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Abstract

Background E-mail marketing is used to get consumers’ attention to one’s products, services, need, etc., and ultimately to get them to act in a specific way. How consumers are affected by E-mail marketing is a topic that has not been thoroughly investigated even though it is of great interest due to the vast increase of E-mail marketing the last couple of years. Thus, there is a major gap in the research of this topic, especially in a B2B context.

Purpose The purpose of this thesis is to analyze behaviors and attitudes of decision-makers in the Swedish manufacturing industry regarding B2B E-mail marketing.

Method The authors used a quantitative research approach with an online-survey in order to collect necessary data. The population is decision-makers within the manufacturing industry in Sweden. The result is based on 1 777 participating decision-makers. The questionnaire was constructed by the authors and is based on the theoretical framework consisting: Tri-Component Model of Attitudes, Planned Behavior, Micheaux’s (2011) theory of perceived pressure and A<sub>ad</sub>. The authors used analysis techniques such as descriptive univariate analysis, Anova-test, factor analysis and linear regression analysis to derive the result.

Conclusion The conclusions drawn from this study are that the decision-makers within the manufacturing industry in Sweden tend to have a negative attitude and behavior toward E-mail marketing messages, only a small minority of the decision-makers had a positive attitude. Furthermore, the authors discovered an association between their attitude and how they actually behave. The study also reveals differences in the attitudes and behaviors regarding age and position within the company. A final conclusion drawn from this study is that the decision-makers do not read all marketing messages they receive and they also delete some marketing messages without reading them. The result of this is a non-functional marketing method, as it does not work as it is intended. A suggestion for marketers working with E-mail marketing is to try to establish more positive attitudes by building relationships with the recipients.
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Introduction

In this introductory chapter, the authors’ ambition is to provide the reader with a general overview of the chosen topic. The following sub-sections will be presented: Background (1.1), problem discussion (1.2), purpose (1.3), research questions (1.4), delimitations (1.5), and definitions (1.6).

1.1 Background

Today, people live in a network civilization where more and more information is available online. Those who use the Internet almost certainly also send E-mails. In fact, it is the most common daily activity among Swedish Internet users according to a recently conducted report (Findahl, 2011). The world today is constantly changing and technology is progressing rapidly, which requires marketers to think creatively to invent new methods to reach out to the consumers. In the late 1990s the use of Internet for the purpose of buying, selling or marketing products and services (electronic commerce) started growing rapidly around the world (McGaughey, 2002). By using Internet as a marketing channel the geographical location was no longer an issue for marketers since people and companies all over the world easily could be reached to a lower cost than with older offline marketing techniques (De Lima-Turner & Gordon, 1997). The Internet has given B2B-marketers a new area to work in which has led to several new communication techniques that marketers can use. One of the most frequently used methods of Internet marketing is E-mail. In the beginning of 2000, there were several studies conducted which indicated that the use of E-mail had been the most popular Internet activity by users, which was one vital reason for the increasing use of E-mail in the field of B2B marketing (Merisavo & Raulas, 2004).

E-mail marketing has a number of advantages that other marketing methods do not offer. The main advantage of using E-mail marketing is that it is very cost effective and exceptionally easy to customize and target (Malholtra & Birks, 2007).

‘It’s not sexy or exciting, but every organization in the world will never dispute the fact that E-mail is the cheapest way of getting to market...’ (Hosford, 2011, p. 2).

The reason why E-mail marketing has experienced a strong growth is undoubtedly because of the financial motive to reach a large population (Merisavo & Raulas, 2004). E-mail marketing can be used for different purposes, according to Merisavo and Raulas (2004) it can be used to share information and promote products and services to build and strengthen the brand. Merisavo and Raulas (2004) also stress the fact that it can be used to guide customers to websites and provide customers with order status.

E-mail marketing is used to get consumers’ attention to one’s product, service, need, etc., and ultimately to get them to act in a predefined specific way. How consumers are affected by E-mail marketing is a topic that has not been thoroughly investigated even though it is of great interest due to the vast increase of E-mail marketing the last couple of years. When it comes to behavior toward marketing, the concept of attitudes is very important for marketing theories as it is represented within a large number of consumer behavior models (Smith & Swinyard, 1983). According to Smith and Swinyard (1983), attitudes serve as a dependent variable when it comes to studies of promotional effects. There has been research conducted on the subject of attitudes toward marketing as early as the 1930s.
(Xiaoli, 2006). Attitudes are a very important subject as it can affect the exposure and the attention people have about an advertisement according to Xiaoli (2006). Further, Xiaoli (2006) mentions that an attitude toward a specific advertisement can lead to a specific attitude toward the brand, as well as affect a customers purchase intention.

There are several studies conducted about people’s attitudes to E-mail marketing in a B2C context (De Lima-Turner & Gordon, 1997; Korgaonkar, Lund & Wolin, 2002; Becker, Chowdhury, Parwin & Weitenberner, 2006), but when it comes to attitudes about E-mail marketing in a B2B context there is a major gap in the research. According to Forrester (2011), attitudes toward E-mail marketing have improved over the last few years. People delete less E-mail marketing messages without reading them and also tend to forward these promotional messages to others. In 2006, 73 % of the consumers said that they deleted most of the E-mail marketing messages without reading them, in 2011 this number was down to 59 %. The same report presents that in 2006, 77 % of the consumers thought that they received too many E-mail marketing messages, while 49 % shared the same opinion in 2011. The decrease is, according to Forrester (2011), probably a result of a larger spread of alternative product information sources such as blogs, search engines, social networks, ratings, reviews, communities, etc.

Even though there is a gap in the research of a B2B context, companies around the world still spend enormous amounts of money on advertisements each year. In 2008 the global spending on Internet marketing was as high as $65.2 billion (marketingcharts.com, 2012a). The trend regarding E-mail marketing is still growing stronger each year around the world.

In US, recent research has been conducted illustrating that 60 % of American companies are going to, or already have, increased their E-mail marketing budget for 2012 (Strongmail, 2011). Another global study in the same field indicates that approximately 58 % of companies using E-mail marketing are going to increase their spending on E-mail marketing in 2012 (marketingcharts.com, 2012b). While many studies indicates that E-mail marketing is growing around the world, the E-mail marketing efforts in Sweden have, during the last couple of years, stagnated and been uniform instead of increasing (IRM, 2011). It is important to know that almost all different types of Swedish marketing investments have stagnated or decreased since 2009, even though Sweden overall just has been slightly affected by the global financial crisis in comparison to other countries (IRM, 2011). There is still a concern about what is going to happen with the economy in the future, which can explain a portion of the decrease of advertising (SCB.se, 2012). Though studies show that there has not been an increase in E-mail marketing efforts over the last couple of years in Sweden, one forecast implies a minor increase in the E-mail marketing efforts in Sweden in 2012 (IRM, 2011). According to the IRM report (2011), companies in Sweden will spend approximately 40 million SEK in 2012 on E-mail marketing, so there is still a vast amount of money spent on E-mail marketing each year by these companies. As companies in Sweden as well as in the rest of the world invest large amounts of money on E-mail marketing, it is of significance to analyze how the receivers in a B2B context perceive this type of marketing methods.

1.2 Problem Discussion

The background leads us to the problem discussion. The topic, which is intended to be analyzed, is if any associations between decision-makers’ attitudes and behavior toward B2B E-mail marketing can be found. A major difficulty for marketing professionals with today's E-mail marketing is to distinguish whether the message actually reaches the right
target audience. Questions that arise are for example whether behaviors differ between a CEO and a middle manager in regards to advertising by E-mail. Negative aspects of direct communication via E-mail marketing has led to an increased dissatisfaction among consumers (Parament, 2008), this has however not affected the corporate strategy, which in recent years significantly increased the marketing budget for E-mail marketing (MarketingSherpa, 2011). The digital era today requires greater and greater efforts for marketing professionals to reach their audiences through the mass media noise. In 2011, a typical corporate E-mail user sent and received approximately 105 E-mail messages per day. This number will also increase in the following years due to the vast spread of 3G networks and smart phones that has facilitated the progression of wireless E-mail. There were about 531 million wireless E-mail users in 2011, this will grow to over 1.2 billion wireless E-mail users by the end of 2015 (Radicati & Khmartseva, 2011). Although E-mail marketing for B2B has grown tremendously in recent years all around the world, not much research in this field has been conducted; especially not in the Swedish market.

E-mail marketing is occasionally associated with SPAM, i.e. unsolicited E-mails sent in bulk. According to Messaging Anti-Abuse Working Group, SPAM accounts for approximately 88-90 % of all delivered messages worldwide. Both SPAM and E-mail marketing is essentially advertising to get people to act in one-way or another (Messaging Anti-Abuse Working Group, 2011). Both types are commonly used but it is vital for companies working with E-mail marketing to know the difference. It is very likely that the company's reputation and brand could be damaged if the company does not understand the difference, which may affect business over a long period of time (Sullivan & DeLeeuw, 2003). It is also important for companies to have a successful E-mail marketing strategy in order to overpower the clutter of SPAM. One of the biggest challenges for today’s E-mail marketers is therefore deliverability. There is currently a strong trend among companies providing E-mail services, such as G-mail, Yahoo, Hotmail, etc., to protect their users against unsolicited E-mails. All these major web clients work in different ways to limit the deliverability so that the users will have a better E-mail environment. A desired environment is where the user decides what is interesting and what is not and where the messages that the user wants will be immediately delivered and everything else removed. There is a strong risk that subscribers of E-mail marketing will rapidly discard the E-mail marketing messages that do not supply value for them. Is this a bad news for the E-mail marketers? No, not necessarily. It may require more work, but it is also a great opportunity for serious E-mail marketers to develop and achieve good results (E-mail marketing reports, 2009).

One of the main problems stated by Micheaux (2011) is that E-mail today is used too much and that the consumer is flooded with E-mail messages. Radicati Group (2010) estimated the number of E-mails sent per day in 2010 to be around 294 billion, which means more than 2.8 million E-mails are sent every second and 90 trillion E-mails are sent per year. (Radicati Group, 2010). Today, people use E-mails to send messages to clients, colleagues and friends. Some of the messages are wanted but most of them are unsolicited. In February 2011, Atos Origin, a multinational IT-companies with 74 000 employees announced their plan to become an E-mail-free organization in three years and make activities to move to social networks. This due to the massive increase of E-mails sent and received within the organization (Atos, 2011).
Atos Origin instead wants to start using improved communication applications as well as new collaboration and social media tools. Atos Origin CEO and Chairman, Thierry Breton said:

‘The volume of E-mails we send and receive is unsustainable for business. Managers spend between 5 and 20 hours a week reading and writing E-mails. We are producing data on a massive scale that is fast polluting our working environments and also encroaching into our personal lives. At Atos Origin we are taking action now to reverse this trend, just as organizations took measures to reduce environmental pollution after the industrial revolution’ (Atos, 2011).

Is this what awaits E-mail as a communication tool in the near future or will it survive and develop to a more productive tool? With this in mind, it is more important than ever to learn more about attitudes and behaviors regarding E-mail marketing. With this study, the authors strive to help the managers working with E-mail marketing to compete with newer technologies and to understand the underlying thoughts regarding the issue to be able to successfully reach out through the noise.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze behaviors and attitudes of decision-makers’ in the Swedish manufacturing industry regarding B2B E-mail marketing.

1.4 Research Questions

- What are the behaviors toward E-mail marketing among decision-makers in Sweden?
- What are the attitudes toward E-mail marketing among decision-makers in Sweden?
- Are there associations between behaviors and attitudes toward E-mail marketing? If so, what is the nature of the associations?
- In what way can the behaviors and attitudes affect the results and outcomes of E-mail marketing?

1.5 Delimitations

The respondents in this study are decision-makers within organizations in the manufacturing industry. All of the manufacturing companies analyzed are located in Sweden. The delimitations that have been applied in this study have lead to an increased ability for generalization as well as a greater accuracy of the investigated subject at hand, namely the Manufacturing industry in Sweden. The authors do not make difference of whether the decision-makers have subscribed to E-mail marketing lists themselves or if the company using E-mail marketing have added their E-mail address without permission.
1.6 Definitions

In this section a list of definitions of the terms that have been discussed in the problem background as well as the problem discussion is provided to the reader.

Advertising: ‘Any paid form of non-personal presentation and promotion of ideas, goods or services by an identified sponsor’ (Kotler, Wong, Saunders & Armstrong, 2005, p. 761).

Attitude: ‘A lasting general evaluation of people (including oneself), objects or issues’ (Solomon, Bamossy, Askegaard, & Hoog, 2010, p. 643). Or, ‘a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given object’ (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1975, p. 6).

B2B: ‘The selling of goods and/or services from a business to another business’ (Kotler et al, 2005, p. 138).

B2C: ‘The selling of goods and/or services from a business to final consumers’ (Kotler et al, 2005, p. 137).

Behavior: ‘A consumer’s actions with regard to an attitude object’ (Solomon et al, 2010, p. 643).

Decision-makers: ‘The persons who ultimately make a buying decision or any part of it – whether to buy, what to buy, how to buy, or where to buy’ (Kotler et al, 2005, p. 262).

E-mail marketing: ‘The promotion of products or services via E-mail’ (Marketing Terms, 2012).

Marketing: ‘Is an organizational function and set of processes for creating, communicating and delivering values to customers and for managing customer relationships in ways that benefit the organization and its stakeholders’ (Gundlach, 2007 p. 243).

SPAM: ‘Sending of unsolicited bulk E-mail – that is, E-mail that was not asked for by multiple recipients’ (McLeod & Youn, 2001 p. 1).
2 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this paper starts with a description of attitudes toward advertisements and E-mail marketing theory. Thereafter a description of the Tri-Component Model of Attitudes and Theory of Planned Behavior will be established, as they will be the foundation for the thesis as a whole.

2.1 Attitudes Toward Advertisements

People’s attitudes are very important when it comes to marketing since they are predispositions for people to evaluate products or services either positively or negatively. Marketing is a tool for companies trying to change people’s attitudes from negative toward positive or strengthen the already existent positive attitudes toward the company or brand (Solomon et al., 2010). According to Solomon et al. (2010), a person’s attitudes exist because they serve some type of function. There are four different kinds of attitude functions: the utilitarian function, the value-expressive function, the ego defense function and the knowledge function. The utilitarian function of attitudes is connected to reward or punishment; a certain behavior might for example result in pleasure or pain. If, on the other hand, an attitude has a value expressive function it expresses a person’s central values or self-concept. The ego-defensive function of attitudes contains attitudes a person might have as protection from different internal feelings or external threats. The knowledge function implies that some attitudes are shaped as a result of needs for structure, meaning or order. By identifying the dominant function best suited for the specific purpose, marketers can use the chosen attitude function to create a successful marketing mix (Solomon et al., 2010).

According to Homer (1990), researchers have found that an attitude toward a specific advertisement ($A_{ad}$) has large influence on people’s attitudes toward brands and also their purchasing intentions. The focus when explaining this theory lies on the attitude toward the advertisement and not the attitude toward the brand. Belch, Lutz and Mackenzie (1986) presents four different alternative models on how an attitude could be part of the creation of a person’s intention to buy or act in a certain way. When it comes to attitudes toward a specific advertisement, ($A_{ad}$) can be defined as:

‘… a predisposition to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner to a particular advertising stimulus during a particular exposure occasion.’ (Solomon et al., 2010 p. 280)

![Affect Transfer Model (Belch et al. 1986)](image)
The *affect transfer model* (figure 2.1) illustrates a direct connection from the attitude toward the ad, to attitude toward the brand, which then leads to an intention to act. This model also implies that there is a direct connection of brand cognition and the attitude toward the brand (Homer, 1990). The second model is the *dual mediation* (figure 2.2), which is similar to the *affect transfer* (figure 2.1). What separates these two is that the brand cognition is affected by attitude toward the ad in the *dual mediation* model (Homer, 1990). The attitude in this model has a larger impact on how the attitude toward the brand will be and therefore also a larger impact on how the intention to act will look like.

The third model is the *reciprocal mediation model* (figure 2.3), which illustrates a balance between the attitude toward the ad and the attitude toward a brand. The intensity of each of the attitudes varies between people and situations, according to Homer (1990).

The last model, *independent influences model* (figure 2.4), illustrates an alternative to how attitudes toward an advertisement impacts a person’s intention. The model indicates that there is no relationship between an attitude toward an ad and an attitude toward a brand, however they both affect people’s intention to act in a certain way (Homer, 1990).
There are different aspects that determine a person’s attitude toward the advertisement; the person’s attitudes toward the advertiser, the specific mood the advertisement evoked, the actual execution of the advertisement, etc. (Solomon et al., 2010). All the different models explained above illustrates the effect attitudes have on intentions to act, which in turn have a strong connection to the behavior. This will be further explained in the end of this chapter.

2.2 Attitudes and Behaviors Toward E-mail Marketing

Attitudes and behaviors toward direct marketing as well as some parts of Internet marketing has since the 80’s been thoroughly researched (Mehta & Sivadas, 1995; Xiaoli, 2006; Smith & Swinyard, 1983; Korgaonkar et al., 2002; De Lima-Turner & Gordon, 1997; Becker, et al., 2006). However, there is a lack of research regarding attitudes and behaviors toward E-mail marketing, this area have not been comprehensively analyzed until this date.

The authors of this thesis therefore scrutinized one of the few known theories in the field, namely Micheaux’s (2011) theory of perceived E-mail marketing pressure. Micheaux (2011) stressed that there is a perceived E-mail marketing pressure concerning the receiver’s perspective. This pressure is frequently a state of irritation aggravated by the impression of getting too many E-mail marketing messages from commercial sources. The receiver feels overwhelmed with the countless volume of E-mail messages, which leads to a major pressure because of the need to confront the vast amount of information. Micheaux (2011) also studied the advertisement sent by a single company in order to understand the perceived pressure by the receiver. The result of the study was that the perceived pressure relates more to the receiver’s past experience of E-mail marketing, personality, state of mind and the attitudes toward the brand or company, than to the actual volume of messages received from a company. It is crucial for companies that they deal with the perceived pressure to avoid attitudinal and behavioral effects that in the long run will hurt the brand or company.

‘The negative behavioral consequences include deleting an E-mail without opening it, qualifying the address as undesirable in a local SPAM filter, unsubscribing, or complaining to the Internet Service Provider (ISP). Emotional and attitudinal manifestations are irritation and negative attitudes toward the brand, its E-mail advertising, and the E-mail advertising channel in general.’ (Micheaux, 2011 p. 48)

Another conclusion about E-mail marketing messages sent to low-involved receivers was that less the recipients reflect on the E-mail marketing messages, the larger the amount of pressure they can tolerate before having negative attitudes and behaviors as a consequence (Micheaux, 2011).
Micheaux’s (2011) elaborated conceptual framework is based on a two-stage marketing value evaluation process from Ducoffe and Curlo (2000). While Ducoffe and Curlo’s theory only relates to individual advertisements instead of E-mail marketing messages, their initial model is based on previous experience with the media and with similar messages. This means that the model is a loop process, which can either establish positive or negative attitudes concerning a flow of E-mail marketing messages. The initial phase is founded on past experience with the media and similar messages. When an E-mail marketing message arrives to the receiver, a rapid oblivious decision is made whether or not it is of potential interest. The decision is primarily based on previous experience with E-mail marketing, with the sender, and with the perceived relevance of the E-mail subject line. Then the recipient must choose route; Route A if the E-mail has no relevance due to the factors above, Route B or Route C if it is perceived as relevant for the recipient to open the message (Micheaux, 2011).

2.2.1 Route A – The Neutral and Ignorance Route

The receiver will choose to ignore or delete the marketing E-mail message if it is classified as valueless. In this route, the recipients will, without effort, immediate make a decision and there is no elaborative process leading to that decision. A few receivers will most likely unsubscribe, but route A is not disturbing or increasing the perception of pressure due to the small amount of cognitive efforts. A possible consequence of this can be that the recipient develops an overall impression of receiving too many marketing E-mail messages in general, but not from any specific company or brand (Micheaux, 2011).
2.2.2 Route B – The Positive Route

If the receiver finds the marketing E-mail relevant and interesting, the recipient will open the mail to inspect the content. By reading the content, the receiver is potentially engaging in a central elaborative processing route according to the elaboration likelihood model (ELM) by Petty and Wegener (1999). This also leads to a further engagement with the marketing messages by behavioral reactions. The positive outcome benefits future marketing messages from the sender as well as the E-mail marketing channel in general. By following route B, the receiver will not be affected by marketing pressure, but may instead reduce the perceived pressure (Micheaux, 2011).

2.2.3 Route C – The Destructive Route

*Route C* is the opposite to route B, it builds up perceived pressure and has a destructive consequence for the sender of the E-mail marketing message. After the receiver has decided that the E-mail marketing message has relevance and is worth opening, the receiver makes excessive efforts by evaluating the content, finding it not to be relevant and thereby producing a negative attitude. This negative attitude may vary depending on the intensity of the effort and can furthermore result in massive avoidance behaviors, for example unsubscribing or even complain to the Internet service provider (ISP) which can cause problems for the sender of the E-mail marketing message. This will affect future experience in a negative way, both to the specific sender and also to the E-mail marketing channel in general (Micheaux, 2011).

The sender of E-mail marketing messages clearly aims for route B, but Micheaux (2011) states that it is much better that the recipient choose route A instead of route C if he or she believes that the message is of no potential interest. By choosing route A, the receiver is more possible to remain available to future E-mail marketing messages from the sender.

2.3 Tri-Component Model of Attitudes (ABC-model)

The notion that the three aspects of affect, behavior and cognition affect human experience is derived from the early Greek philosophers (McGuire, 1969). This was also an area that was mentioned in the first social psychology texts and studies (Bogardus, 1920; McDougall, 1908). The term attitude was however not officially clarified regarding the tri-component model until the end of 1940s. Smith (1947) discerned the difference between affective, cognitive and policy orientation characteristics of attitude. The Tri-component model of attitudes, also known as the ABC-model, was first stated by Rosenberg and Hovland (1960) and is today widely accepted and used by researchers within the field of attitudes and behaviors (Solomon et al., 2010). Rosenberg and Hovland argued that an attitude has three basic components: Affect, Behavior and Cognition, and researchers should measure these components in order to understand attitudes in an accurate way. The model emphasizes the interrelationship of feel, know and do (Solomon et al., 2010).
Affect, behavior, and cognition are theoretical and unobservable in terms of response to the stimulus of attitudes (Breckler, 1984). An example of this is a person who finds telemarketing annoying (cognitive), and feels displeased with this type of marketing (emotional), and therefore tend to act negatively against the telemarketer and that kind of marketing (behavior). A common way to measure the attitude is by requesting people to respond either orally or written, from which the attitude is derived (Fletcher, Haynes & Miller, 2008). The attitude has a direction and intensity. The direction can either be positive or negative and the intensity shows how strong the attitude is. The direction and intensity depends on the degree of internationalization and people’s experience and skills. There is usually an interaction process between the attitudes and skills. If people think themselves as skilled in one area, the attitude generally becomes more positive, leading to increased efforts to develop and improve skills in the field (Krosnick & Schuman, 1988).

_Affect_ describes how a receiver feels about attitude objects and is an emotional component of an attitude. These feelings can be either positive or negative depending on the individual’s cognitions (opinions) about the item and helps making up an attitude toward it. The stronger the related emotions are, the stronger the attitude is expected to be. _The behavior aspect_ relates to the receivers intention to do something with regard to an attitude object. This component is an active element of attitudes and concerns with the person’s tendency to react to the object, the reaction will be different depending on how receivers are influenced by what they know about the object and what they feel about it. Behavior aspects can be difficult to separate from the other two elements due to the lack of insights.
of the researcher. *The cognitive component* refers to the beliefs and thoughts that a receiver has toward the object. This component can also consist of an individual's opinion, perception and knowledge about an issue or item. Individual opinions may not be based on an objective assessment or be true, but still play a vital role in how the person perceives reality and furthermore the attitude of an object. The cognitive component is likely to be more conscious than the other elements of attitudes, and is more vulnerable than others to logic-based persuasive techniques (Solomon et al., 2010). To further explain the different components in the model of attitude, the following examples have been constructed, based on Solomon et al. (2010):

- A cognitive component is belief(s) about something, for example: E-mail marketing messages are usually unsolicited messages and unwanted by the receiver.
- An affective or emotional component that articulates how people feel in a positive or negative way about the attitude object, for example: I like E-mail marketing messages and want to read all of them.
- The behavioral component is where people act or how they perform in some way toward the attitude object, for example: I only read E-mail marketing messages from known senders.

### 2.3.1 Three Hierarchies of Effects

The attitude varies depending on the hierarchy of the different components in the tri-component model. Every hierarchy contains fixed sequence of steps that occurs in the process of creating an attitude.

#### 2.3.1.1 The Standard Learning Hierarchy

The standard learning hierarchy, also known as the high-involvement hierarchy, suggests that the consumer will conduct extensive research and form beliefs. It is fundamental for the standard learning hierarchy that the individual is driven to obtain a lot of information, carefully consider alternatives, and come to a thoughtful decision. The affect or feelings toward the attitude object are followed by the individual’s behavior. The cognition-affect-behavior (CAB) approach is dominant in purchase decisions where a high level of involvement is required. The attitude is based on cognitive information processing. When it comes to purchases that involve a high level of involvement, such as a house, the consumers start with gathering information and considering various choices, then they develop a feeling and beliefs about it and finally they act on the behavior and decide whether or not to buy the house. The outcome of this cautious process of choice is usually presented in loyalty to the product. The consumer forms a positive relationship with the product over time, which is hard to break. This creates a loyalty to the brand (Solomon et al., 2010).

![The Standard Learning Hierarchy](Solomon et al., 2010)
2.3.1.2 The Low-Involvement Hierarchy

In contrast to the standard learning hierarchy, the low-involvement hierarchy entails a cognition-behavior-affect (CBA) order of events. The consumer’s interest in the attitude object may be unenthusiastic and a lack of information and experience is also common. When a consumer makes a decision between, for example, different toothpastes, the chances are high that he might remember that brand X makes his teeth whiter than brand Y, instead of bothering to compare all of the brands on the shelf. This consumer is a typical example of a consumer who forms an attitude by the low-involvement hierarchy. The individual does not base the decision by having a strong preference for one brand or another, but instead base the purchase decision on what they know, as opposite to what they feel. After the product has been purchased, the individual evaluates and establishes a feeling about the product. This limited knowledge approach is not appropriate for high-involvement purchases such as a car or a new home (Solomon et al., 2010).

![Figure 2.8 The Low-Involvement Hierarchy (Solomon et al., 2010)](image)

2.3.1.3 The Experiential Hierarchy

The experiential hierarchy is described as an affect-behavior-cognition (ABC) processing order. In the ABC-scenario, the consumer purchasing decision is influenced entirely on the feeling regarding a particular product or service. Cognition appears after the purchase and enforces the initial affect. For example, a consumer feels that a smart phone is pleasurable and fun. The consumer buys the smart phone and then develops an attitude toward the product. Packaging, the brand name and the advertising about the product can all influence the attitudes. The emotional response has in recent years been emphasized of researchers to be a central aspect of an attitude. However, beliefs and behavior are still considered to be the core of an attitude and acknowledged as important in an individuals overall evaluation of the attitude toward an object (Solomon et al., 2010). Solomon et al. (2010) stressed that ‘emotional contagion’ is usual in attitudes formed by the experiential hierarchy. Emotional contagion implies that the consumer is strongly influenced by emotions in the advertisement or product. Several studies (Aylesworth & MacKenzie, 1998: Lee & Sternthal, 1999: Barone, Miniard & Romeo, 2000) imply that the mood a person is in when being exposed to the marketing message influences how the advertisement is perceived and to what extent the information presented will be remembered. This indicates how the consumer will feel about the advertised product in the future.

![Figure 2.9 The Experiential Hierarchy (Solomon et al., 2010)](image)
2.3.2 Cognitive Dissonance

Cognitive dissonance is a phenomenon which occurs when a person has multiple contradictory ideas or feelings simultaneously. The theory of cognitive dissonance states that people have an inner need to reduce the dissonance by changing the attitudes, beliefs and actions. Justifying, blaming and denying things can also reduce the dissonance (Festinger, 1957). According to Brownstein (2003), cognitive dissonance is one of the most influential and researched areas in social psychology. He also argues that there is a cognitive dissonance in each decision-making situation because the selected option always has some negative aspects and each rejected alternative has some positive aspects. A made decision results in a cognitive restructuring in which the selected option will be strengthened, this is referred to as ‘bolstering’. Bolstering is believed to be a prominent example of defensive avoidance as the decision-maker chooses to emphasize the benefits of the option and simultaneously reduce the potential disadvantages associated with it. Bolstering can likewise lead to that the considered non-chosen alternatives have less attractiveness and be associated with greater risks when compared to the selected item (Festinger, 1957).

2.3.3 Criticism Toward the Tri-component Model of Attitudes

Despite the tri-component model's acceptance by various textbook writers (Baron & Byrne, 1977; Kreech, Crutchfield, & Ballachey, 1962; Lambert & Lambert, 1973; Solomon et al., 2010), the model appears not to have an enormous impact on attitude research. The research of attitude and theories developed to understand the attitudinal process of changes sustains to emphasize mainly on affect to the disadvantage of understanding the other characteristics of attitude (Ostrom, 1969). Also, in the 70s, studies proposed that attitudes were only one of many variables that affected behavior. This approach to attitudes was named the other variables approach by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980). Another criticism of the model has focused on uncertainties surrounding the being of strong links between the affective and cognitive components, and the behavioral component (LaPiere, 1934; Wicker, 1969). Wicker (1969) stated the steadiness argument, challenging the previous theory that people possessed unchanging, underlying attitudes that effect behavior. Wicker argued that attitudes only were inadequately related to obvious behavior between attitudes and behavior in the 42 studies examined (Farley & Stasson, 2003).

2.4 Theory of Planned Behavior

The theory of planned behavior is a development of the prior theory of reasoned action by Fishbein and Ajzen (George, 2004). The theory of reasoned action is based on the assumption that people in general are rational and that people systematically use information that are available (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). According to Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), people’s social behaviors are not controlled by overridden desires or unconscious motives. They argue that people reflects over the different implications of their actions in advance, before committing to a decision to engage or not engage in a certain behavior. The goal with the theory of reasoned action is according to Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) to be able to understand and predict an individual’s behavior. Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) describe in the theory of reasoned action that it is the intention of a person that determines the actual behavior; the same applies for the theory of planned behavior according to George (2004).

According to the theory of reasoned action, there are two factors that determine a person’s intention. The first is the attitude toward the behavior and the second is the subjective
norm (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). The theory of planned behavior however increases the number of factors that influence the intention from two to three, adding the perceived behavioral control as a third factor that influence the intention of a person (Ainsworth, 2006). The figure below illustrates an overview of Ajzen and Fishbein’s (1980) theory of planned behavior.

![Diagram of Theory of Planned Behavior](image)

Figure 2.10 Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991)

It is necessary to look at each factor in-depth in order to explain the theory of planned behavior. The following five components of the theory will be explained in detail: Attitudes, Subjective Norm, Perceived Behavioral Control, Intentions and Behavior. How the theory explains the connections between the five factors as well as examples on research where the theory of planned behavior has previously been successfully applied will be provided.

### 2.4.1 Attitudes

An attitude is a very complex term that is somewhat complicated to define. Below are two different definitions of attitudes presented:

‘An attitude is a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given object’ (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1975, p. 6)

Or

‘An attitude represents an evaluative integration of cognitions and affects experienced in relation to an object. Attitudes are the evaluative judgments that integrate and summarize these cognitive/affective reactions. These evaluative abstractions vary in strength, which in turn has implications for persistence, resistance and attitude-behavior consistency’ (Crano & Prislin, 2008, p. 3)

An attitude has, according to Ajzen and Fishbein (1975), three basic features: They are consistently positive or negative toward an object, they are predispositions and they are also learned. Additionally, a person’s attitude toward an object whether it is positive or negative is usually very rapidly decided before the person have thought it through; this is the reason why attitudes are extremely efficient, adaptive as well as flexible (Crano & Prislin, 2008). A person can have attitudes about everything but the theory of planned
behavior focuses on attitudes toward a behavior (Crano & Prislin, 2008). An attitude toward a behavior is determined by the beliefs a person has about what outcome the behavior will lead to in the end. These beliefs are based on an evaluation of the outcomes a person develops and whether the outcomes are mostly positive or negative (Ainsworth, 2006). According to Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), a person could have a great number of different beliefs about a certain object, however the person would only ‘use’ a small number of them at any given moment. It is these ‘any given moment beliefs’ that according to the theory of planned behavior are the determinants of a person’s attitude. The beliefs that determine people’s attitudes are called behavioral beliefs, according to Ajzen and Fishbein (1980).

### 2.4.2 Subjective Norms

A subjective norm in this context can be defined as following, according to Ajzen and Fishbein (1975):

*‘The subjective norm is the persons perceptions that most people who are important to him think he should or should not perform the behavior in question’* (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1975, p. 302)

‘The important people’ stated by Ajzen and Fishbein (1975) creates the subjective norms a person has. This could for example be: friends, family, co-workers, etc. (Ainsworth, 2006). According to the theory of planned behavior, the forming of a subjective norm is depending on a person’s beliefs, which also applies for the shaping of attitudes (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). The beliefs that affect the subjective norms a person has are called normative beliefs, according to Ajzen and Fishbein (1980). Normative beliefs are similar to subjective norms; the difference is that normative beliefs contain specific groups or people unlike subjective norms that are generalizable to most people or groups of importance to the individual. A person may have a lot of different beliefs, but only the normative beliefs’ will influence the subjective norm according to the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

### 2.4.3 Perceived Behavioral Control

The perceived behavioral control is the third factor added to theory of planned behavior that was not included in the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen, 1991). According to Ainsworth (2006) the perceived behavioral control is an individual person’s perception about how easy or hard it is for the person to adopt a certain behavior. This component is a reflection of prior experiences as well as how the person anticipates obstacles with a certain behavior (Ainsworth, 2006). The perceived behavioral control people feel could, according to Ajzen (1991), differ a lot depending on certain behaviors or situations. According to Ajzen (1991), there is a set of beliefs affecting the perceived behavioral. These types of beliefs are called control beliefs.

### 2.4.4 Factors Affecting Beliefs

Attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control are affected by the beliefs a person has (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980, Ajzen, 1991). These beliefs are grouped into behavioral, normative and control beliefs and according to the theory of planned behavior, these could be affected by many different variables that, according to Ajzen (2005), are called background factors. The background factors are divided into three categories: the personal, the social and the informational category. Furthermore, Ajzen (2005) states that because these background factors could affect the different types of beliefs a person might have, it is not a given connection between the background factors and a person’s beliefs.
2.4.5 Behavioral Intention

Ajzen and Fishbein (1975) explain behavioral intention as an individual’s subjective possibility to act in a certain behavior. According to the theory of planned behavior, a person’s intention to act in a specific way is determined by the attitude, subjective norm as well as the perceived behavioral control as together can be called motivational factors (George, 2004). When it comes to behavioral intention, a general rule according to Ajzen (1991) is that the stronger the intention a person has to behave in a certain manner, the more likely it is that so will be the case. Ajzen (1991) further explains the importance to understand that a behavioral intention is being expressed as a behavior only if it is under volitional control, which means that a person is free to choose if the behavior should be performed or not. There can be several ‘non-motivational factors’ that influence the behavior; such as resources (time, skills, money, etc.) or simply that it is not possible to act in a certain way. It is the motivational and non-motivational factors that symbolize a person’s definite control over the behavior (Ajzen, 1991).

2.4.6 Behavior

Behavior or how a person actually behaves is, according to the theory of planned behavior, the result of an evaluation of attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control, which can be summarized in an intention that will lead to a person’s actual behavior (Ajzen, 2005). The theory of planned behavior strictly focuses on the behavior as a result influenced by the intentions a person has, even though there are, as previously mentioned, other non-motivational factors that could play a vital role for the behavior of a person (Ajzen, 1991). Illustrated below is a more detailed figure of the theory of planned behavior.

![Diagram of Theory of Planned Behavior](image)

Figure 2.11 Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 2005)

It is important to comprehend that the theory of planned behavior is a general theory, which means that it does not mention which intentions, attitudes, subjective norms, etc., are connected to which type of behavior (Ajzen, 2005). However, the theory of planned behavior do describe that there is a connection between the different components.
To summarize the different factors that affect a person’s behavior, the theory begins by explaining various types of background factors a person holds. These different types of factors affect the behavioral, normative and control beliefs a person develops. The behavioral beliefs a person has affect the attitudes toward the behavior that the person develops, and the normative beliefs a person has affect the subjective norm of that person. Last are the control beliefs, which affect the perceived behavioral control of an individual. The perceived behavioral control together with subjective norms and attitudes toward a behavior then constructs the intention a person has to act in a certain behavior, and that intention together with non-motivational factors leads to the actual behavior of a person (Ajzen, 2005).

The theory of planned behavior has been used in several studies regarding behavior in many different types of contexts; George (2004) conducted a study where the theory of planned behavior was applied to understand behavior regarding Internet purchasing. Another research is Ainsworth (2006), who used the theory as a method to apprehend retail employee thefts; these are two examples of when the theory of planned behavior is used as a theoretical framework.

2.5 Integration of Theories

The theories presented in this chapter have been used to construct the questionnaire to be able to capture the attitudes and behaviors of the decision-makers. Because of the complexity of revealing attitudes, the main focus in the analysis of this thesis has been on the tri-component model since it apprehends every part of an attitude (Solomon et al., 2010). The theories: ‘A(\text{\text{att}})’ and ‘Planned Behavior’ is mainly used to connect attitudes with behaviors, and Micheaux’s (2011) theory of perceived pressure is used to comprehend the decision-makers’ perceived pressure regarding E-mail marketing messages.
3 Methodology

In this chapter the authors presents and argues for the choice of quantitative methods. The chapter provides a description of the various scientific techniques used, such as survey design, population and sample, analyzing methods and finally concepts of validity, reliability and generalizability are discussed.

3.1 Research Design

Due to the purpose, the design of this study is an exploratory research design. The objectives of an exploratory design are to give insights as well as understandings in the field of interest. Obtaining the background information needed to increase the knowledge of the problem area fulfills the objectives of an exploratory research design according to Malholtra and Birks (2007). Furthermore, Malholtra and Birks (2007) mention that the exploratory research design is used to reveal attitudes, beliefs, behavior patterns as well as opinions regarding a certain topic to get an overview over how these are structured. However, the study will also require some descriptive research qualities, which are included within the conclusive research design.

The nature of the study is thus quantitative as the interest of this study involves data collection that makes it possible to generalize the results of the study to the population examined. When there is a desire to generalize or to conduct a cross-section in order to make comparisons, or to find connections between different phenomena, quantitative methods are useful according to Holme and Solvang (1997). Quantitative methods are also suitable when striving for a full understanding of a phenomenon or to comprehend different social processes (Holme & Solvang, 1997).

3.2 Survey

3.2.1 Structure

The data was collected through a structured data collection method. This method is described by Malholtra and Birks (2007) as a questionnaire in which the questions are arranged and prepared in a predetermined order. All questions in the survey where fixed-response alternative questions, this because it simplifies the coding, analysis and interpretation of the collected data (Malholtra & Birks, 2007). Each question was carefully designed and selected to ensure the relevancy of the purpose, and the wording of the questions was ordinary so the respondents could understand and answer them. The survey was structured in a way makes it easy for the respondents to complete the questionnaire, this to overcome unwillingness to answer from the respondent’s side and to obtain high response rate.
### 3.2.2 Operationalization of the Questionnaire

Table 3.1 Operationalization Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A decision-maker should read all received E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No E-mail marketing message should be deleted unread</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E-mail marketing messages affect decision-makers</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>E-mail marketing helps decision-makers to make better decisions</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E-mail marketing messages contribute to the company’s development</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I believe that E-mail marketing adds value for a company</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I feel that E-mail marketing messages makes decision-making easier</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I feel that E-mail marketing messages are credible</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I think E-mail marketing messages are a waste of time</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I think E-mail marketing messages is a good way of receiving information</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I think that decision-makers receive too many E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Receiving E-mail marketing messages is annoying</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Perceived pressure, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>E-mail marketing messages provides me/the company with good offers</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Perceived pressure, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>It is stressful to read too many E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Perceived pressure, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>E-mail marketing messages are interesting to read</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Perceived pressure, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>It is fun to read E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Perceived pressure, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>It is rewarding to read E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes, Perceived pressure, Planned Behavior &amp; A(ad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I always open the E-mail marketing messages I receive</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes &amp; Planned Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I never delete unread E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes &amp; Planned Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Marketing messages I have received have helped me making decisions</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes &amp; Planned Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>To what extent do the following affect you when choosing if to open an E-mail marketing message or not?</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes &amp; Planned Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>How often do you check your E-mail during work hours?</td>
<td>Tri-Component model of attitudes &amp; Planned Behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.3 Electronic Survey

The data collection has been conducted with the help of a web-based survey, which was sent out in an E-mail message to the respondents. A web-based survey has the advantages of making it possible to reach a large number of respondents regardless of their geographical location. Another factor that mattered in the choice of data collection method was that E-mail is one of the most inexpensive methods as well as one of the least time consuming ways of conducting a survey of this magnitude (Malholtra & Birks, 2007). In the E-mail that was sent out there was an attached link to the web-based survey. The survey was conducted in Qualtrics, a web-based application to produce online surveys (qualtrics.com, 2012).

3.2.4 Scales

In the survey, the questions had different kinds of scales. The used scales in this survey are nominal scale and Likert scale. According to Malhotra and Birks (2007), a nominal scale is used when numbers only serve as tags or labels for classification and identifying objects. A Likert scale is a type of itemized rating scale where the numbers have descriptions of what they mean attached to them, such as for example number one could be ‘strongly disagree’ and number four could be ‘strongly agree’ (Malhotra & Birks, 2007). The questions with a nominal scale in the survey were questions number 1 to 8 and 30 and the questions with Likert scale where number 9 to 29 (appendix 1).

3.3 Population and Sample

Why decision-makers are chosen as the target group is based on the fact that they have the power to make financial decisions and do business, and are thereby targeted by E-mail marketing messages. Consequently, it is of vital interest to inspect the decision-makers attitudes and behaviors regarding E-mail marketing within the B2B sector.

The authors had an available registry of E-mail addresses to the target group, which did serve as the foundation for the research. This thesis concentrates on the decision-makers within the manufacturing industry in Sweden. To be a part of the population in this study, four criteria needed to be met:

The company must

- have at least 10 employees
- have a turnover which exceeds 10 million SEK
- be a manufacturer
- be established in Sweden

Furthermore, the respondent must

- have a valid E-mail address
- have influence on purchasing decisions
- work within a manufacturing company

A list of 7 896 companies fulfilling the requirements above with a total of 14 020 E-mail addresses was provided to the authors. The companies in the provided list were proportional geographically distributed over Sweden. There are a total of 1 036
787 companies in Sweden, of them 52 256 is manufacturing companies, which accounts for 5% of the total number of companies in Sweden (Ekonomifakta, 2011). The population of this study reaches 15% of the total number of manufacturing companies in Sweden.

A quantitative method is preferred when trying to obtain a generalizable result that is applicable to other groups or conditions. For this to be possible, the researcher must attain a representative sample. Therefore, the authors of this study used a comprehensive record of the elements of the population, also known as a census (Malhotra & Birks, 2007). In other words, the authors sent out the survey to all of the available E-mail addresses in the population. A census is preferred when the sample size is small and the variance in the characteristic of interest is large. The sample size of this survey is reasonably large, however census was used due to the large collection of available data such as names, companies and E-mail addresses to the decision-makers. A common reason that surveys in general have large shortfalls concerning the response rate is that the respondents forget to complete the survey. By sending a reminder to the respondents, the authors minimized the risk that the respondents will forget to answer.

3.3.1 Pilot Testing

The survey was pilot tested before the survey where sent to the respondents of the empirical study. A pilot test is a test of the questionnaire, which is conducted on a small sample of respondents for the reason to improve the questionnaire by identifying and eliminating problems that may be connected to the questionnaire (Malholtra & Birks, 2007). Furthermore, there are different aspects that could be observed when pilot testing a questionnaire such as question content, wording of the questions, form and layout of the questionnaire, question difficulty, and also the instructions for the questionnaire. These above mentioned aspects were observed in the pilot test to ensure fewer random errors in the questionnaire in this thesis. The sample of people in the pilot test were decision-makers similar to the actual respondents of the study, this because of the familiarity of knowledge of the topic. The result of the conducted pilot testing was that some wording where changed as well as some logical issues in the online survey (Malholtra & Birks, 2007).

3.3.2 Response Rate

The survey was sent to 14 020 E-mail addresses, and out of them 1 331 ‘bounced back’. If an E-mail ‘bounced back’ it means that it could not be delivered to the receiver; the survey was, in the end, consequently send to 12 689 people. Out of these 12 689 people, 2 087 responded on the survey, which provided a response rate of approximately 16.5%. Malholtra and Birks (2007) mention that E-mail surveys generally have a response rate fewer than 15 per cent. As this survey had a response rate above the general average and a relatively sizeable number of respondents the authors of this paper find the response rate satisfactory.

3.4 Analysis

3.4.1 Univariate Technique

The univariate technique is preferred for analyzing data with a single measurement of each component in the sample. The reason for using univariate analyzes is to describe and apprehend an image of how the distribution of a specific variable looks like (Malholtra &
Birks, 2007). In this paper, descriptive univariate analyzes was used to acquire values such as mean, standard deviation, and variance.

### 3.4.2 Multivariate Technique

Multivariate techniques are preferred when analyzing data with two or more measurement of each element and when the variables are analyzed simultaneously.

#### 3.4.2.1 Anova

Anova is a statistical model for analysis of variance and is used to compare mean values in more than two groups. ANOVA examines the hypothesis that all means are equal. The test indicates 95% certainty since the analyses are testing all of the averages mean values at the same time. If the ANOVA result is significant, one can be 95% confident that at least one of the means fluctuates from the others in a way that is not due to chance. To determine which mean value that stands out one needs to further analyze the data with a post-hoc test (Malholtra & Birks, 2007). After a significant result is established, a post-hoc test was conducted in order to further analyze the questions from the ANOVA test. There are many different types of post-hoc tests based on different purposes, the authors of this study used Tukey’s post-hoc test because of the flexibilities and easy calculated techniques (Pallant, 2011).

#### 3.4.2.2 Factor

Factor analysis is useful when suspecting that several underlying factors affect several of the dependent variables. The researcher can by looking at the relationship between different variables distinguish any underlying factors. If factors are detected, the researcher can examine the factors in detail instead of analyzing every individual factor (Pallant, 2011). By doing so, factor analysis thus seeks to discover suppressed and unobserved variables, based on analysis of the observed variables. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test within the factor analysis is used to measure the sampling adequacy, which should be 0.5 or more to be satisfactory. A satisfactory value indicates that a factor analysis is appropriate to use. The Bartlett’s test of sphericity is a test used to inspect the hypothesis that the variables are uncorrelated in the population. This means that the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix, every variable correlates perfectly with itself but do not correlate with the other variables. The Bartlett’s is significant if the associated probability is less than 0.05 (Malholtra & Birks, 2007).

#### 3.4.2.3 Linear Regression

The purpose of regression analysis is to present the effect of one variable (the independent variable) on another (the dependent variable). In this thesis a bivariate analysis is used, a bivariate analysis included only two variables, an independent variable and a dependent variable (Malholtra & Birks, 2007).

### 3.4.3 Cleaning the Data

To be able to conduct a proper analysis of the data it must be cleaned (Malholtra & Birks, 2007). Due to the high response rate of the online survey, the authors made the choice of using a method where all uncompleted responses were deleted to increase the quality of the data used in the analysis (Malholtra & Birks, 2007). Also the responses where the respondent answered that he or she did not work within the manufacturing industry were removed. Of the total 2 087 responses that were recorded, 193 were removed because they
did not complete the survey and another 110 were removed because the respondent did not work within the manufacturing industry. Additionally 7 were removed because they did not have influence on decisions at the company. The number of remaining responses that was used in the analysis was 1 777.

3.5 Quality of Data

Reliability and validity may at first seem to be synonymous with each other, but the fact is that they hold very different meanings in the assessment of measures of different concepts (Bryman 2009).

3.5.1 Validity

Validity is a measure of quality, involving whether a research approach reflects the reality, i.e. validity refers to a study’s capability to measure what it was intended to measure (Malhotra & Birks, 2007).

’Validity is an integrated evaluative judgment of the degree to which empirical evidence and theoretical rationales support the adequacy and appropriateness of interpretations and actions based on test scores or other modes of assessment’ Messick (1990, p. 1).

Internal validity means that new research must be consistent with theories in the same area. The external validity can be explained as whether the results of a study can be used in other situations. Respondents in a focus group or questionnaire may act differently from the inherent since they know they are participating in a study (Bryman & Bell, 2009). This paper is of an exploratory nature because of lack of information and knowledge in the area. However, since the authors use already existing and well-known theories in the study, both internal and external aspects of validity are taken into consideration. Furthermore, the survey was significantly checked by means of pilot testing that included a thorough analysis of ‘[…] question content, wording, sequence, form and layout, question difficulty, and instructions’ (Malhotra & Birks, 2007, p. 391).

3.5.2 Reliability

According to Bryman (2009) reliability deals with coherence, consistency and dependability of a measure of the concept. This questions whether the measurement is made correctly and if the study produces the same results if it is performed again. It is important to examine the reliability critical in terms of collection method. Accuracy and reliability illustrates how well an approach gives the same result on different occasions, provided the same prerequisite as a whole (Bryman & Bell, 2005). This proves that a study with high reliability can be considered to have high authenticity and credibleness (Patel & Davidson, 1994). This study is based on primary data, which means that the information is collected through surveys. One advantage of primary data collection is that the data is objective and unbiased. The authors of this study consider the reliability as satisfying since the survey has predefined questions with fixed response options, which results in a simplicity to repeat the survey. Pilot testing has also been implemented to minimize measurement errors, or misconstrued questions. The Cronbach’s alpha implies the average correlation between the items used (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). Moreover, the value of the Cronbach’s alpha should exceed 0.60 for the reliability to be acceptable (Malhotra & Birks, 2007). In this study, the values of the Cronbach’s alpha are present in the result and analysis and specified if significant or not.
3.5.3 Generalizability

Studies’ generalizability describes how well the results apply to other objects than those being practiced in the survey (Patel & Davidsson, 1994). However, it is important to remember that the result the authors have retrieved only is generalizable to the population from which being previously stated (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Thus, results from this study cannot be generalized to other branches or industries. This because a total sample or census with an entire population was chosen, which includes all decision-makers within the manufacturing industry in the sample. Furthermore, no results from this study are generalizable to apply to decision-makers in different branches in Sweden, depending on the behavior, attitudes, and cultures may be specific to each individual branch. By contrast, the method used to determine the attitudes and behaviors for E-mail marketing can be used in populations other than the chosen to investigate. This would mean that comparable results for various branches are given.

3.6 Summary Table of Methodology

Table 3.2 Summary of Methodology Chapter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Quantitative Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Method</td>
<td>Electronic Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Format</td>
<td>Exploratory Research Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Method</td>
<td>Structured Data Collection Method with Primary Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Decision-makers within the Swedish manufactur-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ing industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Method</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Techniques</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>14 020 Respondents / 7 896 companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total number of Manufac-</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turing Companies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Instruments</td>
<td>Qualtrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>SPSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>16.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses after Cleaning the Data</td>
<td>1 777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Empirical Findings

In this chapter, the empirical findings retrieved from the survey are presented to the reader.

4.1 Gender of Respondents

![Gender of Respondents](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1 Gender of Respondents

Only 7.7% of the respondents were females and 92.3% were males. The authors have, because of the large variance, not conducted further analyzes based on the gender of the respondents.

4.2 Age of Respondents

![Age of Respondents](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39 years</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49 years</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59 years</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 69 years</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 years or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2 Age of Respondents

The majority of the respondents (68.4%) were between 40 to 59 years old. Only one respondent was over 70 years old, and because of this, the authors decided to merge the two groups: ‘60-69 years old’ and ‘70 years or more’ in further analysis.
4.3 Highest Finished Education of Respondents

Figure 4.3 Highest Finished Educations of Respondents

Approximately 40% has a High School education and 34% has 3 years or more of studies at University level.

4.4 What of the Following Industries Match the Company’s Branch

Figure 4.4 Company Industry

The engineering industry was the largest branch containing 46.1% of the respondents. The 8 other industries were evenly distributed between 7.8% and 1.7%. The category of remaining or other industries accounted for 15.3%.
4.5 How Many Employees are There in the Companies

Out of the 1,777 respondents, 37.4% refer to small sized companies, while 35.8% account as medium sized companies and the remaining 26.8% belong to large-sized companies. The definitions of small, medium and large-sized companies used in this thesis are defined in EU law: EU recommendation 2003/361 (EU, 2012).

4.6 Current Position in the Company

The majority of the answers correspond to ‘Owner, Partner or CEO’ (32.1%). ‘Senior Manager’ account for 27.2%, ‘Middle Managers’ 18.7%, ‘Project leader or similar’ 17.4% and ‘Worker’ for 4.6%. Another question asked was the level of influence in the decision-making process within the company. Respondents without influence in the decision-making process were excluded from the analysis.
### 4.7 How Often do the Respondents Check Their E-mail Account?

A majority of the respondents tend to check the E-mail ‘more often than once every hour’ (30.9 %). Of the 1 777 respondents, 11 % check the E-mail account ‘more often than every 10 minutes’, but only 1.5 % check the E-mail ‘once a day or less’ during the working hours.

### 4.8 Impact of Known Sender, Subject and Time of Receiving Regarding Opening Frequency of E-mail Marketing Messages
The results from this question indicate that over 90 % of the respondents answered that a known sender affects the degree of opening. The subject of the E-mail message affects the opening frequency, but not as much as a known sender does. A total of 45.8 % thought that the time of receiving the marketing E-mail message did not have an effect at all, but 28.1 % replied that it still affects to some degree.

4.9 ABC and Actual Behavior

Table 4.1 illustrates the statements provided in the authors’ questionnaire, the respondents’ answers in percent as well as the mean value and standard deviation to each statement. Three statements was negatively phrased, hence were recoded prior to any analysis being conducted. The statements are divided into four dimensions represent the respondents: affect, behavior, cognition and actual behavior toward E-mail marketing (table 4.1).

For most of the statements, a major part of the 1777 respondents did not agree with what was stated. The mean value for a majority of the statements is below 2, which are closer to ‘totally disagreeing’ than to ‘totally agreeing’. The statement with the highest mean value accounted for 2.54 and the statement that with the lowest mean value accounted for 1.54 (table 4.1).

Initially reliability was determined for all the statements. Initial reliability testing indicated that the statement ‘I receive too many E-mails’ should be removed, which resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.91 for the items in the questionnaire. It does not appear in table 4.1 as it was not used in further analysis. A Cronbach’s alpha was also determined for the various components in the study (table 3.1). The Cronbach’s alpha for each dimension exceeds 0.6, which is regarded as satisfactory reliability (Malhotra & Birks, 2007). The specific Cronbach’s alpha for each dimension is found in table 4.1.
Table 4.1 Descriptive Results of ABC and Actual Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 - Totally disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 - Totally agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A decision-maker should read all received E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>59,0%</td>
<td>30,3%</td>
<td>8,7%</td>
<td>2,0%</td>
<td>1,54</td>
<td>0,738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No E-mail marketing message should be deleted unread</td>
<td>57,2%</td>
<td>28,9%</td>
<td>10,8%</td>
<td>3,1%</td>
<td>1,60</td>
<td>0,802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E-mail marketing messages affect decision-makers</td>
<td>19,2%</td>
<td>57,9%</td>
<td>21,4%</td>
<td>1,9%</td>
<td>2,06</td>
<td>0,691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>E-mail marketing helps decision-makers to make better decisions</td>
<td>32,7%</td>
<td>54,1%</td>
<td>12,3%</td>
<td>0,9%</td>
<td>1,81</td>
<td>0,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E-mail marketing messages contribute to the company's development</td>
<td>28,2%</td>
<td>55,3%</td>
<td>15,4%</td>
<td>1,1%</td>
<td>1,89</td>
<td>0,686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I believe that E-mail marketing adds value for a company</td>
<td>24,3%</td>
<td>56,7%</td>
<td>18,0%</td>
<td>1,0%</td>
<td>1,96</td>
<td>0,678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I feel that E-mail marketing messages make decision-making easier</td>
<td>45,4%</td>
<td>45,8%</td>
<td>8,6%</td>
<td>0,2%</td>
<td>1,64</td>
<td>0,645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I feel that E-mail marketing messages are credible</td>
<td>27,2%</td>
<td>51,3%</td>
<td>20,9%</td>
<td>0,6%</td>
<td>1,95</td>
<td>0,708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I think E-mail marketing messages are a waste of time (reversed)</td>
<td>18,7%</td>
<td>37,9%</td>
<td>32,3%</td>
<td>11,5%</td>
<td>2,37</td>
<td>0,915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I think E-mail marketing messages are a good way of receiving information</td>
<td>22,3%</td>
<td>46,8%</td>
<td>27,5%</td>
<td>3,4%</td>
<td>2,12</td>
<td>0,788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Receiving E-mail marketing messages is annoying (reversed)</td>
<td>28,2%</td>
<td>43,4%</td>
<td>22,8%</td>
<td>5,6%</td>
<td>2,06</td>
<td>0,856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>E-mail marketing messages provides me/the company with good offers</td>
<td>26,6%</td>
<td>59,1%</td>
<td>13,8%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>1,88</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>It is stressful to read too many E-mail marketing messages (reversed)</td>
<td>14,4%</td>
<td>34,3%</td>
<td>33,9%</td>
<td>17,4%</td>
<td>2,54</td>
<td>0,941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>E-mail marketing messages are interesting to read</td>
<td>31,3%</td>
<td>55,7%</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>1,82</td>
<td>0,654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>It is fun to read E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>42,5%</td>
<td>49,1%</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
<td>1,66</td>
<td>0,635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>It is rewarding to read E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>33,6%</td>
<td>54,0%</td>
<td>11,9%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>1,79</td>
<td>0,658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I always open the E-mail marketing messages I receive</td>
<td>51,7%</td>
<td>27,2%</td>
<td>15,1%</td>
<td>6,0%</td>
<td>1,75</td>
<td>0,92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I never delete unread E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>62,7%</td>
<td>20,7%</td>
<td>10,2%</td>
<td>6,4%</td>
<td>1,60</td>
<td>0,909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Marketing messages I have received have helped me making decisions</td>
<td>42,3%</td>
<td>45,5%</td>
<td>11,4%</td>
<td>0,8%</td>
<td>1,71</td>
<td>0,697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Analysis of results

This chapter presents thorough analysis of the empirical data together with appropriate theories from the theoretical framework. A conclusive analysis is conducted in the end of this chapter.

5.1 Total ABC and Actual Behavior

In this analysis, the authors have divided the statements into four groups: affect, behavior, cognition and actual behavior. The statements connected to the different groups as illustrated in table 4.1 have been combined into total variables; total affect, total behavior, total cognition and total actual behavior. A variable called total ABC has also been constructed combining the total affect, total behavior and total cognition variables into one variable. For the total variables the score of each statement included are combined, giving the respondents a total score on that specific total variable. The authors have divided the respondents into three groups within the total variables: negative respondents with a mean score of two or less, neutral respondents with a mean score between two and three and the positive respondents with a mean score of three or more. A Cronbach’s alpha test was conducted on each total variable in order to make sure that the total variables are reliable, which is illustrated in table 4.1.

Table 5.1 Total Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total Std.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11 - 14</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>15 &lt;</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maximum of 20 (5 statements * 4 points)

The respondents’ opinions on how a decision-maker should behave toward received E-mail marketing were strongly negative, meaning that they disagreed to the statements provided. 74.6% had a total score of < 10, which can be interpreted as a negative opinion regarding how decision-makers should behave toward E-mail marketing, while only 3% had a total score of 15 or above (table 5.1).

Table 5.2 Total Cognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total Std.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11 - 14</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>15 &lt;</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maximum of 20 (5 statements * 4 points)

The respondents’ cognitions of E-mail marketing were slightly less negative than the affect and behavior, but still more than 50% of the respondents had a negative opinion of E-mail marketing (table 5.2).
Table 5.3 Total Affect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total Std.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>&lt; 12</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13 - 17</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>18 &lt;</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maximum of 24 (6 statements * 4 points)

For the total affect, the respondents were mostly negative, as the majority of the respondents had a total score of < 12. Only 3.9 % had a positive affect about E-mail marketing, while almost 60 % had a negative affect regarding E-mail marketing (table 5.3).

Table 5.4 Total ABC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total Std.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>&lt; 32</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>33 - 47</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>48 &lt;</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>50.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maximum of 64 (16 statements * 4 points)

When combining the total affect, total behavior and total cognition the respondents total ABC (attitude) could be derived illustrated in figure 4.12. The respondents total ABC was also mostly negative or neutral, only 1.6 % of the respondents was located in the positive group (table 5.4).

Table 5.5 Total Actual Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Total Std.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>&lt; 6</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7 - 8</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8 &lt;</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maximum of 12 (3 statements * 4 points)

Those who were negative or disagreeing with the statements provided also heavily represented the respondents total actual behavior based on three statements. Almost 80 % had a negative total actual behavior while only 6.4 % had a positive actual behavior (table 5.5).

### 5.2 Anova Analysis: Age and Current Position

A one-way Anova analysis of variance was conducted to analyze the impact of age on the total score of ABC and Actual Behavior. The authors found a significant difference (p=0.021) in age between age group 40-49 and 50-59 with a mean difference of 1.3 and also a significant difference (p=0.000) between the age group 40-49 and 60 < with a mean
difference of 2.6 (table 5.6, 5.7). The 60 + group fell just within the scale of neutral attitude, which differs from the other age groups that fell in the negative attitude group. There was no significant difference in the total actual behavior between the age groups (table 5.6, 5.7).

Table 5.6 Anova Analysis of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total ABC Mean</th>
<th>Total ABC Std. D</th>
<th>Total Actual Behavior Mean</th>
<th>Total Actual Behavior Std. D</th>
<th>Anova Sig.</th>
<th>Anova Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 29</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>30.97</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>29.77</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>31.09</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 &lt;</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 Aggregated Multiple Comparisons of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total ABC Tukey HSD</th>
<th>(I) Recode Age</th>
<th>(J) Recode Age</th>
<th>(I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>-1,323</td>
<td>0,436</td>
<td>0,021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>60 &lt;</td>
<td>-2,561</td>
<td>0,597</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By conducting an Anova test on the respondents’ current job position, the authors discovered a significant difference (p=0.000) between the level of position and both the attitude and the actual behavior toward E-mail marketing messages, as can be seen in figure 5.8. The higher the management position at the company, the more negative their attitudes about marketing messages by E-mail are. Higher level of management people also opens less messages and more often delete unread messages as well as find that E-mail marketing messages have not helped them in their work as often as lower managers or workers believe. The mean score for workers is above the limit, meaning workers have a neutral attitude, while the other groups with a mean score less than 32 have a negative attitude toward E-mail marketing messages. In case of actual behavior, one of the most interesting discoveries is that workers have a negative actual behavior (5.74) but a neutral attitude toward E-mail marketing messages. However, the score is close to the boundary between the two groups and the standard deviation is moderately high and accounts for 2.13 (table 5.8, 5.9).

Table 5.8 Anova Analysis of Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Total ABC Mean</th>
<th>Total ABC Std. D</th>
<th>Total Actual Behavior Mean</th>
<th>Total Actual Behavior Std. D</th>
<th>Anova Sig.</th>
<th>Anova Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner, CEO etc.</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>30.09</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Manager</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project leader etc.</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>33.61</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.9 Aggregated Multiple Comparisons of Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregated Multiple Comparisons</th>
<th>Total ABC Tukey HSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I) Current position</td>
<td>(J) Current position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner, CEO etc.</td>
<td>Project leader etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner, CEO etc.</td>
<td>Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>Project leader etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Manager</td>
<td>Project leader etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Manager</td>
<td>Worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3  Associations Between Total ABC and Total Actual Behavior

![Figure 5.1 Regression Analysis of Total ABC and Total Actual Behavior](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linear regression summary</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>5.95711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Total Actual Behavior</th>
<th>Total ABC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Actual Behavior</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ABC</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an association between total ABC and total actual behavior illustrated in figure 5.1. When analyzing the total actual behavior as independent variable and the total ABC as dependent variable, the association displayed a strong significance (p=0.000) and a correlation of 0.614 (figure 5.1). This denotes that the higher score on total actual behavior, the more positive attitude the respondents also have toward E-mail marketing (figure 5.1).
5.4 Factor Analysis ABC

The 19 assertions from the questionnaire were identified in three different factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and thus of interest to this analysis. The factors explained 57.3% of the total variance, this is in the low end since an accepted valid value is usually estimated from approximately 60% (Malholtra & Birks, 2007). The authors discovered a number of cross loadings in ‘Rotated Component Matrix’, figure 5.11. In these cases the loadings with the highest value was selected and loadings with the lower values were excluded. By analyzing the different factors the authors discovered an interpretable pattern of loadings and the factors were then named according to their utilitarian content. Loadings that correspond perfectly should be close to 1, therefore variables with higher loadings was given a more important role in naming the factors. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was .94, well above the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970; 1974) and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) also reached statistical significance (sig. 0.000), which is desirable due to the factorability of the correlation matrix.

Table 5.10 Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Total Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.912</td>
<td>41.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>8.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>6.715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.1 Component 1 – Positive Attributes

Component 1 contributing 41.6% of the variance as can be seen in figure 4.11. The Cronbach’s alpha indicates a satisfied reliability with a value of .92. The lowest recommended value is 0.6 stated by Malhotra and Birks (2007). The high alpha score indicates that the 12 items that constitute the scale highly correlate with each other. The allegations contained in factor 1 are the optimistic and positive believe whether or not there is a value with marketing messages by E-mail.

5.4.2 Component 2 – Behavior and Actual Behavior

Component 2 contributing 9% of the variance and the Cronbach’s alpha score of 0.78 is acceptable. The underlying variables in this factor are the importance or unimportance of opening, reading and deleting marketing messages by E-mail. What is particularly interesting is that the respondents’ perception of behavior also correlates with their actual behavior (figure 5.1). The respondents that think decision-makers should read all received marketing E-mail messages also try to do it themselves.

5.4.3 Component 3 - Negative Attributes

Component 3 contributing 6.7% of the variance with a Cronbach’s alpha score of 0.64. The three attributes: stressful, annoying and waste of time are related to each other. By examine these three attributes, the authors can analyze and establish the respondents negative attributes of E-mail marketing messages.
Table 5.11 Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4. E-mail marketing helps decision-makers to make better decisions</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. E-mail marketing messages contribute to the company’s development</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. I believe that E-mail marketing adds value for a company</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. E-mail marketing messages affect decision-makers</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. I feel that E-mail marketing messages makes decision-making easier</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. Marketing messages I have received have helped me making decisions</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. E-mail marketing messages provides me/the company with good offers</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14. E-mail marketing messages are interesting to read</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16. It is rewarding to read E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. I think E-mail marketing messages is a good way of receiving information</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15. It is fun to read E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. I feel that E-mail marketing messages are credible</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18. I never delete unread E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. No E-mail marketing message should be deleted unread</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. A decision-maker should read all received E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17. I always open the E-mail marketing messages I receive</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13. It is stressful to read too many E-mail marketing messages</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. Receiving E-mail marketing messages is annoying</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. I think E-mail marketing messages are a waste of time</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Conclusive Analysis

As previously stated, the questionnaires used in this study was divided into five different parts: demographics, behaviors, cognitions, affects, and actual behaviors. As Rosenberg and Hovland (1960) argued in the tri-component theory, an attitude consists of behavior, cognition and affect and must be measured to be able to comprehend the attitude of an object. Therefore, by computing these three groups of questions, a new variable of total ABC was conducted. The total ABC (table 5.4) can thus be considered as a comprehensive variable that explains and describes the respondents’ total attitude toward E-mail marketing messages. The table 5.4 clearly indicates that most of the decision-makers (59.4 %) have a negative attitude toward E-mail marketing and only 1.6 % have a positive attitude. This result also indicates that the decision-makers have an unexcited and halfhearted interest of E-mail marketing messages, which implies that a low-involvement hierarchy best describes their direction to an attitude. Decision-makers base their attitude whether or not to open E-mail marketing messages on behavioral learning’s. After the E-mail marketing messages are opened, the decision-makers evaluate and establish a feeling about the sender and the brand. The factor analysis also revealed two interesting factors for the attitude. Both the positive factor and the negative factor relate and can be used to establish a direction and intensity of the attitude toward E-mail marketing messages (table 5.11).
The two factors mentioned above support the claim that there exists a perceived E-mail marketing pressure troubling the receiver, just as Micheaux (2011) pointed out. The large frequency of negative total actual behavior, as can be seen in table 5.5, summarizes this phenomenon. Table 4.1 reveals that 51.7% of the respondents does not always open the received messages and 62.7% deletes E-mail marketing messages without reading them. This negative attitudinal behavior also implies a negative attitude toward the E-mail marketing channel in general. Over 90% think that a known sender is important when deciding whether or not to open the messages (figure 4.8). The subject of the E-mail message also affects the decision if the message is relevant and thereby choosing either route b or route c. The analysis of the data regarding Micheaux’s (2011) theory was as expected and confirmed the theory of perceived E-mail marketing pressure. Thus, the analysis raised new questions about the elaboration of the content in the E-mail marketing messages, as this issue could not be analyzed by the questions asked in the survey.

The attitudes of the respondents on the subject of E-mail marketing, could be seen in the light of the A(_ω) theory. This thesis tries to illustrate decision-makers’ attitudes toward E-mail marketing as a method for advertising products or services. The respondents’ attitudes toward E-mail marketing are highly represented by those who either have a negative attitude or a neutral attitude toward E-mail marketing (table, 5.4). The attitudes toward E-mail marketing differed slightly between the different age groups and the different positions at the company, but the groups were still either negative or neutral toward it (table 5.6, 5.8). The most reasonable interpretation for this is that, a decision-maker holds a negative attitude toward the E-mail marketing method, which influences the forming of the attitude towards the specific E-mail marketing message. A(_ω) describes that the attitude toward an advertisement affects the intention to act. The result illustrates that decision-makers in the Swedish manufacturing industry mostly have negative attitudes toward E-mail marketing, which could affect their attitude toward the advertisement sent by E-mail, and even affect their intention to act. There are different models in the A(_ω) theory and even though they differ, all illustrates the attitude a decision-maker have toward an E-mail marketing messages affect their intention to act.

According to the theory of planned behavior, a person’s behavior is affected by the person’s intention to act (Ajzen, 2005). The theory also states that the intention to act is based on the sum of aspects affecting the actual behavior (figure 2.10). There are motivational factors that affect the intentions and in this study it is the attitudes toward the behaviors that is analyzed. The decision-makers’ attitudes are in this study mostly negative, which could lead to a negative or insignificant intention to act regarding E-mail marketing message, according to the theory of planned behavior (table 5.4). The concluded results of the analysis of the actual behavior and the attitude showed that the majority of the respondents both have a negative attitude as well as a negative actual behavior toward E-mail marketing (table 5.5). The behaviors the respondents possess also correspond on how the respondents think a decision-maker should behave toward E-mail marketing, according to the factor analysis conducted (table 5.11). A majority of the respondents do not open all E-mail marketing messages they receive and they also delete E-mail marketing messages without reading them (table 4.1). Furthermore, only 12.2% of the respondents fully or partially agreed that E-mail marketing messages have helped them with making decisions in various matters (table 4.1). Thus, the attitudes the respondent have toward E-mail marketing reflects on how they actually behave toward it. Although there could be additional motivational factors that affect the intention and, later on, the behavior, the result from this study illustrates that the negative attitudes in some way are connected to the negative behavior (figure 5.1). As the theory of planned behavior explains, the attitude
affects the intention, which subsequently affects the behavior. The Anova analysis illustrates that both the respondents’ attitude and actual behavior differs depending on the position they belong to, the higher position at the company the respondent had, the more negative attitude and actual behavior toward E-mail marketing they possessed (table 5.8).

The differences in the results of behavior, cognition and affect stress the fact that the decision-makers are experiencing some levels of cognitive dissonance and bolstering (Festinger, 1957). The decision-makers hold more than one cognition, which are psychologically inconsistent. They know that some marketing E-mail messages could add value and be helpful within a decision-making process. One could read all marketing E-mail messages or one could ignore or refuse the link to a successful decision-making process. What the authors could entail of the result is that the majority of the decision-makers choose to ignore the positive aspects of E-mail marketing to justify their behavior to not read all E-mail marketing messages and thereby to reduce their cognitive dissonance.
6 Conclusions

In this chapter the conclusions drawn from the analysis chapter is presented together with a discussion, managerial implications and suggestions for further research.

A majority of the decision-makers in the manufacturing industry in Sweden check their E-mail more than once every three hours, however this does not mean that they read or even open all of the messages. A large proportion of the decision-makers delete unread E-mail marketing messages and they do not find them useful in a decision-making process. The decision-makers’ choice whether to open an E-mail marketing message or not is affected by the subject of the message and if it is from a known sender or not. A majority of the decision-makers behave in a negative manner toward E-mail marketing; however there is a difference depending on the decision-makers’ position in the company. A higher position tends to result in more negative behaviors toward E-mail marketing in general. An interesting finding from the analysis also revealed that the decision-makers’ perception of how a decision-maker in general should behave toward E-mail marketing corresponds to how they actually behave.

Another finding from this thesis is that a majority of the decision-makers have a negative attitude toward E-mail marketing messages. However, there is a grey area with a large proportion of decision-makers with a neutral and undecided attitude, but very few with a positive attitude. The analyses also indicate that both age of the decision-makers and position in the company affect the attitude toward E-mail marketing messages. Older decision-makers tend to have a more negative attitude and senior managers with more influence in the decision-making process also have a more negative attitude toward E-mail marketing.

The authors of this study found a significant association between decision-makers’ actual behavior and their attitude toward E-mail marketing. The association indicates that a more negative actual behavior of the decision-makers also imply a more negative attitude toward E-mail marketing messages. Further analyses also revealed that the decision-makers’ position within the company strengthened the previously described association between behavior and attitude. This means that decision-makers with higher level of management tend to have both more negative behavior and more negative attitudes than decision-makers with a lower position.

6.1 Discussion

The result from this study concludes that decision-makers within the manufacturing industry in Sweden in general have negative attitude, and also behave in a negative manner, toward E-mail marketing messages. Below follows a quote from one of the respondents regarding received E-mail marketing messages:

'I don’t even read them, they are immediately deleted. They are invasive and uninvited.'

One respondent (2012).

This of course could have a negative effect on the result and outcome of the marketing effort. It has previously been established that the attitudes and behaviors are connected.
When both attitude and behavior results in decision-makers not opening their E-mail marketing messages or deleting them without reading them, it affects the outcome of the company that sent the marketing messages by E-mail. The result is that the decision-makers are never being exposed to the marketing messages, which was the intention of the company sending the message.

Another interesting finding from this study is that the attitudes and behaviors toward E-mail marketing differ depending on the decision-makers’ age and position at the company. The attitudes as well as the behaviors were more negative the older the respondents were and also more negative the higher position at the company the decision-maker had. The age factor could be a result of that younger people often are more used to computers than older people. The younger decision-makers might perhaps have greater computer skills and are therefore less negative toward E-mail marketing. The reason that attitudes and behavior differs regarding to the decision-makers’ position at the company, may be explained by that decision-makers with a higher position more frequently is targeted by E-mail marketing and thus exposed to more E-mail marketing messages than those with a lower position. It is also interesting that only 8 % of the respondents were females. The reason for the skewed gender participation could be that the manufacturing industry in Sweden is overrepresented by males, or that there are, at the moment, more males than females working in decision-making positions within the manufacturing industry in Sweden.

6.1.1 Limitations
One of the limitations of this study is the absence of arbitrary theories. Since E-mail marketing is still a comparatively unexplored area, no well-developed theories of attitudes and behaviors regarding E-mail marketing could be found by the authors. The result of this is that the authors of this study have been compelled to apply more general and well-known attitude and behavior theories. Consequently, the authors have constructed the questions in the questionnaire themselves, which may have contributed to lower reliability than if an already-tested questionnaire was used. The authors have also reflected on an issue that could have been conducted in a different manner. There could have been more statements provided in the questionnaire to get a more detailed image of the attitudes and behaviors toward E-mail marketing. The reason that there were no more statements provided in the questionnaire was because the authors thought that more statements could compromise the response rate of the study. However, the strength of this thesis is that it opens a door into a new exciting and important area for further research. The authors of this thesis believe that this is a field that will be exploited further in the near future.

6.2 Managerial Implications
This study has given the authors insights in attitudes and behaviors concerning E-mail marketing. As a result of this gained insights, the authors will describe the contributions to managerial implications.

This thesis stresses the importance that more positive attitudes will consequently give a more positive actual behavior, which in the end will result in higher opening frequency as well as less deleted and unread E-mail marketing messages. It is important for managers working with E-mail marketing to reflect upon the importance of an appealing subject of the message. This study clearly indicates that the subject plays a central role when the recipient chooses to open the marketing messages or not. An even more important
property affecting the opening frequency is if the receiver knows the sender. An effective way to increase the opening frequency is to establish a relationship with the receiver to thereby improve their attitude toward E-mail marketing and the actual brand or company. Negative attitude could be a result from a company sending large amounts of uninteresting E-mail marketing messages. However, if the company instead sends moderate amounts of marketing messages with interesting and relevant content to the recipient, a more positive attitude can be established.

6.3 Further Research

This is an exploratory field with very few previously conducted studies. As previously stated, this study can be seen as a thesis that paves the way to a number of other more comprehensive studies in the same field. Studies of implications of E-mail marketing from a marketing perspective would be both interesting and meaningful. With the result from this study in mind, it would also be valuable to investigate how marketers should act and perform to change the decision-makers’ attitudes as well as their actual behaviors toward E-mail marketing. Qualitative research with a hermeneutics focus could contribute to greater understanding of the problems’ nature. It would also be interesting to examine how attitudes and behaviors affect the efficiency and profitability of E-mail marketing.

This study investigates the attitudes and behaviors in the manufacturing industry in a B2B context. It would also be valuable to repeat the study on decision-makers within other branches and other countries to see if the result is generalizable in other areas. A possible outcome could be that Swedish decision-makers differ in behavior and attitude from other countries.

A final further research proposal is to repeat this survey in the future and over a longer period of time to be able to compare and identify possible changes of attitudes and behaviors. The benefit of a study of longitudinal nature is that it is exceptionally useful when studying development and lifespan issues.
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Appendices

Appendix 1 Questionnaire English

Demographics

1 Are you currently working in the manufacturing industry?
   Yes    No

2 Gender
   Male    Female

3 Age
   Younger than 20  20-29  30-39  40-49  50-59  60-69  70 or older

4 Highest finished education
   Primary School  High School  Occupational College (2 years)  University (3 years or more)  Other education

5 What of the following industries match your company’s main branch?

6 How many employees is there in your company
   Less than 20  20-49  50-249  250-499  500 or more  don’t know

7 What is your position in the company?
   Owner, Partner or CEO  Senior manager  Middle manager  Project leader, or similar  Worker

8 How much influence do you have in the day to day decisions in your company?
   Very much    Pretty much    Pretty little    No at all

ABC -Behavior

9 A decision-maker should read all received E-mail marketing messages
   1 - Totally disagree  2    3    4 - Totally agree

10 No E-mail marketing message should be deleted unread
   1 - Totally disagree  2    3    4 - Totally agree

11 E-mail marketing messages affect decision-makers
12 E-mail marketing helps decision-makers to make better decisions
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree

13 E-mail marketing messages contribute to the company’s development
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree

ABC - Cognition
14 I believe that E-mail marketing adds value for a company
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree

15 I feel that E-mail marketing messages makes decision-making easier
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree

16 I feel that E-mail marketing messages are credible
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree

17 I think E-mail marketing messages are a waste of time
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree

18 I think E-mail marketing messages is a good way of receiving information
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree

19 I think that decision-makers receive too many E-mail marketing messages
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree

ABC - Affection
20 Receiving E-mail marketing messages is annoying
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree

21 E-mail marketing messages provides me/the company with good offers
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree

22 It is stressful to read too many E-mail marketing messages
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree

23 E-mail marketing messages are interesting to read
1- Totally disagree 2 3 4 - Totally agree
24 It is fun to read E-mail marketing messages
   1- Totally disagree   2   3   4 - Totally agree

25 It is rewarding to read E-mail marketing messages
   1- Totally disagree   2   3   4 - Totally agree

Actual Behavior

26 I always open the E-mail marketing messages I receive
   1- Totally disagree   2   3   4 - Totally agree

27 I never delete unread E-mail marketing messages
   1- Totally disagree   2   3   4 - Totally agree

28 Marketing messages I have received have helped me making decisions
   1- Totally disagree   2   3   4 - Totally agree

29a To what extent do known sender affect you when choosing if to open an E-mail marketing message or not
   1- Not at all   2   3   4 - Very much

29b To what extent does the subject affect you when choosing if to open an E-mail marketing message or not
   1- Not at all   2   3   4 - Very much

29c To what extent does the time of receiving affect you when choosing if to open an E-mail marketing message or not
   1- Not at all   2   3   4 - Very much

30 How often do you check your E-mail during work hours?
   • More than every 10 minutes
   • More than every 30 minutes
   • More than once every hour
   • More than once every third hour
   • More often than once a day
   • Once a day or less often
Appendix 2 Questionnaire Swedish

Demographics

1 Arbetar du inom tillverkningsindustrin?
   Ja       Nej

2 Kön?
   Man       Kvinna

3 Ålder?
   Yngre än 20   20-29   30-39   40-49   50-59   60-69   70 eller äldre

4 Vilken är din högsta formella utbildning?
   Grundskoleexamen   Gymnasiexamen   Yrkesfack / Högskola (2 år)   Universitet / Högskola (3 år eller mer)   Annan utbildning

5 Vilken bransch passer bäst in på företagets huvudsakliga verksamhet?
   Verkstadsindustri, Fordonsindustri, Textilindustri, Trävaruindustri, Möbeltillverkningsindustri, Livsmedelsindustri, Läkemedelsindustri, Gummi- och plastindustri, Processindustri, Övrig industri

6 Hur många anställda har företaget?
   Mindre än 20   20-49   50-249   250-499   500 eller mer   Vet ej

7 Vilken befattning har du på företaget?
   Ägare, delägare eller VD   Högre chef   Mellanchef   Projektledare, arbetsledare eller liknande   Worker

8 Hur stort inflytande har du på beslut i den dagliga verksamheten?
   Mycket stort   Ganska stort   Ganska litet   Inget

ABC -Behavior

9 En beslutsfattare skall läsa all mottagen e-postmarknadsföring
   1- Håller inte alls med   2   3   4 - Håller fullständigt med

10 Inga e-postmeddelanden med marknadsföringsbudskap skall tas bort olästa
    1- Håller inte alls med   2   3   4 - Håller fullständigt med

11 Marknadsföringsbudskap via E-post påverkar beslutsfattare
    1- Håller inte alls med   2   3   4 - Håller fullständigt med

12 Marknadsföringsbudskap via E-post hjälper beslutsfattare att fatta bättre beslut
13 Marknadsföringsbudskap via E-post bidrar till företagets utveckling
1- Håller inte alls med  2  3  4 - Håller fullständigt med

ABC - Cognition
14 Jag tror att marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post tillför värde för företag
1- Håller inte alls med  2  3  4 - Håller fullständigt med
15 Jag känner att marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post förenklar beslutsfattande
1- Håller inte alls med  2  3  4 - Håller fullständigt med
16 Jag känner att marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post är trovärdiga
1- Håller inte alls med  2  3  4 - Håller fullständigt med
17 Jag tycker att marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post är slöseri med tid
1- Håller inte alls med  2  3  4 - Håller fullständigt med
18 Jag tycker att marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post är ett bra sätt att mottaga information på
1- Håller inte alls med  2  3  4 - Håller fullständigt med
19 Jag tror att beslutsfattare får för många marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post
1- Håller inte alls med  2  3  4 - Håller fullständigt med

ABC - Affection
20 Det är givande att läsa marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post
1- Håller inte alls med  2  3  4 - Håller fullständigt med
21 Att få marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post är irriterande
1- Håller inte alls med  2  3  4 - Håller fullständigt med
22 Det är roligt att läsa marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post
1- Håller inte alls med  2  3  4 - Håller fullständigt med
23 Marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post ger mig/företaget bra erbjudanden
1- Håller inte alls med  2  3  4 - Håller fullständigt med
24 Marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post är intressanta att läsa
1- Håller inte alls med   2   3   4 - Håller fullständigt med

25 Det är stressande att läsa marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post
2- Håller inte alls med   2   3   4 - Håller fullständigt med

Actual Behavior

26 Jag öppnar alltid marknadsföringsmeddelanden som jag mottagit via E-post
1- Håller inte alls med   2   3   4 - Håller fullständigt med

27 Jag tar aldrig bort olästa marknadsföringsmeddelanden som jag mottagit via E-post
1- Håller inte alls med   2   3   4 - Håller fullständigt med

28 Marknadsföringsmeddelanden som jag mottagit via E-post har hjälpt mig fatta beslut
1- Håller inte alls med   2   3   4 - Håller fullständigt med

29a Hur mycket påverkar känd avsändare när du väljer om du skall öppna E-postmarknadsföringsmeddelanden?
1- Inte alls   2   3   4 - Väldigt mycket

29b Hur mycket påverkar rubrik på meddelandet när du väljer om du skall öppna E-postmarknadsföringsmeddelanden?
1- Inte alls   2   3   4 - Väldigt mycket

29c Hur mycket påverkar tidpunkt för mottagande när du väljer om du skall öppna E-postmarknadsföringsmeddelanden?
1- Inte alls   2   3   4 - Väldigt mycket

30 Hur ofta kollar du din E-post under arbetstid?

• Oftare än var 10:e minut
• Oftare än var 30:e minut
• Oftare än en gång i timmen
• Oftare än en gång var tredje timma
• Oftare än en gång per dag
• En gång per dag eller mer sällan
### Test of Homogeneity of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1271.121</td>
<td>317.780</td>
<td>5.639</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>99851.116</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>56.349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101122.236</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Robust Tests of Equality of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistica</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown-Forsythe</td>
<td>5.260</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>424.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multiple Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Tukey HSD</th>
<th>ABC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Difference (I - J)</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 29</td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39 &lt; 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49 &lt; 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59 &lt; 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 &lt; &lt; 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Test of Homogeneity of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levene</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Mean Dif.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2816.530</td>
<td>704.133</td>
<td>12.692</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>98306.706</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>55.477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101122.236</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Robust Tests of Equality of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown-Forsythe</td>
<td>12.733</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>905.157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Multiple Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agare, de-lägare eller VD</td>
<td>.43878</td>
<td>.46064</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>1.6966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Högre chef</td>
<td>-.59960</td>
<td>.53100</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>-5.8503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellanchef</td>
<td>-.52074</td>
<td>.58287</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-4.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbetstagare</td>
<td>-.91689</td>
<td>.91861</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-5.4250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Högre chef Agare, de-lägare eller VD</td>
<td>.10389</td>
<td>.51423</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>2.4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellanchef</td>
<td>.51103</td>
<td>.52563</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.5454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbetstagare</td>
<td>.39553</td>
<td>.87970</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>6.3575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Högre chef Agare, de-lägare eller VD</td>
<td>.31103</td>
<td>.52563</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.6749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellanchef</td>
<td>.26715</td>
<td>.54205</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbetstagare</td>
<td>.29169</td>
<td>.91851</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>5.4250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Högre chef Agare, de-lägare eller VD</td>
<td>.35169</td>
<td>.88961</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.0874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellanchef</td>
<td>.29169</td>
<td>.91851</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>5.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbetstagare</td>
<td>.84524</td>
<td>.92494</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>1.6804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Robust Tests of Equality of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statistica</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown-Forsythe</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>364.075</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>20.180</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.045</td>
<td>1.379</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6481.886</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>3.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6502.066</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Test of Homogeneity of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.245</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multiple Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Re-code Age</th>
<th>(J) Re-code Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.04646</td>
<td>.32444</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.9324 -.8394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.02990</td>
<td>.31463</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.0292</td>
<td>.8890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-.01154</td>
<td>.31773</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.8791</td>
<td>.8560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-.32240</td>
<td>.33425</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>1.2351</td>
<td>.5903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Re-code Age</th>
<th>(J) Re-code Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.04646</td>
<td>.32444</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.8394 .9324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.07636</td>
<td>.12908</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>-.2761</td>
<td>.4288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.03492</td>
<td>.13467</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>-.3377</td>
<td>.4076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-.27594</td>
<td>.17146</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>-.7441</td>
<td>.1922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Re-code Age</th>
<th>(J) Re-code Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.02990</td>
<td>.31463</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.8890 .8292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.07636</td>
<td>.12908</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>-.2761</td>
<td>.4288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-.04144</td>
<td>.11115</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>-.3449</td>
<td>.2621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-.35230</td>
<td>.15208</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.7676</td>
<td>.0630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Re-code Age</th>
<th>(J) Re-code Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.01154</td>
<td>.31773</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.8560 .8791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.03492</td>
<td>.13647</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>-.4076</td>
<td>.3377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.04144</td>
<td>.11115</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>-.2621</td>
<td>.3449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-.31086</td>
<td>.15840</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>-.7434</td>
<td>.1217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Re-code Age</th>
<th>(J) Re-code Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.32240</td>
<td>.33425</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>-.5903 1.2351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.27594</td>
<td>.17146</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>-.1922</td>
<td>.7441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.35230</td>
<td>.15208</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.0630</td>
<td>.7676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.31086</td>
<td>.15840</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>-.1217</td>
<td>.7434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 6 Anova Analysis – Position / Total Actual Behavior

**Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Actual Behavior</th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Actual Behavior</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>171,929</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42,982</td>
<td>12.032</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6330.137</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>3.572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6502.066</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Robust Tests of Equality of Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Actual Behavior</th>
<th>Statistica</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>749.455</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple Comparisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Actual Behavior</th>
<th>Actual Mean</th>
<th>Behavior Mean</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Homogeneity of Variances</th>
<th>Multiple Comparisons</th>
<th>Actual Mean</th>
<th>Behavior Mean</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistica</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown-Forsythe</td>
<td>11.100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>749.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Actual Behavior</th>
<th>Levene Sta- tistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Actual Behavior</th>
<th>Levene St- atistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Homogeneity of Variances</th>
<th>Multiple Comparisons</th>
<th>Actual Mean</th>
<th>Behavior Mean</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
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Appendix 7 Linear Regression Analysis – Total ABC / Total Actual Behavior

### Linear Regression Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>5.95711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Actual Behavior</th>
<th>Total ABC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Actual Behavior</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ABC</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>38132.4693</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38132.47</td>
<td>1074.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>62989.767</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>35.467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101122.236</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Actual Behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8 Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Matrixa</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jag tror att marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post tillför värde för företag</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post är intressanta att läsa</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det är givande att läsa marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marknadsföringsbudskap via E-post bidrar till förelagets utveckling</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marknadsföringsbudskap via E-post hjälper beslutsfattare att fatta bättre beslut</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner att marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post förenklar beslutsfattande</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det är roligt att läsa marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag tycker att marknadsföring via E-post är ett bra sätt att mottaga information på</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post ger mig/företaget bra erbjudanden</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marknadsföringsmeddelanden som jag mottagit via E-post har hjälpt mig att fatta beslut</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marknadsföringsbudskap via E-post påverkar beslutsfattare</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>-.340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recode irritating</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner att marknadsföringsmeddelanden via E-post är trovärdiga</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En beslutsfattare skall läsa all mottagen e-postmarknadsföring</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recode waste of time</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag tar aldrig bort olästa marknadsföringsmeddelanden som jag mottagit via E-post</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inga e-postmeddelanden med marknadsföringsbudskap skall tas bort olästa</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag öppnar alltid marknadsföringsmeddelanden som jag mottagit via E-post</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recode Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>