enduring delays in delivery, we have packages ‘overnighted. Or we pay for same day delivery services’ (Roberts, 2014, p23). With these services becoming increasingly common we now no longer wish to consider enduring these challenges or deferring gratification when it is possible to receive it immediately. When these ‘self-gratifying’ services are available, today’s society believes it must be put to use, regardless of consequence. We all want that new phone, faster car or even quicker delivery (Roberts, 2014). Overall, we have disregarded community and the challenges of delayed gratification, in favour of a consumer culture focused entirely on individual satisfaction.

Consumers often make unplanned purchases upon being exposed to stimuli, such as price promotion or attractive product appearance. These impulse purchases are not exclusive to brick-and-mortar stores, it is also common in online shopping (Liu, Li & Hu, 2013); in fact, those who shop online were found to be more impulsive than shoppers who did not (Donthu & Garcia, 1999). It has been suggested that for some consumers, making impulsive purchases releases an immediate sense of gratification, which in turn encourages them to make future impulsive purchases (Coley & Burgess, 2003; Gardner & Rook, 1988; Rook, 1987; Rook & Gardner, 1993). These types of consumers are motivated by their urge to act impulsively to achieve the sense of instant gratification this kind of purchase provides them with (Youn &
Faber, 2000). In contrast, some consumers react more favourably to the process of shopping as opposed to the actual purchase, indicating the notion of gratification in this case is sensitive to context (Beatty & Ferrell, 1998). Different consumers are susceptible to different environmental characteristics, with its effects varying in degree (Dawson & Kim, 2009; Youn & Faber, 2000; Youn & Faber, 2002), the stimulus that provokes a response in one consumer may not in another (Lee & Yi, 2008). Previous studies have attempted to identify typical characteristics of the impulse buyer, amongst the many suggestions it was proposed that an impulse buyer is likely to be under 35 years old (Bellenger et al., 1978).

A report published by the Foresight Factory (2015) describes the ‘uber-isation’ (p.2) of product and service deliveries; the development of one-click services has led to the belief that we can have anything we want with ‘the tap of a button’ (p.2). New apps for our smart devices are constantly being released in order to provide us with food, goods and services within the hour. Technology has driven us to regard delays as unacceptable, we have built an ‘on-demand economy’ (p.2) where any inefficiency is an inconvenience to be dealt with, as we continue to crave even faster delivery. In a study carried out by ‘nVision Research Center’ (2015), it was discovered that a total of 54% of participants in the UK had used or was interested in using a delivery service which could provide item delivery in less than two hours. The data revealed that the UK was one of the countries where this type of service was less available; countries such as Sweden, Japan, the USA and Spain all had higher percentages of interest. The highest percentage of usage or interest in these services was a shocking 91% from China. People in the UK, USA and China were also more likely to drop an order during the process due to inconvenience (nVision Research Center, 2015). The demand for immediacy is rapidly increasing, consumers wish to avoid friction in favour of convenience,
even down to trivial elements of the process such as payment options (Foresight Factory, 2015).

When purchasing goods or services online, consumers are presented with a choice; they may choose between receiving the items immediately or whether they are willing to accept a delay in the receipt of said items. The choice to receive goods immediately is often more heavily elevated in price, making this more of a choice between time and money. Sometimes the unwillingness to wait is caused by purchasing items impulsively; early studies suggested that those of us who behave impulsively do so because we favour immediate rewards over delayed satisfaction (O’Donoghue & Rabin, 1999). When we become focussed on immediate gain we are neglecting to consider the consequences these actions may have in the future (Pyone & Isen, 2011). A study conducted by Pyone & Isen (2011) discovered that differences in positive or neutral affect could determine the length at which a participant is willing to wait. It was concluded that if the reward was substantially larger after being delayed then it could increase a consumer’s willingness to wait. However, it was also concluded that people were willing to pay more for the product to be delivered immediately; particularly participants in the neutral affect category who lost interest in the products when anticipating a delay in arrival. The length of time we are willing to wait is partly dependant on our attitudes; those who remain neutral focus highly on immediate results where as those who are positive about possible gratification after a delay are more willing to consider the possibility to receive gratification in the future (Pyone & Isen, 2011).

The cost of delivery can be broken down into two elements: the physical movement of an item is a necessary expense, however, there is an extra value of time; receiving items sooner increases the cost of delivery (Hantula & Bryant, 2005). Standard discounted utility (DU)
theory suggests that it is common to expect a consumer will value or pay more for an item to be delivered as soon as possible, and that the value is likely to increase the faster the delivery (Antonides, 1991; Cairns & van der Pol, 2000; Lowenstein & Prelec, 1992). Behavioural-economic theory also suggests this to be the case, although the theory further discusses that the rate in which value increases is not consistent to time (Ainslie, 1992; Ainslie, 2001). That is to say, the value may decrease significantly during short delays but less dramatically during longer periods of delays (Thaler, 1981). In e-commerce, it is typical for customers to be presented with multiple delivery choices varying in time and price; ‘in essence, a swap of time for money’ (Hantula & Bryant, 2005, p.154). Hantula & Bryant (2005) conducted a study in which participants were asked to bargain with a simulated retailer when purchasing a selection of CDs. They were presented with options of free delivery with delay or another option of faster delivery at a price which was to be bargained. The study found the longer a participant had to wait for delivery, the more they were willing to pay for speedier delivery. In contrast, if the wait for free delivery was minimal then participants were less likely to bargain or pay for delivery. These results reflect and are consistent with other studies on delay discounting (See: DiClemente & Hantula, 2003; Foxall & James, 2003; Foxall & Schrezenmaier, 2003; Rajala & Hantula, 2000; Smith & Hantula, 2003). It is unsurprising we value time and are willing to pay more to avoid inconvenient delays, this research assists in developing pre-existing theories about the rate at which we discount value in terms of delay.

**Millennials**

The term ‘Millennial’ covers a wide range of ages and they will soon become the largest living generation. However, it has been found that a substantial number of individuals included in this classification do not actually identify themselves as part of the ‘Millennial’ generation.
study carried out by the Pew Research Center (2015) revealed less than half (40%) of their participants, within this age group, identified with the term. It was suggested that this may be due to some terms which are used to categorise generations are more recognised or popular than others, for example, the ‘Baby Boomers’ generation is a widely-recognised name. On the other hand, only 56% of all participants in the survey, regardless of age, had heard the term ‘Millennial’. Another part of the study included asking participants which descriptions they felt applied to the majority of their generation. Millennials were found to be more critical of their own generation; over half stated they felt the generation was ‘self-absorbed’, with only 36% feeling they could identify their generation as ‘hard-working’. In comparison to Baby Boomers. Millennials were more likely to consider their generation as idealistic, although they were also more likely to identify with the terms ‘wasteful’ and ‘greedy’.

In an article published online by Forbes (Smith, 2012), it was discussed how there appears to be differences between younger and older generations in the work place. Based on a study carried out by Harris Interactive (2012), it was found that ‘a third (34%) of U.S. employees work for a boss who is younger than they are’ sometimes up to 10 years younger. Rosemary Haefner is referenced in the discussion about work habits and attitudes, stating this must be taken into consideration when there is a difference in age between two workers. In the survey, which included workers aged 25-34 and 55 or older, the following differences in attitudes were discovered:

- Older workers prefer face-to-face communication
- Younger workers favour email/text
• Younger workers expect a promotion every 2-3 years if they are doing a good job.
• They are also more likely to work less than 8 hours a day and prefer not to start any earlier than 8am.
• Both age groups agree with continuing work out of the office but younger workers agree more so.
• Younger workers are less favourable of skipping preparations in order to drive straight into work and prefer to write detailed plans.

It was concluded that Millennials were impatient about advancement or moving on with their careers. Yet they appear to be more methodical in their work, despite working shorter hours.

The term Millennials, used by academics such as Strauss & Howe (2000), is not the only term used to describe this generation. Other terms include the ‘Net-Generation’ (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005; Tapscott, 1999) and the more popular ‘Digital Natives’, originally coined by Marc Prensky (2001a, 2001b). The term ‘Digital Native’ refers to the characteristics of a generation who have access to and are experienced in the usage of digital technologies (Koutropoulos, 2011). In Koutropoulos’ (2011) review of literature surrounding this generation, he found that Prensky and other academics were making wide overgeneralisations to describe the characteristics of this generation. Amongst these generalisations are claims that the Millennial generation prefer games over ‘serious work’, that they are incapable or unwilling to pay attention and mostly that they have perfected the necessary skills to take advantage of digital technologies (Koutropoulos, 2011). These overgeneralisations are not only common within academic writings but it is something which has spread into mainstream media. A quick online search about the Millennial generation will
reveal several articles, quick to criticise this generation and make broad accusations about their ‘laziness’, ‘impatience’ and technological abilities. A key example of these generalisations can be seen in an interview with Simon Sinek (2016), who discusses the accusations made about this generation. Sinek (2016) believes that Millennials are unhappy due to 4 reasons: parenting, technology, impatience and environment. Sinek (2016) ends his interview by claiming it is the older generation’s responsibility to help the Millennials to grow in confidence and correct the issues this generation supposedly face. However, much like many articles making similar claims about the Millennial generation, these accusations appear to be based on little research.

**Methodology**

Prior to carrying out the full-length investigation, a pilot study was conducted, to determine the defining factors that contribute to the way in which people choose their preferred delivery method when shopping online. A brief survey, consisting of 8 questions in total, was distributed amongst a small group of staff and students at the University of Leeds. There were 7 participants, aged between 18 and 39, 6 were female and 1 participant was male. The results showed that the majority of participants used standard delivery (3-5 working days) the most when shopping online. However, upon evaluating the comments, it was suggested that there were exceptional circumstances in which participants prefer next day delivery. Unsurprisingly when the shopper needed an item quickly in order to meet a deadline (e.g. birthday gifts), next day delivery was the chosen method. Other comments included, only being able to receive parcels on certain days and it depends if the cost of next day delivery is too high. Overall the pilot study appeared to indicate that next day was not unpopular or less appealing than standard delivery, but that it simply wasn’t a necessity for everyday shopping online.
These findings were used to shape the following research; a further study of 138 people was carried out and the new questionnaire was developed to reflect the pilot study, so that it may be assessed whether the results were consistent. In an attempt to reach a more diversified audience the questionnaire was distributed online via social media platforms and in this respect, it was successful. The age range increased and the study reached participants aged 17 or younger up to 60 or older. There was also an increase in male participation, although this was still significantly lower than that of female participation, it presented an opportunity to gain deeper insight into possible gender differences than the previous study.

It should be noted that all participation within the study was voluntary and no incentives were offered upon completion. The questionnaire carried out was anonymous, which the participants were made aware of, along with a statement explaining that their answers were to be used for the sole purpose of assisting with this research paper. The data was collected online by a third-party organisation and such information is protected and only available to myself.

In terms of composition, the questionnaire contained a mixture of questions with structured responses and those with comment sections. The aim was to collect data that was both quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative data served to provide strict, straight forward answers which could easily be categorised and compared in association with discriminating factors such as age and gender. Not all questions required a response, which led to some participants skipping the final question where they were asked to leave additional comments about their feelings towards online shopping and delivery. Although making the majority of the questionnaire optional presents the risk of gathering less data when a question is missed, it was designed to encourage participants to deeply consider their response and not deter
those who did not wish to participate in these sections. However, most of the respondents participated fully in all areas of the questionnaire. The comments boxes were intended to identify whether there were any similarities or recurring themes between individual participants and their responses, with data which could provide a more detailed insight into the thoughts of participants in comparison to multiple choice options.

Participants were asked to consider what items they purchase online the most and were free to answer this question in whichever way they saw fit. However, for the sake of this research paper it was decided that some forms of products and delivery methods should be omitted from the study. It was decided that the delivery of groceries and fast food items were to be acknowledged as online purchases but not considered as part of the study because in terms of delivery these items are perishable and clearly timing is a key element in this area.

Another consideration which was made visible by the pilot study is that of the issue concerning subscription services such as Amazon Prime; companies which offer unlimited next day delivery in return for an annual fee. The pilot study brought into question how these subscription services affected the way in which participants think about next day delivery, some of whom pointed out that when they are members of these subscriptions, they tend to feel under the illusion that the service is free as it has already been paid for in advance. It was decided that answers which included the key words ‘Amazon’, ‘Prime’ and ‘Subscription’ were to be categorised and further analysed to compare the way in which these participants shop online and their personal feelings towards delivery of online purchases.
Results

The data from the questionnaire was gathered and organised into subcategories; age, gender and preferred delivery method (see Figure 1-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>17 or younger</th>
<th>18-20</th>
<th>21-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 or older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Prefer Not to Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Method Most Used</th>
<th>Instant (Same day delivery)</th>
<th>Next day delivery</th>
<th>Standard (3-5 working days)</th>
<th>Delivery which could take over 1 week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3

Total responses: 138

Figure 4, shows the percentage of respondents within each age group who shop online daily, weekly, monthly or on occasion. Although it is not the focus of this study to observe how often people shop online, the question was included in the questionnaire to discover whether or not there were other factors which contributed to the way in which shoppers select their preferred delivery method. For example, it was revealed in the pilot study that occasional circumstances required faster delivery in order for participants to meet deadlines. Therefore, it can be suggested that those who only shop online occasionally are shopping with a specific purpose in mind and thus more likely to prefer instant or next day delivery.
The next step in evaluating the data provided from the questionnaire was establishing whether there is a significant relationship between age and preferred method of delivery. Figure 5, below, shows the percentage of respondents within each age group who use either ‘Instant’ or ‘Next Day’ delivery more often than other delivery methods.
The results are clear in that, the older participants were considerably less favourable of the instant and next day delivery services. There is a steady decline through the age groups in the number of participants who stated they used these services more often. It appears that shoppers aged 17 or under were substantially more interested in a quick delivery of products when shopping online. However, it should be noted that there were only 3 participants in this age group. A more diverse set of data from participants in this age group may have produced a less dramatic result which was more aligned with the steady decline of the remaining sets of data.

Figure 6, below, represents the percentage of participants within each age group who use Standard (3-5 working days) delivery the most.

![Figure 6](image)

The results show that the percentage of participants using this method is extremely high in all age groups, except in those aged 17 or younger. As previously stated there were only 3 participants in this age group and 2 out of the 3 had selected they use next day delivery more often. Otherwise, the percentage shows minimal changes between age groups and remains higher than 50%.
The second half of the study focused on a set of questions around which items participants purchased online and whether there were specific items in which they’d prefer to receive faster than others. The participants were also asked to consider their reasons why they felt influenced to use instant or next day delivery. The survey collected a vast amount of data in this area which was difficult to present, for this reason the responses were categorised when trends emerged. Two prominent topics of discussion were cost and subscription services (e.g. Amazon Prime).

Figure 7 shows the list of items mentioned that participants would like to receive faster than others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Doesn’t prefer to receive any items over others)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household items</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive items</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet supplies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work supplies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows gifts and clothes as the most prominent products which consumers prefer to receive faster, shortly followed by technology. Surprisingly there was a large number of participants who stated that there were no items they preferred to receive faster than others, some even stating that they just wish for everything to come ‘as fast as possible’.

The most prominent result that was presented within the data was that the clear majority of participants were using standard delivery (3-5 working days) more often than all other delivery options. 99 (72%) participants out of the 138 surveyed said they used standard
delivery. In comparison, instant and next day delivery only made up for a combined total of 25% of the respondent’s answers.

The results were unexpected as the study of literature, discussed previously, suggested that the consumer economy is driven by speed and efficiency (Roberts, 2014). Under the assumption that younger consumers wish to eliminate the inefficiency of delays it was reasonable to suggest that the option of instant or next day delivery would be more appealing to a sizable portion of the participants. Therefore, the revelation that standard delivery (3-5 working days) was used more often by the majority of the participants, brings into question whether this is a case of popularity or convenience. The question ‘which delivery method do you use the most often?’ does not necessarily equate to the delivery option the participant would prefer to use. Out of those who answered that standard delivery was their most used method, there were comments made in other areas of the survey which suggested that the cost of faster delivery was a negative factor which influenced their decision.

Referring back to Figure 6, it is clear that the standard (3-5 working days) delivery was the leading method in all age groups apart from those aged 17 or younger. The method made up for a high percentage of the answers; accounting for 69-80% in each age group, more than half of each of these groups agreed that this was their most used option. As previously stated, the data reveals that this is simply the most used method but does not necessarily make it the most popular. A further study would benefit from asking questions about preference as well as what is the most commonly used method. The study gathered a large amount of comments based on what influenced participant’s decisions when using the instant or next day delivery methods, and this was answered even if the participant stated that this was not their most used delivery option. The survey revealed that the cost factor of speedy delivery
often was too high to consider, suggesting that this method may be more popular if the price were to be considered reasonable by the consumer.

Discounting the age group ’17 or younger’, due to a notably small number of participants, those who used instant or next day delivery the most belonged to the age group 21-29; this made up for 32% of all those who answered that they used these two delivery methods the most. There was also a surprising number of older participants who showed interest in faster delivery. Out of the 34 participants who said they used these delivery methods the most, 6 (18%) were aged 50-59 and 2 (6%) were aged 60 or older. The remaining 44% was split almost equally between the remaining age groups.

A deeper insight into those who use instant and next day delivery the most reveals that the majority (76%) were female, 21% male and 3% answered that they’d prefer not to say. 16 out of the 34 participants (47%) shop online weekly, 29% on occasion, 21% monthly and 3% daily. It was previously stated that there may be some connection between how often a user shops online and their preferred delivery method. These results indicate that those who use instant or next day delivery the most shop online frequently (weekly) or shop on occasion (e.g. gifts and specific events). Although further studies would need to be conducted to determine whether a relationship existed between these two factors, from this perspective it appears that the significant comments made about cost present the possibility that it is simply more affordable to use this method when you shop online less frequently.
Discussion

Access and Experience

The research revealed that Millennials were more likely to use instant or next day delivery (see figure 5) in comparison to participants of older generations. It was previously discussed that this generation has been proven to have greater access and experience in terms of digital technologies (Morris & Venkatesh, 2000; Trocchia & Janda, 2000). Early studies suggested that younger participants found it easier to learn the required skills to interact with online services (Czara et al., 1989; Hubona & Kennick, 1996). Taking this into consideration it is reasonable to assume that the increase of faster delivery methods used by millennials reflects their ease of use with digital technologies. It is also due to this experience that Millennials may seek a wider variety of products and services online (Sweeney, 2006). The option of choosing instant or next day delivery services has provided an alternative to the standard (3-5 working days) delivery method and could possibly be the reason this study has shown an increase of interest from Millennial participants in comparison to their older counterparts.

Trocchia & Janda (2000) also suggested that older generations were resistant to change; the lack of older participants using instant or same day delivery in this study may represent the shortage of experience required to participate in online shopping. Hernández et al. (2010) stated that older generations were less willing to adopt new methods of shopping. It is possible that even though the older participants in this study have the necessary skills and experience to shop online, they may be unwilling to adopt the newer methods of delivery. If this is the case, the results may indicate that there is in fact not a high amount of young people who use next day delivery but a significantly low amount of older online shoppers using this method.
Another suggestion as to why there are more Millennials using instant and next day delivery may simply be because they represent a significantly high portion of the online retail market. In the U.S., college students make up for a substantial part of their online sales (Kim & LaRose, 2004), logically the UK is likely to show similarities. Online retail sales in the UK reached £133bn in 2016 (Moth, 2017) and with the Millennials soon to become the largest living generation, it is realistic to expect that this generation amounts to a sizeable portion of the UK’s online market.

**I want it Now**

This study found that its participants were using standard (3-5 working days) delivery more often than other delivery methods, which was surprising as this appears to contradict the overall content within the literature. Roberts (2014) stated that the current socio-economic system was one ruled by impulse, with speed and efficiency as its main priorities. This idea was further developed in a study conducted by Foresight Factory (2015), who named this the ‘on-demand economy’ (p.2). The literature suggested that society was experiencing a rapid increase of demand for immediacy and convenience; stating the ‘uber-isation’ and ‘one click’ services now available were responsible for our desire for immediate gratification (Foresight Factory, 2015). It was proposed that Millennials were also partially responsible for this evolution in the online marketplace; that their ‘desire for speed and efficiency can not be over estimated’ (Sweeney, 2006, p.3). Millennials appear to have developed a lack of tolerance for delays (Sweeney, 2006) and therefore the system has changed to meet their requirements. The literature implied that this move forward to speedier online services, joined with Millennial’s lack of tolerance towards delays meant that ‘overnighted’ packages and paying for same day delivery services would become increasingly common (Roberts, 2014).
The study found that this supposed desire for immediate gratification was not as prominent as it was proposed within the literature. However, although the majority of participants indicated that they used standard (3-5 working days) delivery methods more often, there were comments made which appear to coincide with ideas presented within the literature. For example, one participant, regardless of which method he/she used the most often, answered that if they did choose to use instant or next day delivery it was due to ‘being impatient’. Another said that their reason was that they wanted items to arrive ‘as soon as possible’. This comment appeared often in answers given by younger participants, especially those aged 21-29 where we see a rise in participants who use instant and next day delivery services (see figure 5). These comments appear to reflect the idea that online shopping has evolved into an ‘on-demand economy’ where users become increasingly accustomed to receiving products faster than ever. One of the younger participants (aged 18-20), stated that he/she chose faster delivery services because they felt ‘excitement for getting new things’, another said ‘If I run out of something I won’t rest ‘til I have it again’ (aged 21-29). Comments made about wanting to receive items faster were mostly made by the study’s younger participants, again reflecting on the idea that Millennial’s possess a lack of tolerance to any delays in their satisfaction.

**Age and Instant or Next Day Delivery**

The study found an unexpected number of older participants who were using instant or same day delivery on a regular basis (see figure 5). Nearly a quarter (24%) of the participants who answered that they used these services the most often were aged 50-59 or 60 and older. Although the results do not present a considerable number of older participants using these
methods, previous discussion within the literature suggested that speedy delivery was a service designed to meet the expectations of impatient Millennials.

Separating consumers based on socio-economic characteristics such as age and gender is a tool often employed within marketing (Venkatesh et al., 2003; Bigné et al., 2005) and was used within this study to determine the differences between one generation (Millennials) and their older counterparts. In terms of capability of using digital technology and the ways in which users shop online however, it was discovered that these characteristics had minimal impact once an equal level of experience had been acquired (Hernández et al., 2010; McCloskey, 2006). The Millennials have grown up within an increasingly digital world and therefore have acquired greater levels of experience, this does not mean that older generations are incapable of reaching this level. An older individual may take more time to familiarise themselves with the technology (Gomez et al., 1986), but they are likely to behave in the same ways that Millennials do when shopping online, given that they are at equal levels of experience. The study conducted by Hernández et al. (2010) found that there has been an increase in active participation from older generations shopping online. Although within this study there were not many who used the speedier delivery services on a regular basis, there was a considerable number of participants over the age of 50; showing that older generations are becoming increasingly active participants within the online marketplace.

Rejecting the idea that age is an influencing factor within the online marketplace, reinforces suggestions made that positive experiences are more likely to encourage repeat purchases (Im et al., 2008; Miyazaki & Fernández, 2001). In the same way that younger participants commented that they were impatient or excited to receive their items instantly, one older participant (aged 50-59) commented that they ‘just like to have things instantly’. Another
(aged 60 or older) commented that they found faster delivery services ‘convenient’. These comments show that age does not always influence the way in which users shop, reflecting on the more recent studies which found such characteristics to have minimal effect (Hernández et al., 2010; McCloskey, 2006).

**Frequency in which Participants Shop Online**

Figure 4 shows the frequency in which participants from each age group shop online, out of those who said that they use instant or next day delivery services the most often, nearly half were weekly online shoppers. An early study conducted by Donthu & Garcia (1999) found that online shoppers were more impulsive than traditional shoppers, which may suggest that online shoppers are also more likely to shop more often in general.

These impulsive purchasing behaviours can cause a sense of instant gratification within some consumers which in turn encourages repeat behaviour (Coley & Burgess, 2003; Gardner & Rook, 1988; Rook, 1987; Rook & Gardner, 1993). An unplanned purchase may occur after a consumer is exposed to stimuli such as price promotion or attractive imagery (Liu, Li & Hu, 2013). However, consumers are individually susceptible to different stimuli, with varying effect; what might encourage one consumer to purchase impulsively may not affect another (Dawson & Kim, 2009; Lee & Yi, 2008; Youn & Faber, 2000; Youn & Faber, 2002). Some of the comments made by younger participants reflected these suggestions; one participant said, ‘free delivery sometimes sways my purchases’ and another commented that they were ‘sometimes influenced by adding extras to the basket to make it free’. These comments show that some of the participants were affected by the stimulus of offering free delivery in return for purchasing more products. The stimuli encouraged these shoppers to make extra purchases impulsively, if these purchases have increased the participant’s sense of
gratification then it is likely to encourage repeat behaviour. The comments also reinforce an idea previously discussed in the literature, that an impulse buyer is likely to be under 35 years old (Bellenger et al., 1978).

The study found that Millennials were more likely to use speedier delivery services, likely because they crave the instant gratification that comes with the convenience of such a service. It has also been suggested that impulsive purchases encourage repeat behaviour due to a release of immediate satisfaction within some customers. Together, these ideas indicate that Millennials are also more likely to be impulsive purchasers, spending more online and more often than other generations. This was shown in that those who chose instant or next day delivery services, mostly aged 21-29 were also more likely to shop online weekly (see figures 4 and 5).

**Millennials as Regular Online Shoppers**

Referring back to figure 4, we can see that many of the participants under the age of 39 shop online regularly, their activity is almost equally divided between those who shop weekly or monthly. There is a portion of participants within each age group who only shop online on occasion. This appears to be either equal or under the number of participants within the age group who shop online more regularly. However, in the group aged 21-29 there is a rise in percentage of participants who choose to shop online only on occasion. This is also the age group where many participants (31%) indicated that they use instant or next day delivery methods more often; reasserting the idea that these methods are more affordable when shopping online less regularly. The age group 40-49 is equally divided between high numbers of participants (46% each) who shop online either weekly or on occasion, the remaining 8% said they shop online monthly. Age groups 50-59 and 60 or older both show a clear majority
of participants who choose to shop online on occasion, although age group 50-59 is the only group who had any participants indicate that they shop online daily.

As stated in the literature, media and digital technologies have played an increasingly key role in the lifestyles of the younger generations (Harris Interactive, 2004). It is understandable that many of the younger participants choose to shop online regularly as opposed to traditional shopping in brick and mortar stores. In comparison to the U.S. where college students make up the majority of online sales (O’Donell & Associates, LLC, 2014), the UK appears to be experiencing similar trends. Participants under the age of 39 appear to be shopping online more regularly than their older counterparts, which could possibly mean they are also spending more. Aside from digital technologies being widely integrated into the lifestyles of Millennials, Sweeney (2006) noted that this generation can become frustrated when they are presented with limited choice. The internet provides online shoppers with an enormous amount of choice in products and services which are not so easily available in the restricted setting of traditional shopping.

Another view may be that the younger participants indicated that they shop online more regularly simply because they find more ease using digital technologies, in comparison with their older counterparts. It is widely assumed that Millennials have greater amounts of experience in using digital technologies (Morris & Venkatesh, 2000; Trocchia & Janda, 2000). On the other hand, the considerable number of people over the age of 50 (45 participants) who contributed to the study indicates that the older generation are also active in the online market; reinforcing the idea that socio-economic characteristics such as age are of minimal importance when experience is equal (Hernández et al., 2010).
**Cost**

Many of the comments, made by participants who were asked to describe their influences when selecting instant or next day delivery (regardless of whether this was their most used method), referred to the cost of faster delivery services. It was a common theme amongst these comments that instant or next day delivery was an expensive option and sometimes was not justifiable in comparison to the cheaper options of a slightly delayed delivery.

It is now common practice to provide customers with a variety of options for delivery of their product: same day, next day, standard (3-5 working days) and occasionally an option which may take longer (usually this is for exported items from different countries). These were the options participants were asked to choose from when indicating which method that they used the most. However, faster delivery is often highly elevated in price due to the extra value of time. As previously stated, the cost of delivery is a combination of the cost of physically moving a product and the added value of time, essentially the high price of faster delivery service is a trade-off of time for money (Hantula & Bryant, 2005).

A brief review of Standard Discounted Utility (DU) Theory reveals that consumers are likely to value or pay more for items to be delivered faster than expected, the value increases the sooner it can arrive (Antonides, 1991; Cairns & van der Pol, 2000; Lowenstein & Prelec, 1992). This theory seems to correspond with the reality that instant and next day delivery is expensive in comparison to the standard (3-5 working days) delivery method, however it does not account for the fact that the participants in this study appear to be unwilling to pay such a surcharge. It is possible that the younger generations have become accustomed to an ‘on-demand economy’ (Foresight Factory, 2015, p.2) where everything is evolving to become faster and more efficient; so, they no longer believe that the value for such speed is equal to
the price that is being asked. The expense of this service is likely the reason why so many participants, who have been shown to be regular online shoppers, indicated that they often use the standard (3-5 working days) delivery method.

Several comments were made that participants would only use instant or next day delivery on rare occasions due to the ‘high cost’ of the delivery. Others commented that they avoided using the service at all because it was so expensive, along with comments about planning to buy products ahead of time to ‘prevent additional cost’. One participant noted that even though ‘next day delivery isn’t worth an extra fiver’ to save waiting 1-2 extra days but they still ‘do it every time’. It appears that cost of delivery is a significant consideration to make when shopping online and many participants were very aware of the money they were spending to ensure faster delivery. Two participants noted that they ‘begrudge paying’ the extra expenses, they simply want everything ‘as soon as possible but without paying premium for instant delivery. This seems unfair as the cost of physically moving a product is a necessary expense, yet it reflects the way in which we view our economy. These comments are a reflection on the way in which as a society we have come to expect speed and efficiency, we know it is possible although some participants seem unwilling to pay for the added value.

Convenience

Another theme which appeared when analysing the results of the survey, was that many participants claimed that instant or next day delivery was simply more convenient. As previously discussed, Millennials seem to expect a constant flow of connection and instant gratification in all aspects of their lives. They were born into a world where the technological advancements of the internet have allowed this generation to access more knowledge, services and products than any generation before them. The digital environment in which we
are now living in has brought with it an expectation of seamless connection to products and services, and anything left has been known to cause frustration amongst Millennials (Sweeney, 2006). The consumer economy has also evolved into something much more individualised and a demand for personalisation has become normalised (Roberts, 2014). We are searching for short term satisfaction in all aspects of our lives (Roberts, 2014) and society appears to have become accustomed to the ease and convenience of online shopping. The added convenience of one-click services has encouraged us to believe that we can have anything we want with the ‘tap of a button’ (Foresight Factory, 2015, p.2). With this expectation for convenience grows a sense of impatience, which Millennials are often accused of and willing to admit that they lack tolerance for delays (Sweeney, 2006).

A fitting example of this type of impatience was given when one participant answered that they use instant delivery because it is ‘convenient’, they noted that they ‘hate having to wait in for delivery slots’. The reasoning behind this was that the standard (3-5 working days) delivery method is too vague and that it would be pointless waiting for a delivery that could arrive at any point within this period. Instant and next day delivery provides consumers with that extra ‘certainty’ and assurance that their purchase will be with them on a specific day, rather than speculating its arrival. Similar comments seemed to be recurring throughout all age groups, which implies that this insistence on convenience is not exclusive to Millennial consumers as was implied within some of the literature. Although, younger participants were more likely to answer that they used faster delivery services because they always ‘leave things to the last minute’, whereas older participants had made comments that they would try to plan ahead in order to avoid the added cost of next day delivery. This is not a matter of convenience but it does suggest that because Millennials are accustomed to using these
services they are less likely to make preparations in advance to avoid paying extra for items they need urgently.

**Because We Can**

One of the most prominent comments made by a participant within this study was their reason for using instant delivery: ‘because we can’. This simple phrase highlights all previous arguments based on the supposed impatience of Millennials and the rise of an ‘on-demand economy’. The convenience and efficiency of this new consumer economy has encouraged a belief that we can have anything we want almost immediately, and if such a convenient system exists then why shouldn’t we use it? Regardless of how the online market place has evolved to provide us with almost seamless instant gratification, the reason this system works is because consumers use it, and we use it ‘because we can’. This idea was previously discussed when reviewing a study by Roberts (2014), who described the way in which today’s society believes they must put these ‘self-satisfying’ systems to use simply because they exist. This was further highlighted by additional comments from participants who stated, ‘I just like to have things instantly’, ‘I hate waiting’ and ‘I just like having things now’. This theme of, if I can have it now then I want it now, mostly came from the younger age groups from the study, although it was not entirely exclusive to them. The comment, ‘because we can’ was in fact an answer from a participant aged 60 or over, something entirely unexpected when considering the arguments put forward within the literature.

**Amazon Prime and Subscription Services**

An unexpected result which was originally revealed by the pilot study, is the issue of Amazon Prime and other subscription services. These companies offer unlimited next day delivery services when an annual subscription fee is paid. It appeared that within both the pilot study
and the following survey, many participants who use these services are under the illusion that the delivery is then ‘free’. Whilst this might be true, as the annual fee has been paid upfront, it brings to question, how do these services affect the way in which participants view next day delivery services? It was noted how many participants answered that they used these subscription services; their data was categorised and further analysed in an attempt to determine whether there is a relationship between these services and the way in which these participants shop online.

Overall there were 12 participants who made reference to either Amazon Prime or other similar subscription services, ranging from ages 18-59. The majority of this select group of people belonged to the 21-29 age group, closely followed by 18-20. There were two participants considered to be part of the older generation, one aged 40-49 and one aged 50-59. It was expected that these participants would be under the age of 30, as the study appears to show that Millennials shop online more often, using instant or next day delivery services more often than their older counterparts (see figure 5).

Their choice of most often used delivery method was evenly divided between next day delivery or standard (3-5 working days). It appears unusual that these participants also use standard delivery when they have stated that they are subscribers to free next day delivery services such as Amazon Prime. There was no reasoning for this found when analysing the individual comments made by the participants, although it is likely that these participants simply shop from a variety of sites and not just the ones they are subscribed to. These participants were also regular shoppers, the majority (7) indicated that they shopped online weekly, one participant (aged 50-59) even indicated that they were a daily online shopper. This is unsurprising as eliminating the extra cost of delivery, and the convenience of having
products arrive the next day, is likely to encourage more purchases. Although it is uncertain whether these participants were regular shoppers before or after they purchased their annual subscriptions, the service is likely to save the consumer money in the long run.

The comments made by the participants who use subscriptions services is what was the most interesting; these revealed that at least half of the participants felt as though the faster delivery service they were receiving was ‘free’. It appears that after the initial purchase of the subscription has took place, the value of the service decreases and it is further believed to be ‘free’, as though it is separate from the original purchase. It is likely that this is the case with those who purchase Amazon Prime subscription because the subscription offers additional services such as television and music, along with free next day delivery. Those who used other subscription services (e.g. ASOS) did not make comments about feeling as though their faster delivery service was free; they appear aware of their initial purchase of the subscription. It is difficult to draw a clear conclusion about whether these subscription services change the way in which these participants shop as the information provided was limited. However, it seems plausible that the added enticement of saving money or having ‘free’ next day delivery has encouraged these participants to shop more often. It also indicates that having a yearly subscription to a delivery service means that these participants are more likely to use the next day delivery options; there is no need to wait when they can have their products delivered almost immediately at no extra cost.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to identify a possible relationship between the rise of instant and next day delivery services and claims being made about the Millennial generation as impatient. A review of literature concluded that the online retail market was a constantly
evolving environment and that the demand for speed and efficiency is a driving force behind these services. A study of 138 participants, from a varied range of age groups, was conducted and their answers about individual online shopping habits were analysed in terms of which delivery methods they use, how often they shop online and their reasoning for feeling influenced to use faster delivery services.

The increasing availability of instant and next day delivery services is certainly a big step forward in the ever evolving, competitive marketing place. This ‘on-demand economy’ (Foresight Factory, 2015, p.2) combined with the Millennial generation’s lack of tolerance for delays (Sweeney, 2006) is likely what caused businesses to start thinking about how they could deliver their services quicker and more effectively than their competition. However, the study revealed that these faster delivery services were not being used as often as expected (see figures 5 & 6). The literature appeared to lead to the conclusion that instant and next day delivery were the most popular services in a society which favours short term satisfaction (Roberts, 2014). The study revealed a contradictory conclusion, the majority of participants use standard (3-5 working days) delivery methods the most often, some listed reasons why they do not use faster delivery services more often, most of which included comments about the services being too expensive.

The small percentage of participants who do use instant or next day delivery (25%) more often than other methods were mostly aged 21-29. This seems to reinforce the idea that Millennials favour speedier delivery of products due to their disapproval of delays, although the majority of this age group still indicated that they used standard (3-5 working days) delivery the most often. These results would appear to suggest that Millennials therefore are more inclined to use instant and next day delivery services, but there was also active participation from those
who belong to an older generation (see figure 5). As suggested by McCloskey (2006) and Hernández et al. (2010), age is only an influencing factor during the initial stages of online shopping and that experience is the key to behaviour. This study has seemingly supported this argument by showing an active participation of older generations in online shopping and faster delivery methods such as next day delivery. Although it may appear that Millennials are more inclined to use these new services it is reasonable to believe this is because they possess a greater amount of experience with the technology and that older generations may need more time to catch up.

It was expected that Millennials would show a significant amount of interest in instant and next day delivery services, the comments revealed some of the reasons why this was not the case. Many of the comments made by Millennials in the study indicated that cost was a ‘main priority’ regardless of how efficient these faster delivery services are. The extra value added onto items for their speedy delivery is often viewed as too expensive by the participants, therefore they are willing to wait an extra one or two days for cheaper delivery. Instant delivery is certainly still in its infancy as a delivery method, next day delivery is not far ahead either. I believe that, in the future, businesses will find a way to cut the costs which is likely to increase the interest in these services from consumers of all ages.

For now, Amazon Prime and other annual subscription services appear to offer a cheaper alternative for those who shop online on a regular basis. The small number of participants who answered that they used subscription services were also shown to be regular shoppers, most of which did so on a weekly basis. Considering previous comments made about the cost of faster delivery services it is likely that those who pay for subscription services are more likely to buy more, making use of the faster delivery services they have paid for. The issue
that some participants expressed that they felt these faster services were free, after the initial subscription payment was made, appeared to create some interesting results. There appears to be a relationship between subscriptions and how often a participant shops online, although further studies would need to be conducted to verify this.

With cost, seemingly a considerable influence over participant’s decision to use instant or next day delivery services, it was concluded that this service is likely more appealing and affordable when used on occasion. Both the pilot study and the following research indicated that next day delivery serves a purpose in specific circumstances. The service is always available, but most of the participants indicated that it was most useful when they felt they needed their products delivered ‘urgently’, for example, the delivery of last minute gifts. It appears that the online market place is not one driven by speed and efficiency, as indicated by the literature, but one which has evolved to provide convenience. A range of delivery methods gives consumers a choice and therefore it caters to the individual needs of customers.

The rise of instant and next day delivery is an important move forward in the online retail market, it has certainly become a popular service even if not one that is used on a regular basis. Faster delivery services have offered a new, more convenient way of shopping online, one which is almost equivalent to the efficiency of brick and mortar stores. This study concludes that the reason behind this rise of instant and next day delivery service is not due to the apparent impatience of Millennials as a generation, but through the increased competition which the online market brings. Similar to the idea put forward by Roberts (2014), a new, more efficient service has become available and therefore, as a society, we feel that we must put it to use. There is no reason we should not take advantage of this
service, when we know it is possible to have products and services delivered to us efficiently, and almost instantaneously. I believe that these services will continue to rise in popularity as we continue to use them, simply ‘because we can’.
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